

# Contemporary Educational Researches Journal

Volume 09, Issue 2, (2019) 021-038



[www.cerj.eu](http://www.cerj.eu)

## An evaluation of school directors' and teachers' views about supervisors' communication skills

**Fatma Taspinar** <sup>a\*</sup>, Department of Educational Administration, Supervision, Planning and Economics, Near East University, North Cyprus, Mersin 10 Turkey

### Suggested Citation:

Taspinar, F. (2019). An evaluation of school directors' and teachers' views about supervisors' communication skills. *Contemporary Educational Researches Journal*. 9(2), 21-38.

Received from October 15, 2018; revised from December 21, 2018; accepted from April 12, 2019.

Selection and peer review under responsibility of Assoc.Prof.Dr. Deniz Ozcan, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Turkey.

©2019. All rights reserved.

---

### Abstract

Effective supervision is strongly related to the communication between the supervisor and the staff in an institution. The indication that shows the attainment of supervision is directly linked with how the staff of the supervised school understands the supervisor. Therefore, supervisors should be effective communicators and have the ability to apply it. The aim of this study was to examine and compare personal views of supervisors working for the Ministry of Education in Turkish Republic of North Cyprus (TRNC) about their communication skills and how they are perceived by the directors and teachers in primary education. A qualitative research design was used in this study. It was carried out in five primary schools in Güzelyurt in TRNC and a sampling method was followed. The data were collected in the 2015–2016 academic year through a semi-structured personal view form answered by the teachers, directors, and the supervisors supervising these schools. It was noted that communication among teachers, directors and supervisors, and verbal and non-verbal communication of the supervisors were similar, whereas during the communication procedure; conceptions to do with problems in supervising problems seemed to be different among the involved.

Keywords: Communication skills, communication, educational supervision, pervision,

---

\* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: **Fatma Taspinar** , Department of Educational Administration, Supervision, Planning and Economics, Near East University, North Cyprus, Mersin 10 Turkey  
E-mail address: [fatos\\_taspinar@hotmail.com](mailto:fatos_taspinar@hotmail.com) /Tel.: 0533 860 40 79

## 1. Introduction

Individuals in a community, interact, share knowledge, feelings, thoughts, and experiences. Sharing thoughts and feelings is what separates people from other living creatures, and this is possible with their communication skills. Establishing relationships with the environment, since the 1st century, were through communication. Since then, there have been many definitions of communication. Yüksel (2008) defines behavioral and structural approaches to communication concept as "Communication is an exchange for agreement between two or more people." "Communication is a mutual exchange in any effective concept." "Communication is a kind of organization of environmental stimulants in any part of the organism to expose certain behaviors."

Humans exist both communally and organizationally. Organizations are one of the benefits of collective living. People form an organization to fulfill their common aims. Tutar and Yılmaz (2003) argue that organizational communication is the basics of achieving organizational and administrative activities effectively and productively. Gürüz and Eğinli (2015) defined organizational communication as a procedure that keeps members together, provides interaction between the organization and the environment, strengthens the organization, and keeps it going. It also plays a great role in fulfilling administrative functions. Coordination among individuals, effective operation of the organization, and achieving aims is mainly possible by organizational communication.

A school is the first phase in an education system to meet people's expectations from education. A school, concerning its functions is a unity of both communication and interaction. Directors, teachers, students, and parents, who are all involved in the education system, interact and communicate (Hoşgörür, 2012). Every single organization can only survive and reach aims through communication, which is more intensive in education. To fulfill aims and expectations regarding administrative affairs, education, and providing coordination, communication plays a great role.

The effectiveness of administrative procedures, evaluation of applications to meet aims, eradicating deficiencies, and mistakes are of crucial importance in an organization. This can be confirmed only by supervision. Supervision in educational institutions is carried out either by the director or by a supervisor.

Supervision is the confirmation of the functions aiming at expected outcomes through some set principles and rules (Aydın, 2014). Effective supervision is directly related to the level of sustainable interaction among individuals (Köklü, 1996). Effective supervision is strongly based on an ongoing agreement, communication, and interaction in every point that matters between the supervisor and the staff. If interaction brings about the spirit of help and increases trust, sharing is ongoing and consistent (Taymaz, 2005).

As it can be noted, effective supervision is closely related to interaction. An supervisor's effective communication skills raise their effectiveness. Can play a leading role in defining views by directors and teachers, their deficiencies or mistakes? To respond to these issues, the following questions have been asked; (i) Have supervisors received any training or attended any seminars related to their job? (ii) How do directors and teachers perceive interaction among the involved? (iii) How do directors and teachers perceive supervisors' use of verbal communication? (iv) How do directors and teachers perceive supervisors' non-verbal communication? (v) How do directors and teachers perceive problems caused by supervisors in the process of communication?

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. Communication

Ergin (2014) argued that communication has been defined in different ways by many people stressing its various aspects. He summarized some as follows; in the 1970s, Cüceloğlu defined

communication as exchanging thoughts and feelings among individuals, but now, with richer meaning, it is defined as "a very sincere relationship between individuals." Hoben explained communication as "special verbal symbols to express mutual thoughts and feelings." Anderson considered it as "understanding" and went on saying, "communication is a procedure to understand each other." For Barnlund communication is "for self-effectiveness, self-defense and keeping it strong by minimizing the need for uncertainty." We can define communication as mutual sharing of knowledge, thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and messages among individuals or groups of people.

Conveying a message or meaning from one to another in words, by body-language and sound manner is a dynamic process of communication (Kocayörük, 2011). In this way, messages are conveyed mutually in various ways. Therefore, in the process of communication, some basic elements and among these elements, a series of activities and events are experienced. These are defined as processes and occurrences of communication (Kaya, 2015). The source in communication is the one who starts the process to create a behavioral change in the individual or group as the receivers who are the target of the message. If the source intends to share feelings, thoughts, and ideas, he should, first, create a message using at least one of these symbols; mimics, gestures, voice, words, drawings, writing, etc. (Ergin, 2014). Coding is a way of expressing a message by certain symbols by the sender. Working out the codes is done by retranslating the message by the receiver. By this process of coding and working out the codes, the individuals reach a conclusion by commenting on or interpreting the message (Burbules, 2015). On receiving the message, the receiver comments on it and responds to the sender, which indicates that the message has been received and understood correctly (Hoşgörür, 2012).

Verbal communication is related to language and expressions which include voice-tone, stress, and verbal contents, whereas non-verbal communication includes silent expressions by mimics, face-expressions, gestures, and the position of the body. In a communication process, verbal and non-verbal messages complete each other. Verbal and non-verbal communication used together helps understanding the message more clearly. In many cases, body movements are more effective than verbs. Non-verbal behavior determines attitude, feeling, and manner for the others (Gürüz and Eğinli, 2015). Movements of the body and its parts are important code systems in the communication process. Our facial expressions, looks, hand, and arm movements and movement of our head convey certain messages (Kaya, 2015).

## **2.2. Organizational communication in educational institutions**

Communication is of vital importance for organizations in fulfilling common aims. Organizational communication provides interaction among individuals and it plays a basic role in keeping the organization survives. In the lack of communication, an organizational activity cannot be successful (Düzgün, 2016).

As in all organizations, educational institutions too need to communicate to perform tasks. Teachers can coordinate by communicating. Effective communication brings about job satisfaction and increases performance; thus, the organization fulfills its aims (Tutar and Yılmaz, 2009). Atak (2003) adds saying that effectiveness, productivity, and reaching institutional targets are strongly based on organizational communication. It is the basic tool for a school director to effectively run the institution.

Educational organizations are social structures to respond and bring about effective solutions to meet the needs of communities. Any social structure or profession cannot survive without a communication system. Institutions need input and output interaction with the environment. Therefore, effective interaction within organizations requires a good communication network (Gülнар, 2007). Because educational institutions deal with people, communication becomes even more

important. Every activity, verbal or non-verbal, among directors, teachers, staff, students, and parents, is carried out by communication. Basically, education is a communication activity (Bolat, 1996).

### **2.3. Supervision**

In an organization, supervision is strongly necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of administrative procedures, applications to meet aims, eradicate mistakes, and deficiencies. In educational institutions, this procedure is conducted by school directors or supervisors.

Supervision is a process to evaluate the suitability of organizational events to rules and regulations. The basic aim of supervision is to set performance rates of aims and objectives of the organization, to take measures for better results and improve the process. For this reason, the whole process is watched within a plan and program, deficiencies are defined, mistakes done are corrected, and sound operation is fulfilled (Aydın, 2014).

Educational supervision is a tool to fulfill educational aims and provide an environment for effective education. As a sub-system, supervision helps fulfill educational aims. The system can be defined as getting input and output information, evaluating it and, according to the results, trying for the betterment and improvement of the organizational aims (Gökçe, 1994). This issue needs to be considered as a unity regarding the basic aims of the organization. The main target of a school is to teach. All the activities at a school aim at direct or indirect learning. Supervision is an element in this process (Aydın, 2013). Başaran (2013) defines supervision as a process of preventing a school from organizational, administrative, and educational diversions and lead to improvement. The aim of supervision is to sustain the effectiveness of a school.

Bursalıoğlu (2010) stated that recent developments in education have altered the roles and duties of supervisors. Traditional supervisor types are taken over by idealistic and advisory types. Especially constructive supervising has a wide range of tasks in making decisions, coordination, and research studies. These changes in the roles and tasks of a supervisor have led to new directions to social and technical aspects of education. Taymaz (2005) stated that a supervisor in education, with administrative, leadership, guidance, teaching, expertise, and interrogation roles, contribute to individuals' adaptation to the new environment, knowing, motivating, improving oneself, solving problems, developing weaknesses, raising morality, and becoming successful and satisfied.

Köklü (1996), on the other hand, argues that for effective supervision, the supervisor should approach the teachers emphasizing their strengths and exhibit a supportive and elaborate manner. A teacher's qualifications should be considered by the supervisor. Taymaz (2005) emphasizes that a supervisor should help a teacher to solve problems and give professional assistance. Regardless of the source of problems, a supervisor's duty is to help a teacher facing problems. Even more, a supervisor should help teachers with problems not only related to education but also raise success rate, motivate, and encourage the teacher.

### **2.4. Supervision and communication**

Lack of supervision is directly connected with interaction in progress. Effective supervision is built on ongoing mutual interaction, understanding, and communication between a supervisor and staff. Such an interaction raises the spirit of help and reliability, the process of sharing and unity sustains in a coherent way (Taymaz, 2005). Effective supervision is directly related to sustainable interaction among individuals. As long as interaction among supervisors, teachers, and other staff is positive, supervision becomes more effective (Köklü, 1996).

In a school where communication and relations work together, directors, teachers, other staff and parents are always interacting. The staff is also in an ongoing interaction with the Ministry and the supervisors, who control the operation in a school and give feedback to the staff on their applications.

Effective supervision is closely related to the level of interaction with the staff. Effective interaction between supervisors and staff leads to the success of the supervision process. The indication of success of supervision is directly related to how it is perceived by the staff.

Effective communication between supervisors and teachers increases motivation and leads to a positive outcome. The opposite causes defects in the operation of the organization. At this stage, a supervisor's communication skills in dealing with defects are important. Skillful supervisors are more effective.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1. Research method

A qualitative research, based on directors', teachers', and supervisors' personal views about communication skills, was done in this study with a case study (sample event) design. A case study is a visual process which investigates a current issue in its real frame where its scope is not specified and where there are more than one proof or data sources (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013).

#### 3.2. The participants

To answer the research question, a maximum diversity technique, one of targeted-sampling tradition, was used through sampling, suitable for a qualitative method. Targeted-sampling helps a detailed study of cases expected to provide rich resources. Maximum diversity technique aims at forming simple visual samples to define the individuals involved in the problem (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2013). Therefore, the participating directors, teachers, and supervisors, with different tasks, branches, and seniority, were selected according to maximum-diversity technique. The participants composed of 25 teachers and ten directors from different state schools in Güzelyurt and five supervisors.

Demographic information by the participant teachers is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic knowledge of the participating teachers

Gender	
Female	15
Male	10
Age	
25–40	16
41–55	9
Seniority (years)	
1–15	16
16–25	9
Education	
B.A	21
Postgraduate	4
Branch	
Class teacher	9
Preschool teachers	12
PE teacher	1
English teacher	1

Arts teacher	2
PE: Physical Education	

As it can be seen in Table 1, 15 of the participants are female and 10 are male. Sixteen of them are between 25 and 40 and nine are between 41 and 55 age range. Sixteen of the teachers have 15 years and less experience. Four teachers have done their postgraduate studies and the others have B.A. As for their branches, nine are class-teachers, 12 are pre-school teachers, one is a physical education teacher, one is English teacher, and two are arts teachers.

The information to do with the directors' demographic knowledge is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Demographic knowledge of the participating directors

Gender	
Female	6
Male	4
Age	
35–50	5
50 above	5
Experience	
10–20 years	3
21 years and above	7
Education	
B.A	2
Postgraduate	8
Branch	
Class teacher	8
Preschool education	2
Years in administrative affairs	
5 years or less	5
11–20 years	5

As it is shown in Table 2, six out of ten directors are female and four are male. As for their ages, five directors are between 35 and 50 and the other five are over 50 years of age. Three of the administrators have experience between 10 and 20 years and 7 have 21 years of experience. Two directors have postgraduate and the others are with B.A degrees. Eight of the directors are class-teachers and two are pre-school education teachers. Five of them have 5 or less years' experience and the other 5 have 11–20 years of experience.

The demographic data about the participant supervisors are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Demographic information about the participant supervisors

Gender	
Female	1
Male	4
Age	

41–50	1
50 and above	4
Seniority (years)	
25–30	3
Above 30	2
Education	
Postgraduate	4
PhD	1
Supervising years (years)	
8	2
9	1
10	2

As it can be seen in Table 3, one of the supervisors is a female and 4 are male. One is between 40 and 50 and the other four are over 50 years of age. Three of them have 25–30 and two have over 30 years of experience, one with PhD and four with postgraduate degrees. As for their seniority, two have 8, one has 9, and 2 have 10 years of supervising experience.

### 3.3. Data collection tools

A semi-structured personal view report was prepared to define the participants' conceptions of supervision. A personal view report is a written account of thoughts about the issue. Before the report was prepared, local and foreign literature was overviewed and the theoretical bases of the study were formed. On reaching detailed information, open-ended questions were set on a questionnaire with the items thought to be put on the form. Following this procedure, the semi-structured personal view form was evaluated and finalized by academicians for conformation in aim, meaning, and content. It took 14 days, in February 2016 and March 2016 to collect the data.

### 3.4. Data analysis

The analysis procedure started with the transfer of the data onto the computer without any change. The views by directors, teachers, and supervisors were analyzed through content-analysis method, a systematic analysis of written and verbal material and numbering and coding anything said or written by individuals (Balci, 2004). All the answers by the participants were categorized according to their content and themes were specified. Instead of identification, the teachers were specified as T1, T2, T3....., the directors as D1, D2, D3....., and the supervisors as S1, S2, S3..... to provide secrecy.

## 4. Results and Discussion

### 4.1. Training taken in communication by the supervisors

Related to any training taken or seminars attended, the supervisors pointed out the training taken or seminars attended during in-service training, postgraduate, and PhD studies as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Training taken or seminars attended by supervisors

Themes	Frequency	Participants
--------	-----------	--------------

During in-service training	4	S1, S2, S3, S5
During postgraduate studies	3	S2, S4, S5
During PhD studies	1	S1

As it is seen in Table 4, all the participants (n = 5) have received training in communication. S1, S2, S3, and S5 (n = 4) have received training in communication during in-service training; S2, S4, and S5 (n = 3) during postgraduate studies; and S1 (n = 1) during PhD studies. S2 and S4 stated satisfaction with the training received saying, "they are efficient" and "contributed a lot." In light of the information received, it can be assumed that all the supervisors have the skills in effective communication. Bilen (2004) stated that if the improvement of communication skills started from childhood, it would be possible to form more effective communication skills. It can also be assumed that supervisors are aware that relationships with others will be possible through effective communication skills, and the training they receive contributes a lot in developing themselves.

#### 4.2. Conceptions about communication among teachers, directors, and supervisors

Conceptions related to the issue in question are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Findings on conception issues

Themes	Frequency	Participants
Applicable		
Mutual sharing of ideas	5	T6, T9, T17, T20, T21
Supervisors can be reached	4	T7, T8, T13, T24
Supervisors are qualified and equipped	3	T5, T16, T19
Supervisors are inactive in classrooms	1	T1
Supervisors communicate in case of a problem in schools	1	T3
Agreed, but did not state	3	T10, T11, T18
Inapplicable		
Seldom school visits	7	T2, T4, T12, T14, T22, T23, T25
Disagreed, but did not state	1	T15

The information in Table 5 indicates that teachers are satisfied with the communication with the supervisors (n = 17), they can exchange views with the supervisors (n = 5), they can easily interact with the supervisors (n = 4), the supervisors are well-equipped and educated (n = 3), they do not interfere during teaching (n = 1), and they feel themselves a part of a problem in school and help to solve it (n = 1). Some teachers are not satisfied with the communication between the supervisors and teachers (n = 8) and they complain about seldom school visits (n = 7).

Some participants approved the communication stating that there is a mutual exchange of views (n = 5). T6 raised views as "I approve. We can exchange views in any topic and I can consult whenever I face a problem." Some found their supervisors approachable (n = 4) and approve the communication. "Yes, We can reach them any time we need to" stated T8. Some teachers pointed to the directors being fully equipped in their job (n = 3); therefore, their communication was appreciable. T16 added saying "Yes, they are fully equipped for the units they supervise."

Some teachers (n = 8) were not satisfied with the communication with the supervisors with the fact that they seldom visit schools (n = 7). T4 supported this view and said, "Yes they rarely visit schools."



Table 6 shows the findings related to the issue in question.

Table 6. Findings to do with the communication among teachers, directors, and supervisors

Themes	Frequency	Participants
Applicable		
They can reach supervisors	4	D1, D2, D3, D6
Supervisors are helpful	1	D1
Supervisors are aware of the problems	2	D3, D5
There is mutual exchange of views	2	D6, D7
Inapplicable		
Schools are not often visited	4	D4, D8, D9, D10

As shown in Table 6, some of the participants are satisfied with the communication between supervisors and themselves (n = 6). Some directors also are satisfied with the communication and say that they can reach the supervisors whenever needed (n = 4). "I have no complaints. They are always available in need" said D 1. However, some directors complained about the subject matter, saying that schools are seldom visited (n = 4). "There is lack of communication due to seldom school visits" explained D7.

Table 7. Supervisors' views about communication among teachers, directors, and themselves

Themes	Frequency	Participants
Satisfactory		
They are good at communication skills	1	S2
They have knowledge and experience	1	S3
They share ideas	1	S5
They are available in need of help	1	S5
Satisfactory, but not stated any reasons	2	S1, S4

According to Table 7, the supervisors are satisfied with communication (n = 5). The satisfaction is expressed by S2 as they are equipped with communication skills (n = 1), S3 as they are experienced (n = 1), and S5 as their mutual sharing with the directors and teachers (n = 1) and giving help in need (n = 1). Although S1 and S4 expressed satisfaction, they failed to reason it (n = 2).

It is clear that the satisfaction by the majority of the school staff is mainly due to easy reach to the supervisors and their willingness in exchanging ideas, which is an indication of satisfactory communication among the involved. Karik (2003) talks about traditional supervision as a classical bureaucratic and formal mentality in the first place, whereas contemporary supervision focuses mainly on guidance in teaching for better production. The reason for such diversity lies in the new conception of supervising by new supervisors and their willingness to take up this new approach.

#### 4.3. The state of verbal communication by supervisors director, supervisor conception

The issue above was examined under two dimensions; speaking and listening.

#### The supervisors' skills in verbal communication

Table 8. Teachers' views about supervisors' skills in verbal communication

Themes	Frequency	Participants
--------	-----------	--------------

Have effective tone of voice	25	T1, T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T11, T12, T13, T14, T15, T16, T17, T18, T19, T20, T21, T22, T23, T24, T25
Have a wide range of vocabulary	24	T1, T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T11, T12, T14, T15, T16, T17, T18, T19, T20, T21, T22, T23, T24, T25
No response	1	T13
Have correct pronunciation	24	T1, T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T11, T12, T13, T14, T15, T16, T17, T18, T19, T20, T21, T22, T24, T25
Mispronounce the words	1	T23

Teachers' satisfaction with the supervisors' effective tone of voice in verbal communication (n = 25), the vocabulary they use (n = 24), correct pronunciation (n = 24), mispronunciation (n = 1) is clearly expressed in Table 8.

All teachers agreed with the effective use of voice tone (n = 25) by the supervisors. "Yes, they have the ability of talking in an effective tone of voice," said T3. The majority of teachers added that the supervisors have a wide range of vocabulary (n = 24). "They can easily express themselves in a wide range of vocabulary" added T3. Most of the participants admitted that the supervisors have the correct pronunciation. T6 "They are very careful with the correct pronunciation of the words they use."

Table 9. Directors' views about supervisors' use of verbal communication skills

Themes	Frequency	Respondents
Have effective tone of voice	10	D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, D10
Have a wide range of vocabulary	10	D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, D10
Have correct pronunciation	9	D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, D10
No response	1	D1

As it is noted in Table 9, the directors admitted that supervisors use an effective tone of voice (n = 10), have a wide range of vocabulary (n = 10), and they pronounce words correctly (n = 9). "D3 gave views as "The supervisors around me have effective tone of voice." D1 added saying "They have a wide range of vocabulary," and D2 expressed view as "They pronounce words correctly."

Table 10. Supervisors' views about using verbal communication elements in conversation

Themes	Frequency	Respondents
Have effective tone of voice	5	S1, S2, S3, S4, S5
Have a wide range of vocabulary	5	S1, S2, S3, S4, S5

Have correct pronunciation 5 S1, S2, S3, S4, S5

As Table 10 notes, all supervisors admit that they use an effective tone of voice in conversation (n = 5), they have the adequate vocabulary (n = 5), and they have correct pronunciation (n = 5). "I try to be as effective as I can while talking" explained S3. "I believe I have a wide range of vocabulary," added S5.

In light of the above information, the supervisors' skills in their correct use of verbal communication are a result of their teaching background. Özgözü (2008) points out that supervisors adjust their tone of voice to a high pitch. Related to the same issue, Gökçe (2011) stated that teachers are satisfied with the supervisors' verbal communication in Turkish.

#### 4.4. Supervisors' skills in using verbal communication elements while listening

As seen in Table 11, while some teachers agree that supervisors welcome criticism (n = 17), listen without interrupting (n = 24), and give feedback (n = 23), some argue that supervisors reject criticism (n = 5) do not give feedback (n = 2), and welcoming criticism depends on the supervisor (n = 2).

Some teachers expressed views saying that supervisors are open to criticism related to verbal communication elements (n = 17). "They always listen to my criticism," remarked T3. Some teachers, on the other hand, argued that some supervisors did not want to hear criticism (n = 5). "I don't think they are open to criticism. They do not take our criticism seriously because of their status," complained T6. Most of the teachers admitted that supervisors did not interrupt a conversation, but just listen (n = 24). T3 said, "They are good listeners. They listen to me when I talk." Many teachers admitted that supervisors give feedback (n = 23). T6 explained saying, "They keep giving feedback to show that they are being listened to."

Table 11. Teachers' views about supervisors' use of verbal communication elements during a conversation

Themes	Frequency	Respondents
Welcome criticizing	17	T1, T2, T3, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T11, T14, T16, T17, T18, T19, T20, T21, T24
Reject critics	5	T4, T6, T10, T12, T23
Depends on the supervisor	2	T15, T22
Have no respond	1	T25
Listen without interrupting	24	T1, T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T11, T12, T13, T14, T15, T16, T17, T18, T19, T20, T21, T22, T23, T24
Interrupt conversation	1	T25
Give feedback	23	T1, T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T11, T13, T14, T15, T16, T17, T18, T19, T20, T21, T23, T24, T25
Do not give feedback	2	T12, T22

Table 12. Directors' views about supervisors' use of verbal communication elements during conversation

Themes	Frequency	Respondents
Open to criticism	7	D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D9
Object criticism	2	D8, D10
Differ according to supervisor	1	D7
Do not interrupt	9	D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, D10
No respond	1	D1
Give feedback	9	D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, D10
No response	1	D1

As stated in Table 12, most directors admitted that supervisors were open to criticism (n = 7). "They accept criticism. They listen with interest," said D2. However, some directors argued that supervisors were not open to criticism (n = 2). D8 raised views saying, "They like to criticize rather than being criticized." The majority of directors admitted that supervisors did not interrupt a conversation (n = 9). D2 supported this, saying, "They listen without interrupting." Many directors said that supervisors gave feedback related to their verbal communication skills (n = 9). D3 supported this view by saying, "I always receive feedback."

Table 13. Findings related to supervisors' use of verbal communication elements while listening

Themes	Frequency	Respondents
Open to criticism	5	S1, S2, S3, S4, S5
They listen without interrupting	4	S2, S3, S4, S5
The often interrupt	1	S1
They give feedback	5	S1, S2, S3, S4, S5

As supervisors state in Table 13, they accept criticism (n = 5), they do not interrupt (n = 4), and they give feedback (n = 5). S5 admits saying, "I believe I'm open to criticism. We need to take criticism seriously to develop ourselves." "I carefully listen to the person talking and I raise my views then" said S5. S3 explained, "I listen carefully and then give feedback." These views can be the indication that supervisors welcome criticism, they usually listen without interrupting, and give feedback while listening. Yüksel (2008) has a positive look at the issue and goes on saying that in active listening, the listener often gives feedback, which shows that the topic interests the listener.

#### 4.5. Teachers' perceptions of supervisors' skills in using non-verbal communication elements

Table 14. Teachers' views about supervisors' skills in using non-verbal communication elements

Themes	Frequency	Respondents
--------	-----------	-------------

Skills in using gestures and mimics		
Effective face expression	23	T1, T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T11, T13, T14, T16, T17, T18, T19, T20, T21, T22, T24, T25
Ineffective face expression	2	T15, T23
Effective use of body	24	T1, T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T11, T12, T13, T14, T15, T17, T18, T19, T20, T21, T22, T23, T24, T25
No response	1	T16
Good posture	23	T1, T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T11, T12, T13, T14, T15, T17, T19, T20, T21, T22, T23, T24, T25
No response	2	T16, T18
Proper dressing	21	T1, T2, T3, T4, T6, T8, T9, T11, T12, T13, T15, T16, T17, T18, T19, T20, T21, T22, T24, T25
Differs according to supervisor	4	T5, T7, T10, T14

As it is shown in Table 14, the participants raised views that supervisors use gestures and mimics (n = 23), their body (n = 2), and posture (n = 23) effectively. They also expressed that they have good posture (n = 23) and are smart (n = 21). Some said their response differs according to the supervisor (n = 2). T6 pointed out, saying, "They are very effective in their use of face expressions in conveying feelings. They are more effective with their body language. They have good postures. Their behavior and being smart fit the requirements of their profession."

Table 15. Directors' views about supervisors' skills in using non-verbal communication elements

Themes	Frequency	Respondents
Gestures and mimics		
Face expressions	10	D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, D10
Body language	10	D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, D10
Good posture	10	D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, D10
Proper dressing	10	D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, D10

As it is shown in Table 15, all the participants agreed that supervisors used face expressions (n = 10), body language (n = 10) effectively, had good postures (n = 10), and they were very smart (n = 10). "From their face expressions, I can easily understand what they try to convey," said D2. "They use their body language in a meaningful way," added D7. "They are very good at their postures and using body language," remarked D2. "All the supervisors I worked with are absolutely smart" pointed out D1.

Table 16. Supervisors' views about their skills in using non-verbal communication elements

Themes	Frequency	Respondents
Using gestures and mimics		
Effective face expression	4	S1, S3, S4, S5
	1	S2

Effective body language	4	S1, S2, S4, S5
Ineffective body language	1	S3
Good posture	4	S1, S2, S4, S5
No response	1	S3
Proper dressing	5	S1, S2, S3, S4, S5

The indication in Table 16 is that supervisors themselves are quite satisfied with their skills in non-verbal communication. They effectively use face expressions ( $n = 4$ ), body language ( $n = 4$ ); "I can start a positive communication with my face expression in a smooth way," explained S3. "I use body language to be more effective," said S5. Most of the participant supervisors agreed that they used posture in non-verbal communication in an effective way ( $n = 4$ ). "I'm very careful with my attitude and behavior," said S2. All the participant supervisors agreed that they dressed properly ( $n = 5$ ). S2 insisted saying, "I absolutely believe that proper dressing effects the process and I pay attention to be smart." Özgözgü (2008) and Gökçe (2011) came to a similar conclusion that supervisors try to affect their surroundings by their external appearance.

#### 4.6. Teacher, director, and supervisor perceptions of problems originated from supervisors during communication

Table 17. Teachers' views about supervisor-originated problems during the communication process

Themes	Frequency	Respondents
No problems faced	16	T1, T2, T4, T5, T7, T8, T9, T11, T12, T13, T15, T17, T18, T19, T20, T21
Problems faced		
Do as they believe to be the correct	1	T10
Not neutral to events	1	T3
Seldom school visit	5	T6, T14, T22, T23, T25
Unaware of the teaching environment	2	T16, T25
They are care-free	1	T24
They prefer criticizing rather than guiding	1	T25
Difficult to reach them	1	T25

As they stated in Table 17, teachers did not face supervisor-originated problems ( $n = 16$ ). They admitted that supervisors did as they believed to be the right to do ( $n = 1$ ), they were biased ( $n = 1$ ), they seldom visited schools ( $n = 5$ ), they did not know the teaching environment well ( $n = 2$ ), they were indifferent ( $n = 1$ ), and they preferred criticizing rather than guiding ( $n = 1$ ), and it was difficult to reach them ( $n = 1$ ).

Some of the participant teachers admitted that they did not face problems originated by the supervisors. T4 explained views saying, "I haven't faced any specific problems up to now."

Some complained that supervisors seldom visited schools ( $n = 5$ ). T22 put views as, "Most of the problems, I think, is because of seldom school visits."

Table 18. Directors' views about supervisor originated problems during the communication process

Themes	Frequency	Respondents
--------	-----------	-------------

No problems faced	8	D1, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, D10
Problems faced		
Seldom school visits	2	D2, D3

As in Table 18, many directors do not face any supervisor originated problems ( $n = 8$ ). D2 put views as, "There are not any problems during the communication process." Some directors raised views that problems were faced due to seldom school visits ( $n = 2$ ). "It sometimes happens and this is because of seldom school visits" explained D8.

Table 19. Supervisors' views about self-originated problems

Themes	Frequency	Respondents
There are not any problems.	5	S1, S2, S3, S4, S5

As seen in Table 19, supervisors share the same view that there are not any supervisor-oriented problems in the communication process ( $n = 5$ ). S2 objected to the claim and stated, saying, "I never believe that there are problems originating from me." When supervisor oriented problems are at stake, directors insistently emphasized the theme as seldom school visits. It is also pointed out that supervisors' agreement on "they face no problems" is because they are not aware of the negative effects of seldom school visits on teachers and directors. This argument shows similarities with Bengihan's (2006) findings in a previous study that schools in the Turkish Republic of North Cyprus are visited only once an academic year.

## 5. Conclusions

All the supervisors pointed out that by in-service training and postgraduate and PhD studies they have developed themselves, have become more skillful from what they have learned. They were fully aware of the importance of communication skills, and to develop more, they took training courses, and this contributed a lot to their development. Ersoy (2002) in a study called "Inspection System in Primary Education" aiming at providing well-equipped inspectors for an effective inspection system, found out that this issue was in parallel to views of teachers and directors who emphasized the need that supervisors should take in-service training before they are appointed as supervisors, they should take in-service training after 5 years of their appointment, willing candidates should be provided with the opportunity to take training at postgraduate or PhD levels.

While a big majority of teachers have a positive view about exchanging views, reaching supervisors, meeting well-equipped supervisors, not actively interfering during teaching and being ready to be consulted to in case of a problem in school, they still are worried about seldom school visits which affect communication negatively. Directors are usually optimistic about communication with supervisors. They admit that supervisors can be reached easily, they are aware of the problems in education, and there is always sharing views and ideas. Whereas teachers argue that due to seldom school visits, communication between the two sides is negatively affected. All the supervisors involved find the process positive emphasizing the skill they have in communication, their being fully equipped in their profession, mutual sharing of ideas, and being helpful when necessary. None of them admit that there are communication problems. However, they agree that they may not be aware of the negative effects of seldom school visits in communication. Karik's (2003) findings related to this issue contradict with the prevailing applications. In the study, it is found out that the supervisors' priority is

more such as a classical inspection concept – bureaucratic and formal – rather than contemporary supervision and guidance for the betterment of the education process.

All the teachers, directors, and supervisors agree on the effective use of tone of voice by the supervisors in verbal communication, which attracts attention. This shows that all the involved admit that the supervisors have a wide range of vocabulary and they can convey the message easily. Yüksel (2008) points out that the basic elements in writing and speaking are words, which are directly proportioned with the number of words we use fluently and effectively. According to a big majority of teachers and directors, supervisors pronounce all the words correctly, and supervisors, too, are satisfied with their correct pronunciation. Yüksel (2008) argues that the most important element in speaking is pronunciation. Mispronunciation of words results in a negative expression of oneself. In a study by Özgözü (2008) related to the same issue, it was stated that supervisors adjust their tone of voice in a suitable way. Gökçe (2011) supported this view saying that supervisors used Turkish absolutely correctly and adjusted their tone of voice skillfully. When supervisors' use of communication elements in speaking is examined, a big majority of teachers and directors admit that they are open to criticism; otherwise, they would not welcome any criticism. Although all supervisors see themselves ready for any criticism, some teachers and directors are worried and argue that this is not always true. They say that in some cases, supervisors do not welcome criticism. Gürüz and Eğinli (2008) point out that one has to welcome criticism for effective listening. The majority of teachers and directors admit that supervisors usually raise comments and views after listening carefully without interrupting; otherwise, in some cases, there might be worries. Çağdaş (2008) looks into the issue through another angle and argues that for an effective and meaningful communication, the receiver should directly look into the speaker's face, should not interfere, and should wait until the end of the conversation to raise comments (if any). Most teachers and directors admit that supervisors give feedback while listening, which indicates that they listen and are being listened to.

Most of the teachers and directors admit that supervisors use face expressions effectively. Kaypakoğlu (2008) adds to this and says that when communicating, one's face expression reflects feelings such as enjoy, approval, sympathy, excitement, happiness, and worries. As for body language, all teachers and directors agree that supervisors use their abilities effectively. Eğinli (2015) supports this issue saying that gestures such as the movement of the head, hands, arms, and legs strengthen verbal communication and help convey feelings in a better way. All teachers and directors are positive about supervisors' posture, which for Gürüz and Eğinli (2015) is a meaningful signal of taking part in communication. On the whole, teachers and directors find supervisors properly dressed. This issue was taken up by Özgözü (2008) and Gökçe (2011) who had similar findings in their studies, which confirmed that supervisors try to have a positive reflection by being smart.

Teachers do not usually face problems originated from supervisors. Otherwise, supervisors would do as they wished, would not be neutral, would not know the teaching-learning environment well, would be uninterested, would prefer criticizing rather than guiding, and would be difficult to be reached. Many directors, too, admit that they did not face any problems. Or school visits would cause ambiguities. Supervisors state their views admitting that they do not experience self-originated problems. Bengihan (2006) puts forward a finding in a study saying that supervisors' school visits once a year, is mainly to get references about teachers and directors, observing classes and keeping records of teachers working on contract. These findings match with the findings of this study. In the light of the findings of this study, it can be suggested that all that the supervisors are advised to possess as professionals can be provided by in-service training sessions, often school visits at regular intervals, which can raise better coordination and interaction with directors and teachers.

It will add more to positive communication and understanding if supervisors put the effort in solving teachers' and directors' problems, listen to them and show interest in inconveniences in the teaching-learning environment. To achieve this, supervisors should put themselves in teachers' and directors' place to understand the subject question better. They should be constructive, criticize



teachers without offending them, and should try to be good models. They should not only supervise teachers who are new in the profession, but should be equally fair to all new and experienced teachers.

## References

- Atak, M. (2005). Örgütlerde resmi olmayan iletişimin yeri ve önemi. [The importance of informal communication in organizations]. *Havacılık ve Uzay Teknolojileri Dergisi*, 2(2), 59-67.
- Aydın, M. (2013). *Çağdaş eğitim denetimi [Contemporary educational supervision]*. (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Ankara, Turkey: Hatiboğlu Yayınevi.
- Aydın, M. (2014). *Çağdaş eğitim denetimi [Contemporary educational supervision]*. Ankara, Turkey: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Balcı, A. (2004). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler. [Research in social sciences: Method, style, and principles]*. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Ankara, Turkey: Pegem Akademi.
- Başaran, İ. E. (2006). *Türk eğitim sistemi ve okul yönetimi [Turkish education system and school management]*. Ankara, Turkey: Ekinoks Yayıncılık.
- Bengihan, R. (2006). *İlkokul denetmenlerinin görevlerini gerçekleştirme düzeylerine ilişkin yöneticilerin ve öğretmenlerin algıları* (Master's thesis, Near East University, Nicosia, North Cyprus).
- Bilen, M. (2004). *Sağlıklı insan ilişkileri. [Healthy human relationship]*. (9<sup>th</sup> ed.). Ankara, Turkey: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Bolat, S. (1996). Eğitim örgütlerinde iletişim: Hacettepe üniversitesi eğitim fakültesi uygulaması. [Communication in educational organizations: Hacettepe university faculty of education application]. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12, 75-80.
- Burbules, N. C. (2015). Okullarda iletişim [Communication in schools]. (Trans. S. Turan). In W. K. Hoy & C. G. Miskel (Eds.), *Eğitim yönetimi teori, araştırma ve uygulama. [Educational administration theory, research, practice]*. (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). (pp. 341-373). Ankara, Turkey: Nobel.
- Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2010). *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış. [New structure and behavior in school management]*. Ankara, Turkey: Pegem Akademi.
- Çağdaş, A. (2008). *Anne baba çocuk iletişimi [Parent child communication]*. (1<sup>th</sup> ed.). Ankara, Turkey: Kök Yayıncılık.
- Durgun, S. (2006). Örgüt kültürü ve örgütsel iletişim. (Organizational culture and organizational communication). *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(3), 112-132.
- Ergin, A. (2014). *Eğitimde etkili iletişim [Effective communication in education]*. (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Ankara, Turkey: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Ersoy, S. (2002). *İlköğretimde teftiş sistemi [Inspection system in primary education]*. (Master's thesis, Near East University, Nicosia, North Cyprus).
- Gökçe, D. (2011). *Eğitim denetçilerinin iletişim becerileri konusunda öğretmenlerin görüşleri ve beklentileri [Teachers' opinions and expectations about the communication skills of educational supervisors]*(Master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey).
- Gökçe, F. (1994). Eğitimde denetimin amaç ve ilkeleri [Purpose and principles of educational supervision]. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10, 73-78.
- Gülнар, B. (2007). *Örgütlerde iletişim ve iş doyumunu [Communication in organizations and job satisfaction]*. İstanbul, Turkey: Literatürk.
- Gündüz, Y. (2012). Eğitim örgütlerinde denetimin gerekliliği: Kuramsal bir çalışma [Inspection requirement in educational organizations: A theoretical study]. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 34, 1-6.
- Gürüz, D., & Eğinli, A. (2015). *Kişilerarası iletişim bilgiler etkiler engeller [Interpersonal relationships informations barriers effects]*. (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Ankara, Turkey: Nobel Yayınevi.
- Hoşgörür, V. (2012). İletişim [Communication]. In Z. Kaya (Ed.), *Sınıf yönetimi [Classroom management]*. (13<sup>th</sup>

- ed.). (pp. 149-179). Ankara, Turkey: Pegem Akademi.
- Karık, N. (2003). *Eğitim müfettişlerinin görevlerini gerçekleştirme düzeyleri [Levels of perform the duties of the supervisor]*. (Master's thesis, Near East University, Nicosia, North Cyprus).
- Kaya, A. (2015). *Kişilerarası ilişkiler ve etkili iletişim [Interpersonal relationship and effective communication]*. (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Ankara, Turkey: Pegem Akademi.
- Kaypakoğlu, S. (2008). *Kişilerarası iletişim cinsiyet farklılıkları güç ve çatışma [Interpersonal communication gender differences and conflict]*. İstanbul, Turkey: Derin Yayınları.
- Kocayörük, E. (2011). *Etkili iletişim becerileri [Effective communication skills]*. (1<sup>th</sup> ed.). İstanbul, Turkey: Kriter Yayınevi.
- Köklü, M. (1996). Etkili denetim [Effective supervision]. *Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 2, 259-268.
- Özgözü, S. (2008). *İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin denetmenlerin iletişim becerilerine ilişkin algı ve beklentileri [Primary and secondary school teachers in relation to perceptions and expectations of the supervisor communication skills]*. (Master's thesis, Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir, Turkey).
- Taymaz, H. (2005). *Eğitim sisteminde teftiş [Inspection of the education system]*. (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Ankara, Turkey: Pegem Akademi.
- Tutar, H., & Yılmaz, M.K. (2003). *Genel iletişim kavram ve modeller [General communication concepts and models]*. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Ankara, Turkey: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri [Quantitative research methods in social sciences]*. (9<sup>th</sup> ed.). Ankara, Turkey: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yüksel, H. (2008a). İletişimin tanımı ve temel bileşenleri [Definition of communication and basic components]. In U. Demiray (Ed.), *Etkili iletişim [Effective communication]*. (1<sup>th</sup> ed.). (pp. 2-41). Ankara, Turkey: Pegem Akademi.
- Yüksel, H. (2008b). Konuşma ve dinleme [Speaking and listening]. In U. Demiray (Ed.), *Etkili iletişim [Effective communication]*. (1<sup>th</sup> ed.). (pp. 134-187). Ankara, Turkey: Pegem Akademi.