

Examination of educators' self-efficacy for effective communication

Ömer Yahşi^{a*}, İzmir Provincial Directorate of National Education, Fevzipaşa, 452 Sk. 15A, İzmir 35260, Turkey
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3872-6010>

Suggested Citation:

Yahşi, Ö (2021). Examination of educators' self-efficacy for effective communication. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 16(2), 451-467 <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i2.5622>

Received from November 11, 2020; revised from January 30, 2021; accepted from April 12, 2021.

©2021 Birlesik Dunya Yenilik Arastırma ve Yayıncılık Merkezi. All rights reserved.

Abstract

The aim of this study is to determine the perceptions of self-efficacy, effective communication skills of administrators and teachers in İzmir. For learning processes to be effective, it is very important that educators have effective communication skills and develop their self-awareness in this regard. Determining the effective communication self-awareness of educators will contribute to the literature and guide higher policy practices. This study considers the following questions: Is there a significant difference in effective communication self-efficacy subscale scores according to educators' task type and gender, years of service and branch? This study uses the scanning model, a quantitative research method. The data collection tool consists of two parts: first, personal information about the educators; second, the scale items of the Effective Communication Self-Efficacy Inventory. The Inventory consists of 41 items. Four main results were obtained from the findings of this study. A significant difference was found in favor of managers in all three subscales of the inventory. This can be explained by the fact that administrators see communication as a more necessary requirement than do teachers, in order to better maintain the education process.

Keywords: administrators, communication skills, self-efficacy, administrators-teachers.

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Ömer Yahşi, İzmir Provincial Directorate of National Education, İzmir, 35260, Turkey
E-mail address: oyahsi@gmail.com / Tel.: 0532-5963660

1. Introduction

The ability of people to transfer their emotions and skills to others, in short, communication, means the creation of social and cultural-based institutions with certain rules, values that survive for centuries. Communication has an important role not only in the development of the wider social order and also in educational institutions. Communication is generally defined as an interaction process that results in common meanings of knowledge, ideas, attitudes, feelings, skills, and affects a change in behavior between the source and the target (Çetinkanat, 1998). A basic definition is the transfer and sharing of information (Bagin et al., 2008; Heslep, 1998). Bagin defines communication as a collaboration, requiring the mutual exchange of ideas and information (Bagin et al, 2008). Communication is the transmission of information from the source to the receiver, the significance of events that take place between the source and the receiver (Atik, 2009). Effective communication, which includes the process of transferring, contacting, understanding, expressing to others, is associated with effective communication skills (Buluş, Atan, & Sarıkaya, 2017).

One of the most important elements of the education system is that school leaders and teachers have effective communication skills, particularly for understanding and being sensitive towards others (Çetinkaya & Alparslan, 2011). Effective communication is essential for improving school performance, transferring the results to the school community. According to Kowalski (2006), administrators need to seek community support to develop and implement a common vision for successful students, schools; in order to achieve this they must have the skills necessary for a communication leader. Meek (1999) warns that successful communication during a crisis can only be achieved if effective lines of communication are established prior to a crisis occurring. These lines should be established between the administrator, school staff, parents and the public (Bagin, Gallagher & Moore, 2008; Meek, 1999).

The importance of communication, communication skills in educational institutions cannot be denied. Healthy communication between school leaders, teachers affects students, parents, all other stakeholders positively and creates a positive organizational climate (Doğan, Uğurlu, Yıldırım & Karabulut, 2013). There are some opinions stating that without effective organizational communication, even the best strategies or well-prepared plans would fail (Stewart, Martin & Tyrone, 2005). One study observed that the effective communication skills of one school leader positively affected the school climate (Halawah, 2005). Guerrero and Floyd (2005) state that individuals with with effective communication skills have the power to influence others and that effective communication strategies lead to success.

Overcoming communication barriers, the use of effective communication skills are related to communication self-efficacy. Bandura (1997) states that an administrator's sense of self-efficacy determines the effectiveness of his/ her work within the scope of his/her skills, experiences. The school administrators perception of their self-efficacy is effective in success. Cotton (2003) underlines the importance of school administrators possessing many skills for their continuous development. These skills are necessary for other individuals in the educational environment. Bandura (1986) argues that individuals who see themselves as competent think, act differently from individuals who consider themselves incompetent. Stating that individuals with strong self-efficacy behave according to the situation and try harder to cope with difficulties, Bandura (1997) argues that school leaders' perceptions of their self-efficacy is an assessment of their ability to achieve the desired results. Smith, Guarino, Strom, and Reed (2003) emphasize the importance of an administrator's self-efficacy in creating an effective teaching, learning environment in a school. An administrator's perception of their self-efficacy can be seen as an important factor in increasing the motivation and efficiency of teachers, students within an institution (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004). Teachers' perception of their self-

efficacy are considered important for student learning. It has also been found that teachers with high self-efficacy have higher levels of participation, as well as a positive effect on student motivation and success (Raufelder et.al 2013).

The quality of communication between an administrator and teachers can affect the achievement of the school's goals. The formation of a democratic school environment and effective achievement of school goals depend on two-way communication between the administrator and teachers and on the quality of this communication (Şimşek & Altinkurt, 2009). A study conducted with classroom teachers revealed that classroom teachers perceive themselves as competent in communication self-efficacy (Aküzüm & Gültekin, 2017). A study by Çınar (2010) identified the positive effectiveness of school administrators in the communication process. Another study found that the dimensions of administrators' communication skills, perceptions, gender, appearance, defensive behavior, knowledge, needs, listening skills, and empathy were found to be effective, but concluded that these skills should be developed (Şimşek & Altinkurt, 2019).

Because having effective communication skills requires certain experience, gaining these skills is a reflection of educators' previous experiences. For this reason, the pre-service period is also important. Studies on the communication skills of pre-service teachers identify a medium or above average level of teacher candidates' perceptions of their communication skills (Çetinkaya & Alparşlan, 2011; Saracaloğlu, Yenice, & Karasakaloğlu, 2009; Gürşimşek, Ekinci, & Selçioğlu, 2008; Baykara & Pehlivan, 2005).

Considering studies on effective communication and self-efficacy generally, those studies conducted mainly in the field of health, particularly those on developing effective communication skills in nurses and doctors observed that training programs would increase employees' communication skills (Khodadadi, et al., 2013; Doyle, et. al, 2011; Shama et. al, 2009; Bylund, et al., 2008). A study that synthesized the role and the importance of interpersonal effectiveness and communication competence in corporate competitiveness emphasizes the importance of oral and written communication skills in the business education curriculum (Okoro, Washington and Thomas, 2017). This suggests that communication skills can be improved. Another study conducted to determine the effects of interpersonal communication skills on organizational commitment shows the skill of team building has a significant role in organizational commitment (Martin et. al, 2010) A further study examined the knowledge, attitudes, and performance of faculty of medicine members in terms of effective communication skills and observed that although the study participants' knowledge was insufficient, they had a positive attitude and relatively acceptable performance in communication skills (Sharifiad, Rezaeian, Jazini, & Etemadi, 2020).

Studies have been conducted to examine various variables in the opinions of teachers and school administrators on communication skills. A study by Ceylan (2008) found that male teachers had lower communication skills than female teachers. Other studies do not show any differences according to the variable of gender (Memduhoğlu, 2015; Taşkın & Hacıömeroğlu, 2010; Şimşek, 2003). Given that communication skills, motivation in the working environment are two important factors in the development of teachers, communication skills and work motivation are closely related (Majid, Jelas, Azman, & Rahman, 2010). When classroom teachers' communication skills in relation to the dimensions of empathy, equality and effectiveness were examined, female teachers communicated with students more competently than male teachers (Erdem & Okul, 2015).

The aim of this current study is to determine the perceptions of self-efficacy and effective communication skills of administrators, vice-principals and teachers in Izmir. For learning processes to

be effective, it is very important that educators have effective communication skills and develop their self-awareness in this regard. Considering that educators are those who direct societies, it must be remembered that their awareness of communication skills self-efficacy will affect stakeholders in the school microsystem as a whole. Considered in this context, it is thought that determining the effective communication self-awareness of educators will contribute to the literature and guide higher policy practices.

Accordingly, this study considers the following questions:

Is there a significant difference in effective communication self-efficacy subscale scores according to educators' task type?

Is there a significant difference in effective communication self-efficacy subscale scores of educators by gender?

Is there a significant difference in effective communication self-efficacy subscale scores of educators according to years of service?

Is there a significant difference in effective communication self-efficacy subscale scores according to educators' branch of study?

2. Method

This study uses the scanning model, a quantitative research method. The scanning model is a research model that aims to describe a past or current situation as it exists (Karasar, 2006).

2.1. Participants

The participants of the study are administrators and teachers working in state schools affiliated to İzmir Directorate of National Education, Turkey. The data collection tool was sent electronically, the branches with low numbers were removed from the data set in line with the feedback. Gender, job type, years of service, and teaching branch were taken into consideration and a total of 638 participants were determined using the random sampling method. Finally, outliers were removed from the data set, making a final sample size of 583. The distribution of the educators included in the sampling is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of educators participating in the study

		Frequency	%
Gender	Female	337	57.8
	Male	246	42.2
	Total	583	100.0
Job Type	Administrator	221	37.9
	Teacher	362	62.1
	Total	583	100.0
Years of Service	Between 1-10	126	21.6
	Between 11-20	205	35.2

	More than 20	252	43.2
	Total	583	100.0
Branch	Classroom teacher	47	8.1
	Turkish	40	6.9
	Elementary Mathematics	42	7.2
	Technology and Design	44	7.5
	Science	40	6.9
	Turkish Language and Literature	40	6.9
	Arts	39	6.7
	Physical Education	44	7.5
	Pre-school	40	6.9
	Guidance and Psychological Counseling	41	7.0
	Teacher of mentally handicapped	44	7.5
	Religious Culture and Ethics	38	6.5
	English	44	7.5
	Social Science	40	6.9
	Total	583	100.0

The results of the descriptive analysis show the demographic characteristics of the participants to be as follows: by gender, 57.8% (f = 337) are female educators and 42.2% are male educators (f = 246); by job type, 37.9% (f = 221) are administrators; 62.1% (f = 362) are teachers; by years of service, 21.6% (f = 126) have 1-10 years, 35.2% (f = 205) have 11-20 years, 43.2% (f = 252) have over 20 years. Looking at teaching branches, they are fairly evenly distributed although the largest group is classroom teachers (f = 47; 8.1%), the smallest group is religious culture and ethics teachers (f = 38; 6.5%). Differences in distribution are directly related to the demographic characteristics of the main population. However, in the process of selecting educators for the sample, care was taken that the difference between the groups did not exceed a multiple of 3.

2.2. Data Collection Tool

The data collection tool consists of two parts: first, personal information about the educators' gender, job type, years of service, and teaching branch; second, the scale items of the Effective Communication Self-Efficacy Inventory. The Effective Communication Self-Efficacy Inventory was developed by Yahşi and Aydın (2020) to determine the self-efficacy perception of individuals in working life and consists of 41 items. It consists of 3 subscales of effective communication: Cognitive Self-efficacy (items 26, 40, 41, 47, 49, 51, 52, 55, , 57, 58, , 67, 69, and 71), Affective Self-efficacy (items 14,15,17, 18, 19, 20, 21,33, 34, 35, 36, 43, 44, 50, 62, 64, and 68), Psychomotor Self-efficacy (items 10, 12, 29, 42, 60, 61, 63, 65, 66, 70 and 72). Exploratory Factor Analysis (f = 727), Confirmatory

Factor Analysis (f = 210), and Cronbach Alpha Reliability analyzes were used on the collected data. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients calculated to determine the reliability of the scores obtained from the data collected groups for the Explanatory Factor Analysis (EFA) of the inventory were cognitive ($\alpha = .92$), affective ($\alpha = .92$), and psychomotor ($\alpha = .87$). For the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) the scores were cognitive ($\alpha = .89$), affective ($\alpha = .90$), and psychomotor ($\alpha = .83$). The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients related to the scores obtained from both groups shows that the scores obtained from the subscales with the whole measurement tool (EFA: .96; DFA: .91) were highly reliable.

2.3. Analysis of Data

In order to decide on which method to analyze the research findings, normality and homogeneity assumptions were examined. Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were conducted to determine whether the participants came from a normal distribution and the results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Normality test result table

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
JobType	.403	583	.000	.615	583	.000
Branch	.098	583	.000	.942	583	.000
Gender	.381	583	.000	.628	583	.000
Years of Service	.276	583	.000	.783	583	.000
Cognitive Self-efficacy	.109	583	.000	.965	583	.000
Affective Sef-efficacy	.089	583	.000	.975	583	.000
Psychomotor Self-efficacy	.098	583	.000	.975	583	.000

Table 2 shows that the participants' job type, teaching branch, gender, years of service, and subscales of the inventory do not have a normal distribution ($p < .05$). Looking at skewness and kurtosis coefficients, the coefficient of +2 to -2 indicates that the scores show a normal distribution (Pallant, 2001). The cognitive self-efficacy, affective self-efficacy, and psychomotor self-efficacy subscales of job type, teaching branch, gender, years of service, and kurtosis and skewness coefficients of the inventory were found to be between +2 and -2. Again, the histograms and plots related to the measurements were examined and it was decided that the scores showed a normal distribution. Considering homogeneity, the values were greater than 0.05, so it was decided that the homogeneity assumption was sufficient for variance analysis. It was decided to do the research analysis with the independent t-test and one-way analysis of variance. Despite the homogeneous distribution of the groups according to years of service and teaching branch, the Gabriel test (Field, 2013) was used because these groups were not equal.

2.4. Findings

The scores for the first question of the study, whether there is a significant difference according to the job type in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor self-efficacy subscale of the educators for effective communication, are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Subscale independent t-test results by job type

Subscale	Task type	N	M	SD	df	t	P
Cognitive self-efficacy	Administrat or	221	54.964	5.228	581.000	4.632	0.000
	Teacher	362	52.721	5.926			
Affective self-efficacy	Administrat or	221	72.656	6.458	581.000	2.480	0.013
	Teacher	362	71.166	7.370			
Psychomotor self-efficacy	Administrat or	221	45.801	4.486	581.000	2.193	0.029
	Teacher	362	44.901	4.998			

According to Table 3, the total scores of the scales of effective communication self-efficacy perceptions of administrators teachers show a significant difference in favor of administrators in all three subscales. When the cognitive self-efficacy results are examined, the administrators' total scores (= 54.96) are higher than the teachers' ($\bar{X} = 52.72$), $t(581) = 4.63$, $p < .01$. Considering the cognitive self-efficacy scale in terms of arithmetic averages, educators in the position of administrator were very good (4.23; $SD = .40$) and teachers were good (4.06; $SD = .46$). The affective self-efficacy results show the total scores of cognitive self-efficacy in favor of managers are higher, $t(581) = 2.48$, $p < .05$. The results of the affective self-efficacy scale analyzed in terms of arithmetic averages show that educators in the position of administrator were excellent (4.27; $SD = .38$) teachers were close to perfect (4.19; $SD = .43$). Finally, the results of the psychomotor scale for effective communication show administrators' total scores ($M = 45.80$) are higher than teachers', $t(581) = 2.19$, $p < .05$. The results of the psychomotor self-efficacy scale analyzed in terms of arithmetic averages show that both the educators in the position of administrator (4.16; $SD = .41$) and teachers (4.08; $SD = .45$) were good. The average scores of all three subscales show that effective communication self-efficacy is higher than the affective self-efficacy average in both administrators and teachers. These findings are important in terms of showing that educators feel themselves more competent in effective communication.

Results for the second question of the study, whether there is a significant difference according to gender in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor self-efficacy subscale total scores of educators for effective communication are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Subscale independent t-test results by job type

Subscale	Gender	N	M	SD	df	t	p
Cognitive self-efficacy	Female	337	53.190	5.665	581.000	-1.871	0.062
	Male	246	54.093	5.884			
Affective self-efficacy	Female	337	71.677	7.028	581.000	-0.216	0.829
	Male	246	71.805	7.140			
Psychomotor self-efficacy	Female	337	45.196	4.817	581.000	-0.269	0.788
	Male	246	45.305	4.848			

The findings presented in Table 4 show there is no significant difference between cognitive self-efficacy ($t = -1.87$; $p > .05$), affective self-efficacy, ($t = -0.22$; $p > .05$), psychomotor self-efficacy ($t = -0.27$; $p > .05$). The arithmetic averages by gender show cognitive (Female: 4.09, SD = .44; Male: 4.16, SD = .45); psychomotor self-efficacy (Female: 4.11, SD = .44; Male: 4.12, SD = .44) were at a good level, while affective self-efficacy was at an excellent level (Female: 4.22, SD = .41; Male: 4.22, SD = .42). These results are important in terms of showing that affective self-efficacy in effective communication self-efficacy is higher in both women and men compared to other subscales such as job type.

The results for the third question of the study, whether there is a significant difference in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor self-efficacy subscale scores of educators for effective communication according to years of service are presented in Tables 5 and 6.

Table 5: Analysis results of subscale scores by years of service

Subscale	Years of Service	N	M	SD
Cognitive self-Efficacy	1-10	126	53.151	5.768
	11-20	205	52.810	5.668
	More than 20	252	54.401	5.770
	Total	583	53.571	5.771
Affective self-Efficacy	1-10	126	71.873	6.987
	11-20	205	70.620	6.886
	More than 20	252	72.563	7.164
	Total	583	71.731	7.069
Psychomotor self-Efficacy	1-10	126	45.278	5.069
	11-20	205	44.922	4.598
	More than 20	252	45.484	4.887
	Total	583	45.242	4.826

Tables 5 -6 show the cognitive (M = 53.57) and affective self-efficacy (M = 72.56) of educators who worked for 11-20 years were significantly increased according to the cognitive (M = 52.81) and affective self-efficacy (M = 70.62) has been seen to be higher. According to professional processes, the affective self-efficacy of educators who worked for more than 20 years was excellent (4.27; SD = .42). A good level of effective communication self-efficacy was found in other subscales and for all service periods.

Table 6: Subscale variance analysis results by years of service

Subscale	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	p	Significant Difference
Cognitive self-efficacy	Between Groups	314.561	2.000	157.280	4.784	0.009	More than 20 >11-20 years
	Within Groups	19068.235	580.000	32.876			
	Total	19382.796	582.000				
Affective self-efficacy	Between Groups	430.446	2.000	215.223	4.356	0.013	More than 20 >11-20 years
	Within Groups	28656.274	580.000	49.407			
	Total	29086.720	582.000				
Psychomotor self-efficacy	Between Groups	35.933	2.000	17.967	0.771	0.463	
	Within Groups	13518.966	580.000	23.309			
	Total	13554.899	582.000				

The results for the fourth question of the study, whether the cognitive self-efficacy subscale scores of educators for effective communication is significantly different according to teaching branch, are presented in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7: Descriptive analysis results of cognitive self-efficacy scale scores by teaching branch

Subscales	Teaching Branch	N	M	SD
Cognitive subscale	Classroom Teacher	47	56.596	5.436
	Turkish	40	53.825	5.434
	Elementary Mathematics	42	52.000	5.640
	Technology and Design	44	53.182	6.557
	Science	40	52.325	4.565

Turkish Language and Literature	40	52.975	5.122
Arts	39	53.667	5.719
Physical Education	44	53.477	6.140
Pre-school	40	52.450	4.690
Guidance and psychological counseling	41	55.171	5.700
Teacher of Mentally Handicapped	44	52.864	6.508
Religious Culture and Ethics	38	53.605	5.921
English	44	53.114	5.253
Social Sciences	40	54.425	6.644
Total	583	53.571	5.771

Tables 7, 8 show that the teaching branch with the highest level of cognitive self-efficacy is Classroom Teaching (M = 56.60). The lowest level is elementary mathematics education (M = 52). A comparison of the branches shows effective communication self-efficacy levels are significantly higher than primary mathematics education and science teaching in favor of primary school teaching. While the cognitive self-efficacy of classroom teachers (4.35; SD = .42) and guidance and psychological counselors (4.24; SD = .44) are excellent, the cognitive self-efficacy of teachers in other branches is at a good level.

Table 8: Cognitive self-efficacy analysis of variance by teaching branch

Subscale	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Significant Difference
Cognitive self-efficacy	Between Groups	835.590	13	64.276	1.972	0.021	Classroom.>elementary Maths.; Classroom.>science.
	Within Groups	18547.206	569	32.596			
	Total	19382.796	582				

The results for the fourth question of the study, whether the teachers' affective self-efficacy subscale scores for effective communication are significantly different according to teaching branch, are presented in Tables 9 and 10.

Table 9: Descriptive analysis results of affective self-efficacy scores according to teaching branch

Subscale	Teaching Branches	N	M	SD
Cognitive self-efficay	Classroom Teacher	47	74.255	6.983
	Turkish	40	71.275	5.905
	Elementary Maths	42	70.238	7.315
	Technology and Design	44	70.727	7.910
	Science	40	69.375	7.217
	Turkish Language and Literature	40	71.275	6.465
	Arts	39	72.179	6.700
	Physical Education	44	72.250	7.456
	Pre-school	40	70.725	6.333
	Guidance and psychological counseling	41	73.585	7.208
	Teacher of Mentally Handicapped	44	71.432	7.768
	Religious Culture and Ethics	38	72.263	6.985
	English	44	71.205	5.920
	Social Sciences	40	73.200	7.683
	Total	583	71.731	7.069

Tables 9 and 10 show that the branch with the highest level of affective self-efficacy is classroom teaching (M = 74.26). The lowest level is elementary mathematics teaching (M = 7.24). A comparison between branches shows there is no significant difference between affective self-efficacy scores. Scores between teaching branches, the self-efficacy of the teaching branches was found to have excellent and near-perfect values.

Table 10: Affective self-efficacy analysis of variance according to teaching branch

Subscale	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Cognitive self-efficacy	Between Groups	990.470	13	76.190	1.543	0.098
	Within Groups	28096.250	569	49.378		
	Total	29086.720	582			

The results for the fourth question of the study, whether there is a significant difference in the psychomotor self-efficacy subscale scores of the educators for effective communication according to teaching branch, are presented in Tables 11 and 12.

Table 11: Descriptive analysis results of psychomotor self-efficacy scores according to teaching branch

Subscale	Teaching Branch	N	M	SD
Psychomotor self-efficacy	Classroom Teacher	47	47.298	4.620
	Turkish	40	45.525	4.114
	Elementary Maths	42	43.952	4.504
	Technology and Design	44	44.364	5.855
	Science	40	44.100	4.125
	Turkish Language and Literature	40	45.425	4.373
	Arts	39	45.231	5.436
	Physical Education	44	45.000	4.861
	Pre-school	40	44.575	3.986
	Guidance and Psychological Counselor	41	46.195	5.046
	Teacher of Mentally Handicapped	44	44.841	5.203
	Religious Culture and Ethics	38	45.079	5.154
	English	44	45.568	4.060
	Social Sciences	40	46.025	5.337
	Total	583	45.242	4.826

Tables 11 and 12 show that the branch with the highest level of psychomotor self-efficacy is classroom teachers ($M=47.30$), as in other subscales. The lowest level is found in elementary mathematics teachers ($M=43.95$). The psychomotor self-efficacy scale scores do not show a significant difference in scores between teaching branch. The arithmetic mean of the self-efficacy of teaching branches show that the classroom teachers (4.30 ; $SD = .42$), the guidance and psychological counselors (4.20 ; $SD = .46$) have an excellent level and teachers in other branches have a good level of self-efficacy.

Table 12: Results of analysis of variance on psychomotor self-efficacy according to teaching branch

Subscale	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Psychomotor self-efficacy	Between Groups	454.075	13	34.929	1.517	0.106
	Within Groups	13100.823	569	23.024		
	Total	13554.899	582			

3. Discussion and Conclusion

Four main results were obtained from the findings of this study measuring the effective communication skills of educators. A significant difference was found in favor of managers in all three subscales of the inventory. This can be explained by the fact that administrators see communication as a more necessary requirement than do teachers to better maintain the education process. Affective self-efficacy was excellent in both groups. These findings are important in terms of affective self-efficacy as educators feel more competent in effective communication. The same finding can be interpreted to suggest that educators prioritize affective characteristics more in effective communication. The necessity for school administrators to be more sensitive to communication in order to carry out all the required aspects of education effectively may explain them achieving a higher level of this competence. Studies in the literature comparing administrators and teachers support the finding that positive communication between school leaders and teachers positively affects organizational climate (Doğan, Uğurlu, Yıldırım & Karabulut, 2013; Rajhans, 2012 Halawah, 2005, Tabor, 2001). Other studies show that school principals' 21st century and communication skills have a positive effect on their leadership styles (Elekoğlu & Demirdağ, 2020). In addition, some studies show a positive and significant relationship between managers' communication skills and organizational values of institutions (Fidan & Küçükali, 2014; Ada & Gümüş, 2012).

The second result suggests there is no significant difference between female and male educators. There was no significant difference by gender between all inventory subscale scores. Although this result may seem natural, many studies based on gender comparison have been conducted in the literature. These studies reveal no significant difference according to the gender variable (Tümekaya, 2011; Pehlivan, 2005; Memduhoğlu, 2015; Taşkın & Hacıömeroğlu, 2010; Şimşek, 2003; Kozikoğlu & Altunova, 2018). Other studies show that female teachers communicate more effectively than male teachers (Erdem & Okul, 2015).

The subscale scores in terms of years of service show that educators with over 20 years have higher levels of cognitive self-efficacy, affective self-efficacy than teachers who have worked 11-20 years. There was no significant difference for 1-10 years of service or other periods. The higher self-efficacy perception of educators with over 20 years of service compared to those with 11-20 can be explained by the fact that this group has more work experience. However, results of the finding regarding teachers with 1-10 years of service experience do not support this opinion. Although there is no significant difference between teachers of 1-10 years and teachers of 11-20 years, the higher scores of teachers with 1-10 years of experience is partially related to attitudes toward the educational environment and communication of this less experienced group. It may also be related to the demographic characteristics of the sample. It is therefore necessary to examine different variables (attitude, burnout, anxiety, etc.) in similar sample groups, to take the same measurements and compare them to other groups in order to determine the reasons behind the results obtained. Studies have been carried out that show no significant difference in the variables of the institution where administrators are employed, professional seniority, and duration of service at the school (Bozcan & Yalçınkaya, 2018; Oktay, 2008).

The fourth result of the research is the significance level of effective communication self-efficacy according to teaching branch. According to the findings, the scores of classroom teachers and guidance and psychological counselors are higher on the basis of subscales. In the distribution of affective self-efficacy levels according to teaching branches in particular, which are shown as perfect and almost perfect. The differences between teaching branch, cognitive, affective self-efficacy levels show a significant difference in favor of classroom teachers compared to mathematics and science teachers.

This may be explained by the efforts classroom teachers go to to communicate with lower age groups. Classroom teachers' efforts to empathize more are particularly effective. Also, classroom teachers tend to experience more intense interaction with parents. Although showing no significant difference, the higher subscale scores of the guidance and psychological counselors compared to other teaching branches are due to the fact that these teachers are more open to communication, using therapeutic language. In particular, giving motivational interviews and gaining different perspectives due to their more intense interviews with administrators, students, parents are some of the reasons for this. Studies exist that show classroom teachers have high effective communication skills (Aküzüm & Gültekin, 2017). Pre-service teachers' perceptions of communication skills or levels of communication skills are at a medium or above average level (Çetinkaya & Alparslan 2011; Saracaloğlu, Yenice & Karasakaloğlu, 2009; Gürşimşek, Ekinci, & Selçioğlu, 2008; Baykara & Pehlivan, 2005). In addition there are also studies showing that communication skills are related to professional motivation in the literature (Majid et.al, 2010). There are also studies showing that communication skills are related to professional motivation in the literature (Majid, Jelas, Azman & Rahman, 2010).

4. Recommendations

In line with the results obtained from the research, the following suggestions are presented.

New studies can be conducted by increasing the sample numbers of the groups not included in this study. Given that affective self-efficacy scale scores of the Effective Communication Self-Efficacy Inventory are higher than other scales, studies could be conducted to examine affective characteristics in communication and to consider these characteristics together with other variables.

Another significant result is that there is a difference in terms of years of service. The reasons for the higher self-efficacy of those with 11-20 years of service should be investigated. New research could be conducted on the influence of years of service on effective communication self-efficacy and the reasons for this influence.

The three subscale results used in the study show that the participants are generally at an excellent and good level. However, these results are related to teachers' own self-efficacy beliefs. By using these scales together with various performance indicators in new studies, the relationship between teachers' performance and self-efficacy could be analyzed.

References

- Ada,Ş & Gümüş, S (2012). The reflection of instructional leadership concept on educational administration master's programs: a comparison of Turkey and the United State of America. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences* 4(2), 462-474. https://iojes.net/index.jsp?mod=tammetin&makaleadi=&makaleurl=IOJES_674.pdf&key=41214
- Aküzüm, C. & Gültekin, S. Ö. (2017). The investigation of relationship between primary school teachers' communication skills and classroom management skills. *Electronic Journal Of Education Sciences*, 6(12), 88-107. <https://doi.org/10.26449/sss.1427>
- Atik, L. (2009). The effect of communication skills of primary school administrators on total quality management. (Unpublished master's thesis). Selçuk University, Konya <http://acikerisimsiv.selcuk.edu.tr:8080/xmlui/handle/123456789/10112>

- Yahşi, Ö (2021). Examination of educators' self-efficacy for effective communication. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 16(2), 451-467 <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i2.5622>
- Bagin, D., Gallagher, D. R., & Moore, E. H. (2008). The communication process. In A. E. Burvikovs (Ed.), *The school and community relations*. (9th ed., pp. 74-89). MA: Pearson.
- Bagin, D., Gallagher, D. R., & Moore, E. H. (2008). Communicating with internal publics. In A. E. Burvikovs (Ed.), *The school and community relations*. (9th ed, pp. 90-118). MA: Pearson.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1987.4306538>
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.84.2.191>
- Baykara Pehlivan, K. (2005). A study on perception of communication skills of preservice teachers. *İlköğretim Online*, 4 (2), 17-23. <http://ilkogretim-online.org.tr/index.php/io/article/viewFile/2014/1850>
- Bozcan E. Ü. & Yalçinkaya, M (2018). The relationship between ethical leadership behaviors and communication skills of school administrators and organizational commitment levels of teachers in primary education institutions. *Turkish Studies Educational Sciences*, 13(27), 263-284. <https://doi.org/10.7827/turkishstudies.14344>
- Buluş, M., Atan, A., & Erten Sarıkaya, H. (2017). Effective communication skills: A new conceptual framework and scale development study, *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(2), 575-590. <http://acikerisim.pau.edu.tr/xmlui/handle/11499/26633>
- Bylund, C. L., Brown, R. F., Ciccone, B. L., Levin, T.T., Geuguen, J. A., Hill, C., & Kissane, D. W. (2008). Training faculty to facilitate communication skills training: Development and evaluation of a workshop. *Patient Education and Counseling* 70 430–436. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2007.11.024>
- Ceylan, G. (2008). The effect of teacher-student interaction on the classroom atmosphere (Unpublished doctoral thesis), Selçuk University Institute of Social Sciences. <http://acikerisimarsiv.selcuk.edu.tr:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/9642/219207.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.
- Cotton, J. A. (2003). The instructional leadership proficiencies of elementary principals: A study of preparation and continuing professional development needs (Doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 3083797.
- Çetinkanat, C. (1998). Teacher communication skills from the perspective of prospective teachers and inspectors. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 4(2), 209-221. <https://doi.org/10.14527/9786053644309.08>
- Çetinkaya, Ö. & Alparslan, A. G. A. M. (2011). The effect of emotional intelligence on communication skills An investigation on university students. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(1), 363-377. <https://doi.org/10.18657/yeibu.33859>
- Çınar, O. (2010). Principal effectiveness in communication process. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 26(1), 267-276. http://birimler.dpu.edu.tr/app/views/panel/ckfinder/userfiles/17/files/DERG_/26-1/267-276.pdf
- Doğan, S., Uğurlu, C.T., Yıldırım, T., & Karabulut, E. (2013). Evaluation of the communication process between school administrators and teachers according to teachers' opinions.. *Turkish Journal of Education*, January, 3(1), 34-47. <https://doi.org/10.19128/turje.181074>
- Doyle, D., Copeland H. L, Bush, D., Stein, L., & Thompson, S. (2011). A course for nurses to handle difficult communication situations. A randomized controlled trial of impact on self-efficacy and performance. *Patient Education and Counseling* 82 100–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2010.02.013>

- Yahşi, Ö (2021). Examination of educators' self-efficacy for effective communication. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 16(2), 451-467 <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i2.5622>
- Elekoğlu, F. & Demirdağ, S. (2020). Investigation of school principals' 21st century skills and leadership styles according to teachers' perceptions. *Karaelmas Journal of Educational Sciences* 8 (2020) 101-117. <http://ebd.beun.edu.tr/index.php/KEBD/article/view/236>
- Erdem, A. & Okul, Ö.(2015). Primary school teachers' communication skills with students. *Çağdaş Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(1), 1-8. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/408082>
- Fidan, M. & Küçükali, R. (2014). Administrators' communication skills and organizational values in primary education institutions. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi* 4(1) 317-334. <https://doi.org/10.12973/jesr.2014.41.16>
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using*. SAGE.
- Guerrero, L& Floyd K. (2005). *Nonverbal communication in close relationships*. Lawrence Erlbaum
- Gürşimşek, I., Ekinci Vural, D., & Selçioğlu, D. E. (2008). The relationship between emotional intelligence and communication skills of teacher candidates. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 16, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.21764/maeuefd.569593>
- Halawah, I. (2005). The relationship between effective communication of high school principal and school climate. *Education*, 126(2). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ765683>
- Heslep, R. D. (1998). Communication as the absolute foundation of philosophy. *Educational Theory*, 48(1). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228029787_Communication_as_the_absolute_foundation_of_philosophy
- Karasar, N. (2006). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kozikoğlu, İ., & Altunova, N. (2018). The predicative power of prospective teachers' self-efficacy perceptions of 21st century skills for their lifelong learning tendencies. *Journal of Higher Education & Science/Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 12(3). <https://doi.org/10.47477/ubed.781499>
- Khodadadi, E., Ebrahimi, H., Mooghaddasian, S., & Babapour, J. (2013). The Effect of Communication Skills Training on Quality of Care, Self-Efficacy, Job Satisfaction and Communication Skills Rate of Nurses in Hospitals of Tabriz, Iran. *Journal of Caring Sciences*, 2(1), 27-27. <https://doi.org/10.5681/jcs.2013.004>
- Kowalski, T. J. (2006). *The school superintendent: Theory, practice, and cases* (2nd ed.).Sage
- Majid, N. A., Jelas, Z. M., Azman, N., & Rahman, S. (2010). Communication Skills and work motivation amongst expert teachers. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 7(C), 565-567. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.10.075>
- Martin, H.Z, Jandaghi, G, Karimi, F.H. & Hamidizadeh (2010). Relationship between interpersonal communication skills and organizational commitment (Case study: Jahad Keshavarzi and University of Qom, Iran). *European Journal of Social Sciences* 13(3) 387-398. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Relationship-between-Interpersonal-Communication-of-Martin-Jandaghi/2eec720d7ca2b7437398398fc84244a0ab61bc1f#references>
- Meek, A. (1999). *Communicating with the public: A guide for school leaders*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Memduhoğlu, H. B. (2015). Examining primary school administrators' according to the perceptions of teachers and administrators. *Education and Science*, 40(177). <http://dx.doi.org/10.15390/EB.2015.1677>
- Okoro, E. Washington, M & Thomas =. (2017). The impact of interpersonal communication skills on organizational effectiveness and social self-efficacy: A synthesis. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 4(3) 28-32. http://www.ijllnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_3_September_2017/3.pdf
- Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS survival manual*. Open University Press.

- Yahşi, Ö (2021). Examination of educators' self-efficacy for effective communication. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 16(2), 451-467 <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i2.5622>
- Pehlivan, B. K. (2005). A study on perception of communication skills of preservice teachers. *Elementary Education Online*, 4(2), 17-23. <http://ilkogretim-online.org.tr/index.php/io/article/viewFile/2014/1850>
- Rajhans, K. (2012). Effective organizational communication: a key to employee motivation and performance, *Interscience Management Review*, 2(2), 81-85. <https://doi.org/10.47893/imr.2009.1040>
- Raufelder, D., Drury, K., Jagenow, D., Hoferichter, F., & Bukowski, W. (2013). Development and validation of the relationship and motivation(REMO) scale to assess students' perceptions of peers and teachers as motivators in adolescence. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 24, 182-189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2013.01.001>
- Saracaloğlu, S., Yenice, N., & Karasakaloğlu, N. (2009). The relationship between communication and problem solving skills and reading interest and habits of candidate teachers'. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 6(2), 187-206. <https://doi.org/10.31463/aicusbed.496472>
- Shama, M. E., Meko, F. A., Enein, N. Y., & Mahdy, M. (2009). The effect of a training program in communication skills on primary health care physicians knowledge, attitudes and self-efficacy. *J.Egypt Public Health Assoc.* 84(3&4) 261-283. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.683.7835&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Sharifirad, G. R., Rezaeian, M., Jazini, A., & Etemadi, Z. S. (2020). Knowledge, attitude and performance of academic members regarding effective communication skills in education. *J Edu Health Promot* 2012;1:42. <https://doi.org/10.4103/2277-9531.104812>
- Smith, W., Guarino, A. J., Strom, P., & Reed, C. (2003). Principal self-efficacy and effective teaching and learning environments. *School Leadership and Management*, 23(4), 505-508. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1363243032000151015>
- Stewart, C., Martin, K., & Tyrone, P. (2005). *Managing and organization*. Sage..
- Şimşek, Y. (2003). The relationship between the school principals' communication skills and the school culture, Unpublished doctoral thesis, Anadolu University Institute of Educational Sciences, Eskişehir. <https://doi.org/10.16986/huje.2020058754>
- Şimşek, Y. & Altınkurt, Y. (2009). Opinions of vocational high school teachers related to communication skills of their school principals.. *Akademik Bakış*, 17, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.3055>
- Tabor, B. (2001). Conflict management and interpersonal communication style of the elementary principal, Unpublished doctoral thesis, Columbia, Missouri University.
- Taşkın, Ç. & Hacıömeroğlu, Ç. (2010). Adaptation of the teachers' self-efficacy beliefs systems-self form and primary teachers' self-efficacy beliefs. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 27, 63-75 <https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.2712>
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Gareis, C. R. (2004). Principals' sense of efficacy: assessing a promising construct. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(4), 573-585. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230410554070>
- Tümkiye, S. (2011). Investigation of communication skills and attitude to teaching of the students of primary school teaching. *Çukurova University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 20(2), 49-62. <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=2058f206-e90b-4075-8846-9b8c25c7a875%40sdc-v-sessmgr03>
- Yahşi, Ö. & Aydın, S. (2020). Development of effective communication self-efficacy inventory: a validity-reliability study. *International Journal of Current Approaches in Language, Education and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 257-275. <https://doi.org/10.35452/caless.2020.13>