

The Analysis of Classroom Teachers' Application Frequency of Twelve Communication Barriers

Suleyman Dogan

*Yildiz Technical University, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Istanbul, Turkey
E-mail: sudogan@yildiz.edu.tr*

KEYWORDS Values Education. Communication Barriers. Academic Success. Classroom Teacher

ABSTRACT Today, rapid changes have been taking place at all levels of social structure as a result of the developments in communication and information technologies. Aiming at determining the factors that affect classroom teachers' application frequency of twelve communication barriers and the influence level of these barriers' application frequency on student's academic success, a descriptively qualified scanning model was used in this study. In the study, data were collected by using literature review and questionnaire technique within the framework of the general scanning model. The sampling of the research consists of 302 classroom teachers (Female: 180, Male: 122) who work in the 2013-2014 academic year in state and private schools located in Istanbul and were randomly selected. According to the findings, the need to behave carefully in communication is inevitable in the light of the data obtained from these studies. An effective student-teacher communication is primarily necessary for an effective education.

INTRODUCTION

As a result of the developments in communication and information technologies on the verge of the 21st century that we live in, changes are experienced in line with rapid developments at all levels of social structure (Inceli 2015). Since the acceleration of the development is increasing, the need to train qualified manpower that can keep up with the rapid development and change is inevitable. The most viable way of raising the perfect human being, who absorbed all the social values and can keep pace with the requirements of the century, is through a qualified education (Hall and Quinn 2014). It is a fact that a qualified education can be provided by the qualified teachers. The most important aid for every teacher in the process of training qualified human being is the effective communication skills (Aydin 2014).

Communication skills are necessary for creating, continuing communication activity in an efficient way and obtaining a satisfaction from it (Demirci 2002). These skills are competencies which are not often alone and are defined by other feelings and skills. However, as stated by Holbrink and Enqels (1997), they can be taught to everyone who is willing to acquire social skills (Demirci 2002).

Communication is a process of transferring and transmitting information, thoughts and emotions, verbally or non-verbally, from one

individual to another or from one group to another (Güçlü 2003). Communication is defined as transferring and transmitting ideas, information, beliefs and attitudes from one human being to another (Nacino-Brown et al. 1982). Communication is the use of words and other symbols for reaching at various goals (Sayers et al. 1993). Another definition of communication is the exchange of all sorts of information between two systems (Dokmen 1994). Communication is not just about words expressed between human beings. In addition to this, all behaviors, emotions, gestures, facial expressions, mimics, signs and graphs are tools of communication while transmitting a message (Eren 2001). Communication is a process commencing from the necessity of encoding and giving out a message in order to correct the situation of imbalance occurring in the individual himself (Gordon 1993; Yigit 2015). In order communication to be healthy, the receiver and the source are required to trust each other (Cüceloglu 2002).

Communication can be defined as the process of rendering common meanings between two or more individuals. The basic function of it is to share emotions, ideas, knowledge and skills (Yalin 2003). The important issue for the communication process is the occurrence of two-way communication. Individuals feel the need to communicate from the moment they were born. Individual is a dynamic creature. They are, almost every day, redefined by their communication with

other people around themselves (Küçükahmet 2002).

Communicating is a complex and time-consuming task. But it is possible to understand the communication process better, thus to use it more effectively. One of the key steps of these is to be aware of the factors that prevent the effective communication and to find ways to overcome these (Sayers et al. 1993).

Communication barriers usually originate from the inability to ensure psychological adaptation between the receiver or the source or the incorrect evaluation of the feedback that is needed for providing this adaptation (Tutar and Yilmaz 2005; Yurtseven and Altun 2015). The transmitter and the receiver of the message share the responsibility to understand each other mutually. While receiving a message, the responsibility will not finish until showing the understanding of the message in a degree that will satisfy the source (Sayers et al. 1993). Source must pay attention to the responses of the receiver and find signs to show whether he understood it or not. In particular, it can be beneficial to repeat complex messages a few times without boring, in different and descriptive formats (Gürses 2006).

First of all, an effective teacher-student communication is necessary for an effective education. The relationship patterns within the classroom occupy an important place in the effectiveness of learning situations. The healthier teacher creates this structure, the greater the power of learning and the attaining the goal of teaching become (Aydin 2000; Celep 2002; Kisaç 2002; Kaya and Aydin 2016). In-class communication, which is among teacher's responsibilities, is one of the most important dimensions in the success or failure of a class (Geddes 1993; Agaoglu 2005).

According to Gordon (2005), communication barriers are all factors which adversely affect the delivery and the understanding a message. There are various sources of communication barriers. These sources can be physical factors such as noise, crowd, heat, cold and so on, as well as the differences in the formats of perception and response between the persons who communicate.

The sum of communication barriers that may occur between individuals by verbal responses is 12:

1. To order
2. To warn, to intimidate
3. To give moral lectures
4. To preach, to provide solution

5. To deliver a speech
6. To judge, to blame
7. To mock at
8. To interpret, to analyze
9. To praise, to make positive assessments
10. To give confidence, to comfort
11. To ask questions, to interrogate
12. To break promise, to diverge from the subject (Gordon 2005: 29).

When we look at the literature today, we see that the number of studies conducted on the classroom teachers' application frequency of communication barrier and the effect of this on student's academic success was inadequate. Therefore, the study was designed on "the analysis of the application frequency of 12 communication barriers by the teachers working at primary school first stage in terms of different variables."

In this study, in order to obtain efficiency from the processes of improvement of learning and values education, the examination of the application frequency of 12 communication barriers by the teachers working at primary school first stage in terms of different variables was aimed at. The effect of the gender, marital status, severance rank, education level and the year of graduation of the teachers, who participated in the study in the application of 12 communication barriers has been researched. In addition, this study, which also aims at analyzing the effect of class teachers' application frequency of twelve communication barriers on students' academic success, is thought to be important for an objective examination of the positive effects on the process of learning and in terms of teachers' acquisition of a positive perspective for the success of learning as well.

METHODOLOGY

Aiming at determining the factors that affect classroom teachers' application frequency of twelve communication barriers and the influence level of these barriers' application frequency on student's academic success, a descriptively qualified scanning model was used in this study. In the study, data were collected by using literature review and questionnaire technique within the framework of the general scanning model. The collected data were classified in accordance with the specified purposes and were calculated in terms of frequency and percentage. Chi-square and ANOVA techniques were used in compari-

sons of parametric data. Data were analyzed by using SPSS for Windows package program.

Study Group

The sampling of the research consists of 302 classroom teachers (Female: 180, Male: 122) who work in the 2013-2014 academic year in state and private schools located in Istanbul and were randomly selected.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of the participants

Gender	f	%
Female	180	59.6
Male	122	40.4
Total	302	100.0
Loss	0	0
Institution of Employment	f	%
State	257	85.1
Private	43	14.2
Total	300	99.3
Loss	2	.7
Grade Level	f	%
1.Grade	64	21.2
2.Grade	56	18.5
3.Grade	60	19.9
4.Grade	62	20.5
5. Grade	58	19.2
Total	300	99.3
Loss	2	.7

Research Instruments

A questionnaire prepared by the researcher was used in this study. Thomas Gordon's (1989) book entitled *Parent Effectiveness Training* was used and the opinions of four experts on the subject were obtained in the questionnaire preparation process.

Table 2: The results of One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test carried out to determine whether the student academic achievement Scores differed or not differed according to the variable of the application frequency of the "ordering" barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teacher

Score	Group	N	Average	SS	$F_{3;290}$	Sig.
Academic Success	Never	94	4.28	.678	3.245	.022*
	Once	81	3.91	.925		
	Twice	53	4.00	.877		
	Often	66	4.02	.794		
	Total	294	4.07	.823		

p<.05

Data Collection and Analyses

The application permit of the Ministry of Education was taken; the data were collected from the specified schools and classrooms by graduate students from the field of Classroom Teaching. The data collection process occurred in the classroom through observation and by transferring the obtained data into the questionnaire developed by the researcher.

The survey forms were prepared by benefiting from the section of 12 communication barriers in Thomas Gordon's (1989) book entitled *Parent Effectiveness Training*. With the help of surveys, data were collected through a lesson observation of each classroom teacher mentioned in sampling. The survey form was not shown to the classroom teacher before observation and his/her approval was taken by showing the survey questions after the observation while obtaining teacher's personal information. The academic success average of the class was taken from e-school system. Each of the marked survey forms were examined one by one for every question and the frequency and percentage calculations were made along with the number of valid responses (Table 1).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

As seen in Table 2, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was performed to determine whether the arithmetic mean of student academic achievement scores differed or not differed according to the variable of the application frequency of the "ordering" barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teacher. As a result of the analysis, the difference between arithmetic means of the scores was found to be statistically significant. After this process, complementary Post-Hoc analysis tech-

niques were applied to determine due to which sub-groups this significant difference was derived from after ANOVA. In case of the homogeneity of variances as a result of Levene's test, Tukey multiple comparison technique that is widely used was preferred. The results of Tukey multiple comparison analysis is presented in Table 3.

As shown in Table 3, according to the results of Post-Hoc Turkey test performed to determine whether the student academic achievement scores differed due to which sub-groups according to the variable of the application frequency of the "ordering" barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teacher; the academic achievement average of the teachers who never applied the ordering barrier was significantly higher than the academic achievement average of those who applied this barrier just once.

As shown in Table 4, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was performed to determine whether the arithmetic mean of classroom teacher year of seniority scores differed or not differed according to the variable of the applica-

tion frequency of the "threatening" barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teacher. As a result of the analysis, the difference between arithmetic means of the scores was found to be statistically significant. In case of the heterogeneity of variances ($p < .01$) as a result of Levene's test, the widely-used Dunnett's T3 multiple comparison analysis results is presented below.

As shown in Table 5, according to the results of Post-Hoc Dunnett's test; the year of seniority average of the teachers who never applied the threatening barrier is significantly higher than the year of seniority average of those who applied this barrier once.

As seen in Table 6, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was performed to determine whether the arithmetic mean of student grade level scores differed or not differed according to the variable of the application frequency of the "giving confidence" barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teacher. As a result of the analysis, the difference between arithmetic means of the scores was found

Table 3: The results of Post-Hoc Turkey Test performed to determine the student academic achievement scores differed due to which sub-groups according to the variable of the application frequency of the "Ordering" barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teacher

Score	Variable (i)	Variable(j)	Avg. diff. (i-j)	SHx	P
Academic Success	Never	Once	.363	.123	.018*
		Twice	.277	.140	.199
		Often	.261	.131	.190
	Once	Never	-.363	.123	.018*
		Twice	-.086	.144	.932
		Often	-.102	.135	.876
	Twice	Never	-.277	.140	.199
		Once	.086	.144	.932
		Often	-.015	.150	1.000
	Often	Never	-.261	.131	.190
		Once	.102	.135	.876
		Twice	.015	.150	1.000

$p < .05$

Table 4: The results of One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test performed to determine whether the classroom teacher year of seniority scores differed or not differed according to the variable of the application frequency of the "threatening" barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teacher

Score	Group	N	Average	SS	$F_{3;290}$	Sig.
Year of Seniority	Never	154	17.03	10.870	4.297	.006**
	Once	62	13.53	9.058		
	Twice	38	11.58	7.582		
	Often	34	13.56	9.471		
	Total	288	15.15	10.130		

$p < .01$

Table 5: The results of Post-Hoc Dunnett's Test performed to determine the classroom teacher year of seniority scores differed due to between which sub-groups according to the variable of the application Frequency of the "Threatening" barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teacher

Score	Variable (i)	Variable(j)	Avg. Diff. (i-j)	SHx	P
Year of Seniority	Never	Once	.252	.117	.032*
		Twice	.076	.142	.592
		Often	.117	.147	.430
	Once	Often	-.252*	.117	.032*
		Twice	-.175	.153	.252
		Often	-.135	.157	.391
	Twice	Never	-.076	.142	.592
		Once	.175	.153	.252
		Often	.040	.177	.821
	Often	Never	-.117	.147	.430
		Once	.135	.157	.391
		Twice	-.040	.177	.821

p<.05

Table 6: The results of One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test performed to determine whether the student grade level scores differed or not differed according to the variable of the application Frequency of the "giving confidence" barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teachers

Score	Group	N	Average	SS	F _{3;290}	Sig.
Academic Success	Never	111	3.08	1.496	3.735	.012*
	Once	66	3.18	1.402		
	Twice	48	3.35	1.631		
	Often	75	2.55	1.388		
	Total	300	3.01	1.492		

p< .05

to be statistically significant. In case of the homogeneity of variances, the results of the widely-used Tukey multiple comparison analysis are presented in Table 7.

As seen in Table 7, according to the results of Post-Hoc Turkey test performed to determine

whether the student grade level scores differed due to between which sub-groups according to the variable of the application frequency of the "giving confidence" barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teacher; the grade level average of the teachers who

Table 7: The results of Post-Hoc Tukey Test performed to determine the student grade level scores differed due to between which sub-groups according to the Variable of the application frequency of the "giving confidence" barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teachers

Score	Variable (i)	Variable(j)	Avg. diff. (i-j)	SHx	P
Academic Success	Never	Once	-.101	.229	.660
		Twice	-.273	.254	.284
		Often	.534	.220	.016*
	Once	Never	.101	.229	.660
		Twice	-.172	.279	.538
		Often	.635	.248	.011*
	Twice	Never	.273	.254	.284
		Once	.172	.279	.538
		Often	.807	.272	.003*
	Often	Never	-.534	.220	.016*
		Once	-.635	.248	.011*
		Twice	-.807	.272	.003*

p<.01, p<.05

often applied the giving confidence barrier is significantly lower than the grade level average of the teachers who applied this barrier once and twice and with the grade level average of the teachers who never applied this barrier.

As seen in Table 8, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was performed to determine whether the arithmetic mean of student academic success scores differed or not differed according to the variable of the application frequency of the "judging" barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teachers. As a result of the analysis, the difference between arithmetic means of the scores was found to be statistically significant. In case of the homogeneity of variances, the widely-used Tukey multiple comparison technique was preferred. The results of the Tukey multiple comparison analysis is presented in Table 9.

As shown in Table 9, according to the results of Post-Hoc Dunnnett's test; the grade level average of the teachers who never applied the judging barrier is significantly higher than the

grade level average of those who applied this barrier once

As shown in Table 10, as a result of the analysis, the difference between arithmetic means of the scores was found to be statistically significant. In case of the homogeneity of variances as a result of Levene's test, the results of the widely-used Dunnnett multiple comparison analysis are presented in Table 11.

As shown in Table 11, according to the results of Post-Hoc Dunnnett's test; the year of seniority average of the teachers who never applied the diversion barrier is significantly higher than the year of seniority average of those who applied this barrier twice.

As can be seen in Table 12, as a result of the Chi-square test performed to determine whether the institution of employment variable depended or not depended on the application variable of the "analyzing" barrier from one of the 12 Communication Barriers by the Classroom Teachers, the dependence between variables was found to be statistically significant ($X^2=23.073$; $p<.01$).

Table 8: The results of One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test performed to determine whether the student academic success Scores differed or not differed according to the variable of the application Frequency of the "judging" barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teachers

Score	Group	N	Average	SS	$F_{3,290}$	Sig.
Academic Success	Never	86	3.93	.837	5.822	.001**
	Once	71	3.86	.816		
	Twice	60	4.15	.860		
	Often	77	4.35	.703		
	Total	294	4.07	.823		

$p<.01$

Table 9: The results of Post-Hoc Tukey Test performed to determine the student grade level scores differed due to between which sub-groups according to the variable of the Application Frequency of the "judging" barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teachers

Score	Variable (i)	Variable(j)	Avg. diff. (i-j)	SHx	P
Academic Success	Never	Once	.252	.117	.032*
		Twice	.076	.142	.592
		Often	.117	.147	.430
	Once	Never	-.252	.117	.032*
		Twice	-.175	.153	.252
		Often	-.135	.157	.391
	Twice	Never	-.076	.142	.592
		Once	.175	.153	.252
		Often	.040	.177	.821
	Often	Never	-.117	.147	.430
		Once	.135	.157	.391
		Twice	-.040	.177	.821

$p<.05$

Table 10: The results of One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test performed to determine whether the classroom teacher year of seniority scores differed or not differed according to the variable of the application frequency of the “diversion” barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers

Score	Group	N	Average	SS	$F_{3;290}$	Sig.
Year of Seniority	Never	157	16.62	10.812	3.689	.012*
	Once	62	13.63	9.548		
	Twice	33	10.82	8.010		
	Often	36	15.31	8.444		
	Total	288	15.15	10.130		

$p < .05$

Table 11: The results of Post-Hoc Dunnett's Test performed to determine the classroom teacher year of seniority Scores differed due to between which sub-groups according to the variable of the application frequency of the “diversion” barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teacher

Score	Variable (i)	Variable(j)	Avg. Diff. (i-j)	SHx	P
Academic Success	Never	Once	2.995	1.488	.245
		Twice	5.806	1.640	.005
		Often	1.319	1.651	.962
	Once	Never	-2.995	1.488	.245
		Twice	2.811	1.848	.565
		Often	-1.677	1.858	.934
	Twice	Never	-5.806	1.640	.005
		Once	-2.811	1.848	.565
		Often	-4.487	1.981	.148
	Often	Never	-1.319	1.651	.962
		Once	1.677	1.858	.934
		Twice	4.487	1.981	.148

$p < .01$

Table 12: The results of Chi-square Test performed to determine whether the institution of employment variable depended or not depended on the application situation of the “analyzing” barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teachers

Groups	Analyzing				Total	χ^2	Sd	p
	Never	Once	Twice	Often				
School	State	97	86	30	44	257	23.073	3.000**
	Within group %	37.7	33.5	11.7	17.1	100.0		
	Private	9	9	17	8	43		
	Within group %	20.9	20.9	39.5	18.6	100.0		
	Total	106	95	47	52	300		
	Within group %	35.3	31.7	15.7	17.3	100.0		

$p < .01$

As can be seen in Table 13, as a result of the Chi-square test performed to determine whether the school variable depended or not depended on the application variable of the “testing” barrier from one of the 12 Communication Barriers by the Classroom Teachers, the dependence between variables was found to be statistically significant ($\chi^2=8.452$; $p < .05$).

As can be seen in Table 14, as a result of Chi-square test, the dependence between variables was found to be significant ($\chi^2=15.489$; $p < .05$).

As can be seen in Table 15, as a result of the Chi-square test performed to determine whether the gender variable depended or not depended on the application variable of the “diversion” barrier from one of the 12 Communication Barriers by the Classroom Teachers, the dependence between variables was found to be statistically significant ($\chi^2=9.547$; $p < .05$).

As can be seen in Table 16, as a result of the Chi-square test performed to determine whether

Table 13: The results of Chi-square Test performed to determine whether the institution of employment Variable depended or not depended on the application situation of the “testing” barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teachers

Groups	Testing				Total	χ^2	Sd	p
	Never	Once	Twice	Often				
School	State	150	40	31	36	257	8.452	3.038*
	Within group %	58.4	15.6	12.1	14.0	100.0		
	Private	21	7	12	3	43		
	Within group %	48.8	16.3	27.9	7.0	100.0		
	Total	171	47	43	39	300		
	Within Group %	57.0	15.7	14.3	13.0	100.0		

p<.05

Table 14: The results of Chi-square Test performed to determine whether the duration of presence at school variable depended or not depended on the application situation of the “praising” barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teachers

Groups	Praising				Total	χ^2	Sd	p
	Never	Once	Twice	Often				
Duration of Presence at School	Morning	12	14	5	12	43	15.489	6.017*
	Within group %	27.9	32.6	11.6	27.9	100.0		
	Noon	25	35	28	35	123		
	Within group %	20.3	28.5	22.8	28.5	100.0		
	Full-time	53	23	26	32	134		
	Within group %	39.6	17.2	19.4	23.9	100.0		
	Total	90	72	59	79	300		
	Within group %	30.0	24.0	19.7	26.3	100.0		

p<.05

Table 15: The results of Chi-square Test performed to determine whether the gender variable depended or not depended on the application situation of the “diversion” barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teachers

Groups	Diversion				Total	χ^2	Sd	p
	Never	Once	Twice	Often				
Gender	Female	104	32	26	18	180	9.547	3.023*
	Within group %	57.8	17.8	14.4	10.0	100.0		
	Male	58	35	10	19	122		
	Within group %	47.5	28.7	8.2	15.6	100.0		
	Total	162	67	36	37	302		
	Within group %	53.6	22.2	11.9	12.3	100.0		

p<.05

Table 16: The results of Chi-square Test performed to determine whether the graduation field depended or not depended on the application situation of the “giving moral lesson” barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teachers

Groups	Giving moral lesson				Total	χ^2	Sd	p
	Never	Once	Twice	Often				
Graduation	Education	143	42	28	29	242	14.385	3.002**
	Within group%	59.1	17.4	11.6	12.0	100.0%		
	Other	22	23	8	7	60		
	Within group%	36.7	38.3	13.3	11.7	100.0%		
	Total	165	65	36	36	302		
	Within group%	54.6	21.5	11.9	11.9	100.0%		

p<.01

Table 17: The results of Chi-square Test performed to determine whether the graduation field depended or not depended on the application situation of the “preaching” barrier from one of the 12 communication barriers by the classroom teachers

Groups	Preaching				Total	χ^2	Sd	p
	Never	Once	Twice	Often				
Graduation	Education	64	63	58	57	242	10.929	3.012**
	Within group%	26.4	26.0	24.0	23.6	100.0		
	Other	15	28	8	9	60		
	Within group%	25.0	46.7	13.3	15.0	100.0		
	Total	79	91	66	66	302		
	Within group%	26.2	30.1	21.9	21.9	100.0		

p<.05

the graduation variable depended or not depended on the application variable of the “giving moral lesson” barrier from one of the 12 Communication Barriers by the Classroom Teachers, the dependence between variables was found to be statistically significant ($\chi^2=14.385$; $p<.01$).

As can be seen in Table 17, as a result of the Chi-square test, the dependence between variables was found to be statistically significant ($\chi^2=10.929$; $p<.05$).

CONCLUSION

An effective student-teacher communication is primarily necessary for an effective education. The more healthily the atmosphere within the class is created, the more efficient the educational experience becomes. In order to obtain the desired efficiency in values education process, a qualified educational environment must be created within the awareness of communication barriers.

The conclusions that can be deduced from this study, which aimed at commencing the values education by removing the communication barriers, are as follows:

1. The academic success average of the teachers, who never applied the dictating barrier from the twelve communication barriers, was significantly higher than the academic success average of those who applied this barrier just once.
2. The average years of seniority of the teachers, who never applied the barrier of threatening is significantly higher than the average years of seniority of those, who applied this barrier just once.
3. The classroom level average of the teachers who often apply the confidence-building

barrier is significantly lower than the classroom level averages of those who apply either just once or twice or those who never apply.

4. The classroom success average of the teachers, who never applied the judging barrier, is significantly higher than the classroom success average of those, who applied this barrier just once.
5. The average years of seniority of the teachers, who never applied the diversion barrier is significantly higher than the average years of seniority of those, who applied this barrier twice.
6. Dependence between the classroom teachers' application variable of the analyzing barrier from one of twelve communication barriers and the variable of the institution that they work was found to be statistically significant. The ratio of teachers who never applied the analyzing barriers among state school teachers is 37.7 percent, whereas the ratio of those who never applied this barrier among private school teachers is 20.9 percent.
7. Dependence between the classroom teachers' application variable of the testing barrier from one of twelve communication barriers and the variable of the institution that they work was found to be statistically significant. The ratio of teachers who never applied the testing barriers among state school teachers is 58.8 percent, whereas the ratio of those who never applied this barrier among private school teachers is 48.4 percent.
8. Dependence between the classroom teachers' application variable of the praising barrier from one of twelve communication barriers

riers and the variable of the duration of presence at school was found to be statistically significant. The ratio of classroom teachers' application frequency of the praising barrier at schools providing dual education is significantly higher than the ratio of teachers' application frequency of this barrier at school providing full-time education.

9. Dependence between the classroom teachers' application variable of the diversion barrier from one of twelve communication barriers and the gender variable was found to be statistically significant. The ratio of female teachers among the teachers, who never applied the diversion barrier, is higher than male teachers.
10. Dependence between the classroom teachers' application variable of giving moral lesson barrier from one of twelve communication barriers and the variable of graduation area was found to be statistically significant. The ratio of teachers of education faculty graduates, who never applied the giving moral lesson barrier, is higher than the ratio of teachers of other faculty graduates, who never applied it.
11. Dependence between the classroom teachers' application variable of the preaching barrier from one of twelve communication barriers and the variable of graduation area was found to be statistically significant. The ratio of teachers of education faculty graduates, who never applied the preaching barrier, is higher than the ratio of teachers of other faculty graduates, who never applied it.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The need to behave carefully in communication is inevitable in the light of the data obtained from these studies. Keeping this necessity in mind, classroom teachers should be able to provide efficient experiences to their students in the process of values education. It is not possible to reach at our children with barriers such as giving orders, analyzing and judging and train individuals, who absorbed the social values and who are skillful and knowledgeable. For this reason, the process of values education can be thought to pass efficiently by listening to students, establishing empathy, and respecting the feelings and opinions of the students.

REFERENCES

- Agaoglu E 2005. Sınıf yönetimi ile ilgili genel olgular [General phenomena related To classroom management]. In: Zeki Kaya (Ed.): *Sınıf Yönetimi (Classroom Management)*. Ankara: Pegem A Publications.
- Aydin A 2000. *Sınıf Yönetimi [Classroom Management]*. Istanbul: Alfa Publications.
- Aydin H 2014. A comparative study between the United States and Turkey on teachers' lesson planning effort. *Review of Research and Social Intervention*, 46(1): 99-117.
- Celep C 2002. *Sınıf Yönetimi ve Disiplini*. Ankara: Ani Publications.
- Cüceloglu D 2002. *İletişim Donanımları [Communication Equipments]*. Istanbul: Remzi Publication House.
- Demirci EE 2002. *İletişim Becerileri Eğitiminin Merkez Eğitim Merkezi'ne Devam Eden Genç İşçilerin İletişim Becerilerini Değerlendirmelerine Etkisi [Impact of the Education of Communication Skills on the Communication Skills of the Young Workers Who Continues Education at Central Training Center]*. Graduate Thesis, Unpublished. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Dökmen Ü 1994. *Sanatta ve Günlük Yasamda İletişim Çatışmaları ve Empati [Communication Conflicts in Art and Daily Life]*. Istanbul: Sistem Publication.
- Eren E 2001. *Örgütsel Davranış ve Yönetim Psikolojisi [Organizational Conduct and Management Psychology]*. Istanbul: Beta Press Publication and Distribution Co., P. 368.
- Geddes DS 1993. Empowerment through communication: key people-to-people and organizational success. *People and Education*, 1(1): 76-105.
- Gordon T 1993. *Etkili Öğretmenlik Eğitimi [Education of Effective Teaching]*, E. Aksoy ve B.Özkan (Trans.). Istanbul: Yapa Publications.
- Gordon T 2005. *Etkili Anababa Eğitiminde Uygulamalar [Applications in Effective Parent Education]*, Emel Aksay (Trans.). Istanbul: Sistem Publication.
- Güçlü N 2003. *Sınıf Yönetimi*. Leyla Küçükahmet (Ed.): Ankara: Nobel Publications.
- Gürses Y. 2006. *Eğitim Örgütlerinde Yöneticilerin Etkili İletişim Kurma Becerilerinin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma [A Research on Designating the Skills of Administrators in Establishing Effective Communication]*, [Kütahya Central Town Sample]. Graduate Thesis, Published. Kütahya: Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Hall N, Quinn R 2014. Parental involvement at the high school level: Parents' perspectives. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 1(1): 13-21.
- İnceli O 2015. The perceptions of English teachers to the SIOP® Model and its impact on limited English proficiency. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 2(1): 615-628.
- Kaya D, Aydın H 2016. Elementary mathematics teachers' perceptions and lived experiences on mathematical communication. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 12(6): 1619-1629.

- Kısaç I 2002. *Öğretmen-Öğrenci İletişimi, Sınıf Yönetimi [Teacher-Students Communication, Classroom Management]*. Emin Karip (Ed.): Ankara: Pegem A Publications.
- Küçükahmet L 2002. *Öğretimi Planlama ve Değerlendirme [Planning and Assessing Teaching]*. Ankara: Nobel Publications.
- Nacino-Brown R, Oke FE, Brown DP 1982. *Curriculum and Instruction*, London and Basingstoke: The MacMillan Press Ltd.
- Sayers F, Bingamin CE, Graham R, Wheeler M 1993. *Yöneticilikte İletişim [Communication in Management]*. İstanbul: Rota Yayın Yapım Tanıtım Tic.Ltd. Sti, pp. 9-10.
- Tutar H, Yılmaz MK 2005. *Genel İletişim-Kavramlar ve Modeller [General Communication- Concepts and Models]*, Ankara: Seçkin Publications, 71.
- Yalın HI, 2003. *Öğretim Teknolojileri ve Materyal Geliştirme [Instructional Technologies and Material Development]*. Ankara: Nobel Publications.
- Yigit I. 2015. Survival tactics of waste paper pickers in Istanbul. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 2(1): 1-14.
- Yurtseven N, Altun S 2015. Intercultural sensitivity in today's global classes: Teacher candidates' perceptions. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 2(1): 49-54.