

Investigation of communication skills perceived by students from instructors

Serkan Hacicaferoglu^{ABCDE}

Department of Physical Education and Sports, Istanbul Technical University, Turkey

Authors' Contribution: A – Study design; B – Data collection; C – Statistical analysis; D – Manuscript Preparation; E – Funds Collection.

Abstract

Background and Study Aim The aim of this research is to examine the communication skills of the students studying at the faculties of sports sciences, as perceived by the instructors.

Material and Methods The study was conducted using general survey model. The sample group of the study is consisted of a total of 714 randomly selected voluntary students, including 423 males and 291 females, who study at Faculty of Sports Sciences. The Communication Skills Evaluation Scale, was used as the data collection tool in the study. In the analysis of the data, t-test and one-way variance analysis and Tukey test analysis were used.

Results According to the variables of the high school they graduated from, the department they studied and the grade level, it was determined that the communication skills they perceived from the instructors were at a moderate level. In addition, it was determined that the perceived communication level of male students studying in the coaching department was higher than that of male students studying in the teaching department.

Conclusions Male and female students of sports sciences in the learning process should have effective communication skills in order to be prepared for their sociality and professional life. The acquisition of this skill largely depends on the efforts of the instructors in their courses and extracurricular activities during the undergraduate period. In this context, the instructors who attend the courses should be competent in their own branches, as well as being able to communicate positively and effectively with male and female students.

Keywords: prelector, student, gender, communication, communication skills.

Introduction

Keeping strong interpersonal relationships is important in terms of meeting many needs of individuals in their life processes [1, 2, 3, 4]. According to Tubbs and Moss, interpersonal communication is defined as being face-to-face (being in a certain closeness), exchanging messages and messages being verbal and non-verbal messages with or without purpose [5].

Throughout their lives, individuals are in contact with other individuals for social reasons [6, 7]. Communication plays an important role for people in learning the rules of a society, playing their roles based on such rules, and thus becoming socialized [8]. It is also stated that communication is an important key in increasing the satisfaction of a person in the social environment [9, 10]. Otherwise, it is known that the failure of the individual to communicate with their surroundings will lead them to loneliness, and this will cause some psychological disturbances [11].

Another purpose of communication is to send understandable messages and ensure that attitudes and behaviors of others are changed [12]. The concept of communication refers to a

process of transfer from a sender to his/her goal. In order for a communication to be possible, there must be a common thought between the source and the recipient, and the information or the message must pass from one person to another [13, 14, 15]. Messages that are conveyed through communication skills have healthy and remedial effects on people and are one of the most powerful means of understanding others and helping them [16]. Through communication, people also find the opportunity to reveal, share and evaluate the concepts and ideas in their minds [17]. Actually, communication helps people learn how to establish a relationship with individuals and groups who have different roles, beliefs, attitudes, values and behaviors [18]. Effective communication skills play a facilitating role in human relations. When communication is solid and satisfactory, individuals deal with the problems they have experienced throughout their lives. If their communication is not healthy, they may encounter negative situations such as not being understood and not being able to meet their needs [19, 20]. This causes individuals to become successful or unsuccessful in their relationships with other individuals.

The communication process first begins with the family and becomes even richer with the beginning

of the education life of the individual [21]. When the educational environment is considered, it is seen that one of the basic elements of the communication process is the teacher. The effect of teachers on the development of human communication is rather high [20, 22]. People are required to be equipped with effective communication skills during their education for success in their future lives [23]. Communication in a classroom environment must be made by the instructor in order to share behaviors about a subject with the students and make sure that students acquire certain behaviors [24]. In this context, teachers must have effective communication skills [20, 25, 26]. In this context, one of the important factors that increases the influence of the teacher on the student is the ability to communicate well. It is stated that the teacher's healthy communication with the student is necessary for the desired behavioral changes of the students as well as the high academic achievement [3, 4, 27]. Individuals with developed communication skills can deal with the problems better in their lives, develop satisfying relationships and become more successful in their professional careers [28, 29].

The aim of this research is to determine the instructors' communication skill levels perceived by Turkey sports science students studying in the according to their gender, in terms of some variables.

Materials and Methods

Participants.

Population of the research consisted of Sports Sciences Faculties at the universities in the Eastern Anatolian region of Turkey in the 2020/2021 academic year, the sample. The sample of the study consists of 423 male and 291 female, selected by simple random sampling method among students studying in different departments of Sports Sciences Faculties.

Research Design.

The general survey model, which is one of the descriptive survey methods, was used in the study. The Communication Skills Evaluation Scale, which was developed by Karagoz and Kosterelioglu, was used to collect data required in the study [29]. In this study, the reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be .769. The scale sports various communication skill levels as: all of them, most

of them, some of them, a few, and none, aims to determine it in a five item Likert scale. The high scores on the scale indicate that the communication status is positive.

Statistical Analysis.

Answers that were given by participating students to the scale items based on demographical variables were measured using a statistical software package. Shapiro-Wilk test ($p > .224$) was used for the convenience of the data in the analysis of the data. Due to the normal distribution of the data, besides the descriptive analysis, t-test for pairwise comparisons and Cohen's d-data for effect size were used [30]. A one-way ANOVA test was used to compare three or more groups, and the eta-square (η^2) test was applied since we have only one dependent variable in effect size [31]. In the study, the level of significance was accepted as Alpha (α) and the error level as $p < .05$.

Results

In this section, the data obtained from the students studying in different departments of the sports science faculties in the sample and the statistical findings related to these data are given.

It was determined that the level of communication skills perceived by the instructors of the students participating in the research was moderate in both groups. It was determined that there was a statistically significant difference and the effect level was weak ($p < .05$; $d = .015$) (table 1). Therefore, it can be suggested that communication perception of male and female students from their instructors is equal to each other.

It was determined that there was no statistically significant difference in the perceived communication behaviors of male and female students according to the variable of high school they graduated from ($p > .05$) (table 2).

It was determined that there was a statistically significant difference between the perceived communication behaviors of male students according to the variable of the department they studied, and the effect level was small ($p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .018$) (table 3). As a result of the Tukey test, it can be said that the communication level perceptions of male students studying in the coaching department are higher than the male students studying in the teaching department. On the other hand, it was determined

Table 1. According to the gender variable, the levels of communication behaviors perceived by the students from the instructors.

	Gender	N	Mean	Ss	SD	t	p<.05	Cohen's d
Communication Behaviors	Male	423	3.05	.46	.712	1.107	.042	.015
	Female	291	2.98	.44				

Table 2. According to the gender variable, the levels of the communication behaviors perceived by the students from the instructors according to the high school they graduated from.

Gender	Schools Graduated	N	Mean	Ss	SD	t	p>.05	Cohen's d
Male	Sports High School	57	3.06	.47	421	-1.057	.291	.015
	Other High Schools	366	2.99	.45				
Female	Sports High School	55	2.99	.49	289	-1.102	.271	.015
	Other High Schools	236	2.92	.43				

Table 3. Descriptive findings related to the communication behaviors perceived by the students from their teachers according to the variable of the department they studied.

	Department	N	Mean	Ss	Source of variance	Sum of Squares	SD	Mean Square	F	p<.05	η^2
Male	a) Teaching	170	2.97	.47	Between Groups	1.692	2	.846	4.052	.018	.018
	b) Coaching	178	3.09	.45	Within Groups	87.705	420	.209	Tukey b-a		
	c) Management	75	3.12	.40	Total	89.397	422				
a) Teaching	136	2.93	.42	Between Groups	.605	2	.302	1.507			
Female	b) Coaching	88	3.04	.48	Within Groups	57.803	288	.201			
	c) Management	67	2.99	.43	Total	58.408	290				

Table 4. Descriptive findings regarding the communication behaviors that students perceived from the instructors according to the variable of grade level in which they studied.

	Class	N	Mean	Ss	Source of variance	Sum of Squares	SD	Mean Square	F	p<.05	η^2
Male	a) 1 Class	85	3.22	.49	Between Groups	4.544	3	1.515	7.48	.000	.050
	b) 2 Class	245	3.04	.41	Within Groups	84.852	419	.203			
	c) 3 Class	61	2.91	.49	Total	89.397	422				
	d) 4 Class	32	2.88	.52				Tukey a-b, c, d			
Female	a) 1 Class	76	3.08	.46	Between Groups	2.443	3	.814	4.176	.006	.041
	b) 2 Class	130	3.00	.46	Within Groups	55.965	287	.195			
	c) 3 Class	52	2.90	.40	Total	58.408	290				
	d) 4 Class	33	2.78	.35				Tukey a-b, d			

that there was no statistically significant difference in the communication behaviors of the instructors perceived by the female students ($p>.05$).

There was a statistically significant difference between male ($p<.05$, $\eta^2=.050$) and female ($p<.05$, $\eta^2=.041$) student groups depending on the variable of grade level in which they study in the instructors' communication (table 4). In addition, the effect size was found to be close to medium level compared to sports science students. In the Tukey test, it can be said that first-year students in male and female student groups have a higher perception of communication than students in other grade levels.

As a result, it was determined that the communication average of the students studying

in the faculties of sports sciences in the sample was higher than the gender groups. The communication skill levels perceived by the instructors in terms of the school, department and grade levels of the students are at a medium level with scores close to each other. It was determined that male students studying in the coaching department felt more communication from the instructors than the male students studying in the teaching department. It was determined that male and female students studying in the first grade felt more communication with the instructors. In addition, it was found that while there was a significant difference in favor of male students in terms of the department in which

they studied, there was no significant difference for female students.

Discussion

The aim of this research is to examine the perceived communication skill levels of university students studying in different departments of Sports Sciences Faculties in terms of some variables according to their gender. Perceived communication skill levels were close to each other according to gender groups and there was a statistically significant difference (Table 1). In this case, it can be said that the instructors behave in a way towards all their students without discriminating between men and women. It can be said that the teaching staff can be more effective in the information they will convey to the students thanks to their verbal and direct visual communication towards all students from different cultures [32].

It was determined that the communication behaviors perception scores of the students who graduated from sports high schools and other high schools were close to each other according to the variable of gender. In addition, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference (Table 2). In this case, it can be said that the students who graduated from sports high school and other high schools are similar to each other in terms of communication with instructors and are at middle level. When the studies conducted on this subject are reviewed, it is observed that the participants' perceptions of communication behaviors are at the medium level or below the medium level [33, 34]. On the other hand, there are also research results which show that communication skill levels are a bit higher than the average [13, 14, 15, 35]. In another study on the subject, it is stated that female participants have a higher communication skill level than male participants [26]. Koser and Barut state that male participants have higher communication skill levels than female participants [33]. It is expected that the individuals involved in sports will be more involved in the field of sports due to their being in different social environments, influencing the masses with their behaviors and increasing their communication skills [36]. In this context, it can be stated that students studying at sports high schools should perceive a higher level of communication than the instructors.

In the study, it was determined that there was a statistically significant difference in the communication behaviors of male students from their teachers, according to the variable of the department they studied. It was determined that there was no significant difference in female students (Table 3). As a result of the Tukey test for male students, it can be said that male students studying in the coaching department have higher communication skills than male students studying

in the teaching department. This situation can be interpreted as the fact that male students receiving coaching training generally receive practical training with instructors in their course curriculum. It can be said that the students have high communication with their coaches in the activities they do in the sports clubs within the school [37]. Positive harmony and communication between the coach and the parents can be achieved by the athletes to be higher and more successful in sports activities [38]. If the level of communication is high not only between athletes and coaches but also among coaches, managers and health workers, the risk of injury to student athletes can be minimized [39]. Multi-level injuries can be prevented thanks to open communication. In addition, the concept of communication is important in increasing and developing trust, respect, commitment and friendships within the scope of organizational team sports of athletes and / or participants in sports organizations [40]. In this respect, it can be said that it is important for the students of the coaching department to take part in such sports organizations academically in the development of their communication skills [41]. Teachers, teacher candidates, and coaches must be conscious of the fact that they should possess effective communication skills [25] and they are in the position of communicating with their pupils irrespective of their field [42]. From a different point of view, when education is considered as a communication activity, it would be a right approach to gain this gain to students before they start their careers [43]. Instructors who will give these gains should have personal skills such as communication skills as well as subject knowledge [26, 44]. It should have a clear and understandable tone of voice and be able to raise and lower its voice when necessary [45].

In addition, the instructors' being in interaction with their students will make it easy for them to acquire the terminal behaviors in the education processes and adapt themselves to their career. In the literature, it is observed in some studies that communication skill levels perceived by participants are positively at a high level based on their departments [46, 47]. In their studies, Kilcigil et al., state that the perceived level of communication skills of participants is at a lower level according to their departments [48]. Furthermore, some studies in the literature indicate that there is a statistically significant difference in perceived communication behaviors of students with respect to their departments [25, 35], while others have found no significant difference in this aspect [49, 50].

It was found that there was a statistically significant difference in communication behaviors perceived by male and female students in the sample group from instructors based on the variable of their grade levels. As a result of the Tukey test, it can be

said that male and female students studying in the first and second grades feel communication with the instructors who have higher scores than the students studying in other grades (Table 4). In this case, it can be said that male and female students, especially in first grades, are more distant from future anxiety and communicate more with the instructors without any hesitation about passing grades and courses. Supporting the communication between sports and private fields by instructors and coaches in planning and developing the careers of female and male students is important for the success of the sports and education triangle [51]. Some studies suggest that many instructors in the universities do not pay attention to psychological and sociological characteristics of students and thus experience many problems [52, 53]. In their studies, Ocak and Ersen, Saracaloglu et al., state that perceived communication skills of first-grade students are higher than those in upper grades [25, 42]. In the some studies have found that there is a statistically significant difference between communication skills and grade levels of participants [49, 54]. On the other hand, some studies have concluded that there are no statistically significant differences between the variables of communication skills and grades [55, 56].

Conclusions

Male and female students of sports sciences in the learning process should have effective communication skills in order to be prepared for their sociality and professional life. The acquisition of this skill largely depends on the efforts of the instructors in their courses and extracurricular activities during the undergraduate period. In this context, the instructors who attend the courses should be competent in their own branches, as well as being able to communicate positively and effectively with male and female students. It is also known that effective communication seminars can be given within the institution for instructors in order to increase their communication skills towards students to higher levels. Taking into account the perceptions of female and male students, courses aimed at improving communication skills can be included in the curriculum of the departments. By organizing congresses, symposiums and conferences for students about effective communication, awareness on this subject can be increased.

Conflict of interest

The author have no conflicts of interest to declare.

References

1. Fisher AB. *Interpersonal communication*. New York: Random House, Inc.; 1987.
2. Koc K, Gozler A. Examination of Relationship between Self-Respect Levels and Success Tendencies of Sports Sciences Faculty Students. *International Journal of Applied Exercise Physiology*. 2019;8(4): 78–87.
3. Tsigilis N, Karamane E, Gregoriadis A. Examination of Student-Teacher Interpersonal Relationships Circumplex Model in the Greek Educational Context. *Psychological Reports*. : 00332941211061078. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941211061078>
4. van der Lans RM, Cremers J, Klugkist I, Zwart R. Teachers' interpersonal relationships and instructional expertise: How are they related? *Studies in Educational Evaluation*. 2020;66: 100902. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100902>
5. Tubbs SL, Moss S. *Human communication*. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.; 1991.
6. Cuceoglu D. *Human and Behavior*. Istanbul: Remzi Bookstore; 2000.
7. Philippe RA, Schiavio A, Biasutti M. Adaptation and destabilization of interpersonal relationships in sport and music during the Covid-19 lockdown. *Heliyon*. 2020;6(10): e05212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e05212>
8. Gurgen H. *Quality of communication in organizations*. Istanbul: Der Publishing; 1997.
9. Greenockle KM. *The New Face in Leadership: Emotional Intelligence*. *Quest*. 2010;62(3): 260–267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2010.10483647>
10. Ryu H, Lee JY, Choi A, Park S, Kim DJ, Choi JS. The Relationship between Impulsivity and Internet Gaming Disorder in Young Adults: Mediating Effects of Interpersonal Relationships and Depression. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2018;15(3): 458. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15030458>
11. Jones WH, Freeman J, Goswick RA. The persistence of loneliness: Self and other determinant. *Journal of Personality*, 1981; 49(1): 27–48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1981.tb00844.x>
12. Tutar H, Yilmaz MK, Erdonmez C. *General and technical communication*. Ankara: Nobel Publishing; 2003.
13. Yanik M. Effects of the kinds of sports and some variables on the communication skills level of students in physical education and sports. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 2015; 12(2): 1366–1376. <https://doi.org/10.14687/ijhs.v12i2.3368>
14. Kataoka H, Iwase T, Ogawa H, Mahmood S, Sato M, DeSantis J, et al. Can communication skills training improve empathy? A six-year longitudinal study of medical students in Japan. *Medical Teacher*. 2019;41(2): 195–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2018.1460657>
15. Bullington J, Soderlund M, Sparen EB, Kneck A, Omerov P, Cronqvist A. Communication skills in nursing: A phenomenologically-based communication training approach.

- Nurse Education in Practice. 2019;39: 136–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2019.08.011>
16. Ozdemir GA, Kaya H. Midwifery and nursing students' communication skills and life orientation: Correlation with stress coping approaches. *Nursing and Midwifery Studies*, 2013; 2(2): 198–205. <https://doi.org/10.5812/nms.10281>
 17. Caliskan N. *The evaluation of nonverbal communicative behaviors of classroom teachers*. [PhD Thesis], Erzurum: Ataturk University; 2003.
 18. Simsek S, Akgemci T, Celik A. *Introduction to behavioral sciences and behaviors in organizations*. Ankara: Nobel Publishing; 2003.
 19. Korkut F. Developing a communication skills scale: Validity and reliability studies. *Journal of Psychological Counseling and Guidance*, 1996; 2(7): 18–23.
 20. Toksoy SE, Cerit C, Aker AT, Zvelc G. Relational Needs Satisfaction Scale: reliability and validity study in Turkish. *Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi-Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry*. 2020;21: 37–44. <https://doi.org/10.5455/apd.115143>
 21. Sarigoz O. An analytical study on views of teacher candidates about cooperative learning approach. *Journal of International Social Research*, 2017; 10(49): 491–497. <https://doi.org/10.17719/jisr.2017.1601>
 22. Cetinkaya Z. Identifying Turkish language pre-service teachers' views related to communication skills. *Kastamonu University Journal of Education*, 2011; 19(2): 567–576.
 23. Sarigoz O. Opinions on culturally responsive education. *The Journal of International Education Science*, 2021; 8(29): 19–30. <https://doi.org/10.29228/INESJOURNAL.54181>
 24. Bangir G, Senemoglu N. Teacher and student behaviors which improve or obstruct classroom communication. *4th national congress on educational sciences (congress book)*. Eskisehir: Anadolu University Education Faculty Press; 1999.
 25. Ocak G, Ersen BZ. Examination of perceptions of preservice teachers on communication skills. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Education Faculty*, 2015; 33: 1–19.
 26. Dushkin AS, Goncharova NA, Konopleva IN, Kostina LN, Kovalchuk IA. The Peculiarities of Tutors' Professional Competences and Interpersonal Relationships between Tutors and Interns in the System of the Ministry of the Interior of Russia. *Psychology and Law*. 2022;12(1): 54–66. <https://doi.org/10.17759/psylaw.2022120105>
 27. Aspy D, Roebuck R. *Kids don't learn from people they don't like*. Amherst, MA: Human Resource Resources Development Press; 1977.
 28. Yilmaz G, Cimen Z. The communication skill levels of physical education and sport teacher candidates. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, 2008; 10(3): 3–14.
 29. Karagoz Y, Kosterelioglu I. Developing evaluation scale of communication skills with factor analysis. *Dumlupinar Universitesi Journal of Social Sciences*, 2008; 21: 81–97.
 30. Cohen J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, Hillsdale; 1988.
 31. Lakens D. Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: A practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs. *Front Psychol*, 2013; 26(4): 863. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00863>
 32. Seo WJ, Sung Y, Park SH. Cultural preferences for visual and verbal communication styles in sport advertisements. *South African Journal for Research in Sport Physical Education and Recreation*, 2017; 39(2): 199–215.
 33. Koser EI, Barut Y. Study of communication skills, problem solving skills and involvement styles on university student. *International Journal of Society Researches*, 2020; 15(23): 1766–1782. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.622867>
 34. Ozbey O, Dogan D, Ozbey B. Coaches who work in sports training centers evaluation of communication skills. *Gaziantep University Journal of Sport Sciences*, 2020; 5(2): 93–104. <https://doi.org/10.31680/gaunjss.733267>
 35. Karabulak A. A study on tourism guidance students' communication skills: the case of Afyon Kocatepe University. *Journal of Tour Guiding*, 2019; 2(1): 18–30. <https://doi.org/10.12691/ajssm-4-2-3>
 36. Hacioglu M. The determination of body image and communication skills of university students. *Gaziantep Universitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2017; 2(2): 1–16.
 37. Connell G, Spencer K. A player effectiveness analysis system in elite football using an action design research framework. *South African Journal for Research in Sport Physical Education and Recreation*, 2020; 42(3): 73–90.
 38. Wall JM, Baugh LM, Pradhan K, Beauchamp MR, Marshall SK, Young RA. The coach-parent relationship in Canadian competitive figure skating: An interpretive description. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 2019; 45: 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2019.101577>
 39. Ekstrand J, Lundqvist D, Davison M, D'Hooghe M, Pensgaard AM. Communication quality between the medical team and the head coach/manager is associated with injury burden and player availability in elite football Clubs. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2019; 53(5): 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2018-099411>
 40. Joubert YT, De Beer JJ. Benefits of team sport for organizations. *South African Journal for Research in Sport Physical Education and Recreation*, 2011; 33(3): 59–72.
 41. Fang ESY, Kim C. Construction of sports business professional competence cultivation indicators in Asian higher education. *South African Journal for Research in Sport Physical Education and Recreation*, 2014; 36(1): 49–65.
 42. Saracaloglu SA, Yenice N, Karasakaloglu N. The relationship between communication and problem-solving skills and reading interest and habits of candidate teachers. *Yuzuncu Yil University Journal of Education Faculty*, 2009; 6(2): 187–206.

43. Dilekmen M, Basci Z, Bektas F. Educational faculty students' communication skills. *Ataturk University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 2008; 12(2): 223–231.
44. Yilmaz M, Ustun A, Odaci H. Communication skills levels of preschool teacher candidates according to some variables. *Giresun University the Black Sea Journal of Social Sciences*, 2009; 1(1): 8–19.
45. Yildiz DC, Yavuz M. Study of developing effective speech scale. *International periodical for the languages. Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 2012; 7(2): 319–334. <https://doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.3279>
46. Uygun K, Arikan A. Determination of the social studies teacher candidate's communication skills. *International Journal of Turkish Literature Culture Education*, 2019; 8(4): 2256–2281. <https://doi.org/10.7884/teke.4487>
47. Yildiz Y, Kurtuldu K. Examination of communication skills of music teacher candidates. Karadeniz Technical University example. *Route Educational and Social Science Journal*, 2016; 3(3): 208–217. <https://doi.org/10.17121/ressjournal.530>
48. Kilcigil E, Bilir P, Ozdinc O, Eroglu E, Eroglu B. Evaluation of communication skills of students of school of physical education and sports of two different universities. *Spormetre Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, 2009; 7(1): 19–28. https://doi.org/10.1501/Sporm_0000000145
49. Tepekoylu O, SoyTURK M, Camliyer H. Examining the levels of perception of communication skills in physical education and sports college (PESC) students in terms of pre-determined variables. *Spormetre Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, 2009; 7(3): 115–124. https://doi.org/10.1501/Sporm_0000000160
50. Ozturk H. Attitudes of students studying in coaching and sport management department towards playing games involving physical activity. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 2016; 15(2): 717–728. <https://doi.org/10.21547/jss.256720>
51. Henriksen K, Storm LK, Kuettel A, Linner L, Stambulova N. A holistic ecological approach to sport and study: The case of an athlete friendly university in Denmark. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 2020; 47: 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2019.101637>
52. Ergun M. Improvement on teaching efficiency in universities. *Reflections on Education IV– National Symposium on Turkish National Education Body in 2000. (Symposium Book)*, Ankara: Tekisik Publishing; 2001.
53. Guven I. Teachers' Changing roles in the changing age. *Reflections on Education IV– National Symposium on Turkish National Education Body in 2000. (Symposium Book)*, Ankara: Tekisik Publishing; 2001.
54. Ekici S, Hacicaferoglu B, Caliskan K. Investigation of organizational commitment and organizational cynicism levels of managers working in sports organizations affiliated to the Ministry of Youth and Sports. *Celal Bayar University Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, 2017; 12(2): 40–57.
55. Hacicaferoglu B, Gunel I, Duyan M. Effects of organizational stress management on job performance: an application on sports organizations. *European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science*, 2018; 4(10):93–111. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1414166>
56. Hacicaferoglu S, Bakirci O. Investigation of Effective Communication Levels of Athlete Students; Football Sport Example. *Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research*, 2019; 6(44), 3353–3360. <https://doi.org/10.26450/jshsr.1550>

Information about the author:

Serkan Hacicaferoglu; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8301-304X>; hacicaferoglus@itu.edu.tr; Department of Physical Education and Sports, Istanbul Technical University; Istanbul, Turkey.

Cite this article as:

Hacicaferoglu S. Investigation of communication skills perceived by students from instructors. *Physical Education of Students*, 2022; 26(4):173–179. <https://doi.org/10.15561/20755279.2022.0402>

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en>

Received: 17.06.2022

Accepted: 01.08.2022; **Published:** 30.08.2022