Examination of relationships between communication satisfaction and organizational identification of sport science students

Authors' contribution:
A) conception and design of the study
B) acquisition of data
C) analysis and interpretation of data
D) manuscript preparation
E) obtaining funding

Özden Tepeköylü Öztürk[1A-B-D] iD, Mümine Soytürk[2C-E] iD

[1]*Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey*
[2]*Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey*

Author's address: Özden Tepeköylü Öztürk, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Recreation Department, 20100 Kınıklı Campus, Denizli/Turkey, E-mail: otepekoylu@pau.edu.tr

Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine the predictor relationships between the satisfaction sport science students obtain from communication with lecturers and their organizational identification. Moreover, the study aims to determine whether there is a difference in both dependent variables in terms of gender, grade, whether they like their educational department, desire to change their department, establishment of out-of-class communication with lecturers, and being in active communication with lecturers in class. In this study, quantitative correlational techniques are used. Our sample comprised 252 ($\bar{x}$ age = 21.39 ± 2.16) sport science students (127 female; 125 male). The "Student Communication Satisfaction Scale" developed by Goodboy, Martin, and Bolkan (2009) and adapted to Turkish by Akın, Yalnız, and Kazaz (2015) was used as a data collection tool, as was the "Organizational Identification Scale" developed by Mael and Ashforth (1992) and adapted to Turkish by Tak and Aydemir (2004). Parametric data was analyzed using Pearson correlation analysis, simple linear regression analysis, 2 × 2 MANOVA, and two-way ANOVA. Nonparametric data was analyzed using the Kruskal-Wallis H statistical test technique. The results indicate a strong and positively oriented relationship between the communication satisfaction and organizational identification of sport science students. Moreover, it is seen that communication satisfaction is a crucial predictor of organizational identification. According to our data, females' communication satisfaction and identification levels are much higher than those of males. Students' like or dislike of the department where they receive an education and the quality and form of communication they have established with lecturers result in significant differences in both dependent variables.

Key words: Organizational communication, interpersonal communication, communication satisfaction, identification, undergraduate student

Introduction

Today, the human factor in each stage of the organizational structure exists as an element affecting and also affected by the organizational processes through psychology and social relations. Unlike classical and neo-classical theories in management, in organizations which modern approaches handle as an open system, different elements of the organization are assessed concerning their interaction with each other and the environment. With this

perspective, the human subsystem cannot be handled independently from the other factors of the organization. Therefore, individuals in organizations are accepted not only as a cost element but also as an element that must be improved just like other sources whose efficiency should be enhanced and whose success deeply influences the success of the organization (Yüksel, 2000). It can be said that unlike other structures within the organization, the achievement of the human factor as a cultural, social, and psychological being may be possible with the development and maintenance of certain positive feelings and thoughts towards the institution. Identification can also be regarded as one of these positive feelings. It is seen that different definitions have been made in the literature when the identification concept (TLA, 2019), which is described as an object's or individual's adoption of all features of a cluster or integration with it, is assessed organizationally. While Patchen (1970) generalizes it as a depiction including achievement, participation, and work cohesion (cited in Yıldız, 2013), Mael and Ashforth (1992) summarize it as an individual perceiving his institution's achievements and failures as if they were his own and perceiving himself as one with his institution. On the other hand, Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail (1994) summarize it as a cognitive bond involving the characteristics of perceived organizational identity being the same as ego. According to Riketta (2005), though there are different definitions regarding organizational identification, all definitions emphasize the members interiorizing the values of the organization cognitively, emotionally, or both, and feeling themselves to be part of the organization. In this sense, identification ensures an individual's participation in identification-oriented activities, as well as his satisfaction with these activities. This allows him to regard himself as a part of the organization, representing the group and getting into the act of consolidating the elements related to group formation such as integrity and interaction. It provides an opportunity for new organization members to fit into the organization, show their commitment, and internalize organizational values and beliefs (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). For individuals who identify their personal identity with their organization, actions they have performed are perceived to be more significant (Özdemir, 2013). Studies suggest that individuals who identify themselves with their institutions are more eager to move in the direction of organizational interests (Rousseau, 1998), and that their performance enhances these interests (Şantaş, Uğurluoğlu, Kandemir, & Çelik, 2016).

Individuals' organizational emotion, sense, and actions in each unit of universities, which are organizational structures, can be assessed as a crucial subject area for the realization of corporate objectives. When the processes of the universities focusing on the learner (Ortaş, 2005) are taken into account, the significance of the student-university relationship becomes non-negligible, particularly as the primary goal of these organizations is to ensure the qualified labor force of a country. In this sense, as the identification of students themselves with their universities enhances their academic achievement and their organizational commitment (Wilkins, Butt, Kratochvil, & Balakrishnan, 2016), it may suggested that they will act willingly to attain organizational objectives because the students who identify with the school have an internalized sense of belonging. It is indicated that they feel they are an important part of the school environment and school comprises an important part of their own experiences (Finn, 1989). Finn developed a model related to this situation and sequenced into four groups how students act as their identification with the school grows. Students at the first level acknowledge the need to go to school. They are ready for the tasks being a student brings, and they respond to teacher instructions. Second level students open a dialog with the teacher in the class. They are enthusiastic about staying at school after class, doing far more class work and homework than necessary. They join social activities with a scientific background. Students at the third level participate in intense academic studies besides extracurricular social and sportive activities. The fourth level implies the participation of students in the school administration. However, it is not an easy process for these aforementioned acts to strengthen the student-university relationship (Özdemir, 2013) and thus ensure identification with the school. This is because many factors exist within organizations that affect identification, such as meeting the needs of individuals (Hall, Schneider, & Nygren, 1970), perceived organizational support, job satisfaction (Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006), and communication processes (Smidts, Pruyn, & Van Riel, 2017). When approached from the standpoint of undergraduate students, communication processes enabling lecturer-student relationships can be assessed as one of them. This is because communication, which is shortly defined as "the process of knowledge, production, transferring and interpretation" (Dökmen, 2004), has significant functions such as realizing organizational objectives in organizations, managing formal and informal relationships, sharing social emotions and thoughts, and relaying information in education. It does not seem possible to realize organizational and educational objectives in educational institutions without communication. Research conducted on different groups also reveals that there are relationships between organizational identification and organizational communication (Yıldız, 2013; Smidts, Pruyn, & Van Riel, 2017). However, within this period, communication between individuals is not sufficient alone. What is also important is how this process is managed and how the people involved feel about it. For this reason, understanding the outcomes of communication, such as "satisfaction," is suggested as a precondition for forming a holistic explanation (Hecht, 1978b). Communication satisfaction is an emotional

response showing that communication objectives and expectations are realized successfully (Hecht, 1978a). While the individuals who are satisfied with their communication show healthier parameters psychologically, communication dissatisfaction may cause pathological results to arise (Gülnar, 2007) and individuals to have difficulty in their life experience (Hecht, 1978b). Accordingly, communication satisfaction is a socio-emotional outcome taking place as a result of interactions in the communication process (Tsai, Chuang, & Hsieh, 2009). Ensuring a sense of satisfaction in the communication between the lecturer and student in the educational environment is interpreted as an emotional state that teachers must deal with (Goodboy et al., 2009). It is argued that in educational literature, studies related to the teacher-student relationship give more emphasis to attitudes and affective learning and suggest that communication satisfaction in the teacher-student relationship is not necessarily part of the job (Spilt, Koomen, & Thijs, 2011), but is rather a secondary result of these studies (Goodboy et al., 2009). It is seen that studies examining both communication satisfaction and identification as well as two variables attitudinally have been conducted mostly on employees (Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Varona, 1996; Nakra, 2006; Çakınberk, Derin, & Demirel, 2011; Henderson, 2013; Derin & Tuna, 2017; Spilt, Koomen, & Thijs, 2011). For this reason, the current study aims to identify whether there is a relationship between organizational identification and satisfaction that students studying in the field of sport science have obtained from communication with lecturers, as well as whether or not communication satisfaction is a significant predictor of organizational identification. Moreover, the study aims to determine whether there is a difference in both dependent variables in terms of gender, grade, like or dislike of educational department, desire to change department, establishment of out-of-class communication with lecturers, and being in active communication with lecturers in class.

Hypotheses

H¹: Communication satisfaction is the significant predictor of organizational identification.

H²: There is a significant difference in communication satisfaction and organizational identification according to gender and class.

H³: There is a significant difference in communication satisfaction according to the factors of liking the department, desire to change department, and out-of-class communication with lecturers.

H⁴: There is a significant difference in organizational identification according to the factors of liking the department, desire to change department, and out-of-class communication with lecturers.

H⁵: There is a significant difference in communication satisfaction according to in-class communication.

H⁶: There is a significant difference in organizational identification according to in-class communication.

Methods

Research design and sample

This study is a predictive-relational study. The sample of the study is composed of a total of 252 ($\bar{x}$ age = 21.39 ± 2.16) sport science students, 127 female and 125 male. They were chosen using the convenient sampling method and were all willing to participate in the study.

Data collection tools

The data collection tools used in the study were the "Shortened Student Communication Satisfaction Scale" (SSCSS) developed by Goodboy, Martin, and Bolkan (2009) and adapted to Turkish by Akın, Yalnız, and Kazaz (2015); the "Organizational Identification Scale" (OIS) developed by Mael and Ashforth (1992) and adapted to Turkish by Tak and Aydemir (2004); and the "Personal Information Form" (PIF) developed by the researchers.

Shortened Student Communication Satisfaction Scale (SSCSS): The Communication Satisfaction Scale is a 5-point Likert-type scale composed of 8 items. There is no sub-dimension in the scale where there are also reverse items. High scores obtained from the scale suggest that communication satisfaction is high. When the validity and reliability of the scales are analyzed, one-dimensional modal in confirmatory factor analysis which is applied for construct validity is conferred as consistent (χ^2 = 51.11, df = 16, RMSEA = .084, IFI = .95, CFI = .95, NFI = .93, NNFI = .92, GFI = .96, SRMR = .056). The scale's total item correlation co-efficient is ranked between .26 and .63. Cronbach's alpha internal consistency reliability co-efficient is calculated as .75 (Akın, Yalnız, & Kazaz, 2015). Cronbach's alpha calculated as internal consistency co-efficient in this scope of research is designated as .72.

Organizational Identification Scale (OIS): The Organizational Identification Scale is a 5-point Likert-type scale that does not include reverse items. It is composed of 6 items and has no sub-dimension. A high score obtained from the scale indicates that the organizational identification is high.

It is suggested that the results (χ^2 (9) = 25**, χ^2/df = 2.77, GFI = 0.97, AGFI = 0.94, CFI = 0.96, RMSR = 0.037, RMSEA = 0.077) in confirmatory factor analysis applied to test construct validity also show that the competency of the scale for measuring the organizational identification variable is high. Cronbach's alpha internal consistency reliability co-efficient is calculated as .88 (Tak & Aydemir, 2004). In the reliability study applied in this scope of the research, Cronbach's alpha as internal consistency co-efficient is calculated as .90.

Personal Information Form (PIF): Data concerning the demographic information and independent variables of the participants of the study were collected through the "Personal Information Form" designed by the researchers.

Data collection

Data was gathered from students studying in the department of Physical Education and Sports Teaching, Coaching Teaching, Sports Management, and Recreation in the Faculty of Sport Sciences. To apply assessment tools, classes were visited, necessary explanations were made, and volunteer students were supported with filling in the forms.

Statistical analysis of data

The gathered data was evaluated through statistical test techniques such as frequency, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, Kruskal-Wallis H, Pearson, simple linear regression analysis, two-way ANOVA, and 2 × 2 MANOVA. Whether the data fulfill the prerequisites of parametric tests has been concluded by analyzing the skewness and kurtosis values (normal distribution of data) and Levene (the equality of variances) test results. After calculating the Mahalanobis distance of the data, multivariate normal distributions were interpreted. It is suggested that for SSCSS, the kurtosis value is .240 ± .15 and the skewness value is .050 ± .3, while for OIS the kurtosis value is .205 ± .15 and the skewness value is −.847 ± .30. By examining the scatter diagram, it can be concluded whether the correlation shows a linear relationship for correlation and regression analysis. In MANOVA analysis, Box's test was used to test the hypothesis that the covariance matrixes of the independent variables are equal within the groups. In the same analysis, Wilks' lambda test was used to test the difference in the means of dependent variables in accordance with the groups in independent variables. Cronbach's alpha internal consistency co-efficient was calculated to designate the scope of research reliability of the scales used in the study. Type 1 error is suggested as 5%.

Findings

As can be seen from Table 1, the point average of communication satisfaction (CS) of students participating in the study is $\bar{x}$ = 3.29 ± .65 and the point average of their organizational identification (OI) is $\bar{x}$ = 3.31 ± .96. Accordingly, it can be said that the communication satisfaction and organizational identification of sport science students are at the intermediate level.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics related to communication satisfaction and organizational identification of sport science students

Scale factor	n	$\bar{x}$	sd
Communication satisfaction	252	3.29	.65
Organizational identification	252	3.31	.96

When Table 2 is analyzed, it can be seen that there is a positively strong relationship between CS and OI. Accordingly, as the satisfaction the student gains from the lecturer-student communication increases, the student identifies himself more with the institution where he is studying.

Table 2. Pearson correlation analysis towards determining the relationship between the communication satisfaction and organizational identification

n = 252	Communication satisfaction
Organizational identification	.750**

** – $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed).

Table 3. Basic linear regression analysis results concerning the prediction of communication satisfaction with organizational identification

Variable	B	Standard error B	β	t	p
Fixed	−.322	.207		−1.558	.121
Communication satisfaction	1.103	.061	.750	17.936	.000
R = .750; R² = .563; Adjusted R² = .561					
F(1, 251) = 321.688; p = .000					

When Table 3 is analyzed, according to the results of regression analysis, communication satisfaction is a significant predictor of organizational identification ($R = .750$; $R^2 = .563$; $F(1, 251) = 321.688$; $p = .000$). Communication satisfaction explains 56% total variance in organizational identification.

Table 4. 2 × 2 MANOVA test ANOVA results towards analyzing differences in Communication Satisfaction (CS) and Organizational Identification (OI) scores in terms of gender and class

Source of variance	Dependent variable	SS	df	MS	F	p	ηp2
Gender	CS	3.015	1	3.015	7.641	.006	.030
	OI	14.490	1	14.490	17.253	.000	.066
Class	CS	2.274	3	.758	1.921	.127	.023
	OI	5.029	3	1.676	1.996	.115	.024
Gender × class	CS	6.821	3	2.274	5.762	.001	.066
	OI	9.034	3	3.011	3.585	.014	.042
Error	CS	96.282	244	.395			
	OI	204.932	244	.840			
Total	CS	2848.016	251				
	OI	3001.222	251				

When the analysis results (2 × 2 MANOVA) are assessed, the primary effects of gender × class interaction ($\lambda = .916$; $F = 3.621$; $p = .002$) and gender ($\lambda = .933$; $F = 8.671$; $p = .000$) are found to be significant in communication satisfaction and organizational identification, while the primary effect of the class variable is not found to be significant ($\lambda = .964$; $F = 1.488$; $p = .180$). The ANOVA test is applied to determine which independent variable in which dependent variable contributes to multivariate relevance.

Accordingly, meaningful differences are specified in CS and OI in terms of gender × class interaction. When confidence intervals are analyzed, it is seen that the communication satisfaction of 4th grade male students is lower than in the 2nd and 3rd grades. Moreover, it is suggested that the identification of 3rd and 4th grade female students is much higher than those in the 1st grade or males in the 3rd and 4th grades. When the primary effects of the gender variable on dependent variables are analyzed, it is found that both the communication satisfaction and organizational identification of female students are higher than the males'.

Table 5. Communication satisfaction two-way ANOVA results in terms of the factors of liking the department, desire to change department, and out-of-class communication with lecturers

Source of variance	SS	df	MS	F	p	ηp2
Liking the department	2.842	2	1.421	4.517	.012	.038
Desire to change department	.401	2	.201	.638	.529	.005
Out-of-class communication with lecturers	2.206	2	1.103	3.506	.032	.029
Error	72.675	231	.315			
Total	2848.016	252				

When Table 5 is analyzed, statistically significant differences are specified in students' communication satisfaction in terms of liking their department and out-of-class communication with lecturers, while a non-significant difference is found in terms of desire to change department. According to the results of follow-up tests, the CS of those who like their department and are indecisive is higher than those who do not like their department. In addition, the CS of those who like their department is higher than for those who do not like their department and are indecisive ($\bar{x}$ yes = 3.45; $\bar{x}$ indecisive = 3.11; $\bar{x}$ no = 2.72). Similarly, the CS of those who always or sometimes engage in out-of-class communication with lecturers is higher than for those who never do. Moreover, the CS of those who always engage in out-of-class communication is higher than for those who sometimes or never do ($\bar{x}$ always = 3.38; $\bar{x}$ sometimes = 3.11; $\bar{x}$ never = 2.99).

Table 6. Organizational identification two-way ANOVA results in terms of the factors of liking the department, desire to change department, and out-of-class communication with lecturers

Source of variance	SS	df	MS	F	p	ηp2
Liking the department	13.182	2	6.591	12.276	.000	.096
Desire to change department	1.177	2	.588	1.096	.336	.009
Out-of-class communication with lecturers	9.367	2	4.684	8.723	.000	.028
Error	124.027	231	.537			
Total	3001.222	252				

When Table 6 is analyzed, statistically significant differences are specified in students' organizational identification in terms of liking their department and out-of-class communication with lecturers, while no significant difference is found in terms of desire to change their department. According to the results of follow-up tests, the communication satisfaction of those who like their department and are indecisive is higher than for those who do not like their department. The OI of those who like their department is higher than for those who do not and are indecisive ($\bar{x}$ yes = 3.75; $\bar{x}$ indecisive = 2.91; $\bar{x}$ no = 2.33). Similarly, the OI of those who always or sometimes engage in out-of-class communication with lecturers is higher than for those who never do. Moreover, the OIS of those who always communicate with lecturers outside of class is higher than for those who sometimes or never do ($\bar{x}$ always = 3.54; $\bar{x}$ sometimes = 2.98; $\bar{x}$ never = 2.80).

Table 7 shows that there are significant differences in students' communication satisfaction in terms of active in-class communication with lecturers ($\chi2$ (df = 2, n = 252) = 41.354, p = .000). According to t test results with Bonferroni correction, those who argue that lecturers always engage in active communication have much higher communication satisfaction than those who say sometimes ($t226$ = 4.317, p = .000) and never ($t97$ = 6.105, p = .000), while those who argue that lecturers sometimes engage in active communication have much higher communication satisfaction than those who say never ($t175$ = 3.636, p = .000).

Table 7. Communication satisfaction Kruskal–Wallis H Test results in terms of in-class communication

Factor	Active communication	n	Mean rank	df	χ2	p
	Always	75	163.08	2	41.354	.000
Communication satisfaction	Sometimes	153	119.19			
	Never	24	58.77			

Table 8. Organizational identification Kruskal–Wallis H Test results in terms of in-class communication

Factor	Active communication	n	Mean rank	df	χ2	p
	Always	75	164.70	2	51.956	.000
Organizational identification	Sometimes	153	120.59			
	Never	24	44.79			

Table 8 illustrates that significant differences are found in students' organizational identification in terms of active in-class communication with lecturers ($\chi 2$ ($df = 2$, $n = 252$) = 51.956, $p = .000$). According to t test results with Bonferroni correction, those who argue that lecturers always engage in active communication have much higher communication satisfaction than those who say sometimes ($t226 = 4.446$, $p = .000$) and never ($t97 = 8.443$, $p = .000$), while those who say sometimes have much higher communication satisfaction than those who say never ($t175 = 5.762$, $p = .000$).

Discussion

The research findings indicate that the students of sport science have an intermediate perception of the satisfaction they have obtained from communication with lecturers and their identification with their faculties. Moreover, while specifying that there is a positively oriented strong relationship between CS and OI, it is determined that CS is a significant predictor of OI and explains 56% total variance in organizational identification. When the literature is reviewed, it is shown that few studies examining the relationship between these two variables are on the basis of employees in an organization, and no study analyzing organizational identification and satisfaction obtained from the lecturer-student communication process can be found. Studies analyzing the relationship between organizational behavior and communication constituted the theoretical framework of this study. However, the research results were discussed through studies conducted on different groups and/or through studies approaching other variables directly related to the variables in the scope of the research. In this context, in studies conducted on academicians (Derin & Tuna, 2017), teachers (Yıldız, 2013), and executives (Nakra, 2006), a relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational identification is indicated. Nakra (2006) suggests in his study that effective communication has a critical importance to identification. Moreover, it is seen that communication satisfaction is correlated with organizational commitment (Henderson, 2013; Varona, 1996) and belonging (Carriere & Bourque, 2009), besides organizational citizenship behavior (Kandlousi, Ali, & Abdollahi, 2010) expressing personal voluntary actions to attain organizational objectives (Lievens & Anseel, 2004, cited: Sezgin, 2005). If it is taken into account that individuals identify with organizations to satisfy their need to belong and to minimize uncertainty (Derin & Tuna, 2017), and that organizational commitment is a significant determinant of identification (Çakınberk, Derin, & Demirel, 2011), it can be suggested that the aforementioned research results show consistency with this current study. Smidts, Pruyn, and Van Riel (2017) also note that the communication climate in organizations affects identification. In the research conducted on academicians by Derin and Tuna (2017), communication satisfaction was proven to be a significant determinant of organizational identification.

When the genders and grades of our participants are analyzed interactively, it can be concluded that in male students the communication satisfaction of 4th graders is lower than that of lower divisions and generally lower than that of girls. Studies in the literature suggest that, in general, women's communication skills are at a better level than those of men, as they can more clearly express their thoughts, experiences, and anxieties and can build warmer relations (McDowell, 1993; Korkut, 1997; Görür, 2001; Tepeköylü, Soytürk, & Çamlıyer, 2009). For this reason, female students may have obtained more satisfaction than males in their communication process with lecturers. However, a new study to be conducted on the genders of lecturers may strengthen these gender-based explanations further. When findings concerning identification are analyzed, female students in the upper divisions are seen to identify more with their institutions than both female students in lower divisions and male students at the same class level. In the studies conducted on this subject, it is seen that organizational identification increases with duration of stay or length of service at an institution (Bamber & Iyer, 2002; Pepermans, Vloeberghs, & Perkisas, 2003). However, unlike this study, in the studies conducted with undergraduates, it is suggested that the upper divisions identify less with their institutions (Meydan & Polat, 2013). Intersexual differences can be connected with the expectations that the social and familial structure of Turkish society place on men and women. In Turkish society, a post-graduate male individual is expected to start working as soon as possible and to sustain his life; female individuals are treated with more tolerance and are not expected to start a new life unless they get married. Consequently, while this case leads male post-graduates to search for work, it may detract from their identification with the organization.

The study investigates whether undergraduates desire to change their department, if they like their department, if they have had out-of-class communication with lecturers, and whether there is active communication in the class. Accordingly, the presence or lack of desire to change departments did not make a difference in communication satisfaction and identification.

However, it is stated that the students who most identify with their institution and are most satisfied with lecturers' communication are those who like their department and can sufficiently communicate with lecturers outside of class.

No study has been found to analyze and discuss these findings in the literature. However, these findings can be assessed as an unexpected result. It is guessed that lecturers' communication with students in out-of-class contacts individually or in small groups may meet individual needs and expectations and may enable students to feel more secure. Individuals who are emotionally secure also succeed in communication (Cüceloğlu, 2006). Moreover, such contacts may provide an opportunity for private situations to be shared that could not otherwise be shared in class. In this case, it is more probable for students to feel more satisfied. While similar situations concerning identification come into question, on the basis of the findings of this research, when it is taken into consideration that communication satisfaction explains the change in identification at the rate of 56%, similar outcomes concerning both variables can be suggested as unexpected. According to another finding, the students of lecturers who communicate actively with their students in class have a better identification and communication satisfaction level. Communication is a dynamic process that takes place dually between the communication message sender and receiver (Cüceloğlu, 2006). A communication process that loses its dynamism and duality turns into informatics (one-way flow of information; Dökmen, 2004). Gaining satisfaction from such a process does not seem probable.

Conclusion and recommendations

In the communication process between the lecturer and the student, satisfaction obtained by the students significantly affects their identification with the institution where they receive their education. As their satisfaction increases, so does their identification with the institution. However, whether they like the department where they study and the quality of communication they have with lecturers are also significant factors. Therefore, lecturers need to help increase student motivations through positive communication processes both in and outside of the class.

According to the European Statistical Office (Eurostat) and Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2015 International Reports, Turkey has the highest school dropout rates in Europe among National Education level students (primary, secondary, and high school). While reviewing the literature concerning the subject, studies suggesting the relationship between the variables in the scope of this research (organizational identification and communication satisfaction) and commitment to school or decision to drop out of school were encountered. In this respect, this study may be replicated at National Education level schools and be efficient in revealing the reasons students drop out of school and provide information on taking the necessary measures to prevent this from occurring.

Authors' note:
This study was presented at the 15th International Sport Sciences Congress on November 15–18, 2016 in Antalya, Turkey.

References

Akın, A., Yalnız, A., & Kazaz, N. (2015). Turkish version of abbreviated student communıcatıon satisfaction scale: The study of validity and reliability. *Turkish Studies*, *10*(11), 17-24.

Ashforth, B.E & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*(1), 20-39.

Bamber, E.M. & Iyer, V. (2002). Big 5 auditors' professional and organizational identification auditing. *A Journal of Practice & Theory*, *21*(2), 21-38.

Çakınberk, A., Derin, N., & Demirel, E.T. (2011). Shaping of organizational identification by organizational commitment: Example of private education institutions in Malatya and Tunceli. *Journal of Business Research*, *3*(1), 89-121.

Carriere, J. & Bourque, C. (2009). The effects of organizational communication on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in a land ambulance service and the mediating role of communication satisfaction. *Career Development International*, *14*(1), 29-49.

Cüceloğlu, D. (2006). *Yeniden İnsan İnsana* (35th ed.). Istanbul, Turkey: Remzi Kitapevi.

Derin, N. & Tuna, H. (2017). The effect of communication satisfaction on organizational identification at academic organization. *Journal of Selcuk Communication*, *9*(4), 119-128.

Dökmen, Ü. (2004). *İletişim Çaltışmaları ve Empati* (23rd ed.). Istanbul, Turkey: Sistem Yayıncılık.

Dutton, J.E., Dukerich, J.M., & Harquail, C.V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *39*(2), 239-263.

Finn, J.D. (1989). Withdrawing from school. *Review of Educational Research*, *59*(2), 117-142.

Goodboy, A.K., Martin, M.M., & Bolkan, S. (2009). The development and validation of the student communication satisfaction scale. *Communication Education*, *58*(3), 372-396.

Görür, D. (2001). *A study of high school students' evaluations of their communication skills with respect to some variables*. Master's thesis, Çukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences, Adana, Turkey.

Gülnar, B. (2007). *Organizational communication and communication satisfaction as a means of job satisfaction for research assistants: A comparison between public and private universities*. Doctoral dissertation, Selçuk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Konya, Turkey.

Hall, D.T., Schneider, B., & Nygren, H.T. (1970). Personal factors in organizational identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *15*(2), 176-190.

Hecht, M.L. (1978a). The conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal communication satisfaction. *Human Communication Research*, *4*(3), 253-264.

Hecht, M.L. (1978b). Measures of communication satisfaction. *Human Communication Research*, *4*(4), 350-368.

Henderson, R.R. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior, communication, and the relationship to student achievement and school size. Northern Arizona University, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing: 3562135.

Kandlousi, N.S., Ali, A.J., & Abdollahi, A. (2010). Organizational behavior in concern of communication satisfaction: The role of the formal and informal communication. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *5*(10), 51-61.

Knippenberg, D.V. & Sleebos, A.E. (2006). Organizational identification versus organizational commitment: Self-definition, social exchange, and job attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *27*(5), 571-584.

Korkut, F. (1997). Evaluation of communication skills of university students. IV National Congress of Educational Sciences, Congress Book, Anadolu University, Eskişehirm, Turkey (pp. 208-218). Ankara, Turkey: Pegem Akademi.

Mael, F. & Ashforth, B.E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *13*(2), 103-123.

McDowell, E.E. (1993). An exploratory study of GTA's attitudes toward aspects of teaching and teaching style. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, November 18-21, 1993 in Miami Beach, FL. ERIC Number: ED370147.

Meydan, C.H. & Polat, M. (2013). The role of academic success and conscientiousness on identification with school as an organizational form. *Education and Science*, *38*(167), 27-40.

Nakra, R. (2006). Relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational identification: An empirical study. *The Journal of Business Perspective*, *10*(2), 41-51.

Ortaş, İ. (2005). Educational models should be questioned in the new education period of universities. *World of Medical Education*, 18, 6-9.

Özdemir, A. (2013). The relationship between the power sources of the lectures and the organizational identification of the prospective teachers: The mediator role of the intrinsic motivation. *Gazi University Journal of Gazi Educational Faculty*, *33*(2), 269-291.

Pepermans, R., Vloeberghs, D., & Perkisas, B. (2003). High potential identification policies: An empirical study among Belgian companies. *Journal of Management Development*, *22*(8), 660-678.

Riketta, M. (2005). Organizational identification: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *66*(2), 358-384.

Rousseau, D.M. (1998). Why workers still identify with organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *19*(3), 217-233.

Şantaş, F., Uğurluoğlu, Ö., Kandemir, A., & Çelik, Y. (2016). The investigation of the relationship between the level of organizational cynicism, job performance and organizational identification among health employees. *Gazi University, Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, *18*(3), 867-886.

Sezgin, F. (2005). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A conceptual analysis and some inferences for the schools. *Gazi University Journal of Gazi Educational Faculty*, *25*(1), 317-339.

Smidts, A., Pruyn, A.T.H., & Van Riel, B.M. (2017). The impact of employee communication and perceived external prestige on organizational identification. *Academy of Management Journal*, *44*(5), 1051-1062. https://doi.org/10.5465/3069448

Spilt, J.L., Koomen, H.M.Y., & Thijs, J.T. (2011). Teacher wellbeing: The importance of teacher-student relationships. *Educational Psychology Review*, *23*(4), 457-477.

Tak, B. & Aydemir, B.A. (2004). Two empirical works on organizational identification. In the 12th National Management and Organization Congress, Congress Book, May 27-29, 2004 (pp. 59-63). Bursa, Turkey. ISBN: 9789756958926

Tepeköylü, Ö., Soytürk, M., & Çamlıyer, H. (2009). Investigation of communication skill perceptions of students in School of Physical Education and Sports in terms of some variables. *Ankara Spormetre Journal of Physical Education and Sports Sciences*, *7*(3), 115-124.

TLA (Turkish Language Association). (2019). Retrieved on January 12, 2019, from https://sozluk.gov.tr/?kelime=%C3%96ZDE%C5%9ELE%C5%9EME

Tsai, M., Chuang, S., & Hsieh, W. (2009). An integrated process model of communication satisfaction and organizational outcomes. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *37*(6), 825-834.

Varona, F. (1996). Relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment in three Guatemalan organizations. *The Journal of Business Communication*, *33*(2), 111-140.

Wilkins, S., Butt, M.M., Kratochvil, D., & Balakrishnan, M.S. (2016). The effects of social identification and organizational identification on student commitment, achievement and satisfaction in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, *41*(12), 2232-2252.

Yıldız, K. (2013). Analysis of the relation of teachers' organizational identification and organizational communication. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, *13*(1), 264-272.

Yüksel, Ö. (2000). *İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi*. Ankara, Turkey: Gazi Kitabevi.