ZAC Conference Series: Social Sciences and Humanities
(ZACCS: SSH)
https://conf.zenithacademic.co.uk/index.php/zacsssh
ISSN (Print): 3049-7760 ISSN (Online): 3049-7779
3rd International Humanitarian Conference, Baghdad 2024
Volume 001, Issue 01, 2024, pp. 001-145
https://doi.org/10.70516/zaccsssh.v1i1.33

An Analytical Study of Administrative Communication Means Related to Organizational Performance Quality among Secondary School Principals in Al-Karkh, Baghdad

Waad Abdul Raheem Farhan [1, a)] and Mohammed Mahmood Salih [2, b)]

[1] Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Al Hekma University College, Baghdad, Iraq.

[2] General Directorate of Education, Baghdad Al Karkh II, Baghdad, Iraq

[a)] Corresponding author: Waad.farhan@hiuc.edu.iq

[b)] M44amed.9@gmail.com

Abstract. Community understanding requires the exchange of understanding and understanding on the subject of reaching the goal, and this requires both parties of communication who achieve a common understanding, especially in administrative work, which is an essential function in creating a common understanding among workers in programming the work to be implemented. Therefore, the study aimed to study the reality of administrative communications related to the quality of institutional performance. Administrators of some faculties and departments of physical education and sports sciences have chosen, and in order to do this, the descriptive approach was chosen using a survey method as a way to solve the problem and the use of a random sample of secondary school principals in Baghdad Al-Karkh, numbering (532) principals, in addition to the use of several methods and tests that contributed to the implementation of the research procedures, including the use of scale. The quality of institutional performance and means of communication. After conducting statistical treatments and analyzing and discussing the results, several conclusions were reached, including that there is a deficiency in institutional performance, especially in the field of available relationships and human capital. As for the recommendations, the most important of them was to conduct a review in the use of communications related to the technological aspect of implementing community service.

Keywords: : means of communication and quality of institutional performance

INTRODUCTION

Communication is among life's necessities; indeed, the first behavior humans engage in at the beginning of their lives is communication to express their needs. Ideas, opinions, and proposals have no existence in reality unless conveyed to others through communication. Therefore, communication is a social phenomenon that transforms a static group into a dynamic and interactive one. This holds true for secondary school principals as well, where it serves as the driving force behind all their systems: motivations, leadership, decision-making, planning, coordination, and control, all lacking value without effective implementation through communication. The most effective means of communication within institutional frameworks is face-to-face interaction, known for its speed, persuasiveness, and precision in delivery. Additionally, school administrators may use telephones due to the nature of their tasks requiring rapid responses. This does not negate the use of written messages; a principal might write a memorandum on a small piece of paper instructing subordinates to execute tasks.

Typically, communications take a hierarchical form, either downward or upward, in accordance with the organizational structure of the school. Despite the essential communicative tasks they perform, school administrations rarely focus on communication patterns within them. They should recognize the significance of communication for human life, their lives, and their interaction with society. Without effective communication, even excellent strategies and wise plans cannot succeed. Thus, administrators consistently emphasize effective communication and its skills as integral elements of the administrative process. The importance of this study lies in the fact that administrative communications in secondary schools possess a distinct nature due to their prevalence within Iraqi educational institutions. Administrative communication plays a crucial and vital role in the operation of educational institutions in general and secondary schools in particular. The effectiveness of administrative processes therein depends on the efficacy and efficiency of various communication channels linking different internal administrative units. Hence, this study seeks to explore the relationship between administrative communication means and organizational performance quality among secondary school principals in Al-Karkh, Baghdad. The research aims to build and apply a scale for assessing the relationship between administrative communication means and organizational performance quality, and to understand this relationship from the perspective of stakeholders within the student activities departments at Iraqi universities.

Methodology and Tools:

The researchers employed a descriptive approach with a correlational and analytical method, considered the most suitable methodology for achieving the study objectives and aligning with the nature of the research problem. The research population consisted of secondary, preparatory, intermediate, vocational preparatory institutes, teacher institutes, and private secondary schools, totaling 539 principals for the academic year (2015-2016), as indicated in Table (1).

Table (1): Distribution of the Research Sample

Num	Sample	Sample size	Percentile
1	**Construction Sample**	**239**	**44.34%**
2	**Survey Sample**	**34**	**6.18%**
3	**Excluded Sample**	**6**	**1.09%**
4	**Application Sample**	**260**	**42.27%**
5	**Total**	**539**	**100%**

The following devices, tools, and data collection methods were employed: paper questionnaires, laptop computers, electronic calculators, Arabic and foreign sources, field visits for data collection, internet information networks, and personal interviews.

The researchers relied on reviewing relevant literature pertaining to the research topic and conducting a thorough examination of previous studies. Through this process, they formulated their initial constructs. The domains, items, and scales were then presented to a group of experts and specialists to assess their validity. The experts ensured the suitability of each item in terms of vocabulary, formulation clarity, and comprehensibility across alternative options. They evaluated each item's validity and proposed necessary modifications where applicable. Following the collection of questionnaires and the statistical analysis, consensus was reached on all domains and items.

After preparing the measurement questionnaire and determining the domains and items to assess the intended property, the researchers distributed the questionnaire to a group of experts to assess its suitability for the research sample. Based on obtaining the experts' opinions and achieving an agreement rate of (75%) or higher in accepting the domains and items, some items were modified or deleted based on their feedback on the revised questionnaire. "Any item that does not achieve this goal should be excluded or modified and retested" (1). After making these modifications, the number of domains became five and the items totaled (25) items, thereby confirming the content validity of the measurement questionnaire as shown in Table (2)

Table (2) illustrates the number of original, modified, excluded, and added items in the questionnaire measuring the relationship of administrative communication channels.

Num	Scale Items	Original Items	Excluded Items	Excluded Item Numbers	Final Items
1	**Impact of administrative communication on performance speed**	**8**	**3**	**2-5-6**	**5**
2	**Impact of administrative communication on decision-making**	**6**	**1**	**6**	**5**
3	**Impact of administrative communication on information availability and processing**	**6**	**1**	**1**	**5**
4	**Impact of administrative communication on positive interaction among employees**	**6**	**1**	**6**	**5**
5	**Impact of administrative communication on achieving organizational goals**	**9**	**4**	**2-7-8**	**5**
	total	**35**	**10**	**9**	**25**

Then, the survey experiment was conducted to ensure the suitability of the scale for the sample and to assess the clarity of the instructions and items developed. The experiment took place on Sunday, February 14, 2021, conducted by the assistant team under the supervision of the researchers.

Afterwards, the main experiment was conducted on the scale. The purpose of this was to apply the scale for the purpose of statistically analyzing the items, determining their discriminatory power, assessing their internal consistency, excluding non-discriminatory items, and establishing reliability and validity. This process aimed to prepare the scale for application.

To determine the discriminatory power of the scale "Administrative Communication" on a sample comprising 200 excluded directors from the main experiment, its strength was evaluated.

The validity of the scale relies on comparing the scores of the upper group with those of the lower group on the scale. This comparison is conducted through statistical significance testing of the difference between the means. If there is statistical significance between the means, the scale is considered valid. Subsequently, the final version of the measurement questionnaire was distributed to 200 individuals, with instructions provided on how to respond. The questionnaires were then collected, responses were scored, and each questionnaire was assigned a score.

The questionnaires were arranged in descending order from highest to lowest scores, and a proportion of 27% of questionnaires with the highest scores and 27% with the lowest scores were selected for analysis. This resulted in 54 questionnaires in each group, totaling 108 questionnaires subjected to analysis. An independent samples t-test was employed to determine the differences between the means of the upper and lower groups for each item. The calculated t-value, according to the level of significance (0.05), indicated the discriminatory power of each item by comparing it against this threshold. It was found that all items in the measurement questionnaire were discriminatory, as the error level was less than the significance level (0.05), as shown in Table (3).

Table (3)

illustrates the discriminative ability of the items in the Communication Means Scale.

Significance	Error Level	Calculated t-value	Standard Deviation	Mean	Groups	Num
Significant	**0.000**	**23.63**	**0.57**	**2.58**	**Lower Group**	**1**
			0.45	**4.7**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**22.8**	**0.55**	**2.54**	**Lower Group**	**2**
			0.49	**4.6**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**25.34**	**0.65**	**2.3**	**Lower Group**	**3**
			0.44	**4.73**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**21.27**	**0.65**	**2.32**	**Lower Group**	**4**

			0.5	**4.45**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**30.11**	**0.57**	**2.63**	**Lower Group**	**5**
			0.26	**4.92**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**25.76**	**0.65**	**2.51**	**Lower Group**	**6**
			0.35	**4.85**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**27.73**	**0.61**	**2.51**	**Lower Group**	**7**
			0.34	**4.86**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**25.21**	**0.69**	**2.02**	**Lower Group**	**8**
			0.48	**4.61**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**23.52**	**0.62**	**2.41**	**Lower Group**	**9**
			0.47	**4.66**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**21.63**	**0.69**	**2.44**	**Lower Group**	**10**
			0.47	**4.66**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**24**	**0.65**	**2.32**	**Lower Group**	**12**
			0.47	**4.67**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**26.07**	**0.66**	**2.38**	**Lower Group**	**13**
			0.38	**4.82**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**28.37**	**0.61**	**2.27**	**Lower Group**	**14**
			0.39	**4.8**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**27.94**	**0.68**	**2.5**	**Lower Group**	**15**
			0.23	**4.94**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**25.65**	**0.64**	**2.64**	**Lower Group**	**16**
			0.32	**4.88**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**31.97**	**0.52**	**2.6**	**Lower Group**	**17**
			0.28	**4.91**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**29.14**	**0.48**	**2.64**	**Lower Group**	**18**
			0.38	**4.82**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**25.27**	**0.64**	**2.1**	**Lower Group**	**19**
			0.49	**4.6**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**22.79**	**0.53**	**2.64**	**Lower Group**	**20**
			0.48	**4.64**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**24.86**	**0.55**	**2.6**	**Lower Group**	**21**
			0.44	**4.73**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**20.52**	**0.63**	**2.57**	**Lower Group**	**22**
			0.49	**4.57**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**23.1**	**0.61**	**2.51**	**Lower Group**	**23**
			0.47	**4.67**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**29.82**	**0.6**	**1.92**	**Lower Group**	**24**
			0.46	**4.69**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**24.16**	**0.47**	**2.66**	**Lower Group**	**25**
			0.48	**4.64**	**Upper Group**	
Significant	**0.000**	**21.42**	**0.57**	**2.61**	**Lower Group**	**26**
			0.49	**4.58**	**Upper Group**	

Significance at error level < 0.05

Subsequently, the validity (internal consistency reliability) was established. This type of validity is achieved through the correlation of each item score with the total score of the scale, indicating that the item measures the same concept as the overall scale according to the responses of the sample individuals (construct). The sample size consisted of 200 individuals. The internal consistency reliability coefficient for all items was found to be acceptable, as the values of the error level for the correlation coefficients were less than the significance level of 0.05. Table (4) illustrates this.

Table (4)

illustrates the reliability coefficients (internal consistency reliability) for the dimensions of the Administrative Communication Means Relationship Scale.

Scale: Measurement of Administrative Communication Means Survey		Number of Items	Reliability Coefficient Value	Error Level	Correlation Significance
Dimension 1	**Impact of Administrative Communication on Performance Speed**	**5 items**	**0,51**	**0,000**	**Significant**
Dimension 2	**Impact of Administrative Communication on Decision Making**	**5 items**	**0,38**	**0,000**	**Significant**
Dimension 3	**Impact of Administrative Communication on Information Availability and Processing**	**5 items**	**0,46**	**0,000**	**Significant**
Dimension 4	**Impact of Administrative Communication on Positive Interaction among Employees**	**5 items**	**0,52**	**0,000**	**Significant**
Dimension 5	**Impact of Administrative Communication on Achieving Organizational Goals**	**5 items**	**0,39**	**0,000**	**Significant**
Significant at the level of $p \leq 0.05$					

Scientific Foundations of the Scales

Firstly, Scale Validity: The best method to establish the validity of scales is to present them to a group of experts and specialists who evaluate their suitability for measuring the intended attribute, which refers to "the extent to which the test represents the behavioral domain of the measured trait."(2) The researchers distributed the survey related to the scales among a group of experts. Based on their feedback and acceptance of the scale dimensions and items, some items were modified or deleted according to their suggestions. Any item that did not fulfill the objective was excluded or modified and re-tested. Consequently, the measurement survey achieved content validity. Scale validity depends on the validity of its items and their correlation with an external or internal criterion. Additionally, the researchers verified the validity of the Administrative Communication Means Scale through discriminant validity and internal consistency, as indicated in the statistical item analysis. These are critical scale characteristics largely dependent on the discriminant power of the items and their reliability coefficients. Thus, the scale's validity was established. The Organizational Performance Quality Scale, however, was standardized.

Secondly, Scale Reliability: The researchers established the reliability of the scales through a test-retest method. A scale is considered reliable if it yields the same results upon re-application to the same individuals under the same conditions. To determine reliability, the researchers employed the test-retest method and applied the reliability coefficient to the sample population consisting of 18 managers. The initial application of the scale was conducted on February 7, 2021, and after two weeks, the researchers re-applied the scale to the same sample on February 21, 2021, under as similar conditions as possible to ensure accurate results. The researchers then calculated the correlation coefficient between the results of the two tests using Pearson's correlation coefficient. After comparing the error level values for the correlation coefficients, it was found to be less than the significance level of 0.05, confirming that both scales and their dimensions exhibit high reliability. Tables (5 and 6) demonstrate this.

Table (5)

shows the reliability coefficients for the test-retest of the Administrative Communication Methods Scale and its dimensions.

Scale: Administrative Communication Methods and Its Dimensions	Number of Items	Reliability Coefficient	Level of Error	Significance of Correlation
Administrative Communication Methods Scale	**25 items**	**0,84**	**0,000**	**Significant**
Dimension 1: Impact of Administrative Communication on Performance Speed	**5 items**	**0,83**	**0,000**	**Significant**
Dimension 2: Impact of Administrative Communication on Decision Making	**5 items**	**0,79**	**0,000**	**Significant**
Dimension 3: Impact of Administrative Communication on Information Availability and Processing	**5 items**	**0,85**	**0,000**	**Significant**
Dimension 4: Impact of Administrative Communication on Positive Interaction Among Employees	**5 items**	**0,74**	**0,000**	**Significant**
Dimension 5: Impact of Administrative Communication on Achieving Organizational Goals	**5 items**	**0,82**	**0,000**	**Significant**
Significant at the level of significance ≤ 0.05				

Table (6)

shows the values of the test-retest reliability coefficient for the Institutional Performance Quality Scale and its dimensions

Institutional Performance Quality Scale and Its Dimensions	Number of Items	Reliability Coefficient	Level of Error	Significance of Correlation
Scale: Institutional Performance Quality and Its Dimensions	**20 items**	**0,73**	**0,000**	**Significant**
Dimension1: Relationships and Resources	**5 items**	**0,82**	**0,000**	**Significant**
Dimension2: Capital Development	**5 items**	**0,70**	**0,000**	**Significant**
Dimension3: Scientific Research	**5 items**	**0,65**	**0,000**	**Significant**
Dimension4: Community Service	**5 items**	**0,71**	**0,000**	**Significant**
Significant at the level of significance ≤ 0.05				

2-10 Correction of the Scale: After conducting the scientific foundations of the scale, the following emerged:

Firstly: Administrative Communication Scale: It consists of 25 items distributed across five dimensions, each comprising five items. Each item is rated on a five-point Likert scale: (Strongly Agree - Agree - Neutral - Disagree - Strongly Disagree), scored as (1-2-3-4-5) respectively. Therefore, the individual's score on this scale is the sum of all item scores within each dimension. The maximum achievable score is 125, while the minimum score is 25, with a hypothetical midpoint of 75.

Secondly: Organizational Performance Quality Scale: It consists of 20 items distributed across four dimensions, each comprising five items. Each item is rated on a five-point Likert scale: (Always - Often - Sometimes - Rarely - Never), scored as (1-2-3-4-5) respectively. Similarly, the individual's score on this scale is the sum of all item scores within each dimension. The maximum achievable score is 100, while the minimum score is 20, with a hypothetical midpoint of 60.

Statistical Methods

Statistical data processing was conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 22.

RESULTS

Table (7)

Illustrates the description of the Administrative Communications Scale and its dimensions.

Scale and Dimensions	Number of Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Hypothetical Mean	Maximum Sample Value	Minimum Sample Value	Skewness Coefficient
Administrative Communications Relationship Scale	**25 items**	**93,12**	**13,3**	**75**	**115**	**52**	**-0,78**
Impact of Administrative Communications on Performance Speed	**5 items**	**21**	**3,8**	**15**	**22**	**13**	**-0,54**
Impact of Administrative Communications on Decision Making	**5 items**	**18,2**	**2,7**	**15**	**20**	**12**	**0,63**
Impact of Administrative Communications on Availability and Processing of Information	**5 items**	**19,92**	**2,92**	**15**	**21**	**10**	**0,82**
Impact of Administrative Communications on Positive Interaction among Employees	**5 items**	**16**	**2,74**	**15**	**19**	**11**	**-0,39**
Impact of Administrative Communications on Achieving Organizational Goals	**5 items**	**18**	**1,14**	**15**	**21**	**10**	**0,21**

In order to achieve the second objective of exploring the relationship of administrative communication channels within the student activities departments at Iraqi universities, the dimensions of this scale are revealed in Table (7). The scale of Administrative Communication Systems, consisting of 25 items, achieved an arithmetic mean of 93.12 with a standard deviation of 13.3. The hypothetical mean was 75 degrees, while the sample obtained a maximum score of 115 degrees and a minimum score of 52 degrees on the questionnaires. The skewness coefficient, positioned under the Gaussian curve of normal distribution, trended towards (-1) with a value of (-0.78). This indicates that the research sample's perspective on administrative communication relationships was homogeneous and consistent.

Furthermore, since the hypothetical mean is lower than the arithmetic mean, it suggests that secondary school managers have a positive and acceptable outlook towards administrative communication within their departments.

As indicated in Table (7), the first dimension of the scale, which assesses the impact of administrative communication on performance speed and consists of 5 items, had a mean score of 21 degrees with a standard deviation of 3.8. The hypothetical mean was 15 degrees, while respondents achieved the highest score of 22 degrees and the lowest score of 13 degrees in this dimension. The skewness coefficient was -0.54. Given that the hypothetical mean is lower than the arithmetic mean, it suggests that respondents view the impact of administrative communication on performance speed positively.

The second dimension, assessing the impact of administrative communication on decision-making with 5 items, had a mean score of 18.2 degrees with a standard deviation of 2.7. The hypothetical mean was 15 degrees, while respondents achieved the highest score of 20 degrees and the lowest score of 12 degrees. The skewness coefficient was 0.63. Similar to the first dimension, the lower hypothetical mean compared to the arithmetic mean indicates a positive perception among respondents regarding the impact of administrative communication on decision-making.

The third dimension, evaluating the impact of administrative communication on information availability and processing with 5 items, had a mean score of 19.92 degrees and a standard deviation of 2.92. The hypothetical mean was 15 degrees, while respondents achieved the highest score of 21 degrees and the lowest score of 10 degrees. The skewness coefficient was 0.82. Again, the lower hypothetical mean compared to the arithmetic mean suggests a positive perception among respondents regarding the impact of administrative communication on information availability and processing.

The fourth dimension, assessing the positive interaction among employees due to administrative communication with 5 items, had a mean score of 16 degrees and a standard deviation of 2.74. The hypothetical mean was 15 degrees, while respondents achieved the highest score of 19 degrees and the lowest score of 11 degrees. The skewness coefficient was -0.39. Similar to the previous dimensions, the lower hypothetical mean compared to the arithmetic mean indicates a positive perception among respondents regarding the impact of administrative communication on fostering positive interactions among employees.

The fifth dimension, evaluating the impact of administrative communication on achieving organizational goals with 5 items, had a mean score of 18 degrees and a standard deviation of 1.14. The hypothetical mean was 15 degrees, while respondents achieved the highest score of 21 degrees and the lowest score of 10 degrees. The skewness coefficient was 0.21. Once again, the lower hypothetical mean compared to the arithmetic mean indicates a positive perception among respondents regarding the impact of administrative communication on achieving organizational goals.

The researchers attribute the positive outlook of secondary school principals in Baghdad Al-Karkh to their awareness and understanding of the importance of administrative communication. Most of these school principals possess significant awareness and a positive perspective on the role that administrative communication plays in the success of their work within and outside their schools. Through administrative communication, they have been able to effectively communicate among themselves and with others, as affirmed by Saud (2006), who states, "Effective communication plays a fundamental role in the success of human relationships in various life domains. Therefore, it is a skill that employees in governmental and non-governmental organizations must acquire and apply in order to accomplish their tasks" (3).

Effective communication is characterized by awareness and consciousness, as well as the ability to convey ideas to the counterpart and achieve objectives, which all school principals aspire to. "Good communication achieves numerous advantages for the educational institution. The absence of effective communication between administrators and their subordinates isolates administrators from them, hindering their ability to influence them sufficiently and understand their reactions. This leads to the fragmentation of the educational institution and its inability to achieve its desired goals" (4).

The researchers argue that effective communication is the key to the success of any organization, as its continuity depends on it. Without communication, administrators do not know what their colleagues are doing, and management cannot receive necessary input information. Administrators are unable to issue necessary directives, instructions, and guidance. Furthermore, coordination between tasks becomes impossible, and collaboration among employees cannot be achieved because they are unable to communicate their needs and desires to others. All these factors inevitably lead to the collapse of the educational institution, as "communications are among the most important elements of successful management in any institution, encompassing all data, information, and facts that must be disseminated to all parts of the organization. Typically, communication involves data, information, facts, opinions, ideas, inquiries, complaints, directions, and instructions that managers working within the organization must convey and execute" (5).

Presentation and Analysis of the Results of Institutional Performance Quality and Its Dimensions and Discussion

Table (8):

Provides a description of the Institutional Performance Quality scale and its dimensions.

Institutional Performance Quality Scale and Its Dimensions	Number of Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Hypothetical Mean	Highest sample value	Lowest Sample Value	skewness coefficient
Institutional Performance Scale	**20 items**	**75,61**	**11,3**	**60**	**87**	**46**	**-1,07**
Dimetion 1: Relationships and Available Resources	**5 items**	**21,8**	**3,08**	**15**	**23**	**15**	**0,85**
Dimention 2: Human Capital Development	**5 items**	**19,61**	**2,9**	**15**	**21**	**16**	**1,31**
Dimention 3: Scientific Research	**5 items**	**14**	**3,07**	**15**	**19**	**10**	**-0,65**
Dimention 4: Community Service	**5 items**	**20,3**	**2,25**	**15**	**22**	**17**	**0,92**

From Table (8), the Institutional Performance Quality scale consisting of 20 items achieved an arithmetic mean of 75.61 with a standard deviation of 11.3. The hypothetical mean was 60, and the sample achieved a maximum score of 87 and a minimum score of 46. The skewness coefficient under a normal distribution curve shifted towards (-1) with a value of (-1.07), indicating that the research sample's perspective on institutional performance quality was homogeneous and consistent. Since the hypothetical mean is lower than the arithmetic mean, this signifies that the respondents' views towards institutional performance quality within their departments are positive and acceptable.

Additionally, as shown in Table (15), the first axis of the scale, which represents relationships and available resources and comprises 5 items, had an arithmetic mean of 21.8 with a standard deviation of 3.08. The hypothetical mean was 15, and the respondents achieved the highest score of 23 and the lowest score of 15, with a skewness coefficient of 0.85. Since the hypothetical mean is lower than the arithmetic mean, this indicates that the respondents' perspectives on relationships and available resources are positive.

The second axis, Human Capital Development, consisting of 5 items, had an arithmetic mean of 19.61 and a standard deviation of 2.9. The hypothetical mean was 15, and the respondents achieved the highest score of 21 and the lowest score of 16, with a skewness coefficient of 1.31. Since the hypothetical mean is lower than the arithmetic mean, this signifies that the respondents' views on institutional performance quality regarding human capital development are positive.

The third axis, Scientific Research, comprising 5 items, had an arithmetic mean of 14 with a standard deviation of 3.07. The hypothetical mean was 15, and the respondents achieved the highest score of 22 and the lowest score of 17, with a skewness coefficient of -0.65. Since the hypothetical mean is higher than the arithmetic mean, this indicates that the respondents' perspectives on institutional performance quality regarding scientific research are negative.

The fourth axis, Community Service, comprising 5 items, had an arithmetic mean of 20.3 with a standard deviation of 2.25. The hypothetical mean was 15, and the respondents achieved the highest score of 21 and the lowest score of 16, with a skewness coefficient of 0.92. Since the hypothetical mean is lower than the arithmetic mean, this indicates that the respondents' views on institutional performance quality regarding community service are positive.

The researchers attribute this positive outlook to the sample individuals, represented by secondary school managers in Baghdad, for their awareness of the importance of mastering their responsibilities to enhance the status of their schools.

Presentation and Analysis of the Results of the Relationship Between Administrative Communication Channels and Institutional Performance Quality, and Their Discussion

Table (9):

Scale Correlation Coefficient Type of Relationship Level of Error Significance of Relationship Institutional Performance Quality Scale

Scale	Correlation Coefficient	Type of Relationship	Level of Error	Significance of Relationship
Institutional Performance Quality Scale				
Administrative Communication Channels Relationship Scale	**0.42**	**Positive**	**0.000**	**Significant**
Significant at a significance level of ≤ 0.05				

From Table (9), a significant positive correlation coefficient of 0.42 was found at an error level of 0.000, which is lower than the significance level of 0.05. This indicates that administrative communication channels play an effective role in enhancing institutional performance quality. According to both (Talha and Adla, 1997) and as corroborated by the researchers, "It is critically important for the success of institutional performance that communication processes are successful, complete, and comprehensive without any deficiencies in their variables and components. Effective communication is of utmost importance for the administrative work success within the institution."(6)

(Shukriyah, 1998) affirms the researchers' findings by stating, "If the communication channels within the educational institution are effective, the institution's work will be successful because effective communication is an essential element of direction, linking all workforce members to adjust or stimulate their behaviors and motivations towards specific directions outlined by the management."(7)

CONCLUSIONS

1. There are shortcomings in institutional performance, especially in the areas of available resources and human capital.
2. The validity of both the Institutional Performance Quality Scale and Administrative Communication Means when applied to the sample is confirmed.
3. High school principals in Baghdad Al-Karkh demonstrate acceptable institutional performance in the dimensions of available resources, human capital, and community service, as they exceeded the hypothetical mean for these dimensions.

Recommendations

1. Conduct a review of using technology-related communications to enhance community service implementation.
2. Enhance the role and importance of administrative communications for high school principals in Baghdad Al-Karkh, as it significantly impacts performance efficiency and university goal achievement.
3. Activate the internet network as a communication tool to reduce communication costs and minimize the use of paper-based fax correspondence.

	Scale: Quality of Institutional Performance					
	Division 1: Relationships and Available Resources	**Always**	**Often**	**Sometimes**	**Rarely**	**Never**
1	**Administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh prioritize organizing activities to enhance and activate relationships with suppliers.**					
2	**Administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh maintain positive communication with all educational institutions.**					
3	**There are continuous communications and relationships between administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh and all community stakeholders**					
4	**The available financial resources in administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh are sufficient to cover their expenses**					
5	**Administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh strive to build and strengthen friendly relationships with staff.**					
	Division 2: Human Capital Development	**Always**	**Often**	**Sometimes**	**Rarely**	**Never**
1	**administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh adhere to specific criteria for hiring staff that align with the nature of required tasks.**					
2	**Administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh focus on attracting academic competencies.**					
3	**Administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh provide all means for staff to perform their duties effectively.**					
4	**Administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh use specific criteria to evaluate human resource performance.**					
5	**Administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh reward staff for providing additional services.**					
	Division 3: Scientific Research	**Always**	**Often**	**Sometimes**	**Rarely**	**Never**
1	**Administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh encourage both theoretical and applied scientific research.**					
2	**Administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh place significant importance on gaining industry trust through collaboration.**					
3	**Administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh provide financial and moral support to researchers.**					
4	**Administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh create an encouraging environment for scientific research (funding, laboratories, etc.).**					
5	**Administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh link scientific research with local community needs.**					
	Division 4: Community Service	**Always**	**Often**	**Sometimes**	**Rarely**	**Never**
1	**Administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh place significant importance on serving the local community.**					
2	**The department of administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh encourages teachers to research community issues and problems.**					
3	**Administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh introduce specialties and programs that align with the nature and needs of the community.**					
4	**Administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh organize conferences, seminars, and consultations for the community.**					
5	**Administrations of secondary schools in Baghdad Al-Karkh annually document contributions of their staff to community service.**					

REFERENCES

1. Mohamed Shihata Rabie: Measurement of Personality, Alexandria, Dar Al-Ma'arifa Al-Jameia, 1994, p. 14.
2. Esam Al-Namir: Measurement and Evaluation in Special Education, Amman, Dar Al-Yaweri Scientific Publishing and Distribution, 2008, p. 72.
3. Saud Al-Namr: Previously cited source, 2006, p. 38.
4. Bashir Al-Alaq: Fundamentals of Modern Management - Theories and Concepts, 1st ed., Dar Al-Yazouri Al-Ilmiya, Amman, 1998, p. 147.
5. Musa Al-Louzi: Administrative Communications in Jordanian Governmental Institutions, Yarmouk Research, Volume 15, Issue 4, 2012, p. 113.
6. Talha Hussam al-Din and Adla Issa Matar: Introduction to Sports Management, 1st Edition, Maktabat al-Kutub Publishers, Cairo, 1997, p. 140.
7. Shukriyah Khalil: Management in the Sports Field, Al-Faneya for Printing and Publishing, Cairo, 1998, p. 129.