



Analysis of Communication Competence Levels Among Graduates of Communication Faculty

Can Cemal Cingi¹, and Nihan Vural²

¹ Associate Professor, Anadolu University, Turkey

² Assistant Professor, Anadolu University, Turkey

Abstract

Individuals with higher education are expected to have a high “communication level” or, in other words, “communication competence.” However, it is known that new graduates may experience problems in adapting to the jobs they start. While some graduates adapt to the sector quickly, others struggle to fulfill the academic and social roles expected of them. The research aims to investigate the communication competence levels of students who graduated from the departments of the Faculty of Communication and entered business life. The study adopted a quantitative research methodology, the Communication Competence Scale, applied to 400 graduates, 100 from each Anadolu University Faculty of Communication Sciences department. The quota sampling method, one of the non-probability sampling methods, was used in this study, and the target number was reached with the answers from the graduates reached by e-mail. In addition to revealing differences between departments, it also helped students assess the practicality of their training and identify gaps in their skill sets.

Keywords: communication, education, higher education, quantitative research, scale

1. Introduction

It is an essential requirement for individuals working in all business lines to communicate well with each other regarding the success of the work and the employees' happiness. In business lines where teams work, it is crucial that individuals in the same group work harmoniously within a particular hierarchical order. To increase efficiency, a high level of communication within the group should be aimed at. While intra-group communication is necessary for the cooperation of individuals working in the same production unit, good communication between the producers and consumers is also crucial for the marketing of the final product.

Language, religion, and environmental influences create differences in communication between individuals. While language sometimes creates a barrier, common culture supports communication. In Turkish society, asking, “Where are you from?” as the first question to a new acquaintance is an introduction to communication and a search for a common culture. Familiar acquaintance or common culture is the basis for the beginning of communication.

Education affects communication positively. Individuals with higher education are expected to have a high “communication level” or, in other words, “communication competence.” Communication competence is expected to be even higher, especially in people who graduate from communication faculties that provide education on communication. In the education programs of all faculty departments, interpersonal communication and mass communication education are given, and practices are carried out in different fields, such as communication, cinema, television, press, and broadcasting. However, it is observed that new graduates, who are expected to have high communication skills, may have problems adapting to the jobs they start in working life and harmonizing with other employees. While some graduates adapt to the sector quickly, others have difficulty fulfilling the academic and social roles expected of them (İçöz, 2011).

In our study, we aimed to investigate the communication competence levels of the last three years of graduates of the Anadolu University Faculty of Communication Sciences, Departments of Public Relations and Advertising, Cinema and Television, Journalism, and Communication Design and Management. This research aims to determine the extent to which the training they received and the communication skills they gained during their education are helpful in business life and to identify the areas they find lacking.

Individuals' communication skill levels may vary, but it is difficult to determine and compare them. This level is also related to individual characteristics.

It is possible to find many studies on graduates in the literature to determine the communication skill levels of individuals (Can, 2018; Üçler & Büyükçelikök, 2021; Çelik, 2012; Öncel, 2020; Yetkiner, 2018; Büyükbaykal & Büyükbaykal, 2018; Ertuğ & Göksel, 2019; Keskin & Aslan, 2021; Zorver, 2011; İlhan, 2022). However, there is no study in the literature that aims to determine the communication competence levels of graduates.

Studies on communication skills show that communication skills can be measured with various tools (Wiemann, 1977; Rees et al., 2002; Costa et al., 2016). In the literature, there are many studies (Abacı, 1995; Balcı & Yılmaz, 2000; Coffman & Coffman, 1993; Çam, 1999; Korkut, 1996; Korkut, 2005; Nerdrum, 1997) conducted both in Turkey and abroad on the teaching of communication skills to students and adults and their effects (cited in Korkut, 2005: 144). In addition, when the literature on communication skills in Turkey is examined, there are studies in which communication skills are discussed with various dimensions (Korkut, 1996; Çetinkanat, 1998; Ersanlı & Balcı, 1998; Korkut, 2005; Topluer, 2008; Karagöz & Kösterilioğlu, 2008). Among these studies, it is seen that the communication skills scale developed by Korkut (1996) shows a unidimensional structure. Korkut (1996) explains the unidimensional structure of the scale with the low age and experience of the students and the fact that these factors do not cause differentiation in the students' communication skills. The scale developed by Çetinkanat (1998) is a specific scale focusing on teachers' communication skills. The communication skills scale developed by Kösterilioğlu and Karagöz (2008) can be used to measure the communication skills expected from lecturers. The scale developed by Ersanlı and Balcı (1998) was applied to university students and measures communication skills three dimensions: cognitive, behavioral, and emotional. It is seen that these studies mostly focus on the field of educational sciences. In addition, since communication skills are a very broad concept, there is a need to conduct studies that

measure communication skills with other dimensions (Koca & Erigüç, 2017). In this sense, although this study focuses on the studies in the literature on communication skills, a multidimensional structure is measured against the versions of the individual's self-evaluation of communication skills in general. Due to the desirability of this measurement, the "Communication Competence Scale" developed by Wiemann (1977) was preferred in this study.

Traditional research has been helpful to communication studies by looking into a wide range of problems related to how people communicate, their attitudes, and their media exposure. However, survey studies haven't always given us much information about how communication phenomena are structured on many levels. A growing contingent of communication experts acknowledges the importance of multidimensionality in study, concentrating on diverse subjects such as public opinion, media utilization, and communication behavior. Consequently, there is a burgeoning interest in multidimensional communication surveys among researchers.

When we looked at these studies, we could not find a multidimensional and up-to-date study evaluating communication skills. In this sense, this study focuses on the studies in the literature on communication skills; the preferred scale has eight components and assesses the individual's communication skills in a general manner.

The scale planned to be used consists of questions that evaluate communication skills from different dimensions, which are likely to have an impact on inclusion in working life. These are Social Behavior Competence, Individual Aspects in Communication, Empathy Competence, Adaptability Competence, Sensitivity Competence, Communication Incentive Competence, Human Relations and Listening Competence.

2. Method

Following the purpose of the study, the necessary approval was obtained with the decision of Anadolu University Social and Human Sciences Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee dated 28.05.2024 and numbered 40_99 before proceeding to the data collection phase in this study in which the quantitative research method was used. To measure the communication competence level of the study group, written permission was obtained from the authors to use the "Communication Competence Scale," developed by Wiemann (1977) in 1977 and validated and reliable in Turkish by Koca and Erigüç.

An online questionnaire created in "Google Forms" was used as the data collection method in the study. The questionnaire was sent via communication channels such as e-mail and WhatsApp to the graduates of Anadolu University Faculty of Communication Sciences, Journalism, Public Relations and Advertising, Communication Design and Management, and Cinema and Television who graduated in the last 3 years, determined by the quota sampling method, which is one of the non-probability sampling methods. When responses were collected from 400 graduates, 100 from each department, the data collection phase of the study was terminated.

3. Result

The collected data were evaluated using frequency, descriptive statistical values, Skewness and Kurtosis, crosstab, MANOVA (Multivariate Analysis of Variance), and Levene's test for homogeneity of variances in the statistical analyses.

Table 1 shows the distribution of the study participants by graduation year, age, gender, and working model.

Table 1. Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Participants (n = 400)

Sociodemographic Characteristics	n=400	%100
Graduate Year		
2021	109	27,3
2022	100	25
2023	191	47,8
Age		
21-23	107	26,8
24-26	230	57,5
27-29	18	4,5
30-32	36	9
33 and above	9	2,3
Sex		
Female	165	41,2
Male	235	58,8
Working Model		
Employee at Workplace	239	59,8
Working at Home	11	2,8
Hybrid Employee	150	37,4

The reliability coefficient values obtained by Koca and Erigüç (2017, 794-795) and the reliability coefficient values obtained from this study are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Dimensions, Sub-items, and Reliability Coefficient Values of the Communication Competence Scale

Dimensions	Sub-items	Cronbach's Alpha (α) Values Obtained by Koca and Erigüç Cronbach's Alpha (α) Values Obtained from the Study	Cronbach's Alpha (α) Values Obtained from the Study
Social Behavior Competence	S does not mind meeting strangers.	0,76	0,882
	S is generally relaxed when conversing with a new acquaintance.		
	S enjoys social gatherings where he/she can meet new people.		
	S is not afraid to speak with people in authority.		
Individual Aspects in Communication	S is a likeable person.	0,74	0,714
	S is flexible.		
	People can go to S with their problems.		
	S generally says the right thing at the right time.		

	S likes to use his/her voice and body expressively.		
	S is sensitive to others' needs of the moment.		
Empathy Adequacy	S generally knows how others feel.	0, 72	0,864
	S lets others know he/she understands them.		
	S understands other people.		
	S can easily put himself/herself in another person's shoes.		
Harmony Adequacy	S finds it easy to get along with others.	0, 70	0,763
	S can adapt to changing situations.		
	S treats people as individuals.		
Sensitivity Competence	S generally knows what type of behavior is appropriate in any given situation.	0, 50	0,440
	S usually does not make unusual demands on his/her friends.		
	S is an effective conversationalist.		
Communication Incentive Competence	S is "rewarding" to talk to.	0, 50	0,486
	S pays attention to the conversation.		
	S is interested in what others have to say.		
	S doesn't follow the conversation very well.		
Human Relations	S's personal relations are cold and distant.	0, 56	0,642
	S is easy to talk to.		
	S likes to be close and personal with people.		
Listening Adequacy	S interrupts others too much.	0, 54	0,565
	S is a good listener.		
	S's conversation behavior is not "smooth."		

As shown in Table 3, which includes the descriptive statistical values of the “Communication Competency Level” scale used in the study and the skewness and kurtosis values related to normal distribution, the means are between 3.05 and 4.24; skewness values are between -1.518 and 0.100; kurtosis values are between -1.408 and 1.710.

The ranges of skewness and kurtosis values for the distribution to be considered normal are expressed differently in different sources. While some sources state that skewness and kurtosis coefficients should be between -1.5 and +1.5 (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2015), some sources state that it is sufficient for skewness and kurtosis values to be less than 3 (Kline, 2011). Some sources (Hair et al, 2009; George & Mallery, 2010; Hahs-Vaughn & Lomax, 2013) accept kurtosis and skewness values between -2 and +2 for normal distribution, especially in social sciences. Therefore, it was assumed that the data were normally distributed.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics Values of Sub-Dimensions

Descriptive Statistics									
	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error

S does not mind meeting strangers.	400	2	5	3,41	,932	-,200	,122	-,965	,243
S is generally relaxed when conversing with a new acquaintance.	400	2	5	3,24	,947	-,216	,122	-1,387	,243
S enjoys social gatherings where he/she can meet new people.	400	2	5	3,06	1,079	,443	,122	-1,221	,243
S is not afraid to speak with people in authority.	400	2	5	3,34	,965	-,120	,122	-1,132	,243
S is a likeable person.	400	2	5	4,00	,990	-,867	,122	-,215	,243
S is flexible.	400	1	5	3,72	1,062	-1,143	,122	,533	,243
People can go to S with their problems.	400	1	5	4,17	1,084	-1,518	,122	1,710	,243
S generally says the right thing at the right time.	400	2	5	4,24	,717	-,760	,122	,550	,243
S likes to use his/her voice and body expressively.	400	2	5	4,04	,988	-,911	,122	-,142	,243
S is sensitive to others' needs of the moment.	400	2	5	3,70	,632	-1,334	,122	1,487	,243
S generally knows how others feel.	400	2	5	3,86	1,128	-,428	,122	-1,252	,243
S lets others know he/she understands them.	400	2	5	3,83	1,004	-,266	,122	-1,114	,243
S understands other people.	400	2	5	4,00	,836	-,909	,122	,626	,243
S can easily put himself/herself in another person's shoes.	400	2	5	4,00	,692	-,042	,122	-,769	,243
S finds it easy to get along with others.	400	1	5	3,92	,882	-,882	,122	1,105	,243
S can adapt to changing situations.	400	2	5	3,74	,900	-,080	,122	-,889	,243
S Treats people as individuals.	400	3	5	4,20	,819	-,379	,122	-1,408	,243
S generally knows what type of behavior is appropriate in any given situation.	400	2	5	4,10	,820	-,807	,122	,355	,243
S usually does not make unusual demands on his/her friends.	400	2	5	3,83	,785	,100	,122	-,944	,243
S is an effective conversationalist.	400	1	5	3,49	1,067	-,515	,122	-,368	,243
S is "rewarding" to talk to.	400	2	5	3,81	,845	-,184	,122	-,681	,243
S pays attention to the conversation.	400	3	5	3,95	,592	,013	,122	-,148	,243
S is interested in what others have to say.	400	1	5	3,71	1,082	-,740	,122	-,180	,243
S doesn't follow the conversation very well. (Reverse coding)	400	1	5	3,09	1,138	,068	,122	-,817	,243
S personal relations are cold and distant. (Reverse coding)	400	1	5	3,68	,923	-,426	,122	,140	,243

S is easy to talk to.	400	2	5	4,17	,916	-,816	,122	-,326	,243
S likes to be close and personal with people.	400	2	5	3,73	1,045	-,173	,122	-1,205	,243
S interrupts others too much. (Reverse coding)	400	1	5	3,76	,702	-,508	,122	1,649	,243
S is a good listener.	400	2	5	3,79	,900	-,143	,122	-,887	,243
S's conversation behavior is not "smooth". (Reverse coding)	400	1	5	3,67	,891	-,407	,122	,247	,243
Valid N (listwise)	400								

Instructions: Complete the following questionnaire/scale with the subject (S) in mind.

A crosstab analysis was conducted to determine the participants' sociodemographic characteristics according to the departments from which they graduated.

Table 4. Year of Graduation and Departments Cross Tabulation

Graduation Year * Group Crosstabulation

			Total
Graduation Year	2021		109
			27,3%
	2022		100
			25,0%
	2023		191
			47,8%
Total	Count		400
	% within Group		100,0%

The distribution of the 400 participants' level of participation in the sub-dimensions (statements in the scale) is given in the table below (Table 5).

Table 5. Distribution according to the statements (Frequency)

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
S does not mind meeting strangers.	---	87 %21,8	99 %24,8	176 %44	38 %9,5
S is generally relaxed when conversing with a new acquaintance.	---	126 %31,5	67 %16,8	191 %47,8	16 %4
S enjoys social gatherings where he/she can meet new people.	---	176 %44	72 %18	106 26,5	46 %11,5
S is not afraid to speak with people in authority.	---	105 %26,3	90 %22,5	169 %42,3	36 %9
S is a likeable person.	---	56 %14	28 %7	177 %44,3	139 %34,8
S is flexible.	20 %5	56 %14	8 %2	247 %61,8	69 %17,3
People can go to S with their problems.	19 %4,8	23 %5,8	23 %5,8	141 %35,3	194 %48,5
S generally says the right thing at the right time.	---	9 %2,3	39 %9,8	199 %49,8	153 %38,3
S likes to use his/her voice and body expressively.	---	53 %13,3	28 %7	169 %42,3	150 %37,5

S is sensitive to others' needs of the moment.	---	28 %7	73 %18,3	289 %72,3	10 %2,5
S generally knows how others feel.	---	68 %17	83 %20,8	88 %22	161 %40,3
S lets others know he/she understands them.	---	41 %10,3	118 %29,5	109 %27,3	132 %33
S understands other people.	---	35 %8,8	34 %8,5	226 56,5	105 %26,3
S can easily put himself/herself in another person's shoes.	---	1 %0,3	93 %23,3	212 %53	94 %23,5
S finds it easy to get along with others.	8 %2	15 %3,8	79 %19,8	196 %49	102 %25,5
S can adapt to changing situations.	---	30 %7,5	138 %34,5	139 %34,8	93 %23,3
S treats people as individuals.	---	---	102 %25,5	117 %29,3	181 %45,3
S generally knows what type of behavior is appropriate in any given situation.	---	23 %5,8	48 %12	197 %49,3	132 %33
S usually does not make unusual demands on his/her friends.	---	7 %1,8	143 %35,8	163 %40,8	87 %21,8
S is an effective conversationalist.	19 %4,8	57 %14,3	98 %24,5	163 %40,8	63 %15,8
S is "rewarding" to talk to.		22 %5,5	121 %30,3	167 %41,8	90 %22,5
S pays attention to the conversation.	---	---	81 %20,3	259 %64,8	60 %15
S is interested in what others have to say.	15 %3,8	53 %13,3	61 %15,3	177 %44,3	94 %23,5
S doesn't follow the conversation very well. (Reverse coding).	52 %13	92 %23	123 %30,8	104 %26	29 %7,2
S's personal relations are cold and distant. (Reverse coding).	101 %25,3	26 %6,5	145 %36,3	69 %17,3	59 %14,8
S is easy to talk to.	---	24 %6	67 %16,8	126 %31,5	183 %45,8
S likes to be close and personal with people.	---	56 %14	120 %30	102 25,5%	122 %30,5
S interrupts others too much. (Reverse coding).	47 %11,8	221 %55,3	127 %31,8	---	5 %1,3
S is a good listener.	---	28 %7	130 %32,5	142 %35,5	100 %25
S's conversation behavior is not "smooth." (Reverse coding).	70 %17,5	163 %40,8	139 %34,8	20 %40,8	8 %17,5

Instructions: Complete the following questionnaire/scale with the subject (S) in mind.

As seen in Table 5, the statement with the highest level of agreement is “People can come to me when they have problems” in the “individual aspects in communication” dimension with 194 (48.5%) “strongly agree.” 289 (72.25%) “strongly agreed” with the statement “I am

sensitive to the current needs of others” in the “individual aspects in communication” dimension. The statement with the lowest level of agreement is the statement “I am not calm in the way I talk to others” in the “listening competence” dimension with the “strongly agree” of 8 people (17.5%). The statement with the highest level of agreement is the statement “I interrupt others too much when they are talking” in the “listening competence” dimension with the “agree” of 0 (0%) people.

To reveal the communication competence levels of the graduates of the Faculty of Communication Sciences and their level of competence in each dimension, the averages of each department in each sub-dimension, the total averages of each department in all sub-dimensions, and the total averages of all departments in each dimension were analyzed. These averages are presented in the following tables (Tables 6 and 7). Within the scope of this study, averages below 3.50 were evaluated as inadequate, while averages of 3.51 and above were assessed as adequate.

Table 6. Means of Departments according to Dimensions and Communication Competency Total Means

	<i>Journalism</i>	<i>Public Relations and Advertising</i>	<i>Communication Design and Management</i>	<i>Cinema Television</i>
Social Behavior Competence	3,6850	3,0225	2,6250	3,7175
Individual Aspects in Communication	3,6383	4,0250	4,0683	4,1833
Empathy Adequacy	4,0050	3,9325	4,0600	3,6875
Harmony Adequacy	3,9484	3,9089	4,6364	3,9525
Sensitivity Competence	3,6900	3,6767	3,7000	4,1400
Communication Incentive Competence	3,5675	3,5825	3,7200	3,6800
Human Relations	3,5467	3,3667	3,6033	3,8733
Listening Adequacy	3,7700	3,7567	3,8467	3,6133
Communication Competence Total Means	3,7313	3,6589	3,7824	3,8559

As seen in Table 6, Cinema and Television are the most competent departments in the social behavior competence sub-dimension. Journalism is the second most competent department in terms of social behavior. Communication design and management, public relations, and advertising departments have lower scores in social behavior, and communication design and management have the lowest scores.

In the subdimension of individual aspects of communication, it was concluded that all department graduates' aspects were sufficient. Cinema and television had the most adequate individual elements in communication, while journalism had the least adequate individual aspects. Regarding competence, the Public Relations and Advertising department ranked 2nd, and the Communication Design and Management department ranked third.

The Communication Design and Management department was the most competent in the sub-dimension of empathy competence. In contrast, the Journalism department ranked second, and the Public Relations and Advertising department ranked third. The last department was the Cinema and Television department.

Regarding adaptability, the most adequate department was Communication Design and Management, while the least adequate was Public Relations and Advertising. The Cinema and Television department ranked second, and the Journalism department ranked third.

The department with the highest sensitivity competency was Cinema and Television. This department is followed by Communication Design and Management, followed by Journalism, Public Relations, and Advertising.

The most competent department in the subdimension of communication encouragement competence is Communication Design and Management. This is followed by the Cinema and Television, Public Relations and Advertising, and Journalism departments.

The most competent department in human relations is Cinema and Television, followed by Communication Design and Management, Journalism, and Public Relations and Advertising.

- It was concluded that the department with the highest listening competence was Communication Design and Management, while the least competent department was Cinema and Television. The journalism department ranked second, and Public Relations and Advertising department ranked third.

- The averages of the sum of the averages obtained from each of the dimensions also reveal the level of communication competence. Among the four departments, the most competent department in communication competence is Cinema and Television, while the least competent department is Public Relations and Advertising. It is concluded that Communication Design and Management is the second and Journalism is the third adequate department.

Table 7. Subdimension Total Averages

	Social Behavior Competence	Individual Aspects in Communication	Empathy Adequacy	Harmony Adequacy
Journalism	3,6850	3,6383	4,0050	3,9484
Public Relations and Advertising	3,0225	4,0250	3,9325	3,9089
Communication Design and Management	2,6250	4,0683	4,0600	4,6364
Cinema Television	3,7175	4,1833	3,6875	3,9525
Sub-dimension Total Means	3,2625	3,9788	3,9213	3,9525

	Sensitivity Competence	Communication Incentive Competence	Human Relations	Listening Adequacy
Journalism	3,6900	3,5675	3,5467	3,7700
Public Relations and Advertising	3,6767	3,5825	3,3667	3,7567
Communicati on Design and Management	3,7000	3,7200	3,6033	3,8467
Cinema Television	4,1400	3,6800	3,8733	3,6133
Sub- dimension Total Means	3,8017	3,6375	3,5975	3,7467

Looking at the total averages in Table 7, it is clear that all departments are most competent in individual aspects of communication. This dimension is followed by adaptation competence, empathy competence, sensitivity competence, listening competence, encouraging communication competence, and human relations. The social behavior dimension was the least adequate for all departments.

4. Discussion

Colleges and universities aim to train students for a profession and prepare them for professional life. Departments that focus on a specific profession, such as pharmacy, medicine, dentistry, and teaching, provide education programs according to the needs of the profession in question, and students who graduate from these departments practice their careers in the relevant fields. Faculties that provide education in subjects such as administrative sciences and communication sciences graduate individuals with different skills who can work in almost every field. Since business knowledge and communication competence are necessary in every line of business, students who receive diplomas from these schools can work in every factory, company, and organization. The education programs of these departments are planned to be versatile and adaptable to many fields. However, it is still being determined to what extent this planned form of education meets the demands of the business lines or to what extent this educational institution can provide the desired and sought-after features in different business lines. The main reason for our research is to clarify this unexplained situation.

The Anadolu University Faculty of Communication Sciences, included in our study, has four departments. However, individuals who graduated from any department started to work in many other fields, from biscuit production to movie production. Finding jobs in these different fields may mean that education is provided in a multifaceted way. One of the main tasks of the communication faculty is to provide social behavior competence. Behavioral competence will support harmony in the workplace. In their social environment, individuals can communicate with people they desire or find suitable for themselves. However, in a workplace, people from different cultures, with different mindsets, whose only common point is to work in the same environment, need to be at a certain level of social communication.

Especially in group work, these people should communicate at a level that allows them to work together. In our study, it was observed that all graduates were at a high level in terms of social behavior competence. It was observed that the social behavior competence of the Cinema and Television department was higher. The journalism department follows this. Other departments are statistically significantly behind these two departments.

The basis of communication is primarily the individual's self-knowledge, adoption, and openness to communication with their environment. All faculty departments should provide these characteristics. It was observed that all department graduates had a high level of individual aspects in communication. This is an expected result and is in line with previous studies.

Notably, the Cinema and Television department graduates define themselves as individuals who are more flexible, more popular, and use body language more effectively. When we look at the sub-headings of individual aspects of communication, they are at a higher level than other departments. Graduates working in social fields are more likely to have such characteristics than individuals working only in production. While it is not necessary for a factory worker to have a high level of communication, and perhaps even a low level of communication, and only be asked to do the given job, individuals working in the fields of team organization and planning are preferred to be harmonious individuals who can communicate with their colleagues at a high level.

Empathy is a critical concept in the social field. Understanding what the parties feel, what they expect, and even what they imagine will increase communication and business success. In communication, it is essential to understand others and to make the other party feel that we understand them. When you know and express the other party's needs, their desire to work together will increase. Faculty graduates are similar in terms of empathy levels between departments. However, it was observed that graduates of the Communication Design and Management and Journalism departments were more successful in this regard.

Another concept being explored is the ability to be sensitive. Knowing where and how to behave usually starts in childhood during family education. Later on, this ability is developed in secondary education, and it is expected to reach the highest level in all individuals in our faculty. It is pleasing that this concept, which is very important in individual communication, is at a high level in all our faculty students. However, the fact that it is slightly higher in the Cinema and Television department than in other departments can be interpreted as that this department is more focused on this issue.

In daily social life, communication and friendship between individuals develop slowly over months, sometimes years. However, such a period is only occasionally available in business life. For this reason, it is necessary to encourage communication, and it may be essential to achieve a certain level of communication in a shorter period and to start working together as soon as possible. Here, the individual must be not only open to communication but also able to encourage others to communicate. As a result of our research, all of our graduates were found to have a high level of competence in communication encouragement. In addition, it is an essential privilege that the number of students in the Communication Design and Management department is statistically significantly higher than that of other departments (Table 6).

Human relations in the working environment differ from human relations in social life. In social life, individuals can communicate with the individuals they desire, like, and enjoy. However, in business life, they have to be at a certain level of communication with their teammates. Individuals working in sales and service provision especially have to have a

certain level of communication with the opposite group in the buyer position. During this communication, it is not a question of liking or disliking the other party, finding them suitable or not.

For this reason, human relations in the business field can be more complicated than in the social field. It is pleasing that our graduates have very high human ties. However, it has been observed that the Department of Cinema and Television students are more successful in human relations.

The basis of communication between individuals is to listen to the other person first, to make them express themselves without interrupting. This stage is followed by understanding the other person and correctly listing their demands and requests. In sessions where groups negotiate, it is essential that the groups treat each other with respect and understanding and that they listen very well first. The first stage of communication is not to talk but to listen to the other person. In business life, this can change to understanding what the customer or employer wants and expects. The importance of listening in a business relationship is indisputable. As a result of our study, it was found that all department graduates had a high level of listening ability, and Communication Design and Management department graduates were better listeners.

5. Conclusion

In this study, in which the Communication Competence Scale was used, it was concluded that the average communication competence score of 400 graduates of Journalism, Public Relations and Advertising, Communication Design and Management, and Cinema and Television departments was 3.7571. This score means that the communication competencies of the graduates of the Faculty of Communication can be evaluated as “adequate”.

It was noted that all graduates from the department exhibited a high degree of proficiency in various individual facets of communication. This outcome is anticipated and aligns with findings from prior research.

It is significant to observe that graduates from the Department of Cinema and Television characterize themselves as possessing greater flexibility, enhanced popularity, and a more proficient use of body language compared to their counterparts from other departments, particularly when considering the individual components of communication.

There are no significant differences in the levels of empathy among faculty graduates from different departments. It was noted that graduates from the Communication Design and Management and Journalism departments exhibited a higher level of success in this respect.

Within our faculty, it is anticipated that this capability will attain the utmost level in every individual. It is gratifying to note that this concept, which holds significant importance in interpersonal communication, is well-developed among all students within our faculty. Nevertheless, the observation that the Cinema and Television department exhibits a marginally higher incidence compared to other departments may be construed as indicative of a greater emphasis placed on this matter within that particular department.

Consequent to our research findings, it was determined that all of our graduates possess a commendable level of proficiency in fostering effective communication. Furthermore, it is a noteworthy advantage that students in Communication Design and Management exhibit statistically significant superior performance compared to their counterparts in other departments.

Upon analyzing the human relations dimension, it was noted that the students enrolled in the Cinema and Television department exhibited a higher level of success.

As a result of our research, the observation that our graduates exhibit exceptional communication skills can be interpreted as indicative of the high-quality education provided by our faculty across all domains of communication. The elevated levels of certain characteristics in specific departments may be attributable to the distinctions between the students inclined to choose these departments and the faculty members who instruct within them.

It is widely acknowledged that this study, which investigates communication competence from multiple perspectives, is of great value to the field of communication literature. In addition, the contents of the courses can be reorganized from the perspective of the communication faculties.

On the other hand, by discussing the findings with the managers of communication faculties, it is possible to build new courses that will fill the abilities that are currently lacking.

In addition, to assist in the process of bridging these gaps to some degree, it is possible to organize workshops or meetings with individuals who have established themselves in the industry.

Acknowledgment

This study was supported by the Scientific Research Coordination Unit of Anadolu University under project number SBA-2024-2553.

References

- Abacı, R. (1995). Egan ve Nottingham insan ilişkileri becerileri eğitim modellerinin grup üyelerinin kendine saygı, kendini kabul ve kendini gerçekleştirme düzeylerine etkisi. [unpublished research].
- Balcı S., & Yılmaz, M. (2000). Çocukları anaokuluna devam eden annelere verilen iletişim becerileri eğitiminin ailenin işlevlerine etkisi. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, 2(14), 17-24.
- Büyükbaykal, G., & Büyükbaykal, A.C.I. (2018). Türkiye’deki İletişim Fakültelerinde Eğitim ve Yaşanılan İstihdam Sorunları. *Turkish Studies*, 13(18), 321-334. <https://doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.13777>
- Çam, S. (1999). İletişim becerileri eğitimi programının öğretmen adaylarının ego durumlarına ve problem çözme becerisine etkisi. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, 2(12), 16-27.
- Can, S. (2018). İletişim eğitiminde akademi ve sektör beklentileri üzerine bir araştırma. *Humanities Sciences*, 13(3), 57-73. <https://doi.org/10.12739/NWSA.2018.13.3.4C02255>
- Çelik, M.U. (2012). Radyo, televizyon ve sinema bölümü özelinde iletişim fakültelerindeki eğitime ilişkin bir inceleme. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 3(1), 60-65.
- Çetinkanat, C. (1998). Öğretmen adayları ve müfettişlerin bakış açısından öğretmen iletişim becerileri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi dergisi (Journal of Educational Administration in Theory and Practice)*, 4(2), 209-221.

- Coffman, S. L., & Coffman, V. T. (1993). Communication training for hospice volunteers. *Omega Journal of Death and Dying*, 27(2), 155-163. <https://doi.org/10.2190/251V-5WXL-K3H6-08RJ>
- Costa, L. C., Sonia, T. G., Jesús, R. M., Carlos, J. V., & Hofstadt, R. (2016). Psychometric properties of the health professionals communication skills scale (Hp-Css). *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 16(1), 76-86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijchp.2015.04.001>
- Ersanlı, K., & Balcı, S. (1998). İletişim becerileri envanterinin geliştirilmesi: geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, 2(10), 7-12. <https://doi.org/10.17066/pdrd.76133>
- Ertuğ, Z.K., & Göksel, E. (2019). The views of newly graduate engineers' regarding to the undergraduate education received and perceptions of professional competence. *Eskişehir Osmangazi University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 14(2), 347-364. <https://doi.org/10.17153/oguiibf.468739>
- George, D., & P. Mallery (2010). SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference. Allyn & Bacon.
- Hahs-Vaughn, D.L., & Lomax, R.G. (2013). An introduction to statistical concepts. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203137819>
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B., Anderson, R.E., & Tatham, R.L. (2009). Multi- variate data analysis (7th ed). Prentice-Hall.
- İçöz, Aykut (2011). Çalışan ve yönetici için iş hayatı oyun kuralları. Cinius Publishing.
- İlhan, E. (2022). Mezunlar anlatıyor: üniversite geneli seçmeli dersler zaman kaybı mı yoksa geleceğe yatırım mı?. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi (Journal of National Education)*, 51(236), 3563-3592. <https://doi.org/10.37669/milliegitim.929312>
- Karagöz, Y., & Kösterilioğlu, İ. (2008). İletişim becerileri değerlendirme ölçeğinin faktör analizi metodu ile geliştirilmesi. *Dumlupınar University Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(21), 81-98.
- Keskin A.Y., & Aslan M. (2021). Yeni mezun hemşirelerde işe hazır olma ölçeği'nin türkçe'ye uyarlanması: geçerlik ve güvenirlik. *Gümüşhane University Journal of Health Sciences*, 10(1): 70-80. <https://doi.org/10.37989/gumussagbil.734524>
- Kline, R.B. (2011). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling. The Guilford Press.
- Koca, G.Ş., & Erigüç, G. (2017). İletişim yeterlilik ölçeği'nin geçerlik ve güvenirliği. *International Journal of Management Economics and Business*, 13(4), 789-799. <https://doi.org/10.17130/ijmeb.2017433408>
- Korkut, F. (1996). İletişim becerilerini değerlendirme ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi: güvenirlik ve geçerlik çalışmaları. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, 2(7), 18-23.
- Korkut, F. (2005). Yetişkinlere yönelik iletişim becerileri eğitimi. *Hacettepe University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 28(28), 143-149.
- Nerdrum, P. (1997). Maintenance of the effect of training in communication skills: A controlled follow-up study of level of communicated empathy. *British Journal of Social Work*, 27(5), 705-722. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjsw.a011261>

- Öncel L. (2020). Yeni mezunların kişilik özelliklerinin işlerine uyum sağlamalarıyla ilişkisi. Temel benlik değerlendirmelerinin aracılık rolü. [Doctoral thesis, İstanbul University]. <https://nek.istanbul.edu.tr/ekos/TEZ/ET002097.pdf>
- Rees, C., Charlotte, S., & Susie, D. (2002). The development of a scale to measure medical students' attitudes towards communication skills learning: The communication skills attitude scale (CSAS). *Medical Education*, 36(2), 141-147. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2923.2002.01072.x>
- Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (2015). Using multivariate statistics, (sixth ed). Allyn & Bacon/Pearson.
- Topluer, A. (2008). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin iletişim yeterlilikleri ile örgütsel çatışma düzeyi arasındaki ilişki “Malatya ili örneği”. (Publication No. 226934). [Master’s thesis, İnönü University]. UlusalTezMerkezi.
- Üçler, N., & Büyükçelikök, T. Ö. (2021). İletişim fakültesi müfredatlarının medya sektörü iş ilanları üzerinden sektörel beklentileri karşılama yeterliğinin incelenmesi. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 20(3), 1245-1269. <https://doi.org/10.21547/jss.879093>
- Wiemann, John M. (1977). Explication and test of a model of communicative competence. *Human Communication Research*, 3(3), 195–213. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1977.tb00518.x>
- Yetkiner, B. (2018). Radyo, televizyon ve sinema bölümlerinde verilen sinema derslerinin değerlendirilmesi. *İnönü University Faculty of Communication Electronic Journal*, 3(1), 83-99.
- Zorver, C.E. (2011). Kariyer uyumu ve iyimserliği ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. (Publication No. 288232). [Master’s thesis, Hacettepe University]. UlusalTezMerkezi.