An Exploratory Study of Communicative Competencies in Professors and Health Professional Education

Simon Fernandez*

Abstract

V@^ *[æ| ¸æ• c[&[},¦{ •cˇå^}c•q]^¦&^]cå[}• [˜ &[{ {ˇ}å&æcå[} •\å||• å} @^æ|c@ ^åˇ&æcå[}. Dæcæ ¸^¦^ *æc@^¦^å ˜[¦ c@å• ^¢]|[¦æc[¦ˆ •cˇåˆ ˜¦[{ æ •æ{]|^ [˜ •cˇå^}c• æc æ ˇ}åç^¦•åcˆ å} S[ˇc@^¦} B¦æːå| ˇ•å}* æ ˇˇ^•cå[}}æå¦^. A{ [}*

æ• 71 •cˇå^}c• ˜¦[{ *¦æåˇæc^]¦[*¦æ{ {^• å} àå[{^åå&å}^,]@ˆ•å[c@^¦æ]ˆ, •]^^&@ c@^¦æ]ˆ, æ}å æˇåå[|[*ˆ. A|| •cˇå^}c• &[{ }]|^c^å æ •]^&åæ| ˇˇ^•cå[}}æå¦^ &¦^æc^å ˜[¦ c@å• •cˇåˆ æ}å •å*}^å å}˜[¦{å &[}•^}c •cc ˜[¦ {. R^•ˇ|c•: Dæcæ ¸^¦^

labour and the standard of quality expected of new professionals [16].

e signi cance of conducting research in this area must be emphasised because several aspects of communicative competence can be enhanced and built upon, particularly in the academic setting, helping to plan and carry out educational and professional activities [2,12].

e purpose of this study was to con rm graduate and postgraduate students' perceptions of the application and e ects of communicative competency seminars and courses at the university.

Methods

Sample and study design

is research is both descriptive and exploratory. 125 students from the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul in Porto Alegre, Brazil, were included in the sample. 54 of the participants were enrolled in postgraduate, Master's, and doctoral programmes in health sciences, and 71 were graduate students in biomedicine, physiotherapy, speech therapy, and audiology. Only students pursuing educational practise and teaching in the eld of health education were invited to participate and informed about the study. is discipline, which is a required component of the university curriculum, aims to provide technical instrumentation and critical re ection on health education, allowing students to comprehend the underlying assumptions of educational practise, the assimilation of learning and work performance through the selection of key subjects, as well as the structuring and planning of occupational performance.

Survey

A structured questionnaire that was adjusted for the participants' educational backgrounds was the method selected for data collecting. is tool was created by speech therapists enrolled in university postgraduate programmes under the supervision of the institution's speech therapy and pedagogy instructors. Individual questionnaires were lled out in a quiet, undisturbed environment. ere was no deadline for completion set in stone. To ensure con dentiality and participant anonymity, all participants received instruction on how to complete the questionnaire and were then told to place it in a sealed box once nished. Each participant was expected to read and respond to each question independently; the examiner did not read the questions. To guarantee equal application, the method was always overseen by the same examiner. 11 items made up the questionnaire utilised in this study, which included questions on participant identi cation,

communication skill evaluation, the value of communication in the educational process, and student self-evaluation of communication skills. e questions covered the following main areas: a desire to pursue academic careers, the necessity of including communication skills activities in graduate and/or postgraduate classes, prior experience in communication skills courses and classes, and those aspects of oral presentation thought to be most crucial, such as voice production, posture, breathing, body and facial expression, subject, articulation and speech rate, language and vocabulary, use of body language, and use of body language. Finally, the respondent needs to have said which of these characteristics they found the most challenging (Table 1).

Data analysis

Data were analysed using content analysis, which is characterised by the observation of communications using systematic and objective methods for message content description as well as by indicators that enable knowledge inference about the inferred variables of these communications [17]. Descriptive statistics, Fisher's exact tests, and Chi-squared tests were used in the statistical study to compare the factors related to communication abilities. Communication skills and sample factors were compared using the Mann Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests. By using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, normality was evaluated. e programme utilised for statistical analysis was SPSS version 16.0, and the signi cance level was set at a maximum of 5% (p 0.05).

Results

ere were 106 (84.8%) female participants in the study sample, and there were no statistically signi cant variations in gender between the graduate and postgraduate groups (p=0.561). e overall mean age was 24.8 years (SD=0.412), showing a statistically signi cant di erence (p0.001) from the postgraduate participants' mean age of 27 years (SD=4.395), which was higher at 28.1 years (SD=4.006) for graduates and lower at 23.1 years (SD=4.006) for postgraduates. 119 (95.2%) of the study's total participants thought it was essential to implement communication initiatives in academic settings and educational institutions. 53 (98.1%) postgraduate students and 66 (92.9%) graduate students were both represented (p=0.386). In addition to the University, 40 students (32%) reported teaching speech and communication classes at other institutions. Of them, 22 (31%) were graduates and 18 (33.3%) were postgraduates (p=0.465).

Table 1: C[{ ˘}å&æcåç^ •\å||• &[}•åå^¦^å { [•cå {][¦cæ}c å ˆ •c ˘å^}c•. }: å}ååçåå ˘æ|• }˘ { à^¦; %: å}ååçåå ˘æ|•]^¦&^}cæ*^; Scæcå•cå&æ| •å*}å,&æ}&^ |<0.05.

Communicative Skills	Graduate		Postgraduate		Fisher's exact test	Total	
	}=71	%	}=54	%		}=125	%
Aå^˘˘æc^ ç[å&^ ˘˘æ|åc^		21	3	5.5	0.019	18	14.4
	20	28	22	40.7	0.181	42	33.6
A]]¦[][¦åæc^][•c˘¦^	39		24	44.4	0.281	63	50.4
Aå^˘˘æc^ •]^^&@ æ¦cå&˘|æcå[}		63	35	64.8		80	64
	10			20.3	0.469	21	16.8
Aå^˘˘æc^ •]^^&@ ¦æc^		66	32	59.2	0.458	79	63.2
A]]¦[][¦åæc^ -æ&åæ| ^¢]¦^••å[}	6	8.4		7.4		10	8
A]]¦[][¦åæc^ å¦^••			3	5.5	0.094		11.2
	63	89		87	0.788	110	88
A]]¦[][¦åæc^ |æ}*˘æ*^ æ}å ç[&æà˘|æ¦ˆ		24	12	22.2		29	23.2
R^•[˘¦&^-˘|}^•• æ}å]^¦•˘æ•åç^]¦^•^}cæcå[}	27	38	20	37			37.6
A]]¦[][¦åæc^ à[åˆ |æ}*˘æ*^		21	9	16.6	0.648	24	19.2
	13	18	16	29.6	0.199	29	23.2
	38		29	53.7		67	53.6
		1.4	0	0			0.8

Citation:

Discussion

Studies like the one by Braga and Silva (2006) [18] that aim to propose a methodological foundation for tracking the development of a student's communicative competence help to improve professional development for teachers and student training because people who use appropriate communication are more socially acceptable. By fostering greater openness and communication among its students and providing them with the tools necessary to express themselves in conversations and public speaking exercises, universities that recognise these demands will aid students' transition from the classroom to the working world [2,5]. Participants in this survey noted the value of e ective communication in oral presentations and discussions as well as the dearth of these skills in the academic and professional settings. It is acknowledged that communicative treatments can help build and improve a variety of communication skills [2]. Higher education must make an investment in initiatives that can identify a university student's pro le in this situation. e goal should be to create e ective circumstances for the individual to do well at work in the future while also planning help for the demands of students [19]. It is important to emphasise the importance of these communicative and educational activities in the elds of health and other sciences, whose professional success depends on the calibre of the relationships created between the professional and client and within a team [4,20,21]. is is because professionals with e ective communication skills have better integration skills, exhibit assertiveness and competence, strengthen connections in the workplace, and have an impact on the process of adhering.

e most o en mentioned factors listed by students as essential for e ective verbal and nonverbal communication were "content domain," "adequate speech rate," and "speech articulation." Because communicative skill mostly rests on the theoretical underpinnings of the aforementioned problem, the student's choice for the content domain component is reasonable. It can stimulate the listener's interest and dependability, speed up the learning process, and encourage engagement with the general audience [22]. According to statistics that support the results of this study, speech pace and articulation are the two factors most closely associated to communicative competence when it comes to speech production skills [23]. ese authors do, however, also discuss the gaps in the body of knowledge in this area. It should be highlighted that in the therapeutic setting of speech therapy, these communication abilities are frequently enhanced and strengthened. With preventative and instructional actions in schools, universities, and student training facilities, speech rate and articulation can be improved. In schools, universities, and student training facilities, preventive and instructional activities can help students with their speech pace and articulation. "Adequate speech rate," "adequate speech articulation," and "interaction with the public" were among the di culties mentioned by the research participants. As was indicated in the paragraph above, students value communication abilities that are connected to speech production. ese abilities are directly connected to speech comprehensibility, which might hinder message comprehension. When a healthcare expert speaks, this might hinder patient understanding of their health state and prescribed treatments as well as communication between members of the health team.

It was observed that the development of social skills in childhood is a critical factor in preventing the onset of anti-social behaviour and its long-term e ects [24] with regard to the social capacity to engage with the public as self-reported by students in this study sample. ese writers also draw attention to the link between social skills and adaptive behaviour, such as successful academic achievement and coping mechanisms for di cult circumstances. is statistic emphasises the value of social skills in both personal and professional activities, such as interacting with the audience during oral presentations. us, it is signi cant that programmes that encourage the development of positive social skills in kids and teenagers exist [25].

Finally, research on studies that examine the communication abilities of health professionals and in teacher education is lacking. A research in this area found that there is a theoretical and practical gap between instructors' preparation and language/communication abilities, which does not appear to favour the connections between communication and skills gained via already-knowledgeable domains. Due to this, fewer re ective practises have researched and addressed communication, despite the fact that its signi cance in the pedagogical discourse is widely recognised. It has also drawn attention to the paucity of research on the instructor and the students' communicative pro ciency and expressiveness. Studies that examine how well health professionals communicate with their patients, particularly youngsters, are also lacking. However, due to the signi cance of this subject for educational planning and for the professional success of teachers and healthcare professionals, speech therapy is now expanding its actions and processes into educational domains [26]. Despite this, speech therapy is now extending its actions and processes into educational domains due to the signi cance of s signi cantonicatsio

d by studeers ll as comms in chi8nal herapy pr now ex.5(vi.t ld thsD[(healt

Citation:

References

1. E•cĺæåæ CA, Pæc^¦ SR, Væ¦^}c^ G, K¦æ^{^¦ S (2005) V@^ 10-{å}˘c^ [¦æ¦]¦^•^}cæcå[}: ¸@æc •@[˘¦å I-[&˘• [}? A{ J M^å S&å 329:306-309.

2. C[•^}cå}[G, V[åå•&[M, Gå˘åå&^ C, Væ••[¦^¦¦å C, A¦-[}•å E (2022) A••^•• {^}c æ}å c¦^æc{^}c [- }^˘¦[*^}å& åˆ•]@æ*åæå} •c¦[\^ æ}å Pæ¦\å}•[}}q• åå•^æ•^. O]å} N^˘¦[¦ 35:741-752.

3. Xå^å¦æ AC, B^@|æ˘ M (2009)]¦^]æ¦æc[¦ˆ •&@[[¦c^æ&@^¦•. R^ç S[& B¦æ• F[}[æ˘åå[¦ 14:346-351.

4. D^¦ P¦^cc^ ZAP, P¦^cc^ AD, Gæ¦&åæ FA, Så¦çæ AVB, P˘}c^¦ LP (1998) •[&åæ¦ •\å¦¦• å} &|æ••¦[[{: æ &æ•^•c˘åˆ. P•å&[¦ R^'^¢ C¦åc 11:591-603.

5. P^¦¦^} A, Z>¦&@^¦ P, S&@^-[¦å J (2019) ^¢c˘àæcå[} Dˆ•]@æ*åæ (PED) å} c@^ &¦åcå&æ¦¦^ å¦¦. Dˆ•]@æ*åæ 34:475-486.

6. P^¦^å¦æ-G˘å::[CS, P¦^cc^ AD, D^¦ P¦^cc^ ZAP (2012) Eçæ¦˘æcå[} O- A P¦[-^••å[}æ¦ S[&åæ¦ S\å¦¦•]å¦[*¦æ{ -[¦ ˘}^{]¦[^å]^[]¦^ ¸å c@]@ˆ•å&æ¦ åå•æàå¦åcˆ. P•å&[¦ R^'^¢ C¦åc 25:265-274.

7. F[¦^ˆ GX (1993) E}@æ}&å}* å@å¦å--æ{å¦^-@^æ¦c@ c^æ{ &[{{˘}å&æcå[}.A{ P ¦'M 'M E- -G˘æ•