Perceptions of Turkish Academicians on Media Literacy Assessment in Higher Education in Turkey

Türk Akademisyenlerin Türkiye'de Yükseköğretimde Medya Okuryazarlığı Değerlendirmesine İlişkin Algıları

Betül ALTAŞ

Assist.Prof.Dr. ◆ English Language Teaching Department, Çağ University ◆ betulaltas@cag.edu.tr ◆ OrcID: 0000-0003-1111-7231

Sevda ÜNAL

Assist.Prof.Dr. ◆ Journalism Department, Çukurova University ◆ sevdaunal@cu.edu.tr ◆ OrcID: 0000-0003-2754-4780

Abstract

This descriptive study investigates Turkish academicians' perceptions of the media literacy outcomes, assessment, and challenges of media literacy education, and their recommendations to overcome these challenges in higher education. Data were collected from 41 Turkish academicians working at Turkish universities from seven geographic regions. Data were collected via the "Media Literacy Assessment Questionnaire" which was developed by Schilder (2014). Participants were academicians with subject-area specialisation in English Language Teaching, Computer Education and Instructional Technology in the education faculty, and academicians with subject-area specialisation in the departments of communication faculty as these academicians were interested in media and technology and media literacy education. Results of the study reveal that formative assessment was a prominent assessment method; however, most assessment methods that the academicians used were also identified as time-consuming or complex to develop. Results also show that academicians were unsure about how to interpret students' responses to assess their media literacy and identified teachers' insufficient training as a challenge in assessing outcomes. Based on the data results obtained from this study, specifying learning outcomes beforehand shouldn't be accomplished by the force of administration, but should be determined by the consensus among all parties in the field. Results also reveal that critical literacy and pedagogy should be taken into account in media literacy education so that learners can become critically autonomous citizens in this globalised world.

Keywords: Media literacy, Media literacy education, Assessment, Critical pedagogy, Higher education.

Özet

Bu betimsel çalışmanın amacı, Türk akademisyenlerin medya okuryazarlığı çıktıları, değerlendirmesi, medya okuryazarlığı eğitiminin zorluklarına ilişkin algılarını ve yükseköğretimde bu zorlukların üstesinden gelmek için sundukları önerilerini araştırmaktır. Araştırmanın verileri, Türkiye'nin yedi coğrafi bölgesindeki üniversitelerde çalışan 41 Türk akademisyenden toplanmıştır. Veri toplamak için Schilder (2014) tarafından geliştirilen "Medya Okuryazarlığı Değerlendirme Anketi" kullanılmıştır. Bu çalışmada, medya ve teknoloji ve medya okuryazarlığı eğitimi ile ilgilendiği için, iletişim fakültesinde ve eğitim fakültesi bölümlerinden de İngilizce Öğretmenliği, Bilgisayar Eğitimi ve Öğretim Teknolojileri alanlarında uzmanlığa sahip akademisyenler yer almıştır. Araştırmanın sonuçları, biçimlendirici değerlendirmenin öne çıkan değerlendirme yöntemlerinden biri olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır ancak akademisyenlerin kullandığı çoğu değerlendirme yönteminin de zaman alıcı veya geliştirmesi karmaşık olduğu belirlenmiştir. Araştırma sonuçları ayrıca, akademisyenlerin öğrencilerin medya okuryazarlığını değerlendirmek için verdikleri yanıtları nasıl yorumlayacaklarından emin olmadıklarını ve eğiticilerin yetersiz eğitimini, sonuçları değerlendirmede bir zorluk olarak tanımladıklarını göstermektedir. Araştırmada elde edilen sonuçlar, medya okuryazarlığı öğrenme çıktılarının yöneticiler tarafından değil, alandaki tüm paydaşların fikir birliği ile belirlenmesi gerektiğini ortaya

koymaktadır. Araştırma sonuçları ayrıca, öğrencilerin küreselleşen dünyada eleştirel olarak özerk vatandaşlar olabilmeleri için medya okuryazarlığı eğitiminde eleştirel okuryazarlık ve pedagojinin dikkate alınması gerektiğini ortaya çıkarmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Medya okuryazarlığı, Medya okuryazarlığı eğitimi, Değerlendirme, Eleştirel pedagoji, Yükseköğretim.

1. Introduction

In today's information society, there has been a simultaneous interaction between media texts and people in various ways in every field of society. As individuals learn about the world from media, researchers and educators have paid particular attention to media literacy education (Kahne & Bowyer, 2019; McGrew, Breakstone, Ortega, Smith, & Wineburg, 2018). The reason is that "Media literacy deals with the study of cultures and looks at the problems relating to hybridisation, interconnection and cross-cultural issues between societies and peoples. In other words, media literacy is all about intercultural dialogue" (Tornero, 2014, p. 5). As a consequence, the focus of media education is on the critical analysis and production of media messages and improving individuals' media literacy skills to have better cross-cultural dialogue for free and democratic societies (Michallidis, 2010).

Considering the role of the twenty-first century media culture in learners' lives, learning requires active inquiry and process skills underpinning the inquiry-based pedagogy. Hence, media literacy education moves beyond traditional education where there is limited access to information and knowledge via ready-made materials and textbooks, and where students' knowledge is assessed through tests and papers (Jolls, 2008). Drawing from this perspective, open-ended questions constitute the epitome of inquiry models in which the learner actively asks and answers questions to make meaning of media messages (Jolls, 2008). In this inquiry process, scholarly frames and inquiry approaches are offered to practitioners and teachers to benefit from the key questions to enable their students to analyse media content (Schilder & Redmond, 2019).

In the active inquiry process and assessment of inquiry, individuals learn to question particular concepts through media literacy education. For instance, Buckingham (2019) offers four concepts: media language, representation, production, and audiences whereby individuals could critically think and analyse media content. Media language is defined as analyzing the use of language and construction of meaning in each media, and the concept of representation is the study of the representation of reality and credibility of information in media (Buckingham, 2019). Questioning the concepts such as authors and audiences, messages and meanings, and representations and reality are offered by National Association for Media Literacy Education (NAMLE, 2014). Duncan, D'Ippolito, Macpherson, and Wilson (1998) offer questions about the text, audience, and production.

Considering the impact of the domination of the English language, understanding the target culture that is reflected in the content of media sources and materials is another essential point. In parallel with the impact of this language on the content of media texts, media as a medium should be taken into consideration seriously to understand the target culture. Kramsch (1998) addresses the significance of the context in communication from which the meaning of a word emerges because there is an interwoven relationship between language and culture in multiple and complex ways. Media literacy education provides learners with insights to understand the unlimited and complex linguistics features such as vocabulary, grammar, and accent in discourse in which language is used to convey messages and information in diversified contexts (Sherman, 2009). In Sherman's (2009) critical view, this type of education is provided by neither course books nor the classroom environment. Notably, there has been a global demand for media literacy education in which learners can both

understand and use the information to solve complex real-life problems in the virtual and real world (Jolls, 2020).

Incorporating English and American multimedia forms into English Language Teaching classrooms to develop students' media literacy, Dvorghets and Shaturnaya (2015) suggest that language teachers must also have interdisciplinary knowledge. They argue that media literacy is requisite for both teachers and students to have successful cross-cultural communication. Regarding the role of international multimedia materials in individuals' lives, understanding the significance of the cross-cultural communicative aspect of multimedia sources in native and target language is essential and must be a pre-requisite for both teachers and students to be a world citizen.

While studies about media literacy shed light on the perceptions of teachers, scholars, and educators on media literacy education in the western context (Schilder, 2014), the state of media literacy in the socio-political, cultural, economic and educational context of Turkey is not informative enough to understand media literacy education in terms of higher education at the global level. In this regard, this study aims to investigate Turkish academicians' perceptions on media literacy outcomes, assessment, and the existing challenges academicians struggle against in higher education. The study also offers suggestions to those challenges participants faced in their home country. In line with the aims of the study, the following research questions were investigated:

RQ1. Which media literacy outcomes do academicians identify as important?

RQ2. How do academicians assess these outcomes?

RQ3. Which challenges do academicians discern regarding media literacy assessment?

RQ4. Which recommendations do academicians make to overcome the challenges of media literacy assessment?

2. Theoretical Framework

Media literacy education was first identified as part of democratic participation and citizenship in the 1970s (Hobbs & Jensen, 2009). UNESCO, which led an international symposium on media literacy education in 1982 in Grunwald, Germany, also held the first media literacy education conference in the Middle East in 2007 (Altun, 2012). UNESCO has incorporated information literacy into its media literacy facilities since 2011 (UNESCO Türkiye Milli Komisyonu, 2019). Media literacy education has also gained momentum since 2000 by the EU's contributions to the development of media literacy (Silver, 2009). In this regard, the European Commission offered an approach to media literacy in the digital space by the end of 2007 (Silver, 2009). As UNESCO and EU have brought attention to media literacy, media literacy education has been considered seriously in the field of education.

In line with the shift in thought in educational sciences, scholars and educators have also gained insights into understanding the theoretical background of literacy due to Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural approach to literacy in his work (Perry, 2012). Considering Vygotsky's contributions to educational psychology, and the sociocultural theory that used in literacy and second language learning, Mahn and John-Steiner (2013) note that human beings use symbols and signs that are socially created and shared. These signs and symbols are investigated to understand how humans make meaning and use language. However, Perry offers a critical approach to the definition of literacy in sociocultural theory, saying that there is no fixed understanding of literacy from the socio-cultural perspective. According to Perry, the sociocultural perspective offers different theories of literacy from three distinctive perspectives: social practice, multiliteracies, and critical literacy. In defining literacy, those perspectives shed light on power relations in terms of the use of language in the hierarchical structures of the system.

From Freire's (2000) standpoint, literacy is based on the critique that requires both understanding and reflecting on the relationship between the use of language and its connection to the world. Regarding the inquiry-based approach to learning, scholars and educators also paid particular attention to Freire's notion of education that is grounded in critical pedagogy (Hobbs & Jensen, 2009). In Freire's opinion, learners should question the refracted reality of today's global system and reconstruct the knowledge in communication with teachers and other learners. Learners can hereby manifest their worldview in their actions in society. Media literacy education where individuals actively take part in deconstructing and reconstructing the knowledge has been regarded as an essential practice of citizens (Hobbs & Jensen, 2009). That is, individuals are not seen as passive learners as the material objects of education, but they are viewed as active learners who have control over their autonomy in the learning process.

The goal pursued in media literacy education is to enable learners to use critical thinking skills that help them transmit the knowledge to their professional, social, and individual life in their interaction with media (Schilder & Redmond, 2019). From this aspect, scholars offer two approaches to the media literacy assessment: the protectionist approach and the cultural studies approach (Schilder, 2014). In his study, Buckingham (2019) criticizes the protectionist approach to media literacy because media literacy education is viewed as a simple solution to protect learners from side effects of media. However, the aim of educators and scholars is not to prevent media violence and abuse. In this sense, the purpose of the cultural studies approach is to enable individuals to engage in media through top-down instruction (French, 2020). Although both of these approaches to media literacy assessment may seem to be a counter view of each other, Schilder (2014) says that both may overlap to promote the fruitfulness of media literacy education.

In Martens' (2010) opinion, some educators advocate a protectionist approach to assess the efficacy of media literacy education in more quantitative ways, while advocates of the cultural studies approach employ qualitative methods to assess media literacy education. In the investigation of media literacy, researchers benefit from media literacy, communication theory, and constructivist learning theory (Buckingham, 2003; Duffy & Jonassen, 1992; Masterman, 1985; Schilder, 2014).

3. Methodology

To explore respondents' perceptions on media literacy education, media literacy assessment, and assessment challenges as well as recommendation they made for media literacy education, we conducted a descriptive study by employing a media literacy questionnaire. The research from which this article is written was approved by the Çağ University Research Ethics Committee on August 7th, 2020 and the consent form is numbered as 88998576-299-E.2000002385.

3.1. Participants and Research Context

We employed a media literacy assessment questionnaire, using Google Forms in the 2020-2021 academic year. A convenience sampling was employed to select participants, and the participation was entirely voluntary based on their consent. The questionnaire was administered to 150 Turkish academicians working in the faculties of education and communication, and 41 responded to the questionnaire. In this study, the focus of the participant selection was on the academicians working in English Language Teaching, Computer Education and Instructional Technology, and those working in departments of communication faculty. Therefore, data were obtained from academicians with subject-area specialization in English Language Teaching (n=14), Computer Education and

Instructional Technology (n=5) in the education faculty, and with subject-area specialization in departments of communication faculty (n=22). These academicians were interested in media and technology and media literacy education, and some of them taught media literacy courses in higher education.

Response to the questionnaire was anonymous, and confidentiality was assured. 41 Turkish academicians working at state and private universities were in cities from the seven geographic regions in Turkey. The demographic background of respondents is detailed in Table 1 below.

Table 1 *Demographic Background of Respondents*

	n	%
Respondents per City		
İzmir	5	12.2
İstanbul	9	22
Ankara	7	17.1
Eskişehir	3	7.3
Antalya	1	2.4
Gaziantep	11	26.8
Trabzon	2	4.9
Erzurum	3	7.3
Years of Experience		
0-4	15	36.6
5-9	15	36.6
10-14	8	19.5
15+	3	7.3
Number of Respondents Working with Specific Target Populations		
College/undergraduate students	34	82.9
Graduate or doctoral students	4	9.8
Teacher Education	2	4.9
Faculty		
Faculty of Communication	22	53.7
Faculty of Education	19	46.3
Teaching, lesson materials or research on media literacy		
Integrated in a specific subject area(s)	24	58.5
Taught or studied as a separate subject area	17	41.5

In total, 40 respondents answered the question about working with specific target populations, and 82.9% of those respondents indicated that they worked with college or undergraduate students. Additionally, 5 respondents answered the question about specific target groups by identifying the item as "other". Data results obtained from those 5 respondents are presented as follows:

In total, 40 respondents answered the question about working with specific target populations, and 82.9% of those respondents indicated that they worked with college or undergraduate students.

Additionally, five respondents answered the question about specific target groups by identifying the item as "other". Data results obtained from those five respondents are presented as follows:

R1: I manage projects for primary school education.

R2: I'm interested in training in this field.

R19: Labour economics and business administration.

R23: Projects.

R39: I conducted interviews with the primary and secondary school teachers for my MA study related to media literacy.

The quotes above reveal that academicians were not restricted in their disciplinary field, but that they were expected to inform other members of media communities both in the academic and real-life setting.

As presented in Table 1 above, 22 academicians identified their roles as lecturers at the faculty of communication, and 19 academicians indicated that they worked as a lecturer at the faculty of education. As seen in Table 1, 24 academicians (58.5%) indicated that they taught media literacy by integrating into a particular subject area(s), and 17 academicians (41.5%) taught or studied as an independent subject area.

3.2. Instrument: Media Literacy Questionnaire

In this study, "Media Literacy Assessment Questionnaire" which was developed by Schilder (2014), was used to collect data from academicians in seven geographical regions of Turkey. This instrument was used to gain insights into the media literacy assessment in the field and to investigate Turkish academicians' perceptions on the issues that are significant for the assessment of media literacy in the global arena. There were some Turkish respondents in the original study, as the data were international (Evelien Schilder, personal communication, March 9, 2020). In the current study, the questionnaire was translated into Turkish, the respondents' first language, to explore their perceptions in more detail. The translation process was conducted in three steps. First, the original instrument was translated into Turkish by the two researchers of this study. Four English instructors were also asked to translate the instrument items into Turkish. In the second phase, to account for linguistic validity, the Turkish version was checked by three academicians, who were proficient in English and were media literacy experts. The two researchers of this investigation revisited the Turkish version. Finally, a pilot study was conducted in which 10 academicians involved in media literacy education completed the Turkish version of the questionnaire. According to consensus among 10 experts, the items were reduced to 18.

In the first five questions of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to provide their demographic information. Questions from 6 to 10 were about media literacy objectives and outcomes. For instance, question 6, which was asked to determine media literacy objectives was a 4-point Likert. Furthermore, question 10, which was asked to identify specific media literacy outcomes was a 4-point Likert. For this study, internal consistency coefficients of Likert-type questions were also computed by SPSS. As seen in Table 2 below, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated as .885 for media literacy objectives and as .904 for specific media literacy outcomes.

***Table 2** Reliability Analysis*

Tables		Items	Type	Cronbach's Alpha
Table 3	Media literacy objectives	7	a 4-point Likert	.885
Table 7	Specific media literacy outcomes	7	a 4-point Likert	.904
Table 8	The role of assessment in the media literacy course	5	a 4-point Likert	.700
Table 12	Factors impacting media literacy assessment	6	a 5-point Likert	.762
Table 14	The extent of challenges for media literacy assessment	12	a 3-point Likert	.794
Table 15	Academicians' opinions on offered recommendations for media literacy assessment	7	a 4- point Likert	.801

Additionally, respondents were asked questions from 11 to 14 about media literacy assessment. In this regard, question 11, which was asked to identify the role of assessment in the media literacy course was a 4-point Likert type item. As presented in Table 2 above, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated as .700 for the role of assessment in media literacy course.

Moreover, questions from 15 to 17 were about assessment challenges. Herein, question 15, which was asked to rate factors that influenced the way academicians assess media literacy was a 5-point Likert. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated as .762 for factors impacting media literacy assessment. Question 17, which was asked to identify the challenges for the assessment of media literacy education in the field was a 3-point Likert, and Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated as .794 as presented in Table 2 above. Finally, respondents were asked to answer question 18 which was about assessment recommendations respondents provided was a 4-point Likert, and Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated as .801 for academicians' opinions on offered recommendations for media literacy assessment. In this questionnaire, there were six questions with a Likert type in total.

When respondents did not specify outcomes in question 7, they were asked to identify their reasons for not specifying outcomes in the following question 8. This means that they did not need to answer all 18 questions. The questionnaire also comprised open-ended items, which include open-ended responses such as "other" options, are item 4, item 8, item 9, and item 10.

3.3. Data Analysis

Data were analyzed by using SPSS software. This questionnaire was administered in the respondents' native language. To answer research questions, frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were calculated through descriptive statistics. The questionnaire also included 4 open-ended items. Qualitative analysis was used for these items that comprised open-ended responses to the "other" options were presented in the result section.

4. Results

4.1. Research Question One: Media Literacy Outcomes Academicians Identify as Important

The first research question aimed to investigate academicians' perceptions on the objectives and outcomes of media literacy education separately. In this section, they were asked to respond to five questions in total to evaluate the objectives and outcomes of media literacy education in the higher education context.

4.1.1. Objectives of Media Literacy Education

In this part of the questionnaire, participants were asked to identify the objectives of media literacy education. Those items are rated in order of importance from 1 (not at all important) to 4 (extremely important). Table 3 below shows data results as follows:

Table 3 Media Literacy Objectives

Items	n	M	SD
1. I want to prepare students to successfully participate in their personal, civic and professional lives.	41	3.34	0.57
2. I want students to enjoy producing media content.	41	3.17	0.62
3. I want to reduce the risk of unhealthy behaviours supported in media messages.	41	3.48	0.59
4. I want my students to become critically autonomous, to give them a sense of agency or empowerment.	41	3.48	0.55
5. I want students to have pleasure in exploring meaning and asking questions about media messages.	41	3.41	0.59
6. I want to help reduce the harmful effects of media.	41	3.39	0.73
7. I want my students to have confidence in expressing themselves.	41	3.46	0.67

As presented in Table 3 above, item 3 (M=3.48, SD=0.59), item 4 (M=3.48, SD=0.55), item 7 (M=3.46, SD=0.67), and item 5 (M=3.41, SD=0.59) were identified as the most important objectives of media literacy. Based on the data results in Table 3, other items, which were defined as important objectives of media literacy, are presented as item 6 (M=3.39 SD=0.73), item 1 (M=3.34, SD=0.57), and item 2 (M=3.17, SD=0.62).

4.1.2. Defining Media Literacy Outcomes

In addition to defining the objectives of media literacy education, academicians were also asked to define how well they specify outcomes of media literacy as illustrated in Table 4 below.

Table 4 Specifying Media Literacy Outcomes

Items	f	%
1. I do not specify outcomes.	11	26.8
2. I do specify outcomes, but they are broad and open.	30	73.2

As seen in Table 4 above, 30 academicians (73.2%) selected item 2 while 11 academicians (26.8%) selected item 1. To examine in detail, academicians are also asked to explain why they do not define outcomes of media literacy education in the following part of the questionnaire.

4.1.3. Reasons for Not Defining Outcomes

This part of the questionnaire aimed to determine why academicians did not define the outcomes of media literacy education. Academicians, who mentioned that they did not define their outcomes in Section 4.1.2., indicated their reasons in this section as presented in Table 5 below:

Table 5 *Reasons for not Specifying Media Literacy Outcomes*

Items	*f*	%
1. I do not know how to create them.	0	0
2. I want to leave the classroom open for other experience to happen rather than teaching towards specific outcomes.	7	17.1
3. I believe in personalized learning, and therefore do not want to set outcomes for the whole group of students.	7	17.1

In total, 14 respondents answered the question of why they did not explicitly specify media literacy outcomes. As seen in Table 5 above, seven respondents (17.1%) selected item 2 and the other seven (17.1%) indicated item 3. On the other hand, no respondent selected item 1.

As detailed in Table 4 in section 4.1.2., 11 respondents selected item 1. However, regarding data results in Table 5 above, 14 respondents preferred answering the question about why they did not specify the outcomes explicitly and identified the specific reasons for that. In section 4.1.2., academicians who selected item 1 as not specifying outcomes further stated that they left the classroom open for either other experiences to happen or personalized learning, as presented in Table 5 above.

Furthermore, 2 respondents selected the item as "other" to explain the reason why did not define the learning outcomes in media literacy. These quotes from respondents are illustrated as follows:

R7: My answer covers all of the answers in the items partially. The course includes the undetermined learning experiences of students that emerge from the context where they have the experience in multimedia environments.

R41: Specifying learning outcomes beforehand is accomplished by the force of administration. Learning outcomes are not determined by the consensus among all parties in the field. They will differ by the lecturer, his/her points of view, and ideology. It is almost impossible to provide a common system.

In their responses to the explanation of the reasons for not specifying learning outcomes, respondents 7 and 41 meant that specifying learning outcomes and leaving the classroom open for other experiences to occur throughout the learning process are inherent parts of media literacy education. For instance, respondent 7 referred to the significance of both specifying learning outcomes beforehand and students' learning experiences that emerge from the context. Furthermore, in respondent 41's opinion, specifying learning outcomes is seen as an obligatory issue that is put into the process by the administration. H/she underscored that learning outcomes are shaped by

disregarding the consensus among all stakeholders in the field. In comparison to other respondents, respondents 7 and 41 explained why they did not specify the learning outcomes in detail.

Table 6 *Explanation of Who Specifies the Outcomes*

Items	ƒ	%
1. I specify the outcomes myself.	7	17.1
2. The media literacy materials that I am using in my lessons have specified outcomes.	25	61
3. The school or organization in which I work specifies the outcomes.	2	4.9

As seen in Table 6 above, 25 respondents (61%) selected item 2. Furthermore, seven respondents (17.1%) selected item 1, and 2 respondents (4.9%) selected item 3. On average, the item with the highest score which they marked as the explanation of who specifies the outcomes was item 2.

Additionally, 2 respondents selected the item as "other" to verbalize their ideas about who specifies the outcomes. The following quotes from respondents are illustrated as follows:

R7: Considering the course hours allocated to the implication of media literacy, the ECTS course value, and current studies in the field, I determine the learning outcomes.

R41: Every period, learning outcomes differ by student's creativity. We limit the learning outcomes with rigid concepts. Through the practical implications, students must be equipped with skills so that they could see the realities in media.

The quotes obtained from respondents reveal that academicians could shape the outcomes based on contextual factors such as participants, and the educational environment and conditions. In this regard, Respondent 7 explained how h/she selected the criteria for the learning outcomes of the course. Respondent 41 also argued about the learning outcomes which are predetermined by the external drives and factors. In his/her response, h/she addressed the importance of practical implications of media and individual differences among learners.

4.1.4 Important Skills and Attitudes for Media Literacy

In this section, participants were asked to identify the extent of the importance of the specific skills and attitudes that learners would be able to have at the end of the media literacy education. As seen in Table 7 below, they were asked to identify outcomes that are rated in order of importance from 1 (not at all important) to 4 (extremely important).

Table 7 *Specific Media Literacy Outcomes*

Items	n	M	SD
1. Accessing, using, and experiencing a wide variety of media messages	40	3.22	0.65
2. Critically analysing and evaluating media messages	41	3.6	0.58
3. Creating and producing media messages	40	3.22	0.76
4. Developing technological or practical skills	40	3.2	0.68
5. Reflecting on students' own learning and outcomes	39	3.38	0.59
6. To become more open-minded, flexible, and empathetic	40	3.65	0.53
7. Collaborating with other students	40	3.3	0.6

As detailed in Table 7 above, item 6 (M=3.65, SD=0.53) and item 2 (M=3.6, SD=0.58) with the highest scores are the most important skills and attitudes for academicians' work on media literacy. Moreover, item 5 (M=3.38, SD=0.59) and item 7 (M=3.3, SD=0.6) can be evaluated as important skills and attitudes for media literacy. Skills and attitudes which are indicated as less important in their work are item 1 (M=3.22, SD=0.65), item 3 (M=3.22, SD=0.76), and item 4 (M=3.2, SD=0.68).

4.2. Research Question Two: The Way Academicians Assess Outcomes

The second research question aimed to examine how academicians assessed learning outcomes in their media literacy education. In so doing, they answered the questions about the role and types of assessments as an outcome of the evaluations and interpretations of students' work.

4.2.1. The Role of Assessment in Media Literacy Education

This part of the questionnaire illustrates what the role of assessment is in academicians' media literacy course (Table 8). They were asked to identify the role of assessment in media literacy on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

Table 8 *The Role of Assessment in the Media Literacy Course*

Items	n	M	SD
1. Assessment does not play a large role in my work (teaching and student interactions are more important to me).	41	2.73	0.8
2. I use assessment to motivate my students.	40	3.07	0.47
3. I assess media literacy outcomes simply because assessment is inevitable in this world.	40	2.85	0.62
4. Assessment is critical in my work.	39	2.48	0.75
5. The student should be aware that the news in the media may be biased, incomplete, and based on commercial concern. Therefore, I see media literacy education as an important tool to raise awareness about the need to question the news in the media and not to believe it blindly.	40	3.5	0.5

Based on the data results in Table 8 above, item 5 had the highest score (M=3.5, SD=0.5) while item 4 had the lowest score (M=2.48, SD=0.75). Furthermore, item 2 had a higher score (M=3.07, SD=0.47) than item 3 (M=2.85, SD=0.62) and item 1 (M=2.73, SD=0.8).

4.2.2. Type of Assessment Methods

In this section, academicians were asked to identify the assessment method(s) they have used in media literacy education or research. The types of assessment methods are detailed in Table 9 below from most to least used media literacy assessment methods.

Table 9 *From Most to Least Used List of Media Literacy Assessment Methods*

	f
Formative assessment of student work (drafts)	29
Classroom observation	28
Performance-based assessments	27
Media production	24
Self-assessment (reflection on students' learning)	24
Media analysis or critique assignment	24
Self-assessment (attitudinal and values)	17
Written (essay) exams	16
Portfolios	15
Informal questioning in class	13
Conversations and feedback from other teachers	12
Student (b)logs	11
Informal conversations with students	11
Teacher-made quizzes	11
Focus groups with a group of students	10
Interviews with individual students	8
Quantitative surveys	6
Video documentation of classroom	4

As seen in Table 9 above, for formative assessment of student work (drafts) method 29 academicians (70.7%), for classroom observation assessment method 28 academicians (68.2%), and performance-based assessments 27 academicians (65.8%) stated that they mostly used these methods to evaluate media literacy in the higher education context.

As a consequence of this study, the least used assessment methods are respectively selected as interviews with individual students by 8 academicians (19.5%), and quantitative surveys by 6 (14.6%) academicians as well as video documentation of classroom that is indicated by 4 academicians (9.7%).

4.2.3 Evaluating and Interpreting Students' Work

In this part of the questionnaire, academicians were asked to indicate how they evaluate and interpret students' works in media literacy.

Table 10 *The Way to Evaluate and Interpret Students' Media Literacy Work for Each Assessment Method*

	n	By using outcomes or criteria that are clearly expressed beforehand		By using Bloom's taxonomy		By comparing them to previously created examples		Looking for depth of thought, evidence or complex understandings		Using a rubric		Informally (my own judgement)		Looking at the overall context and classroom dynamics		Coding for categories and themes		Comparing pre and post-tests	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Classroom observation	28	2	4.9	3	7.3	4	9.8	6	14.6	1	2.4	2	4.9	10	24.4	0	0	0	0
Conversations and feedback from other teachers	15	0	0	1	2.4	5	12.2	4	9.8	1	2.4	3	7.3	1	2.4	0	0	0	0
Student (b)logs	18	0	0	1	2.4	3	7.3	4	9.8	5	12.2	1	2.4	2	4.9	2	4.9	0	0
Informal conversations with students	15	1	2.4	1	2.4	2	4.9	2	4.9	2	4.9	3	7.3	4	9.8	0	0	0	0
Formative assessment of student work (drafts)	27	3	7.3	0	0	3	7.3	7	17.1	7	17.1	1	2.4	5	12.2	1	2.4	0	0
Self-assessment (attitudinal and values)	20	0	0	2	4.9	2	4.9	7	17.1	3	7.3	2	4.9	4	9.8	0	0	0	0

	n	By using outcomes or criteria that are clearly expressed beforehand		By using Bloom's taxonomy		By comparing them to previously created examples		Looking for depth of thought, evidence or complex understandings		Using a rubric		Informally (my own judgement)		Looking at the overall context and classroom dynamics		Coding for categories and themes		Comparing pre and post-tests	
	n	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Self-assessment (reflection on students' learning)	22	4	9.8	2	4.9	4	9.8	4	9.8	3	7.3	1	2.4	4	9.8	0	0	0	0
Focus groups with a group of students	13	0	0	2	4.9	3	7.3	5	12.2	1	2.4	2	4.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Performance-based assessments	29	6	14.6	1	2.4	3	7.3	5	12.2	6	14.6	1	2.4	6	14.6	1	2.4	0	0
Media production	26	6	14.6	1	2.4	3	7.3	4	9.8	5	12.2	1	2.4	5	12.2	1	2.4	0	0
Portfolios	19	5	12.2	0	0	2	4.9	3	7.3	7	17.1	1	2.4	1	2.4	0	0	0	0
Written (essay) exams	21	4	9.8	1	2.4	2	4.9	5	12.2	5	12.2	2	4.9	2	4.9	0	0	0	0
Total		31		15		36		56		46		20		44		5		0	

To evaluate and interpret students' work, academicians preferred looking for depth of thought and evidence or complex understandings (selected 56 times) as presented in Table 10 above. They stated that they used a rubric (selected 46 times) and this is another most preferred way to assess and evaluate students' work. Academicians also indicated that they looked at the overall context and classroom dynamics (selected 44 times). Furthermore, they identified that they evaluated and interpreted students' work for each assessment method by comparing them to previously created examples (selected 36 times), by using outcomes or criteria (selected 31 times), informally (selected 20 times), and by using Bloom's taxonomy (selected 15 times) as well as coding for categories and themes (selected 5 times).

4.2.4. Perceptions on The Media Literacy Assessment

In this part of the questionnaire, academicians were asked to identify how they perceive media literacy assessment as illustrated in Table 11 below.

Table 11 *Perceptions on the Media Literacy Assessment*

Items	*f*	%
1. I believe that there is one set of global media literacy that can be assessed as a whole, regardless of the context.	7	17.1
2. I believe that media literacy will always need to be assessed in a specific context and that a single media literacy assessment instrument can therefore not be developed.	34	82.9

34 academicians (%82.9) selected item 2 which addresses the significance of contextual factors in media literacy education while 7 academicians (17.1%) selected item 1.

4.3. Research Question Three: Challenges Academicians Discern Regarding Media Literacy Assessment

To examine the challenges academicians encountered in media literacy assessment, the third question aimed to investigate those challenges they identified about the media literacy assessment.

4.3.1. Factors Impacting Media Literacy Assessment

The way academicians currently assess media literacy could rest on particular factors. In this part of the questionnaire, they were asked to rate questions which included factors that influenced the way they assess media literacy. In doing so, academicians were asked to indicate which challenges they had encountered while assessing media literacy on a scale from 1 (never) to 5 (all the time). Table 12 illustrates data results as follows.

Table 12 *Factors Impacting Media Literacy Assessment*

Items	n	M	SD
1. Standards and/or regulations developed by (governmental) institutions such as the ministry of education or education department	41	3.21	1.07
2. School regulations	41	3.07	1.08
3. Amount of students I have to assess	41	3.39	1.08
4. Student characteristics (age, educational level, etc.)	41	4.02	0.75
5. Time and/or money	40	3.09	1.11
6. Access to technology and equipment	41	3.92	0.72

As seen in Table 12 above, 41 academicians indicated that statements in item 4 (M=4.02, SD=0.75) and item 6 (M=3.92, SD=0.72) had an impact on their media literacy assessment. These items have the highest scores rated by them.

Other factors, which also influenced 41 academicians' media literacy assessment, were item 3 (M=3.39, SD=1.08) and item 1 (M=3.21, SD=1.07). Relatively, 40 academicians categorized item 5 (M=3.09, SD=1.11) as the factor which influenced their media literacy assessment. Among factors impacting media literacy assessment, 41 academicians rated the lowest score for item 2 (M=3.07, SD=1.08).

4.3.2. Media Literacy Assessment Challenges for Each Assessment Method

In this part of the questionnaire, academicians were asked to mention any media literacy assessment challenges that they had encountered. As seen in Table 13 below, for classroom observation 26 academicians (63.4%), for formative assessment of student work (drafts) 25 academicians (60.9%) and media production 24 academicians (58.5%) stated that they encountered the challenge most when they used these assessment methods.

Table 13 *Assessment Challenges for Media Literacy Regarding Each Assessment Method*

	n	I am not sure how to interpret or evaluate my students' responses with this assessment		This assessment method is too prescriptive or intrusive		The assessment method is time-consuming or complex to develop		The assessment method is expensive to use or develop		It is hard to measure higher-order thinking with this type of assessment		It is difficult to get honest and authentic responses		It is difficult to control the learning environment using this type of assessment	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Classroom observation	26	4	9.8	2	4.9	10	24.4	0	0	5	12.2	1	2.4	4	9.8
Conversations and feedback from other teachers	15	1	2.4	2	4.9	5	12.2	0	0	0	0	3	7.3	4	9.8
Student (b)logs	20	4	9.8	0	0	9	22.0	1	2.4	4	9.8	0	0	2	4.9
Informal conversations with students	15	3	7.3	1	2.4	2	4.9	0	0	2	4.9	6	14.6	1	2.4
Formative assessment of student work (drafts)	25	3	7.3	0	0	15	36.6	2	4.9	1	2.4	2	4.9	2	4.9
Self-assessment (attitudinal and values)	21	5	12.2	0	0	2	4.9	2	4.9	5	12.2	5	12.2	2	4.9

	n	I am not sure how to interpret or evaluate my students' responses with this assessment		This assessment method is too prescriptive or intrusive		The assessment method is time-consuming or complex to develop		The assessment method is expensive to use or develop		It is hard to measure higher-order thinking with this type of assessment		It is difficult to get honest and authentic responses		It is difficult to control the learning environment using this type of assessment	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Self-assessment (reflection on students' learning)	23	6	14.6	1	2.4	6	14.6	1	2.4	5	12.2	3	7.3	1	2.4
Focus groups with a group of students	13	3	7.3	0	0	4	9.8	1	2.4	1	2.4	2	4.9	2	4.9
Performance-based assessments	22	1	2.4	3	7.3	10	24.4	3	7.3	2	4.9	2	4.9	1	2.4
Media production	24	1	2.4	0	0	14	34.1	5	12.2	2	4.9	2	4.9	0	0
Portfolios	17	2	4.9	0	0	10	24.4	3	7.3	1	2.4	1	2.4	0	0
Written (essay) exams	18	2	4.9	5	12.2	7	17.1	1	2.4	2	4.9	1	2.4	0	0
Teacher-made quizzes	15	2	4.9	3	7.3	6	14.6	1	2.4	1	2.4	1	2.4	1	2.4
Total		37		17		100		20		31		29		20	

As detailed in Table 13 above, academicians stated that most assessment methods they used before were time-consuming or complex to develop (selected 100 times).

Furthermore, as a challenge for assessment methods, the statement of 'I am not sure how to interpret or evaluate my students' responses with this assessment' was indicated 37 times. In higher education, other challenges for the assessment methods were defined as 'It is hard to measure higher-order thinking with this type of assessment' (selected 31 times) and 'It is difficult to get honest and authentic responses' (selected 29 times).

According to academicians, for the assessment methods, the other challenges they encountered were 'The assessment method is expensive to use or develop' and 'It is difficult to control the learning environment using this type of assessment'. In a similar vein, both of these statements were selected 20 times. Finally, the least selected media literacy assessment challenge which they encountered was the statement of 'This assessment method is too prescriptive or intrusive' (17 times).

4.3.3. Challenges in The Media Literacy Assessment

In this part of the questionnaire, many scholars and professionals identify challenges regarding media literacy assessment. In this regard, participants were asked to discern to what extent they believed these were challenges for assessing media literacy education. They were asked to identify the challenges that were rated from 1 (not a challenge) to 3 (major challenge). Table 14 below illustrates the results of the extent of challenges in media literacy assessment.

Table 14 *The Extent of Challenges for Media Literacy Assessment*

Items	Not a challenge		A minor challenge		Major challenge		M	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1. Media literacy outcomes are not explicitly defined, so it is not clear what should be assessed.	2	4.9	21	51.2	14	31.1	2.32	0.57
2. When assessing a media production piece, you cannot fully observe media literacy learning by only looking at the product as you miss the context in which it was produced.	2	4.9	11	26.8	25	61.0	2.60	0.59
3. Formal assessment (such as multiple-choice questions or written exams) may not capture true media literacy learning.	1	2.4	17	41.5	20	48.8	2.50	0.55
4. Assessments capturing higher-order thinking skills related to media literacy are time-consuming, expensive, or complex to develop.	3	7.3	10	24.4	25	61.0	2.57	0.64
5. There is a lack of teacher preparedness and teacher training to assess media literacy outcomes.	3	7.3	8	19.5	29	70.7	2.65	0.62
6. It is difficult to go beyond the assessment of lower-order thinking skills.	4	9.8	19	46.3	14	31.1	2.27	0.65
7. Different teachers often score the same students' work differently.	4	9.8	12	29.3	20	48.8	2.44	0.69
8. Comparing the scores of one class or school to the scores of another class or school is difficult.	7	17.1	12	29.3	19	46.3	2.31	0.77
9. I feel very limited when it comes to assessing media literacy due to outside influences (such as governmental decisions and other decisions out of my control).	9	22.0	12	29.3	18	43.9	2.23	0.80
10. It is very difficult to control learning environments in media literacy research and to therefore get valid quantitative results.	3	7.3	19	46.3	16	39.0	2.34	0.62
11. It is difficult to take your own philosophical views out of assessment and to think about the influence of your own background on the way you assess students.	11	26.8	18	43.9	9	22.0	1.94	0.73

Items	Not a challenge		A minor challenge		Major challenge			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	M	SD
12. Students often seem to say what I want to hear, rather than what they truly think or feel.	7	11.7	17	41.5	16	39.0	2.22	0.73

As presented in Table 14 above, items such as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8 as well as 9 indicate the media literacy assessment challenges that are perceived as a major challenge by the participants. On the other hand, they considered item 6, item 10, item 11 and item 12 as a minor challenge.

The item with the highest score w was item 5 (M=2.65, SD=0.62); whereas however, item 11 (M=1.94, SD=0.73) was rated with the lowest score as a media literacy challenge.

4.4. Research Question Four: Recommendations Academicians Offer to Overcome the Challenges of Media Literacy Assessment

Research question four aimed to reveal what recommendations the participants made in higher education. Accordingly, recommendations of the participants on overcoming the challenges of media literacy are provided in the results below.

4.4.1. Academicians' Opinions on the Recommendations of Other Scholars and Professionals for Media Literacy Assessment

In this part of the questionnaire, scholars and professionals in the field of media literacy have provided recommendations for media literacy assessment. Thus, on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree), academicians were also asked to rate to what extent they believe those recommendations which have been provided by other scholars and professionals would improve the efficacy of media literacy assessment. Data results are presented in Table 15 below.

Table 15 Academicians' Opinions on Offered Recommendations for Media Literacy Assessment

Items	n	M	SD
1. Using a variety of assessment methods.	40	3.37	0.54
2. Conducting more research on media literacy assessment.	40	3.62	0.49
3. Coming together and collaborating as a research community.	40	3.42	0.67
4. Being clear and upfront to students about criteria and outcomes.	40	3.62	0.49
5. Look for depth and sophistication in students' answers, rather than right or wrong answers.	40	3.67	0.47
6. The use of exemplars may help to improve interrater reliability (teachers scoring students' work differently) and to agree on a common standard.	40	3.27	0.67
7. When assessing media literacy, you should avoid getting your own philosophical views in the way of assessing media literacy.	40	3.05	0.74

Based on the data results in Table 15, item 5 (M=3.67, SD=0.47) was the most recommended statement by 40 academicians to create a more effective assessment in media literacy. Subsequently, item 2 (M=3.62, SD=0.49) and item 4 (M=3.62, SD=0.49) which were other recommendations made by 40 academicians to overcome the challenges of assessment have equal mean scores. 40 academicians also rated for item 3 (M=3.42, SD=0.67) and item 1 (M=3.37, SD=0.54).

Furthermore, 40 participants indicated the statement in item 6 (M=3.27, SD=0.67). In comparison to other stated recommendations, the least recommended statement to overcome challenges of media literacy assessment was rated for item 7 (M=3.05, SD=0.74).

5. Discussion and Results

In this current research, we investigated academicians' perceptions on media literacy education, media literacy outcomes and assessment as well as the existing challenges they struggle against in higher education in Turkey. Academicians also provided suggestions to those challenges they faced in media literacy education. In this investigation, enabling students to question the media content and to be critically autonomous, and raising students' awareness about the inappropriate media content, are perceived as significant learning outcomes and objectives of media literacy

education. Identifying learning outcomes beforehand in broad and open ways is also indicated by academicians, and materials they used in their lessons are regarded as the determiner of media literacy outcomes.

In comparison to Turkish academicians' approach to media literacy education and its contribution to learners' critical thinking skills, critical thinking as the predicator of media literacy education is not considered seriously in Russia, the Middle East, and North Africa. For instance, media literacy education in Russia is not integrated into the curriculum as a compulsory course and is not taken into account seriously (Bykov & Medvedeva, 2020). Abu-Fadil (2013) says that educators in the Middle East and North Africa do not incorporate the concept of critical thinking into their educational systems. However, international groups of educators and others have also provided new concepts and methodologies with students so that they can explore new ideas which are creative and are not controlled by the traditions (Abu-Fadil, 2013).

In a comparative study conducted by Mohebzadeh, Emamjomeh, Assareh, and Hamidi (2020), the curriculum of media literacy education in the USA, Canada and Iran offers information about the current status of media literacy in those countries. For instance, media literacy in Canada, which is considered as a language skill, is taught along with English in the curriculum in an interdisciplinary way (Mohebzadeh et al., 2020). On the other hand, media literacy is not included as a separate course in the curriculum in the USA, but educators are provided with educational materials by different American media literacy centres and media literacy education as a research-oriented education is based on empowering critical knowledge and thinking in the USA (Mohebzadeh et al., 2020). Mohebzadeh et al. (2020) say that in Iran, media literacy has been integrated into the high school curriculum as a separate course since 2016. In this sense, it can be said that the historical and socio-political context may determine the conceptualisation of media literacy education in different countries. Similarly, in a current research study conducted in the USA and Israel, Turin and Friesem (2020) note that the historical and socio-political conjecture plays an important role in the conceptualisation of media literacy education in different nations.

In the context of this study, the role of media literacy assessment becomes significant in education in that it raises critical consciousness about the refracted reality, representation of the truth, and producers' commercial concerns in the construction of media content in both national and global context. In other words, academicians use assessment to enable students to question the validity and objectivity of the information in media content. Through assessment, they also aim to motivate students and assess media literacy outcomes. Academicians indicate that they use formative assessment to assess learning outcomes, and also identify classroom observations, performance-based assessments, media production and self-assessment as mostly used assessment methods. The depth of thought in learners' thinking and reflection, providing evidence and reasons, understanding complex ideas, contextual features, and classroom dynamics as well as using a rubric become apparent in the higher education context when they assess media literacy and evaluate students' work for each assessment method.

However, most of the assessment methods Turkish academicians used for media literacy before were defined as time-consuming or complex to develop. They also identified classroom observation, formative assessment, and media production as assessment methods that they had difficulty in employing as part of assessment practice. In this regard, Maxwell (2001) says that evaluation of student's performance over a period of time within a particular setting by considering the link between learning process and performance through classroom observation provides valid evidence for learning outcomes. In addition, formative assessment enables learners to make a self-

reflection and self-correction on their learning process so learners raise consciousness about their learning in the long term (Moss & Brookhard, 2019). In parallel with the socio-political, educational and economic as well as cultural changes under the conditions of globalisation, self-reflection and self-correction are critical skills to improve intercultural communication through media. Therefore, it is not possible to have media literacy skills without the knowledge of intercultural literacy, and vice versa (Belousa & Stakle, 2010). As a consequence of this study, it can be said that there is a gap between academicians' theoretical and practical approaches to media literacy. Results reveal that although academicians aim to use formative assessment to assess learning outcomes and they identify classroom observations, performance-based assessments, media production, and self-assessment as mostly used assessment methods, they also have difficulty in employing those methods and regard them as time-consuming and complex to develop. Regarding the assessment and evaluation of media literacy education in the South Africa context, Saleh (2013) notes that some educators consider evaluation as an assessment, but the definitions of those terms are not the same though they are interchangeably used. For instance, evaluation is carried out in Africa to satisfy external needs (Johnson & Foertsch, 2000). Addressing the improvement of instruction through assessment, Saleh (2013) implies that educators should be aware of why they use the assessment information. From the critical perspective of Saleh (2013), "evaluation is a process used to determine the worth of something; it is an attempt to determine whether some product, process, activity, or procedure is of value or is satisfactory" (p. 356). Thus, educators should consider the objectives, why and what they are evaluating and should also be aware of the difference between terms: evaluation and assessment. In the implementation of media education in Europe, Polakevičová and Lincényi (2017) say that media education, as a combination of two differently perceived terms, aims to equip learners with media competence, enabling them to be aware of the impact of media on their life. In other words, the focus of media literacy education is on whether or not and how learners can operate and manipulate media, obtain and interpret media text, and engage in the communication process.

In this study, student characteristics such as educational background and access to technology and equipment are defined as challenges by Turkish academicians in assessing media literacy assessment. However, the educators should provide diversified assessment approaches due to the diversity in students' needs, and the significance of equitable assessment opportunities should be covered in the teacher training and teacher professional development process to avoid any unfairness in assessment (Nusche, 2013). Referring back to the previous decade and the critical reading of media literacy in Turkey, Yılmaz and Taylan (2016) argue that the financial and socio-cultural background of individuals should not be disregarded in media literacy education. Individuals' critical thinking skills can be improved in education only when they can get involved in media consumption and production process as active agents (Yılmaz & Taylan, 2016). In doing so, they must be able to have the access to technological equipment and materials as the initial phase of media literacy education.

In this study, another assessment challenge that was indicated by academicians is related to feeling unsure about how to interpret students' responses to assess their media literacy. In this sense, academicians stated that lack of preparedness and teacher training were seen as major problems for the assessment of media literacy. As a consequence, it became significant that academicians needed to be equipped with skills to perform their tasks efficiently in education. To enhance media literacy assessment, they indicated that looking for in-depth insights and sophisticated responses in students' answers, is required rather than looking for standardized answers.

In this investigation, the necessity and application of critical literacy and critical pedagogy have become more significant in the Turkish higher education context. Considering today's technologically

and politically structured global system, media literacy education as critical pedagogy should be incorporated into the curriculum as a compulsory course, but not as an elective course in higher education. Educators and academicians, whose expertise incorporates critical literacy, critical pedagogy, language study, and language teaching, should also be involved actively in media literacy education. Furthermore, media literacy as critical pedagogy should be taken into account in teacher training programmes as well as post-graduate education in Turkey so that media literacy education can be improved in educational contexts. Accordingly, academicians may not see teacher preparedness and training as insufficient for media literacy assessment anymore. Through these implications in further studies, the challenge of Turkish academicians' feeling unsure about how to interpret students' responses to assess their media literacy, may be effectively sorted out in higher education.

Educators and scholars in language teaching and communication departments should collaborate to empower media literacy in teacher education programmes and post-graduate education. In so doing, those professional people can actively contribute to the field and, in turn, enable individuals and learners to take actions in daily life as part of their democratic participation and citizenship. In Bruner's (1986) opinion, language as a medium of communication is never neutral because language use aims to convey a particular point of view and ideology and the implications of a world view from a particular position. Similarly, the language used in media requires the critical study of meaning and symbols. As the researchers of this study with the subject-area specialisation in English Language Teaching and Communication, we suggest that language teaching scholars in the field of educational sciences and language studies and educators in the field of communication studies should also collaborate to support media literacy education in the Turkish higher education. In a similar vein, Domine (2007) highlights that the construction of knowledge plays an essential role in media literacy education because the teacher perceives the process between media and students based on their philosophical and pedagogical orientation to media.

Belousa and Stakle (2010) indicate that the process of globalisation requires the meta-content of education as a consequence of the change in the social and cultural contexts in EU countries. According to Belousa and Stakle (2010) "Membership in a European and global community has played a significant role in fostering conditions conductive to pluralism in the society. These changes have brought forward a discussion on issues of successful interaction in diverse multicultural environment" (p. 115). As a result of globalisation, intercultural literacy is also a significant issue in education that educators should consider seriously since it requires education to maintain a democratic society (Belousa & Stakle, 2010). From McLaren's (1995, 1997) perspective, intercultural education enables students to understand their cultural identity and other cultural identities. In the report entitled "Testing and Refining, Criteria to Assess Media Literacy Levels in Europe" which was published by the European Commission in April 2011, media literacy levels in European countries are evaluated to encourage member states to share information and experience on media literacy (Shapiro & Celot, 2011). In Turkey, media literacy education, which regulates its policies in the field of education and other fields within the framework of EU laws in the EU harmonisation process, has become more interactive with the integration of digital technologies into education. Thus, the data obtained from this descriptive study can also be among the reference sources that can contribute to further studies which will be conducted in EU countries.

To sum up, the purpose of the study was to investigate Turkish academicians' perceptions on media literacy assessment in higher education. Further studies could be conducted with academicians with subject-area specialisation in social studies because the focus of this study was on the perceptions

of academicians with subject-area specialisation in English Language Teaching, Computer Education and Instructional technology, and Departments of Communication in Turkey. Thus, one limitation of this study is that results may not be generalised to academicians in social studies.

References

Altun, A. (2012). *An overview of Unesco activities in connection with media literacy (1977-2009).* https://milunesco.unaoc.org/mil-articles/an-overview-of-unesco-activities-in-connection-with-media-literacy-1977-2009/

Belousa, I., & Stakle, A. (2010). Intercultural and media literacy: Global tendencies in metacontent of teacher education in Latvia. *Discourse and Communication for Sustainable Education*, *1*(1), 109-132. https://doi.org/10.2478/dcse-2013-0010

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds.* Harvard University Press.

Bykov, I., & Medvedeva, M. (2020). Media literacy in the system of the secondary education in Russia. *Revista Espacios*, *41*(48), 393-401. https://doi.org/10.48082/espacios-a20v41n48p29

Buckingham, D. (2003). *Media education: Literacy, learning and contemporary culture*. Polity Press.

Buckingham, D. (2019). *The media education manifesto.* Polity Press.

Bulger, M., & Davison, P. (2018). The promises, challenges, and futures of media literacy. *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, *10*(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.23860/JMLE-2018-10-1-1

Domine, V. (2007). "Doing technology" in the classroom: Media literacy as critical pedagogy. In R. A. Goldstein (Ed.), *Useful theory: Making critical education practical* (pp. 131–147). Peter Lang.

Duffy, T., & Jonassen, D. (1992). *Constructivism and the technology of instruction: A conversation*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Duncan, B., D'Ippolito, J., Macpherson, C., & Wilson, C. (1998). *Mass media and popular culture*. Harcourt.

Dvorghets, O. S., & Shaturnaya, Y.A. (2015). Developing students' media literacy in the English teaching context. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *200*, 192-198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.08.051

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. R. Ramos, Trans.). Continuum.

French, S. D. (2020). *Critical approaches to digital video composition and media literacy in preservice teacher and high school contexts: Understanding students' perspectives.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Arkansas. https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/3747

Gabai, S., & Ornager, S. (2014). Promoting intercultural dialogue between east and west through media literacy and pop culture. In J. M. Perez Tornero (Director), S. Tayie (Director), & S. Tejedor (Director) *Media literacy and intercultural dialogue* (pp. 43-59). Gabinete de Comunicacion y Educacion. Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona (UAB).

Hobbs, R., & Jensen, A. (2009). The past, present, and future of media literacy education. *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, *1*(1), 1-11.

Hobbs, R. (2017). Teaching and learning in a post-truth world. *Educational Leadership, 75*(3), 26-31.

Iasevoli, B. (2018, March 22). Arming teens in the fight against fake news. *Education Week.* https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/arming-teens-in-the-fight-against-fake-news/2018/03

Johnson, D., & Foertsch, M. (2000). Critical issue: Monitoring the school literacy program. *Center for Literacy and Assessment at North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.* https://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/content/cntareas/reading/li700.htm

Jolls, T. (reviser). (2008). *Literacy for the 21st century. An overview and orientation guide to media literacy education* (2nd ed.). Center for Media Literacy.

Jolls, T. (2020, August). Media literacy in the time of Covid-19*. Family Online Safety Institute.* https://www.fosi.org/good-digital-parenting/media-literacy-time-covid-19

Kahne, J., & Bowyer, B. (2019). Can media literacy education increase digital engagement in politics? *Learning, Media and Technology, 44*(2), 211–224. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2019.1601108

Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture.* Oxford University Press.

Lemish, D. (2015). *Children and media: a global perspective.* John Wiley & Sons.

Mahn, H., & John-Steiner, V. (2013). Vygotsky and sociocultural approaches to teaching and learning. In I. B. Weiner, W. M. Reynolds, & G. E. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 7.). (pp. 117-146). John Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118133880.hop207006

Martens, H. (2010). Evaluating media literacy education: concepts, theories and future directions. *Journal of Media Literacy Education, 2*(1), 1-22. https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/jmle/vol2/iss1/1

Masterman, L. (1985). *Teaching the media.* Comedia.

Maxwell, G. S. (2001). *Teacher observation in student assessment.* Queensland School Curriculum Council.

McGrew, S., Breakstone, J., Ortega, T., Smith, M., & Wineburg, S. (2018). Can students evaluate online sources? Learning from assessments of civic online reasoning. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 46*(2), 165–193. https://doi:10.1080/00933104.2017.1416320

McLaren, P. (1995). *Critical pedagogy and predatory culture: Oppositional politics in a postmodern era*. Routledge.

McLaren, P. (1997). *Revolutionary multiculturalism: Pedagogies of dissent for the new millennium.* Westview Press.

Michallidis, P. (2010). New directions in global media literacy. *The Journal of Media Literacy, 57*(1&2), 39-41. https://28ed58ae-6e6e-4aef-abfa-efa01afa7c48.filesusr.com/ ugd/24687f_a9d2850ffa4f4ed6bbc2bb8edd9108ed.pdf

Mohebzadeh, Z., Emamjomeh, S. M. R., Assareh, A., & Hamidi, F. (2020). A comparative study of media literacy education curriculum in Canada, Iran, and The United States. *Iranian Journal of Comparative Education, 3*(3), 737–756.

Moss, C. M., & Brookhart, S. M. (2019). *Advancing formative assessment in every classroom: A guide for instructional leaders* (2nd Ed.). ASCD.

National Association for Media Literacy Education (NAMLE). (2014). *Key questions to ask when analyzing media messages.* https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B8j2T8jHrlg CZ2Zta2hvWkF0dG8/view

Nusche, D. (2013). Student assessment: Putting the learner at the centre. In *Synergies for Better Learning: An International Perspective on Evaluation and Assessment* (pp. 139-269). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264190658-7-en

Perez Tornero, J. M. (2014). Media literacy: The cultural heritage of our time. In J. M. Perez Tornero (Director), S. Tayie (Director), & S. Tejedor (Director) *Media literacy and intercultural dialogue* (p.5). Gabinete de Comunicacion y Educacion. Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona (UAB).

Perry, K. H. (2012). What is literacy? – A critical overview of sociocultural perspectives. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education, 8*(1), 50-71.

Polakevičová, I., & Lincényi, M. (2017). Implementation of media education in Europe-comparison between media education in different countries in Western and Central Europe. *InterNaciones, 3*(7), 87-102. https://doi.org/10.32870/in.v3i7.6864

Schilder, E. A. M. (2014). *Perceptions of media literacy assessment: A mixed methods study* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Schilder, E., & Redmond, T. (2019). Measuring media literacy inquiry in higher education: Innovation in assessment. *Journal of Media Literacy Education, 11*(2), 95-121. https://doi.org/10.23860/JMLE-2019-11-2-6

Shapiro, H., & Celot, P. (2011). Testing and refining criteria to assess media literacy levels in Europe. *Final Report.* https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/ 4cbb53b5-689c-4996-b36b-e920df63cd40/language-en

Sherman, J. (2009). *Using authentic video in the language classroom.* Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Silver, A. (2009). A European approach to media literacy: Moving toward an inclusive knowledge society. In Mapping Media Education in the World (pp. 11-13). New York: The United Nations-Alliance of Civilizations. Retrieved from http://www.revistacomunicar. com/verpdf.php?numero=32&articulo=32- 2009-05&idioma=en

Turin, O., & Friesem, Y. (2020). Is that media literacy?: Israeli and US media scholars' perceptions of the field. *Journal of Media Literacy Education, 12*(1), 132-144. https://doi.org/10.23860/JMLE-2020- 12-1-10

UNESCO Türkiye Milli Komisyonu. (2019). Bilgi ve İletişim Komisyonu (CI) Raporu. https://www.unesco.org.tr/Home/Page/1709?slug=B%C4%B0LG%C4%B0-VE-%C4%B0LET%C4%B0%C5%9E%C4%B0M-KOM%C4%B0SYONU-(CI)-RAPORU-

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Harvard University Press.

Yılmaz, A., & Taylan, A. (2016). Türkiye'de medya okuryazarlığının 10 yılı: Medya okuryazarlığını eleştirel okumak. In E. K. Durur (Ed.), *Medya okuryazarlığı* (pp.287-325). Siyasal Kitapevi.

Genişletilmiş Özet

1. Giriş

Günümüz bilgi toplumunda, toplumun her alanında medya metinleri ile insanlar arasında çeşitli şekillerde eş zamanlı bir etkileşim söz konusudur. Bireyler medya aracılığıyla dünya hakkında bilgi edindikçe, araştırmacıların ve eğitimcilerin medya okuryazarlığı eğitimine verdikleri önem artmıştır (Kahne ve Bowyer, 2019; McGrew ve diğerleri, 2018). Özgür ve demokratik toplumlarda, kültürler arası diyaloğu artırmak için medya okuryazarlığının odak noktası, medya mesajlarının eleştirel analizi ve bireylerin okuryazarlık becerilerini geliştirmektir (Michallidis, 2010). Yirmi birinci yüzyıl medya kültüründe öğrenme, sorgulamaya dayalı pedagojiyi destekleyen aktif sorgulama ve süreç becerilerini gerektirir. Dolayısıyla medya okuryazarlığı eğitimi, hazır materyal ve ders kitapları aracılığıyla, bilginin ve bilgiye erişimin sınırlı olduğu ve öğrencilerin bilgilerinin testler ve kâğıtlarla değerlendirildiği geleneksel eğitimin ötesine geçmektedir (Jolls, 2008). Dvorghets ve Shaturnaya'ya (2015) göre, medya okuryazarlığı hem öğretmenlerin hem de öğrencilerin kültürler arası iletişimde başarılı olması için gereklidir.

İngiliz dilinin emperyalist etkisi göz önüne alındığında, medya kaynaklarının ve materyallerinin içeriğine yansıyan kültürü anlamak bir diğer önemli noktadır. Bu emperyal dilin medya metinlerinin içeriği üzerindeki etkisine paralel olarak, hedef kültürü anlamak için medyanın aracı rolünün ciddiye alınması gerekmektedir. Kramsch (1998), dil ve kültür arasında çoklu ve karmaşık şekillerde iç içe geçmiş bir ilişki olduğu için, kelimenin anlamının ortaya çıktığı iletişim bağlamının önemine değinir.

Medya okuryazarlığı eğitimi, öğrencilere, farklı bağlamlarda mesajları ve bilgileri iletmek için kullanılan dilin, kelime dağarcığı, dilbilgisi ve aksan gibi sınırsız ve karmaşık dilbilimsel özelliklerini anlamaları için içgörü sağlar (Sherman, 2009). Sherman'ın (2009) eleştirel bakış açısına göre, bu tür bir eğitim ne ders kitapları ne de sınıf ortamı tarafından sağlanmaktadır. Özellikle, öğrencilerin sanal ve gerçek dünyadaki karmaşık gerçek yaşam problemlerini çözmek için bilgileri hem anlayabilecekleri hem de kullanabilecekleri medya okuryazarlığı eğitimine yönelik küresel bir talep bulunmaktadır (Jolls, 2020).

2. Kavramsal Çerçeve

1970'lerde medya okuryazarlığı eğitimi öncelikle demokratik katılımın ve yurttaşlığın bir parçası olarak tanımlanmıştır (Hobbs ve Jensen, 2009). 1982 yılında Almanya'nın Grunwald kentinde medya okuryazarlığı eğitimi konusunda uluslararası bir sempozyuma öncülük eden UNESCO, 2007 yılında Ortadoğu'daki ilk medya okuryazarlığı eğitimi konferansını gerçekleştirmiştir (Altun, 2012). 2011 yılından itibaren UNESCO bilgi okuryazarlığını medya okuryazarlığı faaliyetlerine dahil etmiştir (UNESCO Türkiye Milli Komisyonu, 2019). Medya okuryazarlığı eğitimi 2000 yılından itibaren AB'nin medya okuryazarlığının gelişimine yaptığı katkılarla ivme kazanmıştır (Silver, 2009). Bu bağlamda, Avrupa Komisyonu 2007 yılı sonunda medya okuryazarlığını dijital ortama da uyarlamıştır (Silver, 2009). UNESCO ve AB'nin medya okuryazarlığına dikkat çekmesi ile birlikte medya okuryazarlığı eğitimi ciddi bir şekilde ele alınmaya başlamıştır.

Medya okuryazarlığının amacı, öğrencinin medya ile etkileşimlerinde bilgiyi profesyonel, sosyal ve bireysel yaşamlarına aktarmalarına yardımcı olan eleştirel düşünme becerilerini kullanmalarını sağlamaktır (Schilder ve Redmond, 2019). Bu açıdan medya okuryazarlığı değerlendirmesinde temel olarak iki yaklaşımla karşılaşırız: korumacı yaklaşım ve kültürel çalışmalar yaklaşımı (Schilder, 2014). Buckingham (2019) korumacı yaklaşımı, medya okuryazarlığını basitçe medyanın zararlı etkilerinden koruma yöntemi olarak ele almasından dolayı eleştirir. Kültürel çalışmalar yaklaşımının amacı ise bireylerin genelden özele öğretim yoluyla medyayla ilgilenmesini sağlamaktır (French, 2020). Medya

okuryazarlığı değerlendirmesine yönelik bu yaklaşımların her ikisi de birbirinin karşıtı gibi görünse de Schilder (2014), medya okuryazarlığı eğitiminin verimliliğini artırmak için her ikisinin de örtüşebileceğini söylemektedir.

Uluslararası multimedya materyallerinin bireylerin hayatındaki rolünü, multimedya kaynaklarının anadilde ve hedef dilde kültürler arası iletişimdeki önemini anlamak hem öğretmenler hem de öğrenciler için bir dünya vatandaşı olmak için temel ve ön koşul olmalıdır. Medya okuryazarlığı ile ilgili çalışmalar genelde Batı bağlamında medya okuryazarlığı eğitimine ilişkin öğretmen, akademisyen ve eğitimcilerin algılarına ışık tutarken (Schilder, 2014), Türkiye'de medya okuryazarlığının sosyo-politik, kültürel, ekonomik ve eğitim bağlamındaki durumu yeterince bilgilendirici değildir. Bu nedenle bu araştırma, Türk akademisyenlerin, medya okuryazarlığının çıktıları, değerlendirmesi ve medya okuryazarlığı eğitiminin zorluklarına ilişkin algılarını ve de yükseköğretimde bu zorlukların üstesinden gelmek için sundukları önerileri araştırmak amacıyla yürütülmüştür.

3. Yöntem

Araştırmanın verileri, Türkiye'nin yedi coğrafi bölgesindeki üniversitelerde çalışan 41 Türk akademisyenden toplanmıştır. Çalışma için gerekli izinler alındıktan sonra, veri toplama aracı olarak Schilder (2014) tarafından geliştirilen "Medya Okuryazarlığı Değerlendirme Anketi" kullanılmıştır. Medya okuryazarlığı değerlendirme anketi katılımcılara, 2020-2021 akademik dönemlerinde Google forms aracılığıyla uygulanmıştır. Çalışmanın katılımcıları, kolaylı örneklem yöntemi kullanılarak seçilmiş ve araştırmaya katılım tamamen gönüllük esasına dayalı olarak yürütülmüştür. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, Bilgisayar Eğitimi ve Öğretim teknolojileri alanında çalışan akademisyenler ile iletişim fakültesi bölümlerinde görev yapan akademisyenler oluşturmuştur. Çalışmada, ilgi alanı medya ve teknoloji ve medya okuryazarlığı eğitimi olduğu için iletişim fakültelerinden (n=22) ve eğitim fakültesi bölümlerinden de İngilizce Öğretmenliği (n=14) ve Bilgisayar Eğitimi ve Öğretim Teknolojileri (n=5) alanlarında uzmanlığa sahip akademisyenler yer almıştır.

Araştırmada katılımcıların konu ile ilgili görüşlerini belirlemek amacıyla açık uçlu, likert tipinde ve çoktan seçmeli sorulardan oluşan bir veri toplamı aracı kullanılmıştır. Anket, akademisyenlerin medya okuryazarlığı eğitimi hakkındaki algılarını daha detaylı araştırmak için Türkçeye çevrilmiştir. Çeviri süreci üç aşamalı olarak gerçekleştirilmiştir. Çeviri sürecinin ilk aşamasında, anket bu çalışmanın iki araştırmacısı tarafından Türkçeye çevrilmiştir. Ayrıca, dört İngilizce bölümü öğretim elemanından anketin maddelerini Türkçeye çevirmeleri istenmiştir. Çevirinin uygunluğu ve kapsamı konusunda, ileri derece İngilizce bilen ve medya okuryazarlığı ile ilgili çalışan, alanında uzman üç akademisyenden görüş alınmıştır. Bu çalışmanın iki araştırmacısı tarafından Türkçeye çevrilen versiyon tekrar gözden geçirilmiştir. Son olarak medya okuryazarlığı eğitiminde yer alan 10 akademisyen ile anketin Türkçe versiyonu tamamlanarak pilot bir çalışma yürütülmüştür. Alanda faaliyet gösteren 10 uzman akademisyenin ortak görüşü sonucunda, anketteki soru sayısı 18'e düşürülmüştür. Ölçeğin, ilk beş sorusunda katılımcılardan demografik bilgilerini vermeleri istenilmiştir. Veri toplama aracında 6 soru likert tipinde maddelerden oluşmaktadır. Likert tipindeki maddeler medya okuryazarlığı amaçları (7 madde, 4'lü derecelendirilmiş), spesifik medya okuryazarlığı çıktıları (7 madde, 4'lü derecelendirilmiş), medya okuryazarlığı dersinde değerlendirmenin rolü (5 madde, 4'lü derecelendirilmiş), medya okuryazarlığı değerlendirme biçimini etkileyen faktörler (6 madde, 5'li derecelendirilmiş), medya okuryazarlığı değerlendirilmesinde karşılaşılan güçlüklerin kapsamı (12 madde, 3'lü derecelendirilmiş), medya okuryazarlığı değerlendirmesi için sunulan önerilere ilişkin akademisyenlerin görüşleri (7 madde, 4'lü derecelendirilmiş) ilgili maddeler olup bu maddeler ait Cranbach Alpha iç tutarlık katsayıları sırası ile .885, .904, .700, .762, .794 ve .801 olarak hesaplanmıştır. Bu soruların

çözümlenmesinde her bir soruda yer alan maddeler için aritmetik ortalama ve standart sapma değerleri hesaplanmıştır. Veri toplama aracındaki 4., 8., 9. ve 10. sorularda "diğer" olarak işaretlenebilen açık uçlu yanıtları içeren maddeler de yer almaktadır. Açık uçlu sorular, betimsel analiz ile çözümlenmiştir. Çoktan seçmeli sorular ise konu ile ilgili katılımcıların görüşlerine ait frekans ve yüzde değerleri hesaplandı. Verilerin analizinde SPSS programından yararlanılmıştır.

4. Sonuç ve Öneriler

Araştırmada, medya okuryazarlığı değerlendirilmesinde biçimlendirici değerlendirmenin öne çıktığı sonucuna ulaşılmıştır; ancak akademisyenlerin kullandığı çoğu değerlendirme yönteminin de zaman alıcı veya geliştirmesi karmaşık olduğu belirlenmiştir. Sonuçlar ayrıca akademisyenlerin, öğrencilerin medya okuryazarlığını değerlendirmek için verdikleri yanıtları nasıl yorumlayacaklarından emin olmadıklarını ve eğiticilerin yetersiz eğitimini, çıktıları değerlendirmede bir zorluk olarak tanımladıklarını göstermektedir. Ayrıca, akademisyenler medya okuryazarlığını değerlendirmenin zorluklarını aşmak için önerilerde bulunmuşlardır. Tartışma ve sonuç bölümünde, bu çalışmanın sonuçları, medya okuryazarlığı eğitimi, kültürlerarası diyalog, akademisyenler ve eğitimciler ile iş birliğini teşvik etmek için farklı ülkelerde yürütülen diğer araştırma çalışmalarından elde edilen sonuçlarla karşılaştırılmıştır.

Sonuçlar, medya okuryazarlığı eğitiminde, öğretmen yetiştirme programlarında ve bu alandaki akademisyenler için lisansüstü eğitimde eleştirel pedagojinin dikkate alınması gerektiğini önermektedir. Bu kapsamda, araştırma, eleştirel okuryazarlık ve eleştirel pedagojinin gerekliliği ve uygulanmasının Türkiye'de yükseköğretim bağlamında daha önemli hale geldiğini göstermektedir. Bu nedenle, günümüzün teknolojik ve politik olarak yapılandırılmış küresel sistemi göz önüne alındığında, eleştirel pedagoji ile desteklenen medya okuryazarlığı eğitimi, yükseköğretimde seçmeli değil, zorunlu ders olmalı ve eleştirel okuryazarlık, eleştirel pedagoji ve dil eğitimi ile dil öğretiminde uzmanlıklara sahip eğitimciler ve akademisyenler, medya okuryazarlığı eğitimine aktif olarak dahil olmalıdır. Ayrıca, medya okuryazarlığı eğitiminin güçlendirilmesi için Türkiye'de lisansüstü eğitimin yanı sıra öğretmen yetiştirme programlarında da eleştirel pedagoji ile desteklenen medya okuryazarlığı eğitimi dikkate alınmalıdır. Eleştirel pedagoji ile desteklenen medya okuryazarlığı eğitimi, Türk akademisyenlerin öğrencilerin medya okuryazarlık becerilerini değerlendirmedeki zorlukların üstesinden gelmesini sağlayabilir.

Hem dil öğretimi hem de iletişim bölümlerindeki eğitimciler ve akademisyenler, öğretmen eğitimi programlarında ve lisansüstü eğitimde medya okuryazarlığını güçlendirmek için iş birliği yapmalıdır. Bruner'e (1986) göre, bir iletişim aracı olarak dil asla tarafsız değildir, çünkü dil kullanımı belirli bir bakış açısını ve ideolojiyi ve belirli bir konumdan bir dünya görüşünün sonuçlarını aktarmayı amaçlar. Benzer şekilde, medyada kullanılan dil, anlam ve sembollerin eleştirel olarak incelenmesini gerektirir. Bu bağlamda, İngiliz Dili Öğretimi ve İletişim alanında uzmanlığa sahip araştırmacıların yüksek öğretiminde medya okuryazarlığı eğitimini desteklemeleri için iş birliği yapmaları önerilmektedir.

Küreselleşmenin bir sonucu olarak, kültürlerarası okuryazarlığın eğitimdeki önemi artmıştır. Demokratik toplumsal yapının sürdürülebilirliğinde eğitime ihtiyaç duyulması kültürlerarası okuryazarlığın eğitimciler tarafından ciddiyet alınmasını gerektirmektedir (Belousa ve Stakle, 2010). McLaren'ın (1995, 1997) bakış açısından kültürlerarası eğitim, öğrencilerin kültürel kimliklerinin yanı sıra diğer kültürel kimlikleri de anlamalarını sağlar. Avrupa Komisyonu tarafından Nisan 2011'de yayımlanan, "Avrupa'da Medya Okuryazarlığı Seviyelerini Değerlendirmek İçin Test Etme ve İyileştirme, Kriterler" başlıklı raporda, üye ülkeleri medya okuryazarlığı konusunda birbirleriyle bilgi ve deneyim

paylaşmaya teşvik etmek için Avrupa ülkelerindeki medya okuryazarlık düzeyleri değerlendirilmektedir (Shapiro ve Celot, 2011). Ayrıca AB uyum süreci ile birlikte eğitim ve diğer alanlardaki politikalarını AB yasaları çerçevesinde düzenleyen Türkiye'de medya okuryazarlığı eğitimi, dijital teknolojilerin eğitime entegrasyonu ile daha etkileşimli hale gelmiştir. Dolayısıyla bu betimsel çalışmadan elde edilen veriler, AB ülkelerinde yapılacak daha sonraki çalışmalara da katkı sağlayabilecek referans kaynaklar arasında yer alabilir.

Özetle, bu çalışmanın amacı Türk akademisyenlerin yükseköğretimde medya okuryazarlığı değerlendirmesine ilişkin algılarını incelemektir. İleride yapılacak araştırmalarda benzer bir çalışma sosyal bilgiler alanında uzmanlığa sahip akademisyenlerle de yapılabilir çünkü bu çalışmanın odak noktası İngilizce Öğretmenliği, Bilgisayar Eğitimi ve Öğretim Teknolojileri bölümlerinde ve iletişim fakültesi bölümlerinde medya okuryazarlığı ilgi alanına ve uzmanlığına sahip akademisyenlerin algılarını araştırmak üzerinedir. Dolayısıyla, bu çalışmanın bir sınırlılığı, sonuçların sosyal bilgiler alanındaki akademisyenlere genellenemeyeceğidir.

Yayın Etiği Beyanı

Bu araştırmanın, Çağ Üniversitesi tarafından 07.08.2020 tarihinde 88998576-299-E.2000002385 sayılı kararıyla verilen etik kurul izni bulunmaktadır. Bu araştırmanın planlanmasından, uygulanmasına, verilerin toplanmasından verilerin analizine kadar olan tüm süreçte "Yükseköğretim Kurumları Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Yönergesi" kapsamında uyulması belirtilen tüm kurallara uyulmuştur. Yönergenin ikinci bölümü olan "Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiğine Aykırı Eylemler" başlığı altında belirtilen eylemlerden hiçbiri gerçekleştirilmemiştir. Bu araştırmanın yazım sürecinde bilimsel, etik ve alıntı kurallarına uyulmuş; toplanan veriler üzerinde herhangi bir tahrifat yapılmamıştır. Bu çalışma herhangi başka bir akademik yayın ortamına değerlendirme için gönderilmemiştir.

Araştırmacıların Katkı Oranı Beyanı

Araştırmacıların mevcut araştırmaya katkıları eşit düzeydedir.

Çatışma Beyanı

Araştırmanın yazarları olarak herhangi bir çıkar/çatışma beyanımız olmadığını ifade ederiz.