JMLE

Debates about the Future of Media Literacy in Turkey

Ebubekir Cakmak, *University of Abant Izzet Baysal, Turkey*
Sait Tuzel, *University of Canakkale Onsekiz Mart, Turkey*

Abstract

Media literacy has been widely debated in Turkey since the early 2000s and has been in the curriculum of the secondary schools as an optional subject for nearly a decade. During this time period, about four million students have received media literacy education. The multidisciplinary structure of media literacy has contributed to the interest of many researchers from varying fields. These researchers, who have different viewpoints, acceptations and expectations, have formed certain groups in a short time period and have started to defend their particular media literacy approaches and practices. This study examines the basic debates and issues that have emerged in Turkey's short but active movement to educate in the area of media literacy. Issues include the question of which teachers (trained in education or communication) should teach the media literacy classes, the role of the government media regulatory agency in media literacy, and the debates on protective and empowerment approaches. In addition, the debates on educational censorship, textbooks, and media literacy have been integrated in the educational system under which models have been focused. Because of the focus on asking who is responsible for media literacy in Turkey, there has been less attention to issues of pedagogy, instructional strategies and curriculum resources. The blame is not completely on the government ministries as academic in-fighting also fuels debates about the future of media literacy in Turkey. Such territorial debates about the locus of media literacy may limit the growth of the field.

Keywords: *Media literacy, curriculum, government, education, Turkey, history*

In the past decade there has been an explosion of policies, educational practices, and academic publications in media literacy in Turkey. In 2005, when the first conference was organized in Turkey on media literacy, Google gave only four results for the search term "media literacy" (Pekman 2006, 16). Today, the same search generates more than 102,000 results. When we examine the development of media literacy in Turkey, this small fact reveals a great deal about the subject. The media literacy concept, which did not exist in the agenda of the teachers, educational professionals, politicians, and curriculum developers ten years ago, has shown enormous development in a short time period, and has been observed in academic studies, on the websites of the public institutions, in online discussion platforms, in local and national media, and in curriculum. Today, in Turkey media literacy classes have appeared in the secondary school curriculum as an optional subject and the topic has been integrated within language arts classes.

As it has grown in importance, debates regarding media literacy have become quite pervasive in Turkey. We found it important to explore issues such as the milestones passed in the last decade in the media literacy movement in Turkey, the problems experienced during the inclusion process of media literacy within the educational system, and the possible future opportunities and difficulties that are pending in the field of media

literacy. This article is focused on some of the basic debates that emerged during the short but active journey of media literacy in Turkey. While evaluating the basic debates, we observed that some of the issues brought to the agenda by Hobbs (1998) in the USA were also experienced in Turkey. However, there have been other issues, which stem primarily from the Turkish education system. We do not claim that the issues dealt with in this study reveal all the debates and developments experienced in Turkey in the field of media literacy; however, at this moment in time, these are the most basic and important debates that are reflecting and shaping the development of the field.

Brief History of Media Literacy Education in Turkey

Until the 2000s in Turkey, there were units in some school subjects that included information on television, newspapers, telephones and similar media. These units were incorporated in courses, such as life sciences, citizenship, and social sciences. However, these topics were not taught with the media literacy concept in mind. The concept of media literacy entered Turkey's agenda for the first time with the Communication Council organized in 2003 (Iletisim Surasi 2003). The existence and importance of media literacy was emphasized in the final declaration of the Council. The most serious step came in 2004 with the proposal by the Turkish Radio and Television Supreme Council (here after: RTUK) to the Ministry of Education about adding the media literacy classes to the curriculum of the primary schools. Subsequently, promotion of this concept was broadcast on television, smart signs systems for television programs were formed, national websites (http://www.medyaokuryazarligi.org.tr/) were established, international congresses were organized, and similar other activities in the mid-2000s quickly ensured quickly that media literacy became an important issue in the national agenda. No doubt, another reason for this was the Turkey-European Union relations, which were at their peak in those years. The Council included media literacy among the life-long learning skills in a declaration that was released in 2006 for member and candidate countries and recommended that it should be included in the educational systems (http://www.csem-eu-conference.be/).

With the joint efforts of the Ministry of Education and the RTUK, a curriculum was prepared, pilot studies were conducted; and as of the 2006-2007 academic year, a two hours course in media literacy was offered as an optional subject in the secondary schools (MEB 2006a). With the optional class practice, the NGOs, educators and academicians became increasingly interested in this topic. Various workshops and congresses were held to determine the missing points on this topic, and research reports, articles and books were released. In addition to all these efforts, two basic studies were conducted in 2012 which guided media literacy education in Turkey. The first one was the Media Literacy Workshop, which had a wide participation of Ministry representatives, media producers, educators, academicians, and representatives of NGOs. The second one was the Media Literacy Research in Turkey Scale, which researchers conducted under the auspices of the RTUK. The intersection point of both activities was that the media literacy classes, in the situation at that time, were not sufficient, and it was determined that the educational approach should be changed and the program should be updated. The results of these activities received great admiration in the media and in public opinion and also aroused an interest among educational administrators in Turkey.

Then, in 2013, the media literacy teaching program (MEB 2013) and the course book were renewed and updated (Orhon, Pembecioglu, Altun, Tuzel & Cakmak 2014). In the last decade, about four million students have received media literacy education (Hurriyet 2014). Distance and face-to-face teacher training activities were conducted. In the curriculum reform framework that has continued since 2011, the language arts classes at primary and secondary schools have been associated with the media literacy. By so doing, media literacy classes secured their place in the educational system, as of 2015, as an independent and optional subject associated with other subjects for the 13 and 14-year-old student group. In the section that follows, we outline some of the debates that have emerged as a result of the rapid rise of media literacy education in Turkey.

Who is the Owner of Media Literacy?

During the history of media literacy in Turkey, a wide variety of participants, from educational scientists to communication specialists, from health science professionals to media employees, have contributed to the debates on this issue in light of their own perspectives. Of course, each group brought with it a particular point of view about the media that has contributed to the various debates and conflicts. For instance, a Media Literacy Workshop was organized with a broad participation by the RTUK in 2012, and a group of pedagogues, communication specialists, teachers, media professionals, NGOs, and bureaucrats from various ministries came together (RTUK 2012a). In this workshop, some conflicts stemming from different targets, viewpoints and educational practices of the participants were apparent. Some participants were angry at the anti-media and over-protective approach mentioned by others. Some participants blamed others for defending hypothetical information far from the practice of contemporary journalism and media production. Those who defended media literacy felt that it should focus on the Internet and Web 2.0 media rather than traditional media devices such as television, newspaper and magazines, labeling the other approaches as outdated and folksy. The longest and most violent debates were on the issue of determining which faculty would teach the subject. During these debates, some academicians argued that this class should be taught by educational faculty graduates, while others insisted on its being taught by communication graduates. Very few participants emphasized that this argument proceeded in the wrong direction because the focused issue should have been on the proficiencies of the person who would teach this class and the methodology of the media literacy classes rather than which faculty graduates would teach these classes.

Although the groups could not reach a mutual conclusion in the Media Literacy Workshop, it became clear that there were two powerful factions that had differing viewpoints from each other on the issues: tensions between educational faculty members and the faculty members of the communication department continues. According to the present laws, the media literacy classes are taught mainly by the ICT, social sciences and Turkish language teachers from the educational faculty (the Law TTKK, No. 113, 2013). However, the Ministry of Education assigns the present ICT, language arts and social science teachers to teach media literacy instead of appointing communication graduates to the faculty (MEB 2014).

Both groups were motivated to provide job opportunities to graduates from their staff, and defended their arguments accordingly. The unemployment rates in Turkey support this situation. The unemployment rate of university graduates in Turkey is 12.3% (TurkStat 2014), which is four times higher than that of the USA (USA Bureau of Labor Statistic, 2014) and two-times more than the European Union (EuroStat 2013). Competition for jobs therefore leads to a situation in which some university departments are less preferable (sometimes even not preferred) when compared with the other departments. Pekkaya and Colak (2013) revealed that the largest factor affecting university preferences among the students in Turkey is the guarantee of finding a job. A relatively large employment gap for teachers emerged when media literacy was accepted as an optional subject in 2006. At this point, the issue of who would teach media literacy classes became important because the field of communication has an unemployment rate of 22.1%, the highest of the academic disciplines (TurkStat 2012). It has been suggested that educational staff in other areas will face the same problem in the near future. For this reason, the major debate of the short history of media literacy in Turkey has been the question, "Who is the owner of this field?"

Some academicians supported these debates by releasing articles (Altun & Cakmak 2012; BTE 2012; Tuzel 2012c), some by newspaper declarations, some by social media, and some by stating their viewpoints on personal blogs. For instance, the dean of the faculty of communication at İstanbul University said, "The media literacy classes should be taught by communication faculty graduates" in a speech reporting in a national

newspaper. He added that "by so-doing, the army of the unemployed in the media would be provided with jobs" (Erdogan 2009). While these debates on media literacy occurred between the educationalists and communication specialists, both faculties progressed slowly in adding the relevant classes to the curricula. Although at some universities, some faculties did make efforts to develop the relevant skills by adding optional classes to the curricula, it might be suggested that these efforts were insufficient.

In analyzing the great debates in the USA during the late 1990s, Hobbs (1998, 17) noted, "The variety in the approaches, philosophies and targets on media literacy are *an inevitable result* for a field that was born right in the intersection point of media research and educational sciences." In addition, she emphasized that such debates might have had an important potential for the education world which could benefit from some insights offered by the communication arts and sciences. This determination might be valid for Turkey in some aspects; however, unlike the USA, the basis of the debates in Turkey are "unemployment and employment" problems. Very few of the efforts spent for the debates on "which faculty graduates will teach the media literacy classes" are spent on truly vital problems of media literacy. The important regulatory body for the media industry (RTUK) is at the very center of the media literacy education movement in Turkey, in contrast to the Ministry of Education, which has been extremely passive, which may contribute to the "turf wars" between the disciplines.

What is the Role of the Media Regulator in Advancing Media Literacy Initiatives?

The Turkish Radio and Television Supreme Council (RTUK) has historically held the most active role in the onset and in the progress of the media literacy movement in Turkey. Composed of nine members elected by the National Assembly, the Communications Council also has had an important role in the inclusion of the media literacy concept in reports and strategy documents prepared by the state institutions, as well as in developing media literacy as state policy, and giving it support in symposiums, workshops, panels, and similar academic activities organized since the early part of the twenty-first century. The Council has increased public awareness on the issue through the development of its website and through public announcements. The most important step taken by RTUK was ensuring that the optional media literacy classes were included in the education system for secondary school students through the cooperation of the Ministry of Education in 2006. From then on, the RTUK took the initiative for preparing the media literacy curriculum (MEB 2006a), its renewal (MEB 2013), and providing in-service trainings for teachers (MEB 2014). Therefore, it is the most important institution guiding the media literacy movement in Turkey.

No doubt, media literacy being under the auspices of a powerful institution like the RTUK brought with it many advantages. The topic has remained prominent in the national agenda for the last decade, and it was included in the official strategic documents of the state. Numerous academic meetings have been organized around the subject, and it was included in the educational system. Public announcements emphasizing the importance of media literacy were released in national channels in prime times; and thus, it was conveyed to millions of people. It is not possible to advance at such speed in Turkey with the efforts of any other institution. On the other hand, such a powerful overseer has led to two basic problems in terms of the development of the field of media literacy.

The first problem is the situation in which protectionism has become a dominant perspective in Turkey. The RTUK is a financially and administratively autonomous council established for organizing and auditing the radio and television sector in Turkey (The Law 6112, Item34). The RTUK has entered the public agenda primarily with its ability to issue "cease broadcasting" penalties with pecuniary penalties given to television channels and programs. The perception of the RTUK in the society is that of a "watchdog" which audits and protects society from the media. The chairman of the RTUK said in a speech in 2013, "RTUK intervenes in any program it wants. It makes any channel broadcast the program it wants or makes the broadcast cease" (Egitim Ajansi 2013). The chairman of the Council said that this was not true; however, ironically he later stated in a

speech that the RTUK made more than 1500 penalty decisions in 2011, and most of these were given to the advertisements to protect children. Therefore, media literacy in Turkey is perceived as a movement that protects children from the media, since it is under the auspices of the RTUK and aligned with the mission of the RTUK as well. This protectionist approach is also reflected in the curricula, policy documents, and research reports. It is usually handled as an authoritarian approach or as a very limited form, or even sometimes simply ignored.

The second problem caused by the RTUK being in the lead role in the media literacy movement in Turkey is the fact that media literacy is considered solely in relation to the frame of traditional mass media. It is written on the website of the Council, "The RTUK is a financially and administratively autonomous state council established for organizing and auditing the radio and television broadcasting in Turkey within the scope of the laws of the Republic of Turkey" (RTUK 2014). As it is obvious in the description of the mission of the Council, it has a scope that is limited merely to television and radio. This leads to the danger of media literacy being limited to only to mass media in Turkey. However, recent studies show that the children in Turkey spend more time on the Internet and mobile devices (RTUK 2013; RTUK 2012b). As a result, the media literacy curriculum in Turkey includes predominantly those activities that relate to television (Cakmak 2010).

Protection vs Empowerment

As a result of its alignment with the government media regulatory agency, media literacy in Turkey is under the influence of a protective approach that emphasizes the harms and risks of mass media. This approach has come forth in academic publications, at meetings, and in activities and reports on the public opinion. It is apparent in the motto of "declaring war against the media because of their harmful effects" (Alper, Aytan & Unlu 2015; Altun 2009; Akinci 2008; Aydeniz 2011; Turkoglu 2006). A powerful and dominant group of scholars in Turkey claims that the media literacy movement should focus on the harmful effects of the media, and arouse an awareness of the issue among the students (Erturk & Gul 2006; İnal 2011; Paker 2009; Tufan 2007; Vural 2008; Yılmaz 2010). Another less powerful group claims that media literacy skills should be developed by encouraging children to learn new things and seek entertainment via the media without standing against them (Altun 2010; Bilici 2011; Bilici 2014; Cakmak 2010; Tuzel, 2012a; Tuzel, 2012b; Tuzel, 2013).

In the protective media literacy approach, the focus is on "concerns" about the media. People have to be protected from the misguidance and addiction that media promotes. Media users are viewed in the position of passive victims of the media. As Neil Postman (1993) claimed, new means of media are "harmful" devices that threaten the published and preserved culture that has been based on written sources for hundreds of years. For this reason, in many studies, the media is portrayed as the first and sole reason of corruption of family values, of the collapse in the carnal breakdown of individuals, and for individuals becoming addicted consumers (Share 2006, 11). As a result of this, the attitude toward media literacy has been sloganized as "education vs. the media" (Masterman & Mariet 1994, 21). At the base of the protective approach, there is the hypothesis that assumes that individuals are passive receivers of media products, and that the media influences the lives of individuals in a negative way. As a result of such a viewpoint, it is considered necessary to keep people away from the dangerous messages of the media (Buckingham 1994). The media literacy scene in Turkey clearly reflects these descriptions.

There are three basic reasons for the extremely strong acceptance of the protective media literacy approach in which the educational systems are in a defensive position against the media: (1) cultural (2) moral and (3) ideological reasons. The educational system in Turkey considers language skills and knowledge transmission as an important means in preserving and transmitting culture. This situation is clearly stated in the curricula of both classes (MEB 2005; MEB 2006b) where media literacy can assist with "protecting children from low-level or foreign cultural products, and making them adopt higher or national cultural products" (p. 4).

The protective approach is reflected in the curriculum of a class that covers media literacy by exploring popular foreign media products (MEB 2006; 2013). This preservationist thread is not unique to Turkey: it can also be found in approaches to media education in England, Canada, and Australia, where examples of a cultural defensiveness can be found regarding media contents imported from other countries. Pungente et al. (2005, 148) show the "desire for bringing the identity of being a 'Canadian' into the foreground and fighting against the media products that make the propaganda of American cultural imperialism" as the most important reason for media literacy education in Canada. Greenaway (1997) states that media literacy education started in Australia due to similar reasons. Therefore, in Turkey, like in other countries in the world, the rationale for media literacy education is connected to the need for cultural defense from US media produced in Hollywood, Madison Avenue and Silicon Valley.

Another factor that is important in the dominance of the protective approach in Turkey is the perceived need for moral defense. Conservatives note that "the media spread the messages that corrupt the moral values of the society" (Tuzel 2012b, 24). The strong belief in the opinion that the exposure of children to scenes that include violence and sexual contents influence them negatively has been influential in the emergence of a moral panic among some people (Ayranci, Kosgeroglu & Gunay 2004; Dag et al. 2005). In addition, research studies from the international literature have reinforced this view, making it common for people to come to the conclusion that media content influences the moral development of children in a negative way (Bushman & Anderson 2001; Nansel et al. 2001; Strasburger, Wilson & Jordan 2014) has reinforced this perception. The argument has even been used by politicians, bureaucrats and researchers who take advantage of its rhetorical value in convincing parents and citizens of the importance of media literacy education.

The third and the last reason for the adoption of the protective approach is generally framed as the need for ideological defense. When considered in this perspective, the media is the platform on which erroneous claims, slander, manipulated information, stereotypical judgments and viewpoints are collected (Altheide 1995; Chomsky 1997; Barsamian 2001; McChesney 1999). It is believed that the media messages misguide individuals and abuse them both emotionally and economically. For this reason, children having knowledge of the language, methods and techniques of the media must be the starting point of media literacy education.

For the abovementioned reasons, the protective approach has penetrated into the policy documents, education programs, laws, and the viewpoints of the politicians in Turkey. The viewpoints that seriously criticize the protective approach and oppose have not been sufficiently accepted in Turkey. These alternative approaches, which emerged in the 1930s in the field of differentiating and gaining critical consciousness were adopted widely until the 1960s (Tuzel 2012b). Although it seems to have lost its influence over time, with the rise of media literacy education, it has again found a place in Turkish society and has thus preserved its existence.

Educational Censorship and Media Literacy Textbooks

Media literacy is a subject that deals with written, oral, and visual texts and the electronic texts in which these elements are included. It is an open issue whether such a course can reach its goals merely with the activities of a published textbook. Reliance on a textbook may weaken the potential of media literacy education to address the everyday popular culture that is a part of children's daily lives. In addition, the textbooks and teachers' guides have not been updated for five years. Given the quick-changing structure of the media, this becomes another volatile issue. However, educational bureaucrats and institutions which control the content of the curriculum through the preparation of a textbook inevitably leads to the exclusion of many forms and types of media that are used by the students in their daily lives outside of the classroom environment.

In Turkey, for each class, there is a textbook and a teachers' guide which are distributed to students and teachers free of charge by the Ministry of Education. The teachers' guide for the middle-school elective in

media literacy was prepared and published in 2006, and was used until 2014 without being updated. This has led to the failure of students to respond, since the textbooks no longer contain up-to-date information (RTUK 2012b, 9). Related to the issue of updating the media literacy textbooks, at the meetings held in 2013, a group of academicians proposed that a website, instead of the hardcopy textbooks, should be prepared. They stated that by so doing, the written, oral and visual media texts could be presented to the students in an interactive way. They suggested that this website could be updated regularly and present materials to the teachers in media literacy classes. However, the authorities of the Ministry of Education stated that the legal procedures were not suitable for such a situation. They perceived there to be drawbacks including copyright infringement, commercials, debatable political issues, and above all, a potential loss of control. The strong centralist structure of the Ministry of Education maintains control over education through the provision of written curriculum materials, presented in textbook format. When the proposal for the development of online curriculum resource materials was rejected, a written textbook was prepared in 2014, just as in the previous curriculum.

According to McLuhan's statement, "The medium is the message," the medium is important in itself. Therefore, it is extremely difficult to reflect the power of film and video using a written text. For this reason, long and boring descriptions of audiovisual materials become necessary, and this decreases the motivation of the teachers and students in the classes. For instance, in the written class material preparation process, a short video presentation of a piece of news had to be converted into a written text consisting of several transcribed pages with an activity in the book. Instead of using the real television news in a direct manner, the names of the institutions and people in the news were changed or censored. In addition, the logos of the social media like Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter, including the official television channel of the state, were censored due to concerns that it would be regarded as a commercial activity. This situation has led to media literacy activities that are highly distorted and artificial. As a result, media literacy teachers and students consider the course materials to be boring and far from reality. They hope that the classes will be made more relevant by the increased availability and use of audio-visual materials (RTUK 2012b, 9).

Media Literacy Education Model: Specialist Subject or Integrated Model

Another fundamental debate on media literacy education in Turkey is the issue as to whether the classes will be taught as a specialist subject or integrated into the larger curriculum. Media literacy started as an optional-specialist elective course in secondary schools. Some academicians believe that the specialist structure of the media literacy classes has great value and should be made compulsory. Another group claims that media literacy should be integrated within other courses. Recently, the number of educationalists, bureaucrats and NGO representatives who support the integrated approach have increased significantly. One of the reasons for this increase is that the results of the evaluations of the current practices have been somewhat negative (RTUK 2012). Proponents of the integration approach purport the following advantages: (1) more students will gain media literacy skills (Hobbs 1998, 25; Tuzel 2012b); (2) the arguments on the issue of which teachers will lecture the media literacy classes will end; (3) there is the possibility of media literacy education starting at earlier ages (4) media literacy activities can be practiced contextually (Hobbs 1998); (5) it offers the opportunity for media texts to be used as objects of inquiry (Kress 1992). The studies conducted on the issue of integrating the media literacy within the context of different courses is viewed as appropriate for integration into the language arts and social science curricula (Cakmak 2012; Tuzel 2012a).

Over a relatively short time period, Turkey has established a basic learning ground for media literacy in the scope of primary and secondary school language arts courses and in the framework of a national curriculum. Elective classes in media literacy in secondary schools are still continuing even as it becomes more commonly thought that media literacy can be integrated within the relevant curriculum, especially for younger

children, and it can continue through the upper grades as well. In Turkey, as in other nations around the world, a blend of both approaches is beginning to be practiced together.

Conclusion

The RTUK has a catalytic influence on the development of media literacy education in Turkey. This situation has led to increased public awareness of the value of media literacy in a relatively short time and made different sectors of the society interested in this topic. There are various groups with different approaches to the debates, and these groups can be classified into five categories in terms of their media literacy approaches. The first group focuses on the negative effects of the media messages on children. The second group focuses on the issue of which skills should be developed in which style in order to make the media messages understood most accurately. The third group intensifies in developing an awareness among parents and adults in order to prevent children from being harmed by the media. The fourth group examines the effects of the mass media devices on the society. Those in the fifth group work on the efficiency of the education that goes hand in hand with the media. The different viewpoints, acceptances and approaches of each one of these groups contribute greatly to the debates.

When considering media literacy as an academic field of study, it is impossible not favor one group over another. However, when the pedagogy is considered, these groups have to present a perspective on which they all agree. This is critical to the efficient integration of media literacy in Turkey's educational system and in drawing the borders of the curriculum and guiding the teaching practices. The multivocality in the debates ensures that different societal groups will contribute to the debates, and keep the topic on the agenda. The same multivocality, however, increases the polarization on the structural debates and makes it more difficult for the groups to arrive at a consensus. It also leads to delays on the content of media literacy education and its basic pedagogy. For instance, although there are heated debates regarding which teachers will instruct the classes, the issue of teacher qualifications has not been discussed at all. Likewise, the issue of the content of the pre-service and in-service teacher training has not been discussed. Currently, many teachers who are teaching the media literacy classes state that they do not know what to teach in these classes (RTUK 2012b, 11).

There is a growing need for a pedagogical approach that will structure classroom practices in media literacy teaching. This approach must be similar in structure to the "Five Key Questions" approach that pioneers the critical pedagogy in the USA (NAMLE, 2007) or to the "Flower Model" of Israel, which covers the author, technical structure of the text, the message, the receiver and the media industry (Friesem 2013). It could also be patterned after the "Triangle Model" of Canada, which questions the author, the audience and the elements of the text (Pungente et al 2005). It must form the framework of the pedagogy of the media literacy classes in the classroom and guide the teachers. So, how can the main guidelines of the media literacy pedagogy that will bring different groups together be determined?

Firstly, it is expected that this pedagogy is in accordance with the media literacy principles that are accepted in the international literature. In this context, media literacy is not based on a pedagogy in which the information on the media is conveyed to the students and enlightenment would occur (Share 2002, 21). The critical questioning skill, which is considered in the very center of media literacy, cannot be given to the students by informing them about the potential negative effects of the media (Thoman & Jolls 2005, 34). Real skills cannot be conveyed to the students by filtering or censoring the texts they see in their everyday lives. On the contrary, students should be presented with real media texts and be required to question these in terms of the basic principles of critical pedagogy (Hobbs & Moore, 2013; Hobbs 2013). Students must not be given the expected answers; they must be asked the proper and critical questions (Thoman & Jolls 2005, 34).

In addition, media literacy deals with the teaching and learning the media itself. This situation must not be confused with the notion of media-assisted education, for instance, using the media as a means of education

in science or history classes. Simply bringing videos, CD-ROMS or other visual content to the classroom is not sufficient for the classes. Therefore, the media literacy is not only education *with* the media but also education *about* the media (Thoman & Jolls, 2005).

Media literacy is not about saying "Do not watch!" Therefore, the purpose cannot be to keep children away. On the contrary, it is telling them, "Think in critical manner!" "Question!" and "Ask the right questions!" Although frequent criticisms are made in the classes, the purpose is not confrontation with the media.

Media literacy aims to raise individuals who not only read, listen, watch and analyze, but also create media in different forms. However, although production is an important component of the media literacy, it is not the media literacy itself.

Creating an efficient pedagogical perspective in Turkey depends on the cooperation with teachers and students with the abovementioned principles in mind, planning intra-class activities and sharing them with other shareholders, and discovering an applicable and applied process that requires developing curriculum activities. For media literacy to achieve an efficient position in the schools in Turkey will require a mutual consensus among groups on a basic pedagogical understanding and a respect for the dynamic elements of the process.

Finally, media devices show constant change and improvement, and depending on the ever-advancing technology, make a dynamic media literacy content necessary. Researchers and implementers in this field are moving toward the critical questioning pedagogy, which is at the very center of media literacy rather than the technology-focused changes, which have the potential of determining the limits of the future debate issues. The increase in the number of studies that are focused on the content of media literacy classes in Turkey have, for now, left the structural debates aside. In the near future, the issues, such as teacher training, development of curriculum activities, and determining the contents of the media literacy pedagogy in Turkey will occupy the agenda more than ever.

References

Akinci, Nergis. 2008. "Çocuk ve Medya" *Turkiye Klinikleri Pediatrik Bilimler Dergisi 4*, 6: 72-75. [in Turkish]

Alper, Kadir, Aytan, Nejmi and Unlu Suleyman. "Gorsel Medya Caginda Cocukların. 2015. "Video Oyun Bagimliliklari." *Egitim ve Ogretim Araştırmaları Dergisi 1,* 4: 98-106. [in Turkish]

Altheide, David. 1995. An ecology of communication: Cultural formats of control. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Altun, Adnan. 2009. "Medyadaki Kalip Yargilarin (Stereotiplerin) Ustesinden Gelmek İcin Medya Okuryazarligi." *Bilim ve Aklin Aydinliginda Egitim Dergisi, 111*: 20-34. [in Turkish]

------- 2010. "Medya Okuryazarliginin Sosyal Bilgiler Programlariyla Iliskilendirilmesi ve Ogretimi" (PhD diss., Gazi University). [in Turkish]

Altun, Adnan and Cakmak, Ebubekir. 2012. "Medya Okuryazarligi ve Ogretmen Egitimi: Medya Okuryazarligi Dersini Kim Ogretmeli?" (paper presented at the annual meeting for the 21. Ulusal Egitim Bilimleri Kongresi, Marmara University, Istanbul, September 12-14). [in Turkish]

Aufderheide, Patricia. 1992. "*Media literacy: A report of the National Leadership Conference on Media Literacy.*" (A report of the National Leadership Conference on Media Literacy, Communications and Society Program, Aspen Institute, Queenstown, MD, December 7 - 9).

Aydeniz, Hediyetullah. 2011. *Bilincli Medya Kullanimi.* Ankara: Aile ve Toplum Hizmetleri Genel Mudurlugu Yayinlari. [in Turkish]

Ayranci, Unal; Kosgeroglu, Nedime and Gunay, Yasemin. 2004. "Televizyonda Çocukların En Çok Seyrettikleri Saatlerde Gösterilen Filmlerdeki Şiddet Düzeyi." *Anadolu PsikiyatriDergisi* 5(3): 133 -140. [in Turkish]

Barsamian, David. 2001. Propaganda and the public mind. Conversations with Noam Chomsky. Cambridge: South End Press.

Bilici, E. Ibrahim. 2011. "Turkiye'de Ortaogretimde Medya Okuryazarligi Dersi Icin Bir Model Onerisi. (PhD diss., Erciyes University). [in Turkish]

-------. 2014. *Medya Okuryazarligi ve Egitim*. Ankara: Nobel Yayincilik. [in Turkish]

BTE. 2012. Bilisim Teknolojileri Dersinin ve Ogretmenlerinin Durumu, 2012 (Retrieved from http://www.bte.org.tr/durum_raporu.html) [in Turkish]

Buckingham, David. 1994. "Media education: Beyond the milenium." *Metro Magazine, 100*: 49-57.

Bushman, Brad and Anderson, Craig. 2001. "Media Violence and The American Public: Scientific Fact Versus Media Misinformation". *American Psychologist 56*: 477-489.

Cakmak, Ebubekir. 2010. "Ingiltere ve Turkiye'deki İlkogretim Medya Okuryazarligi Egitimi Program ve Uygulamalarının Karsilastirmali Olarak Incelenmesi." (PhD diss. Abant Izzet Baysal University). [in Turkish]

Chomsky, Noam. 1991. Media Control: The Spectacular Achievements of Propaganda. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Dag, Ihsan; Oktem, Ferhunde; Yazıcı, M. Kazım; Guvenc, Gulden; Rezaki, Murat; Ozcan, D. Nilüfer; Ozer, Omer; Ozer, A. Omer and Tuncel, Mine. 2005. *Televizyon Programlarındaki Şiddet İçeriğinin, Müstehcenliğin Ve Mahremiyet İhlallerinin İzleyicilerin Ruh Sağlığı Üzerindeki Olumsuz Etkileri.* Ankara: Radyo ve Televizyon Ust Kurulu, 2005. [in Turkish]

Egitim Ajansi. 2013. "RTUK'un Program Kaldırma Yetkisi Yok" *Egitim Ajansı*, December 12. (Retrieved from http://www.egitimajansi.com/haber/rtukun-program-kaldirma-yetkisi-yok-haberi-23709h.html) [in Turkish]

Erdogan, Nurten. 2009. "Istanbul Universitesi Medya Okuryazarligi Ogretmeni Yetistirecek" *Cumhuriyet Gazetesi,* January 16, 2009. (Retrieved from http://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/haber/diger/35112/iU_medyaokuryazarligi_ogretmeni yetistirecek.html) [in Turkish]

EuroStat. 2013. *Unemployment rate by level of educational attainment.* European Union, 2013. (Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Unemployment_and_beyond)

Friesem, Jonathan. 2013. "Helga Keller – The Mother of Media Literacy in Israel". Symposium on the Historical Roots of Media Literacy. Kingston, RI, September

Greenaway, Peter. 1997. "Media and Arts Education: A Global View from Australia." In *Media literacy in the Information Age: Current Perspectives*, edited by Robert Kubey, 187-198. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Hobbs, Renee. 1998. "The Seven Great Debates in the Media Literacy Movement." *Journal of Communication* 48(1): 16-32.

------ 2013. "Improvization and Strategic Risk-Taking in Informal Learning with Digital Media   Literacy." *Learning, Media and Technology* 38(2): 182 - 197.

Hobbs, Renee and Cooper Moore, David. 2013. Discovering Media Literacy: Teaching Digital Media and Popular Culture in Elementary School. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Corwin/Sage.

Hurriyet. 2014. "Medya Okuryazarligi Dersi 'Sil Bastan' " *Hurriyet Gazetesi,* September 23. (Retrieved from http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/egitim/27261110.asp) [in Turkish]

Iletisim Surası. 2003.*"Iletisim Surası Sonuc Raporu."* A report of Iletisim Surası, Basbakanlik. Basin-Yayin ve Enformasyon Genel Mudurlugu, Ankara. [in Turkish]

Inal, Kemal. 2011. "Cocuklar Nicin Medya Okuryazarı Olmalı?" In *Cocuk Haklari ve Medya   El Kitabi: Anne, Baba ve Medya Calisanları Icin,* edited by M.R. Sirin, 417-426.   Istanbul: Cocuk Vakfi Yayinlari. [in Turkish]

Kress, Gunter. 1992. "Media literacy as cultural technology in the age of media." In *New directions: Media education worldwide,* by C. Bazalgette, E. Bevort and J. Savino, 190-202. London: British Film Institute.

Masterman, Len and Mariet, Francois. 1997. *Media education in 1990s Europe.* Council of Europe Press.

McChesney, W., Robert. 1999. *Rich media, poor democracy: communication politics in dubious times.* Urbana: University of Illınois Press.

MEB (Minister of Education). 2005. *Ilkogretim Turkce Dersi Ogretimi Programı ve Kılavuzu (6,7,8. Sınıflar)* Ankara: Milli Egitim Bakanlıgı Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Baskanlıgı. [in Turkish]

-------. 2006a. *Ilkogretim Medya Okuryazarlıgı Dersi Ogretim Programı ve Kılavuzu.* Ankara: Milli Egitim Bakanlıgı Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Baskanlıgı. [in Turkish]

-------. 2006b. Ilkogretim *Turkce Dersi Ogretimi Programı ve Kılavuzu (6,7,8. Sınıflar).* Ankara: Milli Egitim Bakanlıgı Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Baskanlıgı. [in Turkish]

-------. 2013. *Ortaokul ve Imamhatip Ortaokulu Medya Okuryazarlıgı Dersi Ogretim Programı .* Ankara: Milli Egitim Bakanlıgı Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Baskanlıgı. [in Turkish]

-------. 2014. "Ogretmenlik Alanları, Atama ve Ders Okutma Esaslarına İliskin Cizelge." *Tebligler Dergisi* 77*(*2678): 262-298. [in Turkish]

Nansel, Tonja; Overpeck, Mary; Pilla, Romani; Ruan, W. June; Simon, Bruce and Scheidt, Peter. 2001. "Bullying behaviors among US youth: prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 285: 2094-2100.

Orhon, Nezih.; Pembecioglu, Nilufer.; Altun, Adnan. Tuzel, Sait and Cakmak Ebubekir. 2014. *Medya Okuryazarlıgı Ogretim Materyali.* Ankara: Milli Egitim Bakanlıgı Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Baskanlıgı. [in Turkish]

Paker, K., Oya. 2009. "Cocuk Temsilleri ve Medya Okuryazarlıgı Egitimi." In *Cocuk ve Medya*, by S. Akcali, 129-151. Ankara: Nobel Yayincilik.

Pekkaya, Mehmet and Colak, Nurdan. 2013. "Universite Ogrencilerinin Meslek Secimini Etkileyen Faktorlerin Onem Derecelerinin AHP ile Belirlenmesi.*" Journal of Academic Social Science Studies* 6(2): 797-818.

Pekman, Cem. 2006. "Avrupa Birliginde Medya Okuryazarlıgı." Paper presented at the First International Conferance of Media Literacy, Marmara University, Istanbul, May 23-25, 2005. [in Turkish]

Postman, Neil. 1993. Technopoly: The Surrender of Culture to Technology. New York: Vintage.

Pungente, John J., Duncan, Barry and Andersen, Neil. 2005. "The Canadian Experience: Leading the Way". Gretchen Schwarz and Pamela U. Brown (Eds.). *Media Literacy: Transforming Curriculum and Teaching* (140-160). NSSE, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.

RTUK (Turkish Radio and Television Supreme Council) 2014. *About RTUK.* Retrieved from http://www.rtuk.org.tr/Home/SolMenu/5386#

------ 2012b. *Medya Okuryazarlıgı Dersi Arastırması.* Ankara: Radyo ve Televizyon Ust Kurulu Yayınları.

------ 2012a *Medya Okuryazarligi Calistayi Sonuc Bildirgesi.* A report of RTUK. Retrieved from http://www.medyaokuryazarligi.org.tr/cal9.html [in Turkish]

------ 2013. Türkiye'de Çocukların Medya Kullanım Alışkanlıkları Araştırması. Ankara: Radyo ve Televizyon Ust Kurulu Yayınları.

Share, J. S. 2006. "Critical media literacy is elementary: A case study of teachers' ideas and experiences with media education and young children." (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles).

----- 2002. "What Media Literacy is Not." CML MediaLit Kit. Los Angeles: Center for Media Literacy.

Strasburger, C. Victor, Wilson, J. Barbara and Jordan, B. Amy. 2014. *Children, Adolescents & the Media.* London: Sage Publications.

Thoman, Elizabeth and Jolls, Thoman. 2005. Literacy for the 21st Century an Overview & Orientation Guide To Media Literacy Edıcation. Los Angeles: Center for Media Literacy.

TurkStat. 2014. *Hane Halkı Isgucu Istatistikleri.* Ankara. [in Turkish]

------. 2012. *Bolumlere Gore Issizlik Oranlari.* Ankara [in Turkish]

Tufan, Enver. 2007. "Medya Okuryazarligi Dersinin Okullardaki Siddet Uzerine Etkileri" Paper presented at the annual meeting for the 3. Ulusal Sanat Egitimi Sempozyumu: Sanat Egitimi ve Siddet, Gazi University, Ankara, November 19-21, 2007. [in Turkish]

Turkoglu, Nurcay. 2006. "Seytan'ın Akordeonu ve Sazı: Medyada Bolluklar ve Bosluklar." *Kuresel Iletisim Dergisi,* 1:1-8 [in Turkish]

Tuzel, Sait. 2012a. "Medya Okuryazarlıgı Egitiminin Turkce Dersleriyle Iliskilendirilmesi." *MKU Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu Dergisi* 9, 18: 81-96. [in Turkish]

----- 2012b. "Ilkogretim Ikinci Kademe Turkce Derslerinde Medya Okuryazarlıgı Egitimi: Bir Eylem Arastırması." (PhD diss., Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, 2012b). [in Turkish]

----- 2012c. "Türkçe Ders Programında Yeni Bir Öğrenme Alanı: Medya Okuryazarlığı?" Paper presented at the annual meeting for the X. Türkçenin Eğitimi-Öğretimi Kurultayı, Mersin University, Mersin, July 5-6, 2012c. [in Turkish]

----- 2013. "Sosyal Medyada Hikayeyi Görsel Dilde Anlatmak: Bir Eylem Araştırması." Paper presented at the annual meeting for the XI. Türkçenin Eğitimi-Öğretimi Kurultayı, Nigde University, Nigde, July 4-6, 2013. [in Turkish]

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2014. *Employment Status of the Civilian Population 25 Years and Over by Educational Attainment*, 2014 Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.t04.htm

Vural, Izlem. 2008. "Televizyon Haberlerini Okumak: Cocuk İzleyicilere Gore Televizyon Haberlerinden Yansıyan Turkiye." *Galatasaray Universitesi İletisim Fakultesi*, 9: 69-100. [in Turkish]

Yılmaz, Meral. 2010. "Medya Okuryazarlıgı Dersi Ogrenciyi Bilinclendiriyor." *Semerkand Aile Dergisi,* 60: 22-29 [in Turkish]