



Turkish Teacher Candidates' Perceptions of the “Media Literate Individual” Through Metaphors

Belgin Arslan-Canseverⁱ
Ege University, Izmir, Turkey
belgin.arslan.cansever@ege.edu.tr

Abstract

The aim of this study is to identify teacher candidates' perceptions of media literate individuals through metaphors. An open-ended questionnaire was used to collect data. Participants were asked to complete the sentence “A media-literate individual is like; because... “. SPSS 17.0 was used to calculate the frequency count and percentage of the elicited metaphors and the categories thereafter formed. The pilot study was comprised of 60 teacher candidates while the principle study was comprised of 341 teacher candidates (197 female and 144 male). In the data analysis, frequency, percentage calculations and content analysis were employed. In order to determine validity and reliability, Miles and Huberman's (1994) criteria were utilized. Findings revealed the creation of 70 valid metaphors grouped into 8 conceptual categories. These metaphors differed based on the gender and program type of the teacher.

Keywords: Media Literacy, Media Literate Individuals, Turkish Teacher Candidates, Metaphor, Gender.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows:

Arslan-Cansever, B. (2013). Turkish Teacher Candidates' Perceptions of the “Media Literate Individual” Through Metaphors. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, 6(2), 204-213. Retrieved [DATE] from <http://www.ijsre.com>

INTRODUCTION

The acceleration of technologic developments over the last quarter of the 20th century has resulted in inevitable changes to our social and cultural lives. As a result of this process, individuals are now expected to be knowledgeable, skillful and literate in a number of different fields including science, visuality, technology, culture, and media. This expectation requires that the conventional definition of literacy, which is to be able to properly read a certain text or to write in a grammatically correct way in the primary language, be reviewed. For Nergis (2011, p. 1136) literacy is an “individual’s adaptation to his environment, his ability to solve problems, to be able to acquire the information required to make the right decision, and to be able to use information tools like libraries, the Internet, technology devices and others in the acquisition of this information”. With broader definitions of literacy gaining acceptance, media literacy is increasingly viewed as an important life skill related to a human being’s awareness of himself and of the influence of other societies’ and cultures’ perceptions (Deveci & Cengelci, 2008).

Media Literacy

In general, media literacy refers to the ability to use information channels efficiently; to perceive and analyze messages through these channels (Alagozlu, 2012); and to evaluate and transfer them (Thoman & Jolls, 2008). In other words, it is an “individual’s ability to benefit from media channels and know how to use them; an ability to receive, perceive, internalize, elaborate, criticize and evaluate; and, to transfer messages from ‘traditional’ media (newspaper, magazine, radio, television etc.) and ‘new’ media (Internet, mobile phone, game pad etc.) to others through oral or written language (Aslan, Aslan & Arslan-Cansever, 2012, p. 47). In today’s information age, it is thus expected that media literates will develop a critical perspective on and evaluate and analyze the media messages they read, hear, or see.

Features of a Media Literate Individual

Oncel (2007, p. 7) defined a media literate individual as, “a person who can distinguish and perceive re-fictionalized messages on media; one who deserves to be called media competent, since it is necessary to have a certain skill and amount of background information as well as education in order to be able to articulate media messages”. According to the European Center of Media Literacy a media literate individual (Altun, 2010, pp. 20-21) is one who:

- Can use media technologies efficiently, in order to meet, keep, re-gain and share his interest and needs;
- Can make conscious choices by reaching various media forms via different cultural and traditional resources;
- Can grasp how and why media content is produced;
- Can critically analyze the techniques, languages, rules and messages transferred by media;
- Can use media in a creative way in order to explain and share opinions, information, and views;
- Can determine media content and services that can be harmful, and can avoid them; and
- Can use media efficiently while exercising his democratic rights and fulfilling his citizenship responsibilities;

Potter (2005) claimed that a media literate individual should have cognitive, aesthetic, emotional, and moral capabilities in terms of structuring information carried by media message. Toker-Erdogan (2010, p. 51) associates the cognitive dimension with mental processes and reasoning. Deciphering the symbols embedded in media messages, and understanding how the message was produced and presented are evaluated within the cognitive dimension. The emotional dimension includes an individual’s awareness of the emotions of media messages. These emotions may not be strong emotions like anger, fear, and hatred as sometimes abstruse emotions form part of the messages. The aesthetic dimension involves the skill of understanding media content from an artistic perspective. It also includes the ability to realize the media producer’s original artistic understanding of a production. Lastly, the moral dimension involves trying to understand the values embedded in the messages.

Media Literacy in Education

Kellner & Share, (2005) notes that media literacy has only recently begun to be a discussion topic in education, and is rarely discussed or referred to in teacher education. In other studies conducted in Turkey, researchers have found that teacher candidates generally focus only on the levels of media literacy (Butun, 2010; Karaman & Karatas, 2009; Karatas, 2008; Tuncer, 2013). Despite these shortcomings, it is believed that determining how media literate individuals are perceived by teacher candidates is as important as determining candidates’ levels of media literacy. These perceptions will undoubtedly influence the learning of the future students of these candidates.

Metaphors and Education Relationship

Metaphors, which are considered to be strong research tools for teacher candidates when understanding certain perceptions of a phenomenon (Saban, 2009), can help in the visualizing and reification of an abstract topic in education (Singh, 2010). Teacher candidates’ metaphors for media literate individuals thus an important data source in terms of understanding their perspective on the issue. According to the Turkish Language Society (2011) a metaphor, “is a word that is used in a different meaning than its original meaning as a result of an interest or comparison”. For Morgan (1998), metaphor is a form of understanding and seeing the world; it has an effect on and shapes an individual’s daily life. Metaphors that structure, direct, and control individuals’ thoughts about

events and issues are seen as important mental processes (Saban, Kocbekar & Saban, 2006). Similarly, Lakoff & Johnson (2003) define metaphor as one way of thinking and judging. From a more holistic perspective, metaphors, which show the big picture by shading hidden differences and divisions (Yildirim & Simsek, 2011), can be thought of as symbols or connotations of concepts, rather than concepts themselves (Yob, 2003).

According to the studies conducted in recent years in Turkey, metaphors have been used as important data collection tools in the scientific research process (Tasdemir & Tasdemir, 2011). The main aim of this study is thus to determine teacher candidates' perceptions of the 'media literate individual' through the metaphors they produce. Within this scope, the following research questions were asked:

1. What metaphors do teacher candidates produce around the media literate individuals?
2. In what kind of conceptual categories can these metaphors be collected?
3. Do teacher candidates' metaphors vary according to program type?
4. Do teacher candidates' metaphors vary according to gender?

METHOD

Population and Sample

The population of the study is composed of 2030 students studying in post-secondary (university) Faculties of Education Classroom Teaching (CT) and Social Sciences Teaching (SST) programs in the 2012-2013 school year in Izmir's city districts. The sample size in this study was 323 with a 95% confidence interval based on the " $n = Nt^2pq/d^2 (N-1) + t^2pq$ " formula (Bas, 2010). Given potential problems in survey feedback, 360 surveys were distributed to teacher candidates. Of the participants, 19 produced invalid metaphors and so were excluded from the research leaving 341 surveys to be evaluated. This research focused on SST and CT candidates because the former will teach Media Literacy courses in the future and the latter will shape students' lives in many broad regards from the start of their educational life. Of the candidates, 197 (57.7 %) were female and 144 (42.3 %) were male. In terms of program type, 179 (52.3 %) were CT while 162 (47.7 %) were SST candidates.

Instrument

For data collection, the sentence structure of an open-ended survey, which has been used in different studies to determine teacher, student and school perception in Turkey (Cerit, 2006; Nalcaci & Bektas, 2012; Saban, Kocbekar, & Saban, 2006; Saban, 2009), was adapted to the topic of the media literate individual. The final survey distributed to participants asked them to indicate their program and gender and complete the sentence, "A media literate individual is like...; because...".

Procedure

A pilot study was conducted with 60 students, the results of which were not included in the data analysis for this research. Participants were asked to choose one metaphor, which could be concrete or abstract, and refer to an entity that was living or non-living, that they felt best defined the media literate individual and to write their reasons for this following the "because" part of the sentence. Participants were chosen on a voluntary basis.

Data Analysis

SPSS 17.0 was used to calculate the frequency count and percentage of the elicited metaphors and the categories and content analysis method used in data coding.

Elo & Kyngäs (2007) define content analysis as a research method that can be used with both inductive and deductive approaches when analyzing quantitative and qualitative data and suggest three steps for its application. The first or "preparation" step involves choosing the proper analysis approach for the study. In this study, inductive content analysis was selected given that there are no other metaphor studies in the literature analyzing the research topic of this study. The study thus refers to the themes found in the research rather than foreknown themes. In this first preparation step, completed survey forms were divided, enumerated, and codified based on program type and gender variables. In this step 19 survey forms were found to contain more than one metaphor and so could not be used leaving 341 to be further evaluated.

The second step of content analysis is "organization" whereby codes are listed, grouped, and categorized. In the organization step, forms were sorted and the metaphors produced by teacher candidates were listed and uploaded to the computer. From here, 79 metaphors were obtained. Nine of these metaphors were produced by

both groups and so the total number of metaphors is 70. Metaphors produced by teacher candidates were categorized according to their explanations.

In the organization step, validity and reliability studies were also conducted. In order to determine validity and reliability, Miles & Huberman's (1994) criteria were used. On the basis of these, in order to maintain internal validity, teacher candidates' perceptions of the media-literate individual were interpreted and compared with the media literate individual's characteristics as defined in the literature. As for the external validity, the method and the characteristics of the study participants were defined in detail. In order to determine reliability, two experts were consulted. These experts were asked to match the produced metaphors to conceptual categories. After assessing the researcher's and experts' agreement and disagreement, agreement was found to be 91% according to Miles & Huberman's suggested "agreement percentage = [agreement/agreement+ disagreement] X 100" formula.

The last step in the analysis is "reporting", in which the analysis process and discussion of results are shared. In this step a model, a conceptual system, conceptual map or categories are invoked. In this study, results related to the following items were shared: metaphors produced by teacher candidates, categories of these metaphors, and the classification produced by these metaphors based on program type and gender. In the discussion, the original metaphors produced by teacher candidates are quoted and the findings are evaluated within the framework of data in the literature.

RESULTS

Teacher candidates studying in the CT department produced 39 metaphors related to the media-literate individual while the SST candidates produced 40 metaphors. There were nine common metaphors produced by candidates in both programs. These included *bee* (f=10), *CEO* (f=7), *child* (f=7), *critic* (f=30), *gourmet* (f=40), *Internet* (f=2), *philosopher* (f=8), *sieve* (f=5), and *tree* (f=14). The total number of unique metaphors produced by teacher candidates studying in the two departments is thus 70. The metaphors produced within the study, and their frequencies, listed alphabetically are: *agenda*, *airplane*, *ant*, *archeologist* (f= 3), *artist*, *avalanche* (f= 3), *bazaar customer*, *book*, *book worm* (f= 10), *brain*, *camera* (f= 2), *candle* (f= 16), *columnist*, *commentariat*, *computer that screens virus*, *conscious consumer*, *cook* (f= 5), *detective* (f= 11), *dictionary*, *encyclopedia*, *endoplasmic reticulum*, *expert*, *father* (f= 3), *football analyst* (f= 5), *fruit tree*, *gendarme*, *Google*, *horse* (f= 16), *housekeeper*, *individual who is on a diet*, *intellectual person*, *lighthouse*, *magazine*, *news department*, *newsman* (f= 2), *lamp*, *leader*, *light* (f= 9), *locomotive*, *machine* (f= 5), *microscope* (f= 2), *plant* (f= 2), *police* (f= 5), *politician*, *repairman*, *researcher* (f=5), *riddle*, *satellite receiver*, *scientist* (f= 21), *show glass*, *Sociologist* (f= 3), *spotlight*, *strainer*, *sun* (f= 8), *teacher* (f= 10), *thinker* (f= 3), *typewriter* (f= 2), *vigilant*, *wise* (f= 12), *witness*, and *woman*. The most frequently used metaphors produced by the 341 teacher candidates participating in the research included *gourmet*, *critic*, *scientist*, *horse*, *candle*, *tree*, and *conscious consumer*.

The metaphors created by teacher candidates were evaluated according to their common features as noted in the candidates' reasons, and were collected into eight categories. Table 1 shows these categories and the metaphors contained in the categories.

Table 1: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Categories Composed by Metaphors

Categories	Metaphors	f	%
Knowledgeable/Cultured Media Literate	Agenda, book, columnist, encyclopedia, father, magazine, riddle, Internet, dictionary, newsman	18	5.28
Media Literate as Beneficial to Others	Tree, plant, lighthouse, sun, light, spotlight, lamp, fruit tree, candle, teacher, repairman	64	18.77
Critical Media Literate	Critic, football analyst, artist, airplane, show glass	38	11.14
Curious Media Literate	Vigilant, child, woman, housekeeper	10	2.93
Picky Media Literate	Horse, strainer, endoplasmic reticulum, book worm, bazaar customer, individual who is on a diet, sieve, witness, computer that screens virus	37	10.85

Investigative /Analyst Media Literate	Researcher, bee, brain, wise, scientific, typewriter, thinker, intellectual person, Google, news department, philosopher, gendarme, ant, microscope, Sociologist	72	21.11
Expert Media Literate	Archeologist, cook, expert, detective, gourmet, commentariat, camera, machine, police, politician, satellite receiver	76	22.29
Leader Media Literate	Conscious consumer, CEO, avalanche, leader, locomotive	26	7.63
Total		341	100

Category I: Knowledgeable/Cultured Media Literate

This category is composed of 10 metaphors created by 18 participants. These metaphors are: *encyclopedia, father, riddle, magazine, agenda, Internet, book, columnist, dictionary and newsman*. Of the participants creating metaphors in this category, 9 are female and 8 are male. According to respondents, media literates should read media correctly. He or she should have background information on the reasons for and results of media in the fields of politics, society, and economics. Metaphors in this category included:

“The media literate is like a dictionary; because, he can analyze complex media messages with his knowledge and culture, like a dictionary”.

“The media literate is like riddling, for a media literate, knowledge accumulation is a prerequisite.”

“The media literate is like my father; because, life stops in our house when it is news time. My father is knowledgeable almost about everything in the world and in our country.”

In this category, the knowledge and culture accumulation of a media literate enable him to carefully select everything he will reads, watches, or listens to. Here, the media literate, rather than the media is in control. Examples of this include:

“The media literate is like a book; because, he can consciously pick and watch the good ones among many others.”

Findings in this category concur with Seefeldt’s (2004) research, in which the aim of media literacy is defined. According to this study, the aim of media literacy is to train citizens to understand social issues and develop logical views of social problems and to ensure that they are up-to-date and knowledgeable. It seems that following and discussing current events contributes to the training of efficient citizens and enables student to feel that they are in charge of their own lives. Considine (2008), sees media literacy as a type of efficiency that can be gained by with knowledge of media and culture.

Category II: Media Literate as Beneficial to Others

This category is represented by 64 participants and 11 metaphors. These metaphors are: *tree, plant, lighthouse, sun, light, spotlight, lamp, fruit tree, candle, teacher, and repairman*. More female than male respondents created metaphors in this category. Some of the respondents in this category perceived the media literate as an individual who is knowledgeable about media content and helpful to himself and others in terms of using this knowledge. Some of the metaphors in this category included:

“The media literate is like a tree; because, trees provide shades to human beings; media literate is beneficial to him and others.”

“The media literate is like a plant; because, he makes other people’s lives more livable. Media literate make the world more livable by his ability to distinguish right and wrong in media.”

The media literate enlightens others by properly understanding and interpreting the media. He transforms others by saving them from misinformation on media. He does this by using his common sense, knowledge, and culture. The media literate is also aware of how to acquire the information he wants. Other metaphors in this category included:

“The media literate is like a sun; because, he enlightens others –just like the sun- by truly understanding and interpreting the news.”

“The media literate is like a spotlight; because, he helps others find the truth in the darkness of misinformation coming from media channels.”

Category III: Critical Media Literate

This category is represented by 38 participants and 5 metaphors. These metaphors are: *critic, football analyst, artist, airplane, show glass*. In this category 23 female and 15 male respondents created metaphors. According to respondents, the media literate critically investigates what he reads, sees, and hears. He elaborates on and so adds original views to the issue. He evaluates and criticizes media and can approach what is reflected in the media from a broad perspective. Metaphors in this category included:

“The media literate is like an artist; because, he can evaluate what he reads and sees from a different perspective.”

“The media literate is like an airplane; because, what he sees multiplies, he can think about them and evaluate them from critical perspective.”

“The media literate is like a shop window; because, if we consider media as a shopping mall, media literate should be the shop window with his critical point of view.”

This emphasis on the media literate as critical is supported by the literature. A study conducted by Feurstein (1999) revealed that media literacy courses – when supported by materials – increase students’ media literacy and critical thinking skills. Similarly, Arke (2005) observed a significant relationship between media literacy and critical thinking. For Arke, media literacy education is an important tool in terms of training individuals to think critically. For Thoman and Jolls (2008), media literacy training helps individuals to gain the skills needed to understand the resource and purpose of knowledge, and to think critically. Tokar-Erdogan (2010) likewise notes that media literacy affords an individual the ability to assess the world from critical perspective.

Category IV: Curious Media Literate

This category is represented by 10 participants and 4 metaphors. These metaphors are: *vigilant, child, woman, and housekeeper*. Seven female students and 3 male students created metaphors in this category. Here the media literate is not indifferent to what is happening around him or her. He or she has a sense of curiosity and willingness to learn. This sense of curiosity is satisfied through research on and observation of media. Metaphors in this category included:

“The media literate is like a child; because he is curious about everything on media, like children who are curious about everything.”

“He is like the opposite of three monkeys; he hears, knows and sees everything.”

Category V: Picky Media Literate

This category is represented by 37 participants and 9 metaphors. These metaphors are: *horse, strainer, endoplasmic reticulum, book worm, bazaar customer, individual who is on a diet, sieve, witness, and computer that screens viruses*. In this category, 17 female participants and 20 male participants created metaphors. Here, the media literate is picky. He knows which information to take from the media; he can pick the good from the bad. He understands the essence of the media messages and analyzes them by distinguishing the good and bad. Metaphors in this category included:

“The media literate is like the endoplasmic reticulum, he is semi-permeable.”

“He is like a strainer; because, he selects what he watches, listens or reads on media.”

“The media literate is like an individual on a diet picks his meals, media literate picks the important and necessary news on media.”

“The media literate is like a horse; because, he does not eat everything he is offered.”

Pekman (2006) supports this finding in that he sees the basic aim of media literacy as developing an individual’s awareness and particularity in the presence of media messages in different forms (commercials, music, advertisements, billboards, etc.).

Category VI: Investigative /Analyst Media Literate:

This category is represented by 72 participants and 15 metaphors. These metaphors are: *researcher, bee, brain, wise, scientific, typewriter, thinker, intellectual person, Google, news department, philosopher, gendarme, ant, microscope, and Sociologist*. This category contained the most metaphors and male participants produced more of these than female participants. Here, respondents were particularly interested in the media literate’s investigative/analyst capacities with regards to media messages. The media literate is perceived as someone who investigates everything, follows everything he sees, reads, and hears and then explains his thoughts. Metaphors in this category included:

“The media literate is like scientist; because, he never accepts the events as they are; he investigates them.”

“The media literate is like a thinker; because, he verifies the reality of everything.”

“The media literate is like a philosopher; because, he always asks “what if” and investigates.”

“The media literate is like a bee, he analyzes the flower that he is going to make honey.”

For Federov (2003), the media literate likewise analyzes, investigates, and interprets the messages of the media. According to Potter (2005), the media literate individual interprets the messages of media by being aware of them and analyzing them by means of conscious interaction.

Category VII: Expert Media Literate

This category is represented by 76 participants and 11 metaphors. These metaphors are: *archeologist, cook, expert, detective, gourmet, commentariat, camera, machine, police, politician, and satellite receiver*. In this category, female participants produced 27 metaphors and male participants produced 34 metaphors. Here the media literate is seen as an expert. He or she has a voice about the media that has been acquired through his or her accumulation of knowledge on the subject. This knowledge also means the ability to interpret the media quite well. Metaphors in this category include:

“The media literate is like a detective; because, he traces the true news amongst others coming from media.”

“The media literate is like a gourmet; he picks the most delicious and best foods. Media literate picks the correct and useful for people.”

“The media literate is like a news commentator; because, reading, understanding or interpreting what is happening in media, requires certain skills.”

These findings concur with Hobbs & Frost’s (1999) research on the difference between students who take and students who do not take media literacy within the content of different courses (grammar, social sciences, health, and science). It was determined that students who take the abovementioned courses improve their skills of recalling information, remembering, and interpreting. Toker-Erdogan (2010), on the other hand, believes that all media messages depend on control, and media literacy supports the skills needed to control one’s relationship with media. This skill supports the references to expert in the present study. The level of awareness of someone deemed to be an expert on media messages is high and as a result he or she can control the overt and covert messages produced in the media.

Category VIII: Leader Media Literate

This category is represented by 26 participants and 5 metaphors. These metaphors are: *conscious consumer, CEO, avalanche, leader, and locomotive*. In this category, 15 metaphors were produced by female respondents and 11 were produced by male respondents. Respondents in this category see media literates as people who know what and how to consume media and in turn can lead others with these skills. Metaphors in this category include:

“The media literate is like a CEO; because, he needs to carefully read and analyze the events around him.”

“The media literate is like a leader; because, he elaborates everything.”

Metaphors, Program Type and Gender

In assessing the research results, the possibility that program type and gender would influence perceptions of media literacy was taken into account. In classifying according to program type, the metaphors that CT teacher candidates produce are: *archeologist, horse, father, wise, scientific, conscious consumer, plant, avalanche, typewriter, magazine, thinker, intellectual person, Google, agenda, sun, light, spotlight, gendarme, woman, camera, housekeeper, book, bookworm, columnist, leader, policeman, individual who is on diet, artist, satellite receiver and witness*. Those produced by SST candidates are: *vigilant, researcher, encyclopedia, cook, brain, expert, riddle, detective, lighthouse, strainer, endoplasmic reticulum, football analyst, news department, commentariat, ant, lamp, locomotive, machine, fruit tree, microscope, candle, teacher, bazaar customer, politician, Sociologist, dictionary, newsman, repairman, airplane, computer that screens virus and show glass*.

As can be seen, the metaphors created by teacher candidates vary based on program type. ST candidates tended to develop metaphors around the media literate's "investigative/analyst" and "picky" (f=28, 8.21 %) feature. SST candidates, on the other hand, developed metaphors to refer to the media literate's benefit to others (f= 28, 8.21%) and expertise (f= 18, 5.27 %).

This study revealed that metaphors created by teacher candidates also differ according to gender. Female students created metaphors around the media literate's benefit to others (f= 47, 23.85%) such as *tree, plant, lighthouse, sun, fruit tree, candle, teacher, and repairman*, while male students paid attention to the media literate's "investigative/analyst" (f= 49, 34.02%) feature with *researcher, bee, brain, wise, scientist, typewriter, thinker, news center, Google, gendarme, and microscope* metaphors. This differentiation between genders can be seen as a reflection of traditional cultural values in Turkish society. In Turkish society, men are more independent than women; they are raised to be outgoing and free. Women, on the other hand, are raised to be more introverted and controlled. Arslan Cansever's study (2010) further explains this gender socialization process differentiation in Turkey. Here, women are more home-centered while men are better acquainted with external world in their rearing thus preparing them for their future social roles.

DISCUSSION

In this study, teacher candidates' metaphorical perceptions of the media literate individual were assessed. Seventy valid metaphors were developed by participants and these were grouped into 8 different categories. Approximately two-thirds of participants developed metaphors that fell into the categories "beneficial to others"; "investigative/analyst", and "expert". *Gourmet* was the most frequently used metaphor and is in the "expert" category. This suggests that for most teacher candidates, the media literate is an individual who is knowledgeable, picky, and conscious about media. Participants also paid attention to the media literate's beneficial (f= 64, 18.77%) and leadership (f= 26, 7.63 %) features. This finding coincides with Considine's (2008) "group work, cooperative learning and solidarity" descriptions emphasized in the definition of media literacy.

This research has shown that teacher candidates' metaphoric perceptions of the media literate individual differ based on program type. CT candidates developed metaphors focused on "investigating/analyzing" and "picky" features, whereas, SST candidates created metaphors related to an individual who was "beneficial for others" and an "expert". This "investigating/analyzing" characteristic of a media literate individual is also found in Federov's (2003) study. According to this study, media literacy raises the awareness of an individual in terms of the impact of media on society and the individual. According to Potter (2005), the media literate individual interprets the messages of the media by being aware of them, and through conscious interaction.

The "picky" characteristic of the media literate individual as identified by the teacher candidates was noted in a selective offered by the Radio and Television Supreme Council (2010) in secondary schools that aimed to develop media literacy in children. The RTSC sought to have children be conscious about and analyze the media they consumed.

This study has further revealed that perceptions of media literacy differ based on gender. Female participants emphasized the media literate's benefit to others, while male participants emphasized the 'investigative/analyst' characteristic. These findings support the second step of Thoman and Jolls' (2008) three steps of media literacy. In these steps, students are trained to analyze messages from a critical perspective and are encouraged to develop investigation skills and the ability to themselves structure messages. Three of the metaphor categories defined by teacher candidates – critical, investigative/analyst, and picky – fall under the cognitive dimension; one of the dimensions that Potter (2005) notes is used to structure media messages. These three categories also support the mental processes and reasoning definition that Toker-Erdogan (2010) associates with the cognitive dimension.

CONCLUSION

It can be argued that most pre-service teachers have a perception of media-literacy. It should be remembered, however, that the study is confined to pre-service teachers studying at a Faculty of Education in Izmir. It is important, therefore, that media literacy perceptions and awareness be further researched in different studies with more diversified samples (students, teachers and parents) including regions with different developmental levels. This study is limited to qualities measured by an open-ended question designed or adapted by researcher around the media literate individual. In future studies, it may be helpful for researchers to engage in a detailed discussion on media literacy and awareness of media literacy with the in-depth interview method.

REFERENCES

- Alagozlu, C. (2012). *Turkiye'de ve Avrupa Birliği ülkelerinde medya okuryazarligi [Media literacy in Turkey and in European Union Countries]* (Unpublished expertise thesis), T.C Radyo ve Televizyon Ust Kurulu, Ankara, Turkey.
- Altun, A. (2010). *Medya okuryazarliginin sosyal bilgiler programlariyla iliskilendirilmesi ve ogretimi [Teaching of media literacy and its integration into social studies curricula]* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Ankara: Gazi Universitesi Egitim Bilimleri Enstitusu,.
- Arke, E. T. (2005). *Media literacy and critical thinking: is there a connection?* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Duquesne University, Pittsburg.
- Arslan-Cansever, B. (2010). *Ergenlerin internet kullanımının aile ve okul baglamında yarattığı sorunlar [The problems of teen-age socialization related with spending time on Internet from the perspectives of family and school]* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Izmir: Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.
- Aslan, K., Aslan, N., & ve Arslan-Cansever, B. (2012). *Egitim bilimine giris [Introduction to science of education]*, Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Bas, T. (2010). *Anket Nasil Hazirlanir, Uygulanir, Degerlendirilir? [How survey is prepare, apply and evaluate]*, Ankara: Seckin Yayıncılık.
- Butun, E. (2010). *Medya okuryazarligi dersine iliskin ogretmen, ogrenci ve veli gorusleri (Samsun ili ornegi) [Teacher, student and parents' view on media literacy course (Sample of Samsun city)]*. (Unpublished master thesis), Ondokuz Mayıs Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu, Samsun.
- Cerit, Y. (2006). Ogrenci, ogretmen ve yoneticilerin okul kavramıyla ilgili metaforlara iliskin gorusleri, [School metaphors: The views of students, teachers and administrator] *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri*, 6(3), 669-699.
- Considine, D. (2008). Case for media literacy in today's schools. [Online]: Retrieved on December, 19, 2011 from www.medialit.org/reading_room/article_368.html.
- Deveci, H., & ve Cengelci, T. (2008). Sosyal bilgiler ogretmen adaylarından medya okuryazarligi'na bir bakis, [A look to the media literacy by social studies teacher candidates], *Yuzuncu Yil Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, Cilt: V, Sayı II, 25-43.
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2007). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* , 62(1), 107-115.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Media Education and media literacy: experts' opinions, european media@culture-online, [Online]: Retrieved on December, 19, 2011 from <http://www.european-mediaculture.org>.
- Feurstein, M. (1999). Media literacy in support of critical thinking, *Journal of Educational Media*, 24(1), 43-54.
- Hobbs, R. & Frost, R. (1999). Instructional practices in media literacy education and their impact on students' learning. *New Jersey Journal of Communication*, 6, 123-148.
- Karaman, M. K., & ve Karatas, A. (2009). Ogretmen adaylarının medya okuryazarlik duzeyleri [Media literacy levels of the candidate teachers], *Ilkogretim Online*, 8(3), 798-808.
- Karatas, A. (2008). Ogretmen adaylarının medya okuryazarlik duzeyleri. [Media literacy levels of the candidate teachers], (Unpublished master thesis). Kocatepe Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyon.

- Kellner, D., & Share, J. (2005). Toward critical media literacy: core concepts, debates, organizations, and policy. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 26(3), 369-386.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Morgan, G. (1998). *Yönetim ve örgüt teorilerinde metafor*. (Cev. G. Bulut) İstanbul: Türkiye Metal Sanayicileri Sendikası.
- Nalcaci, A., & ve Bektas, F. (2012). Öğretmen adaylarının okul kavramına ilişkin algıları, [Teacher candidates' perceptions regarding the concept of school], Ahi Evran Üniversitesi, *Kirsehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (KEFAD)*, Cilt 13, sayı:1, 239-258.
- Nergis, A. (2011). Okuryazarlık kültürü ve değişen okuryazarlık türleri [Literacy culture and everchanging types of literacy], *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, Cilt: 3. Sayı:3. ss.1133-1154.
- Oncel T. (2007). *Medya okuryazarlığına giriş [Introduction to media literacy]*, İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım.
- Pekman, C. (2006). Avrupa Birliği'nde Medya Okuryazarlığı [Media Literacy in the European Union], 1. *Uluslararası Medya Okuryazarlığı Konferansı*, İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi.
- Potter, J. (2005). *Media Literacy. (Third Edition)*. California: Sage Publications.
- Radio and Television Supreme Council (2010). Medya Okuryazarlığı. [Online]: Retrieved on December, 22, 2011 from <http://www.medyaokuryazarligi.org.tr/4.html>
- Saban, A. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının öğrenci kavramına ilişkin sahip oldukları zihinsel imgeler [Prospective teachers' mental images about the concept of student] *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(2), 281-326.
- Saban, A., Kocbekar, B. N., & Saban, A. (2006). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen kavramına ilişkin algılarının metafor analizi yoluyla incelenmesi [An investigation of the concept of the teacher among prospective teachers through metaphor analysis], *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri (KUYEB)*, 6 (2), 461-522.
- Seefeldt, C. (2004). *Social studies for the preschool-primary child (Seventh Edition)*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Singh, K. (2010). Metaphor as a tool in educational leadership classrooms. *Management in Education*, 24(3) 127-131.
- Tasdemir, M., & Tasdemir, A. (2011). İlköğretim Programı Üzerine Öğretmen Metaforları [Teachers' Metaphors on Elementary School Programme], Antalya: 2. *International Conference on New Trends in Education and Their Implications Conference*.
- Thoman, E., & Jolls, T. (2008). 21. yüzyıl okuryazarlığı: Medya okuryazarlığına genel bir bakış ve sınıf içi etkinlikler [Literacy for the 21st century: An overview and orientation guide to media literacy education] (Cev. C. Elma & A. Kesten) Ankara: Ekinoks Yayınevi.
- Toker-Erdogan, M. (2010). *Toplumsal cinsiyet eşitliğinin sağlanmasında medya okuryazarlığının rolü*, [The role of media literacy on providing social gender equality] (Unpublished expertise thesis). Başbakanlık Kadının Statüsü Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara.
- Tuncer, A. (2013). *Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin medya okur-yazarlık düzeyleri (İzmir Ornekleme)*, [Media Literacy Levels of the Students in Education Faculty (Sample of Izmir)] (Unpublished master thesis), Ege Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Turkish Language Society (2011). *Buyuk Türkçe sözlük*. [Online]: Retrieved on July, 12, 2012 from <http://www.tdkterim.gov.tr/bts/>
- Yildirim, A. & Simsek, H. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri [Qualitative research methods in social sciences]*(6. Baskı), Ankara: Seckin Yayınları.
- Yob, I. M. (2003). Thinking constructively with metaphors. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 22, 127-138.

¹ Dr. Belgin Arslan-Cansever is currently working at the division of Classroom Teaching of the Department of Primary School Education at the Faculty of Education, Ege University, İzmir, Turkey. In 2005 she received Socrates/Erasmus scholarship to work as a research at Haagse Hogeschool in Lahey, the Netherlands, and in 2009, she served as the visiting scholar at the Faculty of Education, Durham University in United Kingdom. She has published articles on national and international journals, co-authored a book, and written a book chapter as well as giving presentations and projects completed. Her main area of interests includes media literacy, child/adolescent-Internet interaction, recreation and intercultural comparative studies in educational sociology.