Examining Media Literacy Perceptions of Preservice Social Studies Teachers in Turkey

Aykut Özel*

* Independent Researcher, Kütahya, Türkiye.
Email: draykutozel@gmail.com

How to cite
Özel, A. (2023). Examining media literacy perceptions of preservice social studies teachers in Turkey. *Journal of Curriculum Studies Research*, *5*(2), 86-117. https://doi.org/10.46303/jcsr.2023.21

Note
This article is based on the author's doctoral thesis titled "Examining the perceptions of the preservice social studies teachers about
media literacy", and prepared at Kütahya Dumlupınar University.

ABSTRACT
The most commonly used definition of media literacy is the capacity to access, analyze, evaluate and generate information for specific implications. Media literacy helps individuals to critically analyze media forms, question media influences and uses, utilize media intentionally, and produce alternative media. The purpose of this study is to investigate how preservice social studies teachers perceive media literacy. In order to do this, the Media Literacy Perception Scale (MLPS) was administered, and a descriptive survey approach was used for the research. A total of one thousand social studies education students from seven different regions of Turkey were randomly selected for the sample, ranging from students enrolled in the first, second, third, and fourth years at seven different state universities. A proportional stratified sampling technique was employed in the study. The dependent variable in this research is the media literacy perceptions of preservice social studies teachers, and the independent variable is a variety of demographic characteristics. In order to examine and interpret the gathered research data, One-Way Anova and t-test analyses were performed. Based on the findings of the research, the participant students majoring in social studies education often showed high levels of perceptions of media literacy on both the scale and sub-dimensions. According to the research, a number of variables, including the amount of time spent watching TV, the amount of time spent online, and the region of residency, significantly affect students' media literacy perceptions. The findings suggest that future students of these preservice teachers will benefit from their teachers' increased media literacy skills.

KEYWORDS

Media literacy; media literacy perception; social studies education; preservice teachers.

INTRODUCTION

In today's world, a media culture has emerged that shapes daily life, political views, social behavior, as well as the personalities of people, and it consumes most leisure time (Kellner, 2003). Thoman & Jolls (2008) claim that in contemporary multimedia culture, we are more likely to receive information about the world around us in the form of striking, spectacular images and sounds rather than mere text on a page. Thoman et al. (2008) further assert that the excessive consumption of media and its pervasiveness in today's society should concern us. People are now regularly exposed to the media in a variety of conscious and unconscious ways, which is especially detrimental for students. Without media literacy, it is almost impossible to resist the detrimental impact of the media in today's environment where we are so heavily influenced by it.

Media literacy education is a type of education that aims to teach students about the media, its techniques and effects as well as to develop critical thinking skills (Quin & McMahon, 2001). Because media literacy education teaches us to look at things differently and analyze everything presented to us rather than simply accepting it as is, it raises awareness and therefore eliminates ignorance on the subject. Today, media literacy education is viewed as a process of personality development through the use of mass media tools (Fedorov, 2015).

Media Literacy

The most widely accepted definition of media literacy is the ability to access, analyze, evaluate and generate information for specific implications (Aufderheide, 1993). According to Christ & Potter (1998), the four components of a skills-based approach are access, analysis, evaluation, and content creation. Each component contributes to the dynamic nonlinear learning process.
 In the twenty-first century, media literacy has become an essential component of literacy, and literacy has evolved into a tool for developing one's ability to actively participate in society by decoding a variety of symbols and codes (Braun, 2007). Media literacy has elevated the concept of literacy to a whole new level, allowing people to distinguish between true and false information. Rapid advances in information and communication technologies have also reshaped the meaning of literacy and introduced new skills such as understanding, manipulating, transforming and transporting video, multimedia and Web-based media (Anderson, 2008; New Media Consortium, 2005). As a result, media literacy allows media messages to be examined in depth and from all perspectives.

Gaining skills in information management, understanding the possible effects of media use, and increasing the potential of democratic discourse was the main reason for media literacy education (Angell, 2005). As one of the main prerequisites for full and effective citizenship practice today, media literacy education is part of the fundamental rights of citizens in every country around the world, such as freedom of expression and the right to information, and is critical to the achievement and consolidation of democracy (Tornero, 2004). The goal of media literacy education is to develop a broad foundation of competence, not only in print media but

also in other symbolic systems such as audio and video, and thus is frequently referred to as a form of literacy (Buckingham, 2013).

Media Literacy Education and Its Current Status in Turkey

The main goals of media literacy education are learning how to manage information, comprehending the potential impact of media use, and enhancing democratic discourse (Angell, 2005). Media literacy education is essential to achieving and preserving democracy and is a basic component of citizens' fundamental rights around the world, including the freedom of expression and the right to information, and media literacy is also one of the primary prerequisites for full and effective citizenship practice today (Tornero, 2004). Media literacy education is an education that aims to provide students with information about the media, its techniques and effects as well as to enable them to have a critical understanding (Quin and McMahon, 2001). The use of cognitive processes in critical thinking is part of media literacy education.

In 2004, the Radio and Television Supreme Council (also known in short as RTÜK) proposed for the first time that a media literacy course be taught in primary schools in the Violence Prevention Platform, which was established under the Ministry of State, where the leading public institutions, non-governmental organizations, and universities of our country are represented (Medya Okuryazarlığı Derneği, 2013). The Supreme Council's proposal was accepted and included in the action plan. The Supreme Council also sent a letter to the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) that year, emphasizing the importance of providing media literacy classes in schools. A declaration on media literacy standards was given with the contributions of RTÜK and MoNE during the First International Media Conference, which was conducted for the first time in Turkey by the Marmara University Faculty of Communication, between 23-25 May, 2005. Between 2004 and 2006, media literacy programs of various countries were then examined and on 24 November, 2006, an International Media Panel was held in Ankara with the participation of academicians from Turkey and other countries. This panel led to the formation of a commission consisting of academicians to examine the cases from the United States and several European nations. A commission comprised of the Board of Education and Discipline, RTÜK experts, and communication science academicians created the 'Media Literacy Curriculum and Teacher's Guide'. As a result, the Ministry of National Education (MONE) Board of Education and Discipline approved the Primary Education Elective Media Literacy Course Curriculum on 31 August, 2006 (Medya Okuryazarlığı Derneği, 2017). As a consequence, the media literacy course began to be taught in five pilot provinces chosen by the Ministry of National Education in the 2006-2007 academic year, and it began to be taught as an elective course in the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades of primary schools in the 2007-2008 academic year.

Purpose and Importance of the Research

Media literacy is a necessary skill for students today and in the future because it allows them to interpret, express, and interact with the media. There is a need to create a media literacy

strategy because of the media's increasing influence in our daily lives. This strategy will prepare teachers and students for the influence of the media on their lives both now and in the future. The significance of media literacy education is undeniable for a number of reasons, including the media's significant influence on economics, politics, and society as a whole, rising media exposure, the aggressive media targeting of young people, and changes in the ways in which people express themselves.

Media literacy is still an emerging field. Studies have shown that media literacy benefits students' physical health, just as it does every part of their lives (Eisner, 2003). Media technologies are not neutral or exclusive to the classroom as we are greatly influenced by the messages in the media. However, a number of educators continue to view the media as a neutral tool or instructional resource (Buckingham, 2013). The importance of media literacy in the classroom should be emphasized.

The media literacy course, which is offered as an elective course in Turkey, is primarily taught by social studies teachers. Therefore, the current study aims to create a media literacy perception scale, and to investigate the media literacy views of social studies preservice teachers enrolled at several Turkish universities. The research is expected to contribute to the field of media literacy education by revealing information regarding the media literacy beliefs of preservice social studies teachers.

METHOD

Research Sample

This study is a descriptive survey model with the goal of identifying the levels of preservice social studies teachers' media literacy views and the link between those perceptions and numerous variables. Survey models are research methodologies that seek to capture the past or present in its actual state (Karasar, 2012). This research method is used to explain how things, institutions, societies, and events are structured, and survey research is a generalized study, which draws conclusions about the population that the sample represents, based on the data collected from the sample (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007).

The independent variable of the research is demographic characteristics, while the dependent variable is the media literacy perceptions of preservice social studies teachers.

The Sample

Seven distinct state universities from seven different regions were chosen to make up the research universe in order to adequately represent Turkey as a whole. In other words, the intention was to represent every region of Turkey in the research sample, and various social and socioeconomic traits would be present in the study group. Students in the social studies teaching program in the first, second, third, and fourth years participated in the research conducted. The research includes 52% female and 48% male students, with an average age of 21.31 years. Each university provided a sample of one thousand students with relatively representative power for the study. The study employed two-stage sampling.

A proportional stratified sampling technique was employed in the initial phase to draw samples from the population according to the research problem and the subject. A stratified sampling approach was used in the study to choose one state university from each geographical region. Stratified sampling is utilized when substrata or subunit groups are present in a given universe because it is crucial to understand the universe through the presence of substrata (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2005). The second phase of the study employed the random sampling methodology.

Data Collection Instruments

The "Media Literacy Perception Scale" (MLPS) developed by the researcher was administered to examine how prospective social studies teachers perceive media literacy. The first sub-dimension of the MLPS was called "The Effect of Media on Society - (Effect)," the second "Metacognitive Media Awareness - (Awareness)," and the third "Use of Media Tools - (Use)." MLPS is a Likert-type five-point scale.

The Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the whole scale was found to be .86, .82 for the effect of the media on society, .74 for the metacognitive media awareness dimension, and .73 for the use of media tools in this study. The overall structure and sub-dimensions of the MLPS have sufficient and trustworthy internal consistency, according to the results. The "Media Literacy Perception Scale" (MLPS) with sixteen questions and three dimensions (factors) was developed after validity analyses (EFA + CFA) and reliability (Cronbach Alpha) of the data were conducted and the statements were finalized.

Table 1

Goodness of fit values for first and second level DFA

Fit Indices Examined	Level 1 of DFA (Phase I)	Level 1 of DFA (Phase II)	Level 2 of DFA	Acceptable Fit
χ 2/sd	2,881	2,255	2,255	2 ≤χ 2/sd≤ 3
GFI	0,938	0,957	0,957	.90 ≤GFI ≤ .95
NFI	0,888	0,920	0,920	.90 ≤NFI ≤ .95
CFI	0,923	0,954	0,954	.90 ≤CFI ≤ .95
RMSEA	0,056	0,046	0,046	.05≤RMSEA≤.08

Data Analysis

Skewness and kurtosis values were evaluated as in the scale development process to assess the data set's multivariate normality. The fact that the skewness and kurtosis values are close to zero indicates that the data set is normal. According to the literature, a ratio of the skewness and kurtosis values to their standard deviation values, of between ∓1.5 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) and ∓2.0 (George & Mallery, 2010) indicates that the data set is normally distributed. The

skewness and kurtosis values in this study were found to be between +0.31 and +1.88. Table 2 shows the values needed to satisfy the normality and homogeneity assumptions.

Table 2

Values of normality and homogeneity for MLPS and its sub-dimensions

Dimensions	$\overline{X}$	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Effect (F1)	4.39	-.186	.177	-.890	.455
Awareness (F2)	4.08	.219	.177	-.602	.455
Use (F3)	4.17	.031	.177	-.764	.455
MLP	4.22	.093	.177	-.547	.455

Research Ethics

All the guidelines outlined in the 'Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive' were followed throughout the entire process, including planning and carrying out the research as well as collecting and analyzing data. The acts listed in the second section of the regulation, "Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics," have not been carried out.

FINDINGS

Table 3

The T-test results between media literacy and student sub-dimension averages by gender

Dimensions	Gender	N	$\overline{X}$	ss	Sd	t	p
Effect (F1)	Female	533	4.37	.429	998	.368	.058
	Male	467	4.42	.417			
Awareness (F2)	Female	533	4.04	.379	998	.024	.001
	Male	467	4.12	.408			
Use (F3)	Female	533	4.13	.470	998	.264	.001
	Male	467	4.23	.454			
MLP	Female	533	4.18	.313	998	.483	.001
	Male	467	4.25	.304			

(p< .05)

As can be seen in Table 3, in terms of gender differences in general media literacy perceptions and sub-dimensions, there is no statistically significant difference in the mean scores in the Effect dimension (t(Effect)(998)=.368; p>.05), but statistically significant differences were found in favor of male students in the Awareness and Use sub-dimensions (t(Awareness)(998))=.024; t(Use)(998)=.264; p<.05) and general media literacy perceptions (t(MLP)(998)=.483; p<.05).

This finding shows that, while students' general media literacy perceptions and sub-dimensions of Awareness and Use differ by gender, they have similar views on the Effect sub-dimension.

Given that the MLPS does not reveal a statistically significant variation in the effect size by gender, it is believed that media literacy is a factor that affects everyone, regardless of gender.

The MLPS's general media literacy perceptions, Awareness, and Use sub-dimensions show a clear gender difference that is significantly in favor of male students. In this regard, it is believed that male students are more engaged with the media, and view events from a different angle than female students.

Table 4

One-way ANOVA, Levene, and post-hoc test results between the media literacy and sub-dimensions averages of students by the number of siblings

Dimensions	Gender	N	$\overline{X}$	ss	Sd	t	p
Effect (F1)	Female	533	4.37	.429	998	.368	.058
	Male	467	4.42	.417			
Awareness (F2)	Female	533	4.04	.379	998	.024	.001
	Male	467	4.12	.408			
Use (F3)	Female	533	4.13	.470	998	.264	.001
	Male	467	4.23	.454			
MLP	Female	533	4.18	.313	998	.483	.001
	Male	467	4.25	.304			

(p< .05)

Table 4 shows that there is no statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the groups in the Effect and Use sub-dimensions in terms of age differences in general media literacy perceptions and sub-dimensions. On the other hand, there is a statistically significant difference found between media literacy perceptions (F(MLP)=3.139) and the mean scores of age groups in the awareness sub-dimension (F(Awareness)=4.1104). The Levene's test was then utilized to select the post-hoc test that would ascertain whether groups differed. Tukey was chosen as the post-hoc test because the Levene test result in the awareness dimension was greater than .05, whereas the Games-Howell test was chosen as the post-hoc test because the Levene test result in the general media literacy perception was less than .05 (Field, 2005).

The post-hoc test revealed a statistically significant difference between the first and third groups, with the third group outperforming the first in terms of the number of siblings variable in the awareness sub-dimension (Tukey) and general media literacy perception (Games-Howell).

The students with 1-2 siblings had higher perceptions on both the scale and the awareness dimension than the students with 3-4 siblings. The students with fewer siblings are thought to benefit more easily from various opportunities than the students with more siblings.

Table 5

One-Way Anova results between media literacy and its sub-dimensions mean scores by grade point averages of students

Dimensions	Gender	N	$\overline{X}$	ss	Sd	t	p
Effect (F1)	Female	533	4.37	.429	998	.368	.058
	Male	467	4.42	.417			
Awareness (F2)	Female	533	4.04	.379	998	.024	.001
	Male	467	4.12	.408			
Use (F3)	Female	533	4.13	.470	998	.264	.001
	Male	467	4.23	.454			
MLP	Female	533	4.18	.313	998	.483	.001
	Male	467	4.25	.304			

(p< .05)

As can be seen in Table 5, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the groups when the difference in the general perception of media literacy and its sub-dimensions by the grade point averages of the students is analyzed. This is due to the fact that most of the research participants had not completed a media literacy course.

Table 6

One-Way Anova, Levene, and post-hoc test results between media literacy and its sub-dimensions mean scores by the educational status of students' mothers

Dimensions	Gender	N	$\overline{X}$	ss	Sd	t	p
Effect (F1)	Female	533	4.37	.429	998	.368	.058
	Male	467	4.42	.417			
Awareness (F2)	Female	533	4.04	.379	998	.024	.001
	Male	467	4.12	.408			
Use (F3)	Female	533	4.13	.470	998	.264	.001
	Male	467	4.23	.454			
MLP	Female	533	4.18	.313	998	.483	.001
	Male	467	4.25	.304			

(p< .05)

Table 6 cont.

One-Way Anova, Levene, and post-hoc test results between media literacy and its sub-dimensions mean scores by the educational status of students' mothers

ANAOVA			Levene	Post-Hoc

Dimension		N	X̄	ss	F	p	p	Type	(J	(I-J)	Error p
F3	Illiterate	194	4.07	.458					Primary school	-.102	.039 .094
									Middle school	-.151	.049 .025
									High school	-.223	.056 .001
									BA and above	-.252	.092 .068
	Primary school	503	4.17	.465					Illiterate	.102	.039 .094
									Middle school	-.049	.041 .846
									High school	-.121	.049 .138
									BA and above	-.150	.088 .530
	Middle school	164	4.22	.480	4.341	.001	.193	Tukey	Illiterate	.151	.049 .025
									Primary school	.049	.041 .846
									High school	-.072	.057 .811
									BA and above	-.101	.093 .887
	High school	107	4.29	.448					Illiterate	.223	.056 .001
									Primary school	.121	.049 .138
									Middle school	.072	.057 .811
									BA and above	-.029	.097 1.00
	Bachelor and above	32	4.32	.347					Illiterate	.252	.092 .068
									Primary school	.150	.088 .530
									Middle school	.101	.093 .887
									High school	.029	.097 1.00
MLP	Illiterate	194	4.15	.322					Primary school	-.066	.026 .110
									Middle school	-.081	.032 .136
									High school	-.113	.037 .030
									BA and above	-.100	.061 .582
	Primary school	503	4.22	.306					Illiterate	.066	.026 .110
									Middle school	-.014	.027 .996
									High school	-.046	.033 .723
									BA and above	-.033	.059 .993
	Middle school	164	4.23	.322	2.492 .030		.449	Tukey	Illiterate	.081	.032 .136
									Primary school	.014	.027 .996
									High school	-.032	.038 .961
									BA and above	-.019	.062 1.00
	High school	107	4.27	.290					Illiterate	.113	.037 .030
									Primary school	.046	.033 .723
									Middle school	.032	.038 .961
									BA and above	.012	.064 1.00
	Bachelor and above	32	4.25	.291					Illiterate	.100	.061 .582
									Primary school	.033	.059 .993
									Middle school	.019	.062 1.00
									High school	.012	.064 1.00

(p< .05)

Table 6 indicates that no statistically significant differences were detected between the mean scores of the groups in the sub-dimensions of Effect and Awareness when the difference in general media literacy perception and sub-dimensions was analyzed in terms of the educational status of the mother. However, there were statistically significant differences between the mean scores of educational statuses in the general media literacy perception (F(MLP)=2.492) and the Use (F(Use)=4.341) sub-dimensions. The Levene's test was then utilized to select the post-hoc test to determine which groups differed. Given that the Levene test result

was higher than .05 in terms of use and general perceptions of media literacy, the Tukey test was chosen as the post-hoc test (Field, 2005).

The post-hoc test revealed a statistically significant difference in the sub-dimension of Use between the illiterate, middle school, and high school groups, favoring the high school group (Tukey). A statistically significant difference in general media literacy perception (Tukey) was found between the high school and illiterate groups, again in favor of the high school group.

The students' perceptions of the Use sub-dimension increase as mothers' educational levels increase. It is usually accepted that if educated mothers can use media technologies, so can their children. As regards the sub-dimensions of Effect and Awareness among the students, the lack of a statistically significant difference according to the mother's educational level can be attributed to the fact that, regardless of the mother's educational level, if the mothers themselves do not have the Effect and Awareness dimensions of media literacy, their children will not either.

As can be seen in Table 7, a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the groups was discovered only in the Use dimension (F(Use)=4.800) when the perception of general media literacy and its sub-dimensions were compared to the father's educational status. The Levene's test was then utilized to select the post-hoc test that would determine which groups differed. Since the Levene test result was greater than .05 in the dimension of use, the Tukey test was selected as the post-hoc test (Field, 2005).

As a result of the Post-Hoc test in the sub-dimension of Use (Tukey), there was a statistically significant difference in favor of the Bachelor and above group between the Illiterate and the Bachelor's and above group; in favor of the Bachelor and above group among Primary School and High School and Bachelor's and above groups; in favor of the High School group between High School and Primary School groups; and again in favor of the Bachelor and above group among Bachelor and above, Illiterate and Primary School groups.

Table 7

One-Way Anova, Levene, and post-hoc test results between media literacy and its sub-dimensions mean scores by the educational status of students' fathers

ANOVA							Levene	Post-Hoc				
Dimension	(I)	N	$\overline{X}$	ss	F	p	p	Type	(J)	(I-J)	Error	p
F1	Illiterate	41	4.35	.470								
	Primary school	399	4.38	.434								
	Middle school	223	4.41	.407	.610	.692	.384					
	High school	229	4.38	.410								
	BA and above	108	4.44	.433								
F2	Illiterate	41	4.00	.404								
	Primary school	399	4.06	.400								
	Middle school	223	4.08	.402	1.463	.199	.855					
	High school	229	4.13	.380								
	BA and above	108	4.10	.385								
F3	Illiterate	410	4.01	.481						Primary school	-.097	.076	.795
										Middle school	-.204	.078	.096
										High school	-.215	.078	.067
										BA and above	-.275	.085	.017
	Primary school	399	4.11	.475						Illiterate	.097	.076	.795
										Middle school	-.107	.039	.060
										High school	-.118	.038	.025
										BA and above	-.178	.052	.007
	Middle school	223	4.22	.457	4.800	.000	.376	Tukey	Illiterate	.204	.078	.096
									Primary school	.107	.039	.060
									High school	-.011	.043	1.00
									BA and above	-.071	.055	.794
	High school	229	4.23	.449						Illiterate	.215	.078	.067
										Primary school	.118	.038	.025
										Middle school	.011	.043	1.00
										BA and above	-.060	.055	.884
	Bachelor and above	108	4.29	.434						Illiterate	.275	.085	.017
										Primary school	.178	.052	.007
										Middle school	.071	.055	.794
										High school	.060	.055	.884
MLP	Illiterate	41	4.13	.323								
	Primary school	399	4.18	.315								
	Middle school	223	4.23	.308	2.525	.058	.541					
	High school	229	4.24	.296								
	BA and above	108	4.27	.319								

(p< .05)

As the fathers' educational levels increase, so do the perceptions of the students in the sub-dimension of use. It is believed that because educated fathers, like educated mothers, can use media tools, their children can as well. As regards the sub-dimensions of Effect and Awareness among students, the lack of a statistically significant difference according to the father's educational level can be attributed to the fact that, regardless of the father's educational level,

if the fathers themselves do not have the Effect and Awareness dimensions of media literacy, their children will not either.

Table 8

One-Way Anova results between media literacy and sub-dimensions of mean scores by students' household incomes

Dimension	Household Income	N	$\overline{X}$	ss	F	p
Effect (F1)	1500 TL and below	306	4.38	.428	1.419	.236
	1500-2500 TL	370	4.39	.419		
	2500 -3500 TL	193	4.36	.418		
	3500 TL and above	131	4.46	.436		
Awareness (F2)	1500 TL and below	306	4.04	.389	2.075	.102
	1500-2500 TL	370	4.08	.383		
	2500 -3500 TL	193	4.13	.417		
	3500 TL and above	131	4.11	.402		
Use (F3)	1500 TL and below	306	4.14	.474	1.799	.146
	1500-2500 TL	370	4.16	.464		
	2500 -3500 TL	193	4.21	.472		
	3500 TL and above	131	4.23	.431		
MLP	1500 TL and below	306	4.19	.303	1.962	.118
	1500-2500 TL	370	4.21	.310		
	2500 -3500 TL	193	4.23	.324		
	3500 TL and above	131	4.26	.307		

($p< .05$)

Table 8 shows that the mean scores of the groups do not significantly differ when the difference in the students' perceptions of general media literacy and its sub-dimensions was analyzed according to their household incomes. Therefore, it is thought that household income has no effect on students' perceptions of media literacy.

Table 9

One-Way Anova, Levene, and post-hoc test results between media literacy and its sub-dimension mean scores by the geographical region where students live with their families

ANOVA Dimension (I)		N	$\overline{X}$	ss	F	p	Levene p	Post-Hoc Type (J)	(I - J)	Error	p
F1	Marmara	176	4.40	.400							
	Aegean	88	4.42	.404							
	Central Anatolia	160	4.40	.434							
	Mediterranean	128	4.38	.409	.383	.890	.362				
	Black Sea	141	4.39	.425							
	Eastern Anatolia	145	4.40	.433							
	Southeast Anatolia	162	4.35	.458							
F2	Marmara	176	4.13	.397							
	Aegean	88	4.12	.364							
	Central Anatolia	160	4.08	.409							
	Mediterranean	128	4.05	.366	1.121	.348	.235				
	Black Sea	141	4.04	.383							
	Eastern Anatolia	145	4.06	.390							
	Southeast Anatolia	162	4.07	.426							
F3	Marmara	176	4.25	.448				Aegean	.010	.060	1.00
								Central Anatolia	.028	.051	.998
								Mediterranean	.085	.054	.690
								Black Sea	.117	.052	.280
								Eastern Anatolia	.153	.052	.049
								Southeast Anatolia	.137	.050	.093
	Aegean	88	4.24	.474				Marmara	-.010	.060	1.00
								Central Anatolia	.018	.061	1.00
								Mediterranean	.075	.064	.903
								Black Sea	.107	.063	.618
								Eastern Anatolia	.143	.063	.250
					2.711	.013	.302	Southeast Anatolia	.127	.061	.367
								Marmara	-.028	.051	.998
								Aegean	-.018	.061	1.00
	Central Anatolia	160	4.22	.455				Mediterranean	.057	.055	.943
								Black Sea	.089	.053	.643
								Eastern Anatolia	.125	.053	.217
								Southeast Anatolia	.109	.052	.343
	Mediterranean	128	4.17	.458				Marmara	-.085	.054	.690
								Aegean	-.075	.064	.903
								Central Anatolia	-.057	.055	.943
								Black Sea	.031	.056	.998
							Tukey	Eastern Anatolia	.068	.056	.892
								Southeast Anatolia	.052	.055	.965

(p< .05)

Table 9 cont.

One-Way Anova, Levene, and post-hoc test results between media literacy and its sub-dimension mean scores by the geographical region where students live with their families

		ANOVA					**Levene**	**Post-Hoc**			
Dimension	**(I)**	**N**	**$\bar{X}$**	**ss**	**F**	**p**	**p**	**(J)**	**(I - J)**	**Error**	**p**
F3	Black Sea	141	4.13	.461				Marmara	-.117	.052	.280
								Aegean	-.107	.063	.618
								Central Anatolia	-.089	.053	.643
								Mediterranean	-.031	.056	.998
								Eastern Anatolia	.036	.055	.994
								Southeast Anatolia	.021	.053	1.00
	Eastern Anatolia	145	4.10	.430				Marmara	-.153	.052	.049
								Aegean	-.143	.063	.250
								Central Anatolia	-.125	.053	.217
								Mediterranean	-.068	.056	.892
								Black Sea	-.036	.055	.994
								Southeast Anatolia	-.016	.053	1.00
	Southeast Anatolia	162	4.11	.511				Marmara	-.137	.050	.093
								Aegean	-.127	.061	.367
								Central Anatolia	-.109	.052	.343
								Mediterranean	-.052	.055	.965
								Black Sea	-.021	.053	1.00
								Eastern Anatolia	.016	.053	1.00
MLP	Marmara	176	4.26	.300							
	Aegean	88	4.26	.292							
	Central Anatolia	160	4.23	.316							
	Mediterranean	128	4.20	.285	1.585	.148	.328				
	Black Sea	141	4.19	.298							
	Eastern Anatolia	145	4.19	.318							
	Southeast Anatolia	162	4.18	.347							

(p< .05)

Table 9 indicates that a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the groups was discovered only in the Use dimension (F(Use)=2.711) when the perception of general media literacy and its sub-dimensions were compared to the geographical region where students live with their families. The Levene's test was then utilized to select the post-hoc test that would determine which groups differed. Since the Levene test result was greater than .05 in the sub-dimension of Effect, the Tukey test was selected as the post-hoc test (Field, 2005).

The Post-Hoc test revealed a statistically significant difference in the Use sub-dimension (Tukey) between the students from the Marmara region and those from Eastern Anatolia.

The reason for the significant difference in the Use sub-dimension of the MLPS in favor of the students living in the Marmara region might be the fact that the Marmara region, as Turkey's most developed region, has more advanced means of using media tools, whereas Eastern Anatolia is a disadvantaged region. On the other hand, even though a number of regions still have issues using media tools, it is believed that the media literacy and general media literacy perceptions have an impact on life in the sub-dimensions of Effect and Awareness, regardless of the region of residence.

Table 10

One-Way Anova, Levene and post-hoc test results between media literacy and its sub-dimensions mean scores by students' TV watching time

ANOVA							Levene	Post-Hoc				
Dimension	(I)	N	$\bar{X}$	ss	F	p	p	Type	(J)	(I-J)	Error	p
F1	Never	352	4.44	.429	2.408	.048	.478	Tukey	1-2	.086	.031	.046
									2-4	.047	.038	.743
									4-6	.124	.059	.216
									6 +	.031	.119	.999
	1-2	388	4.35	.409					Never	-.086	.031	.046
									2-4	-.039	.038	.834
									4-6	.038	.058	.967
									6 +	-.055	.119	.990
	2-4	186	4.39	.429					Never	-.047	.038	.743
									1-2	.039	.038	.834
									4-6	.077	.062	.728
									6 +	-.016	.121	1.00
	4-6	61	4.32	.451					Never	-.124	.059	.216
									1-2	-.038	.058	.967
									2-4	-.077	.062	.728
									6 +	-.093	.129	.951
	6 +	13	4.41	.428					Never	-.031	.119	.999
									1-2	.055	.119	.990
									2-4	.016	.121	1.00
									4-6	.093	.129	.951

(p< .05)

Table 10 cont.

One-Way Anova, Levene and post-hoc test results between media literacy and its sub-dimensions mean scores by students' TV watching time

ANOVA							Levene	Post-Hoc				
Dimension	(I)	N	$\overline{X}$	ss	F	p	p	Type	(J)	(I-J)	Error	p
									1-2	.050	.030	.450
									2-4	.063	.034	.365
	Never	352	4.12	.413					4-6	.144	.051	.042
									6 +	.251	.138	.406
									Never	-.050	.030	.450
									2-4	.013	.033	.995
	1-2	388	4.07	.391					4-6	.095	.050	.323
									6 +	.201	.138	.603
									Never	-.063	.034	.365
F2	2-4	186	4.06	.362	3.126	.014	.027	Games & Howell	1-2	-.013	.033	.995
									4-6	.082	.053	.532
									6 +	.188	.139	.664
									Never	-.144	.051	.042
									1-2	-.095	.050	.323
	4-6	61	3.98	.357					2-4	-.082	.053	.532
									6 +	.106	.144	.944
									Never	-.251	.138	.406
									1-2	-.201	.138	.603
	6 +	13	3.87	.491					2-4	-.188	.139	.664
									4-6	-.106	.144	.944

(p< .05)

Table 10 cont.

One-Way Anova, Levene and post-hoc test results between media literacy and its sub-dimensions mean scores by students' TV watching time

ANOVA Dimension	(I)	N	$\overline{X}$	ss	F	p	Levene p	Post-Hoc Type	(J)	(I-J)	Error	p
F3	Never	352	4.21	.485								
	1-2	388	4.18	.457								
	2-4	186	4.14	.443	2.255	.061	.098					
	4-6	61	4.05	.448								
	6 +	13	4.06	.447								
MLP	Never	352	4.26	.327					1-2	.058	.022	.075
									2-4	.059	.028	.219
									4-6	.142	.042	.008
									6 +	.144	.087	.467
	1-2	388	4.20	.296					Never	-.058	.022	.075
									2-4	.000	.027	1.00
									4-6	.083	.042	.286
									6 +	.085	.087	.865
	2-4	186	4.20	.299	3.991	.003	.185	Tukey	Never	-.059	.028	.219
									1-2	-.000	.027	1.00
									4-6	.083	.045	.360
									6 +	.085	.088	.874
	4-6	61	4.12	.317					Never	-.142	.042	.008
									1-2	-.083	.042	.286
									2-4	-.083	.045	.360
									6 +	.001	.094	1.00
	6 +	13	4.12	.291					Never	-.144	.087	.467
									1-2	-.085	.087	.865
									2-4	-.085	.088	.874
									4-6	-.001	.094	1.00

(p< .05)

Table 10 displays that when the differences in the general media literacy perception and sub-dimensions were examined according to the students' daily TV watching time, statistically significant differences were found between the sub-dimensions of Effect (F(Use)=2.408) and Awareness (F(Awareness)=3.126) and the mean scores of the groups in the general media literacy perception (F(MLP)=3.991). The Levene's test was then utilized to select the post-hoc test that would determine which groups differed. Tukey was chosen as the post-hoc test because the Levene test result was higher than .05 in the Use dimension and overall media literacy, whereas the Games-Howell test was chosen as the post-hoc test since the Levene test result was lower than .05 in the Awareness dimension (Field, 2005).

The post-hoc exam revealed a statistically significant difference between the groups of students who never watch TV and those who do so for 4-6 hours per day in the awareness dimension (Games-Howell) and general media literacy perception (Tukey), favoring the students who never watch TV. In addition, in the effect (Tukey) dimension, a statistically significant difference was found between the students who never watch TV and those who watch TV for 1-2 hours a day, again favoring the students who never watch TV.

The results show that the students who never watch TV have higher perceptions of media literacy in the general media literacy perception and Awareness sub-dimension compared to the students who watch TV for 4-6 hours, and that the media literacy perceptions of the students who never watch TV are higher than those of the students who watch TV for 1-2 hours in the Effect sub-dimension. This may imply that viewing TV directs the students and causes them to accept that the messages they receive are true by preventing them from evaluating the information critically. There is no difference in the students' perceptions of their media literacy in the Use sub-dimension, corresponding to the theory that the use of media tools is shaped by their environment rather than the amount of time they spend watching TV.

Table 11

One-way ANOVA, Levene, and post-hoc test results between media literacy and its sub-dimensions mean scores by students' daily Internet usage time

ANOVA						Levene	Post-Hoc				
Dimension	(I)	N	$\overline{X}$	ss	F	p	p	Type	(J)	(I-J)	Error	p
F1	Never	6	4.31	.476								
	1-2	170	4.33	.421								
	2-4	358	4.39	.423	1.775	.132	.756					
	4-6	276	4.39	.422								
	6 +	190	4.45	.427								
F2	Never	6	4.17	.298								
	1-2	170	4.05	.384								
	2-4	358	4.11	.388	.942	.439	.313					
	4-6	276	4.07	.393								
	6 +	190	4.07	.419								

(p< .05)

Table 11 cont.

One-way ANOVA, Levene, and post-hoc test results between media literacy and its sub-dimensions mean scores by students' daily Internet usage time

ANOVA							Levene	Post-Hoc				
Dimension	(I)	N	$\overline{X}$	ss	F	p	p	Type	(J)	(I-J)	Error	p
F3	Never	6	3.88	.494	4.142	.002	.483	Tukey	1-2	-.206	.192	.821
									2-4	-.285	.190	.564
									4-6	-.326	.191	.428
									6 +	-.380	.192	.274
	1-2	170	4.08	.449					Never	.206	.192	.821
									2-4	-.079	.043	.353
									4-6	-.120	.045	.060
									6 +	-.174	.049	.003
	2-4	358	4.16	.461					Never	.285	.190	.564
									1-2	.079	.043	.353
									4-6	-.041	.037	.800
									6 +	-.095	.041	.146
	4-6	276	4.20	.457					Never	.326	.191	.428
									1-2	.120	.045	.060
									2-4	.041	.037	.800
									6 +	-.054	.044	.726
	6 +	190	4.26	.482					Never	.380	.192	.274
									1-2	.174	.049	.003
									2-4	.095	.041	.146
									4-6	.054	.044	.726
MLP	Never	6	4.14	.378	2.284	.059	.659					
	1-2	170	4.16	.296								
	2-4	358	4.22	.308								
	4-6	276	4.22	.303								
	6 +	190	4.25	.333								

(p< .05)

As can be seen in Table 11, when the difference in the general media literacy perception and the sub-dimensions based on the students' daily Internet usage time was examined, only the Use (F(Use)=4.142) sub-dimension revealed a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the groups. The Levene's test was then utilized to select the Post-Hoc test that would determine which groups differed. Since the Levene test result was greater than .05 in the Use sub-dimension, the Tukey test was selected as the post-hoc test (Field, 2005).

The post-hoc test resulted in a statistically significant difference in favor of the students who used the Internet for more than six hours per day versus the students who used the Internet for one to two hours per day and more than six hours per day in the Use sub-dimension (Tukey).

When the students' perceptions of media literacy are compared based on the amount of time they spend online each day, it can be seen that the perceptions of the students who use the Internet for more than six hours per day are higher than those of the students who only use it for one or two hours per day. Therefore, it is hypothesized that this is because students are now using the internet for longer periods of time, which increases their interest in and engagement with media technologies. There was no statistically significant difference in the media literacy perceptions of the students according to the duration of Internet use in the general media literacy perception and the sub-dimensions of Effect and Awareness. It is therefore believed that this is because students do not favor educational websites on the Internet, which prevents the Internet from having any impact on educating students with regard to the consequences of media literacy and increasing their awareness.

Table 12

One-Way Anova, Levene, and post-hoc test results between media literacy and its sub-dimensions mean scores by the universities students attended

ANOVA						Levene	Post-Hoc				
Dimen.	(I)	N	$\overline{X}$	ss	F	p	p	Type	(J)	(I-J)	Error	p
F1	Akdeniz	130	4.57	.355					Gazi	.305	.046	.000
									Karadeniz Technical	.299	.044	.000
									Marmara	.405	.051	.000
	Atatürk	160	4.56	.356					Gazi	.287	.044	.000
									Karadeniz Technical	.282	.041	.000
									Marmara	.388	.049	.000
	Dicle	130	4.46	.369					Gazi	.194	.047	.001
									Karadeniz Technical	.189	.044	.001
									Marmara	.295	.051	.000
	Dumlupınar	120	4.46	.430	21.99	.000	.000	Games & Howell	Gazi	.188	.052	.006
									Karadeniz Technical	.182	.050	.006
									Marmara	.289	.056	.000
	Gazi	160	4.27	.427					Akdeniz	-.305	.046	.000
									Atatürk	-.287	.044	.000
									Dicle	-.194	.047	.001
									Dumlupınar	-.188	.052	.006
	Karadeniz Technical	170	4.28	.396					Akdeniz	-.299	.044	.000
									Atatürk	-.282	.041	.000
									Dicle	-.189	.044	.001
									Dumlupınar	-.182	.050	.006
	Marmara	130	4.17	.458					Akdeniz	-.405	.051	.000
									Atatürk	-.388	.049	.000
									Dicle	-.295	.051	.000
									Dumlupınar	-.289	.056	.000

(p< .05)

Table 12 cont.

One-Way Anova, Levene, and post-hoc test results between media literacy and its sub-dimensions mean scores by the universities students attended

ANOVA							Levene	Post-Hoc				
Dimen.	(I)	N	$\overline{X}$	ss	F	p	p	Type	(J)	(I-J)	Error	p
F2	Akden.	130	4.76	.106					Atatürk	.328	.012	.00
									Dicle	.562	.011	.000
									Dumlupınar	.705	.012	.000
									Gazi	.811	.011	.000
									Karadeniz Technical	1.00	.011	.000
									Marmara	1.26	.014	.000
	Atatürk	160	4.43	.095	29.94	.000	.000	Games & Howell	Akdeniz	-.328	.012	.000
									Dicle	.233	.009	.000
									Dumlupınar	.377	.010	.000
									Gazi	.483	.010	.000
									Karadeniz Technical	.674	.010	.000
									Marmara	.939	.013	.000
	Dicle	130	4.19	.062					Akdeniz	-.562	.011	.000
									Atatürk	-.233	.009	.000
									Dumlupınar	.143	.009	.000
									Gazi	.250	.008	.000
									Karadeniz Technical	.441	.008	.000
									Marmara	.705	.012	.000

(p< .05)

Table 12 cont.

One-Way Anova, Levene, and post-hoc test results between media literacy and its sub-dimensions mean scores by the universities students attended

ANOVA							Levene	Post-Hoc				
Dimen.	(I)	N	$\overline{X}$	ss	F	p	p	Type	(J)	(I-J)	Error	p
									Akdeniz	-.705	.012	.000
									Atatürk	-.377	.010	.000
									Dicle	-.143	.009	.000
	Dumlu.	120	4.05	.077					Gazi	.107	.009	.000
									Karadeniz Technical	.297	.010	.000
									Marmara	.562	.013	.000
									Akdeniz	-.811	.011	.000
									Atatürk	-.483	.010	.000
									Dicle	-.250	.008	.000
	Gazi	160	3.94	.079					Dumlu pınar	-.107	.009	.000
								Games &Howell	Karadeniz Technical	.191	.009	.000
					29.94	.000	.000		Marmara	.455	.012	.000
									Akdeniz	-1.00	.011	.000
									Atatürk	-.674	.010	.000
									Dicle	-.441	.008	.000
	Karadeniz Technical	170	3.75	.084					Dumlu pınar	-.297	.010	.000
									Gazi	-.191	.009	.000
									Marmara	.264	.012	.000
									Akdeniz	-1.26	.014	.000
									Atatürk	-.939	.013	.000
									Dicle	-.705	.012	.000
	Marmara	130	3.49	.121					Dumlu pınar	-.562	.013	.000
									Gazi	-.455	.012	.000
									Karadeniz Technical	-.264	.012	.000

(p< .05)

Table 12 cont.

One-Way Anova, Levene, and post-hoc test results between media literacy and its sub-dimensions mean scores by the universities students attended

ANOVA							Le.	Post-Hoc				
Dimen.	(I)	N	$\bar{X}$	ss	F	p	p	Type	(J)	(I-J)	Error	p
									Atatürk	.246	.049	.000
									Dicle	.417	.049	.000
									Dumlupınar	.444	.052	.000
	Akdeniz	130	4.61	.390					Gazi	.522	.046	.000
									Karadeniz Technical	.654	.046	.000
									Marmara	.720	.048	.000
									Akdeniz	-.246	.049	.000
									Dicle	.172	.049	.010
									Dumlupınar	.198	.053	.004
	Atatürk	160	4.36	.444					Gazi	.277	.047	.000
									Karadeniz Technical	.408	.047	.000
									Marmara	.475	.049	.000
									Akdeniz	-.417	.049	.000
									Atatürk	-.172	.049	.010
	Dicle	130	4.19	.394					Karadeniz Technical	.236	.047	.000
								Games	Marmara	.303	.048	.000
F3					50.35	.000	.033	&	Akdeniz	-.444	.052	.000
								Howell	Atatürk	-.198	.053	.004
	Dumlu.	120	4.17	.428					Karadeniz Technical	.210	.050	.001
									Marmara	.277	.052	.000
									Akdeniz	-.522	.046	.000
									Atatürk	-.277	.047	.000
	Gazi	160	4.09	.396					Karadeniz Technical	.132	.044	.050
									Marmara	.198	.046	.000
									Akdeniz	-.654	.046	.000
									Atatürk	-.408	.047	.000
	Karadeniz Technical	170	3.96	.410					Dicle	-.236	.047	.000
									Dumlupınar	-.210	.050	.001
									Gazi	-.132	.044	.050
									Akdeniz	-.720	.048	.000
									Atatürk	-.475	.049	.000
	Marmara	130	3.89	.389					Dicle	-.303	.048	.000
									Dumlupınar	-.277	.052	.000
									Gazi	-.198	.046	.000

(p< .05)

Table 12 cont.

One-Way Anova, Levene, and post-hoc test results between media literacy and its sub-dimensions mean scores by the universities students attended

ANOVA Dimension	(I)	N	$\bar{X}$	ss	F	p	Levene p	Post-Hoc Type	(J)	(I-J)	Error	p
MLP	Akdeniz	130	4.65	.188					Atatürk	.190	.021	.000
									Dicle	.356	.022	.000
									Dumlupınar	.418	.023	.000
									Gazi	.549	.021	.000
									Karadeniz Technical	.651	.021	.000
									Marmara	.806	.022	.000
	Atatürk	160	4.46	.181	308.87	.000	.167	Tukey	Akdeniz	-.190	.021	.000
									Dicle	.165	.021	.000
									Dumlupınar	.228	.022	.000
									Gazi	.358	.020	.000
									Karadeniz Technical	.460	.020	.000
									Marmara	.616	.021	.000
	Dicle	130	4.29	.172					Akdeniz	-.356	.022	.000
									Atatürk	-.165	.021	.000
									Gazi	.192	.021	.000
									Karadeniz Technical	.295	.021	.000
									Marmara	.450	.022	.000
	Dumlu.	120	4.23	.180					Akdeniz	-.418	.023	.000
									Atatürk	-.228	.022	.000
									Gazi	.130	.022	.000
									Karadeniz Technical	.232	.022	.000
									Marmara	.388	.023	.000
	Gazi	160	4.10	.190					Akdeniz	-.549	.021	.000
									Atatürk	-.358	.020	.000
									Dicle	-.192	.021	.000
									Dumlupınar	-.130	.022	.000
									Karadeniz Technical	.102	.020	.000
									Marmara	.257	.021	.000
	Karadeniz Technical	170	3.99	.175	308.87	.000	.167	Tukey	Akdeniz	-.651	.021	.000
									Atatürk	-.460	.020	.000
									Dicle	-.295	.021	.000
									Dumlupınar	-.232	.022	.000
									Gazi	-.102	.020	.000
									Marmara	.155	.021	.000
	Marmara	130	3.84	.203					Akdeniz	-.806	.022	.000
									Atatürk	-.616	.021	.000
									Dicle	-.450	.022	.000
									Dumlupınar	-.388	.023	.000
									Gazi	-.257	.021	.000
									Karadeniz Technical	-.155	.021	.000

Table 12 shows statistically significant differences found between the mean scores of the groups in all the sub-dimensions and the general media literacy, taking into account how differently students perceive media literacy and its sub-dimensions depending on the university they attended. The Levene's test was then utilized to select the post-hoc test that would determine which groups differed. Since the Levene test result was less than .05 in the Effect, Awareness, and Use sub-dimensions, Games & Howell was then selected as the post-hoc test; and the Tukey was selected as the post-hoc test because the Levene test result was higher than .05 in the general media literacy and the Use sub-dimension (Field, 2005).

According to the results of the post-hoc tests, the Akdeniz University students' mean scores in the Effect, Awareness, and Use (Games & Howell) sub-dimensions and the general media literacy (Tukey) were found to be statistically significant and higher than those of the students at other universities, while Marmara University students' mean scores differed statistically significantly but were lower.

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

The analysis of the data reveals that the social studies teaching students' perceptions of media literacy were high on both the scale and the sub-dimensions. Tatar (2016) found that preservice teachers' levels of media literacy was above average. When the students' perceptions of media literacy are compared based on gender, both males and females both see media literacy's impact similarly, despite the males' perceptions of the general media literacy and the Awareness and Use sub-dimensions being greater than those of the females. This finding is in contradiction to research by Som and Kurt (2012) and Sarsar and Engin (2015). However, in terms of the Effect dimension, both male and female perceptions are comparable to those of these studies. Aslan and Basel (2017) in their study, found that the level of media literacy differed according to the gender variable and that it was higher in female students. Saçan and Adıbelli (2016) also concluded that the sub-dimension of having information on media literacy levels according to gender was in favor of female students. Alınca (2019) found that media literacy characteristics are higher in males, regardless of gender. According to Pala and Başıbüyük (2020) the digital literacy of male and female students' scores were close to each other and it was found that there was no significant change. Karasu and Arıkan (2016), Çakmak (2019) Banaz (2017) also found that there was no significant difference regarding gender.

Depending on the number of siblings, students' perceptions of media literacy vary in terms of Awareness and general media literacy perception, but they are similar in terms of the Effect and Use dimensions. The students with one to two siblings had higher perceptions than those with three to four siblings, both in the Scale and Awareness dimensions. The digital literacy skill scores of the number of siblings were found to be significant variable. According to Pala and Başıbüyük (2020) it was found that the scores belonged to the students who did not have siblings have the highest literacy skills.

There was no difference in the students' perceptions of media literacy on either a scale or dimensional basis when the perceptions of the students were compared to their academic grade point averages and the monthly household income of their families.

The educational status of the students' mothers was seen to have an impact on their perceptions of the general media literacy and Use dimensions. However, it was observed that the students whose mothers are high school graduates had higher perceptions in the use sub-dimension among students with mothers who were illiterate, and who were secondary or high school graduates. Similarly, in terms of general media literacy perception, the perceptions of the students whose mothers are high school graduates were higher perceptions again between those with illiterate mothers and high school graduates. Pala and Başıbüyük (2020) found that the educational status of the mother has an effect on the digital literacy skill scores of the students.

Considering how the students perceived general media literacy and its sub-dimensions in terms of the educational status of their fathers, it was found only in the Use sub-dimension that the students whose fathers have Bachelor degrees or above had higher perceptions than those with illiterate fathers and BA or above graduate. Similarly, perceptions of the students whose fathers had Bachelor degrees or above were higher among those with fathers who are primary school, high school, and BA or above graduates. Similarly, perceptions of the students with high school-graduate fathers were greater than the groups of students whose fathers were primary school graduates and high school graduates. Again, perceptions of students whose fathers had Bachelor degrees or above were higher than the groups of illiterate fathers and BA or above graduates. Pala and Başıbüyük (2020) found that the educational status of the father had an effect on the digital literacy skill scores of students Bulut Özbek (2016) found that the media literacy levels of the parents were moderate.

Regarding the students' perceptions of general media literacy and its sub-dimensions in terms of the geographical region where they live with their families, only the Use sub-dimension showed statistically significant differences between students from the Marmara region and those from Eastern Anatolia, and the perceptions of the Marmara region students were found to be higher. Pala and Başıbüyük (2020) found with regard to the digital literacy skills of students according to the place of residence; the average of digital literacy skills of the students living in the city center was higher than that of students living in the town and district centers of the city.

Depending on how much TV they watch each day, the students' perceptions of media literacy differ in the Effect and Awareness dimensions, and general media literacy perception, but they are similar in the Use dimension. The perceptions of the students who never watched television were higher than those of the students who watched television for four to six hours per day in terms of both the general media literacy perception and the Awareness dimension. Regarding the Effect dimension, students who never watched TV had higher perceptions than those who watched TV for one to two hours per day. In their research on pre-service teachers, Karaman and Karataş (2009) discovered that the amount of time spent watching TV has an

impact on the degree of media literacy. However, this study indicates that students who watch TV ten to twenty hours per week have greater media literacy skills than people who watch TV less frequently or more frequently. Yılmaz and Özkan (2013) also found in their research that, the frequency of watching TV was effective in the media literacy scores of students. In contrast, Som and Kurt (2012) and Çakmak (2019) discovered that the amount of time spent watching TV had no impact on media literacy.

Considering the students' perceptions of media literacy in terms of how much time they spent online each day, the only difference was found in the use dimension, whereas the other dimensions and the general perception of media literacy had no differences. Based on the Use dimension, only students who use the Internet for more than six hours per day had higher perceptions than those who use it for one to two hours per day. According to a study conducted by Karaman and Karataş (2009), an increase in the amount of time spent online has a positive impact on media literacy skills. In line with these findings, Walsh (2009) underlines that those students should have access to the Internet and other technology both at home and in the classroom in order to implement media literacy effectively. In a study conducted by Çakmak (2016), it was found that the media literacy levels of the teachers whose weekly Internet usage time was 'between one two five hours' were higher than the teachers whose weekly Internet usage time was 'less than 1 hour' or 'between six to ten hours'.

With regard to the Effect, Awareness, and Use sub-dimensions and general media literacy, the mean scores of the Akdeniz University students were found to be statistically significant and higher than those of the students from other universities, while the Marmara University students' mean scores were statistically significantly different but were lower.

Consequently, there are a number of important implications based on the findings of the current study. For instance, this study implies that college students pursuing social studies education in Faculties of Education should take a media literacy course.

More importantly, in order to train teachers who can teach media literacy, it would be advantageous to establish departments at universities under the same name for teaching media literacy.

In addition, given that children of more educated parents have a greater perception of media literacy, it would be beneficial to offer courses to parents and members of all social groups, as well as conferences and training.

The use of media tools should also be increased in underdeveloped geographic regions.

Similarly, the use of media tools, such as computers and the Internet, should be made more widespread in small settlements, and more emphasis should be placed on the field of media literacy education.

Moreover, in order to minimize the damaging impact of the media, TV viewing time should be reduced as much as possible. Raising media-literate people should be prioritized in order to combat the harmful effects of TV.

In addition, Internet use should be prioritized in order to improve how media tools are perceived.

Furthermore, students' perceptions of media literacy will improve if they are encouraged to utilize computers and tablets for educational purposes.

Finally, but not the least, the definition of media literacy as well as the requirements and appropriate goals for a media literacy education program can be determined using the Delphi technique, which is a needs assessment technique.

Limitations of the Research

The study was limited to seven regions of Turkey and pre-service social studies teachers enrolled at the Faculties of Education at a state university chosen from each region. The sample of the research consisted of a total of one thousand students enrolled in social studies education programs at seven different state universities, one from each region of Turkey. The study is limited to evaluating students' responses to items on the Media Literacy Perception Scale based on various variables.

Support and Credits

This study is based on a doctoral thesis titled "Examination of Pre-service Social Studies Teachers' Perceptions of Media Literacy."

Contribution Rate of Researchers

Each author of the study made an equal contribution at every step of the research process.

Conflict Statement

In our capacity as the authors of the study, we hereby declare that we have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Statement of Publication Ethics

The entire procedure, from the planning of this research to its implementation, and from the data collection to the data analysis, meets with all the guidelines outlined in the 'Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive'. The acts listed in the second section of the regulation, 'Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics', have not been carried out.

The study, 'Examining Media Literacy Perceptions of Preservice Social Studies Teachers by the Seven Regions of Turkey', was written in accordance with all applicable scientific, ethical, and citation guidelines. The data was not falsified, and this paper has not been submitted for review to any other scholarly publication.

REFERENCES

Alınca, S. (2019). *İzmir bornova ve karşıyaka halk eğitimi merkezlerinde çalışan öğretmen ve usta öğreticilerin medya okuryazarlığı düzeyleri* [Master's thesis, Ege University, İzmir]. https://acikbilim.yok.gov.tr/bitstream/handle/20.500.12812/351023/yokAcikBilim_10301796.pdf?sequence=-1&isAllowed=y

Anderson, D. (2008). The low bridge to high benefits: Entry-level multimedia, literacies, and motivation. *Computers and Composition*, *25*(1), 40-60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2007.09.006

Angell, H. (2005). *What music videos teach at-risk adolescent girls: Making a case for media literacy curriculum* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, Florida]. https://www.proquest.com/openview/1f82df97a5f940e48cd8e80334c6a25e/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

Aslan, N., & Basel, A. T. (2017). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin medya okur-yazarlık düzeyleri (İzmir örneklemi). *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 25(4), 1353-1372. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/331462

Aufderheide, P. (1993). *Media literacy. A Report of the national leadership conference on media literacy*. Washington, D. C: Aspen Institute.

Banaz, E. (2017). Ortaöğretim öğrencilerinin medya okuryazarlığı düzeyleri (Giresun ili örneği) [Master's thesis, Giresun University, Giresun]. https://acikbilim.yok.gov.tr/bitstream/handle/20.500.12812/87726/yokAcikBilim_10152585.pdf?sequence=-1&isAllowed=y

Braun, L. W. (2007). *Teens, technology, and literacy: or, Why bad grammar isn't always bad*. Connecticut: Libraries Unlimited.

Buckingham, D. (2013). *Media education: Literacy, learning and contemporary culture*. Massachusetts: John Wiley & Sons.

Bulut Özek, M. (2016). Ebeveynlerin medya okuryazarlık düzeylerinin farklı değişkenler açısından İncelenmesi. *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 7(1), 805-818. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/253782

Christ, W. G., & Potter, W. J. (1998). Media literacy, media education, and the academy. *Journal of communication*, *48* (1), 5-15. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1998.tb02733.x

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education.* New York: Routledge.

Çakmak, E. E. (2019). Öğretmenlerin Medya Okuryazarlık Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. *The Journal of Limitless Education and Research*, 4(3), 300-316. https://doi.org/10.21666/muefd.963205

Eisner, E. W. (2003). The arts and the creation of mind, *NCTE, 80*(5), 340-344. https://acurriculumjourney.files.wordpress.com/2014/04/eisner-2003-the-arts-and-the-creation-of-mind.pdf

Fedorov, A. (2015). *Media Literacy Education.* Moscow: Information For All.

Field, A. (2005). *Factor analysis using SPSS.* London: Sage.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step. A simple study guide and reference.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Karaman, M. K., & Karataş, A. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının medya okuryazarlık düzeyleri. *İlköğretim Online*, *8* (3), 798-808. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/90837

Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel Aratrma Yöntemi: Kavramlar, İlkeler, Teknikler.* Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Kellner, D. (2003). *Media culture: Cultural studies, identity and politics between the modern and the post-modern*. Los Angeles: Center for Media Literacy.

Karasu, M., & Arıkan, D. (2016). Öğretmen Adaylarının Sosyal Medya Kullanım Durumları ve Medya Okuryazarlık Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi, 17(2),* 549-566. https://doi.org/10.12984/egeefd.280757

Medya Okuryazarlığı Derneği (2013). Retrieved May 12, 2013, from http://www.medyaokuryazarligi.org.tr/neden.html

Medya Okuryazarlığı Derneği (2017). Retrieved May 24, 2017, from http://www.medyaokuryazarligi.gov.tr/menu_goster.php?Guid=E56CE034-6CEB-41AE-A12C-B618EBEA461B&MenuId=2

New Media Consortium. (2005). *A global imperative. The report of the 21st century literacy summit.* Stanford, CA: The New Media Consortium.

Quin, R., & McMahon, B. (2001). Living with the tiger: Media curriculum issues. In R. Kubey (Ed.), Media literacy in the information age: Current perspectives. *Information and behavior* (pp. 307-321), 6. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Pala, Ş. M., & Başıbüyük, A. (2020). Ortaokul beşinci sınıf öğrencilerinin dijital okuryazarlık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Cumhuriyet Uluslararası Eğitim Dergisi*, *9*(3), 897-921. https://doi.org/10.30703/cije.672882

Saçan, S., & Adıbelli, D. (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinin medya okur-yazarlık düzeylerinin bazı faktörler ile ilişkisi. *Global Media Journal TR Edition, 6*(12), 27-43. https://globalmediajournaltr.yeditepe.edu.tr/sites/default/files/Selvinaz%20SA%C3%87AN%20&%20Derya%20ADIBELL%C4%B0%20.pdf

Sarsar, F., & Engin, G. (2015). Sınıf Öğretmeni adaylarının medya okur-yazarlık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, *16*(1), 165-176. https://doi.org/10.12984/eed.36378

Som, S., ve Kurt, A. A. (2012). Bilgisayar ve öğretim teknolojileri eğitimi bölümü öğrencilerinin medya okuryazarlık düzeyleri. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, *2*(1), 104-119. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/17529

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon/Pearson.

Tatar, I. (2016). *Öğretmen adaylarının medya okuryazarlığı ile çevrimiçi bilgi arama stratejileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Doctoral dissertation, Anadolu University, Eskişehir]. https://earsiv.anadolu.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11421/3131/2857.pdf?sequence=1

Thoman, E., & Jolls, T. (2008). *Literacy for the 21st Century: An overview and orientation guide to media literacy education. Theory CML medicalit kit.* Los Angeles: Center for Media Literacy.

Thoman, E., Jolls, T., Share, J., Elma, C., & Kesten, A. (2008). *21. yüzyıl okuryazarlığı: Medya okuryazarlığına genel bir bakış ve sınıf içi etkinlikler.* İstanbul: Ekinoks Yayınevi.

Tornero, J. P. (2004). *Promoting digital literacy: Final report (EAC/76/03).* Barcelona: Education and Culture.

Walsh, M. (2009). Pedagogic potentials of multimodal literacy. In *Tan Wee Hin, L., and Subramanıan, R. (Eds.). Handbook of research on new media literacy at the K*, *12*, (pp. 32-47). Australia: ACU National.

Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2005). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri.* Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Yılmaz, Ö., & Özkan, B. (2013). Bilgisayar ve öğretim teknolojileri ve okul öncesi öğretmen adaylarının medya okuryazarlık düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması. *(Electronic Journal of Vocational Colleges*, *3*(1), 1-6. http://acikerisim.klu.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/20.500.11857/3850/3850.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y