

Exploring the Representation of the Field of Communication in Academic Publishing: A Content Analysis of the Journals of Communication Schools in Turkey

İletişim Bilimleri ve Akademik Yayıncılıkta Temsili: Türkiye'deki İletişim Fakültesi Dergileri Üzerine Bir İçerik Analizi

Ezel TÜRK 

Yeşim AKMERANER 

Fırat TUFAN 

Abstract

This study aimed to explore the properties of the articles published in the journals of communication schools in Turkey to understand the communication field's general framework as represented in these journals. These properties include their subdisciplines, research methods and techniques, project support, levels of collaboration, and authors' language preferences. For this purpose, all of the articles published between 2016 and 2020 in the journals of the communication schools listed in the Turkish Index (TR Index) were examined via quantitative content analysis. The Turkish Academic Network and Information Center, an institute of the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK), developed the TR Index. Eleven journals and 1641 articles in total were analyzed within this context. The analysis showed that the majority of the articles published in the journals of communication schools displayed an interdisciplinary approach. The articles that analyzed new media predominantly adopted qualitative methods. In addition, collaborative studies were less than single-authored studies, a very limited number of the studies was supported by a project, and the number of articles written in foreign languages was remarkably few.

Keywords: Communication, Communication Research, Journal of Communication Schools, Interdisciplinarity, Content Analysis

* Research Assistant, Dr., Istanbul University, Faculty of Communication, Department of Public Relations, Istanbul, Turkey, E-mail: ezel.kamcili@istanbul.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-4652-5035

** Research Assistant, Istanbul University, Faculty of Communication, Department of Journalism, Istanbul, Turkey, E-mail: yesim.akmeraner@istanbul.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-6260-2811

*** Assoc. Prof. Dr., Istanbul University, Faculty of Communication, Department of Radio and Television, Istanbul, Turkey, E-mail: firattufan@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-4992-8593

Öz

Bu çalışma, Türkiye'deki üniversitelerin iletişim fakülteleri bünyesinde yayımlanan dergilerinin ve bu dergilerde yayımlanan makalelerin; konusu, bilimsel yöntemi ve tekniği, iş birliğine dayalı çalışma prensipleri, yazım dili tercihleri gibi bazı temel unsurlara göre genel profilini ortaya koymayı ve bu kapsamda yapılacak olan değerlendirmeler için temel bazı veriler sunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu doğrultuda, Türkiye'deki iletişim fakülteleri bünyesinde yayımlanan ve TÜBİTAK ULAKBİM tarafından geliştirilen TR Dizin kapsamında dizinlenen dergilerin tamamının 2016-2020 yılları arasındaki tüm sayılarında bulunan makaleler nicel içerik analizi tekniği ile incelenmiştir. İncelenen 11 dergi ve 1641 makale aracılığı ile elde edilen veriler, Türkiye'deki iletişim fakültesi dergilerinde yayımlanan makalelerin çoğunlukla disiplinlerarası yaklaşımla ele alındığını, ağırlıklı olarak yeni medya konularının nitel bir yaklaşımla incelendiğini ortaya koymuştur. Ayrıca, iş birliğine dayalı çalışmaların tek yazarlı çalışmalara kıyasla daha az olduğu, çok az sayıda çalışmanın bir proje kapsamında desteklendiği ve yabancı bir dilde yazıldığı tespit edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İletişim, İletişim Araştırmaları, İletişim Fakültesi Dergileri, Disiplinlerarasılık, İçerik Analizi

Introduction

Although communication studies are marked by interdisciplinarity (Boz & Gür, 2021; Craig, 1999; Donsbach, 2006; Waisbord, 2019), McCloskey (1994) posited that communication is at the center of all other interdisciplinary fields. The author did this by indicating the significance of communication in everyday life, as well as its strategic role in education systems around the world. Another study explained that having good communication skills is one of the most essential keys to finding a job and building a successful career (Curtis, Winsor & Stephens, 1989). Due to its functional role in every aspect of human life, communication as a phenomenon had become the center of attention for scholars and researchers by the beginning of the 20th century, in line with the development of communication technologies. The institutional foundation of communication education was again dated to the beginning of the 20th century with the establishment of journalism schools (Zelizer, 2011). On the other hand, Turkey had to wait until the beginning of the 1950s to welcome this progress. Communication became the subject of academia long after communication education had begun in Turkey. Tokgöz (2003) underlined the importance of the doctoral theses carried out between 1971 and 1994, as they paved the way for the formation of communication as an interdisciplinary field, and they helped to develop a disciplinary identity for it as well. The first five doctoral theses, known as “the first five,” consist of studies conducted on mass communication, such as radio, television, and cinema (Tokgöz, 2003). Other studies following “the first five” focused on the topics of new communication technologies, press and politics, television (TV) broadcasting policies, cultivation theory, radio propaganda, journalism education, and popular culture (Tokgöz, 2006).

In line with the abolition of the state monopoly in radio and TV broadcasting in Turkey, as well as the beginning of commercial broadcasting in the early 1990s, communication education in universities began to institutionalize and become prevalent. Together with the proliferation of graduate education, academic literature on communication burgeoned quickly both qualitatively and

quantitatively. Today, more than 70 communication faculties and more than 30 academic journals in the field of communication exist in Turkey.

This study aimed to discover communication journals' general profile in Turkey, examining their articles according to various aspects. Covering issues published between 2016 and 2020, this study showed communication studies' current trends in Turkey.

Communication(s) As an Inter-Disciplinary Field

The communication field has long been characterized by the confluence of multiple disciplines alongside thematic and methodological fragmentations and specializations. The field's intellectual traditions have been formed in line with the specific socio-political, economic, and academic features of the United States (U.S.) and European countries. As media influence and persuasion studies that were theoretically and methodologically grounded in the discipline of psychology flourished in the U.S., culturalist and semiological perspectives developed in France, and public opinion and philosophy studies took root in Germany (Waisbord, 2019, pp. 18-19). Communication studies' development outside of the West's central countries bore traces of Western intellectual traditions.

Craig (1999) defined the scholarly traditions that shaped the communication field as "rhetorical, semiotic, phenomenological, cybernetic, sociopsychological, sociocultural, and critical traditions" (p. 119). Born as a multidisciplinary field, communication is also characterized by methodological diversity and by a variety of epistemological and ontological viewpoints. Most journals in the field seem to welcome both empirical and critical manuscripts whose methodological tools range from ethnographies to textual analysis, surveys, and archival study (Zelizer, 2016, p. 15). Commonly debated themes include whether this multi-disciplinarity in many aspects renders communication research's identity controversial and eclectic, whether it attracts more attention from other disciplines, and the lack of coherence within the field (Arik & Bayram, 2011; Donsbach, 2006; Jiménez & Guillem, 2009; Kane, 2016; Nordenstreng 2007).

The communication field's institutional formation is closely related to the establishment of journalism schools in various regions of the world. Beginning in the early 1900s, the rising number of journalism schools in the U.S.; the establishment of institutions in Germany and Austria for studying social issues via the press; the acceptance of journalism as a laboratory for theory development in the United Kingdom; and the foundation of journalism training programs across East Asia, Latin America, and Africa marked communication's institutional formation worldwide (Zelizer, 2011, pp. 4-6). The communication field's development in Turkey is parallel to this path. Communication education can be dated to the establishment of journalism schools in the late 1940s; these schools provided vocational training at the middle and high school levels. Subsequently, the Journalism Institute was founded in the body of the Faculty of Economics at Istanbul University in 1950, and the College of Journalism and Broadcasting was founded in the body of the Faculty of Political Sciences at Ankara University in 1965 (Tokgöz, 2003). The doctoral theses written from 1971-1994 are thought to have laid the communication field's interdisciplinary foundation in Turkey. The first five doctoral theses conducted in the 1970s on mass communication, such as radio, TV, and cinema,

are particularly accepted as communication research's pioneers in Turkey (Tokgöz, 2014). However, the communication field's traditional clusters, such as journalism, public relations, radio, and TV, appeared after two communication faculties at Istanbul and Ankara Universities were founded in 1992. Afterward, the institutional foundation of communication continued with the establishment of other communication faculties across Turkey.

It is important to note that the communication field in Turkey has stood between vocational training and academic education, and a similar type of tension exists in American academia (Zelizer, 2016, p. 10). As information and communication technologies (ICT) have diffused into every aspect of social life, communication has become the center of interest for various disciplines, from the social and computational sciences to the humanities. This dialogue with other disciplines intensified the academic dimension of communication study and education. On the other hand, the developments in ICTs directly affected the media industry and required updated vocational training. In this sense, applied courses in journalism and radio-TV broadcasting increased in number but still appeared to be insufficient (Arık & Bayram, 2011; Kükrer, 2011; Tokgöz, 2006; Uzun, 2007). In addition, the communication curriculum contents varied greatly in terms of theory and practice across communication schools. This phenomenon is not specific to Turkey. Donsbach (2006) complained that "our departments have many different names even within one country. And we do many different things. Sure, we all deal with some communication phenomena, but under very different circumstances" (p. 439).

As social relations and media industries are highly mediated through continuous technological developments, traditional research clusters disintegrate into niche specializations. This intensified the blurring boundaries between disciplines as communication became an object of study for various areas. Conceptual, theoretical, and methodological transitivity among disciplines broadened communication studies' horizons as in the example of computational methods in communication research. In addition, the changing media landscape resulted in niche specializations, such as "platform studies," within social media studies. Nevertheless, these features of communication might be defined as literature obsolescence. According to a study covering the analysis of the books indexed under "communication" in the Web of Science from 1990-2018, the literature used in communication studies becomes more quickly obsolescent compared with other social science areas (Yalçın, 2019, p. 235).

The interdisciplinarity of communication can also be seen in the diversified identities of communication scholars, ranging from history to political science, sociology, and psychology. Considering the early contributions of other disciplines that shaped the communication field, it is not surprising to see many communication professors or senior scholars with PhDs from other disciplines. However, recent research highlighted that the number of scholars in the field who have PhDs in communication has increased. In a survey conducted with members of the International Communication Association in 2005, almost two out of three members said they had received their degrees in communication (Donsbach, 2006, p. 440). The findings of the research conducted in Turkey revealed that 30% of associate and assistant professors working in communication faculties held both a bachelor's and a doctoral degree in communication, whereas this number was 20% for

professors (Arik & Bayram, 2011, p. 94). Another study supported these findings by indicating the hybrid foundation of communication faculties in Turkey, as well as communication scholars' diverse academic backgrounds, ranging from the social to the physical sciences (Akgül & Akdağ, 2018). On the other hand, a very recent study indicated an opposite tendency. It showed that four-fifths of faculty members working in communication programs have doctoral degrees in communication. Newer programs are relatively closed to scholars outside of communication, and older programs prefer their own graduates, which might harm the field's interdisciplinary development (Boz & Gür, 2021).

Communication is defined by “what communication scholars do”, “what communication journals publish”, and “whatever piece of scholarship finds room in communication associations, journals, departments, and schools” (Waisbord, 2019, p. 234). Thus, it is significant to take a closer look at the journals of communication faculties in Turkey to uncover communication's disciplinary landscape, methodological preferences, level of internationalization, and collaboration among scholars.

Aim and Methodology

Although communication education at universities in Turkey is based on traditional departments, such as journalism, public relations, and, radio-TV, , it is clear that various disciplines have fed the communication field. With their powerful influence on everyday life, new media technologies and applications have also affected communication studies, providing a foundation for new media departments in recent years. In such a scholarly environment, traditional disciplines of communication have welcomed burgeoning disciplines or have adopted the methods or research interests of other fields of study. Within such a scholarly context, this study aimed to fulfill the need to grasp the current disciplinary landscape of the communication field in Turkey. For this purpose, the articles published in the journals of communication schools in Turkey were analyzed according to their subdisciplines, research methods and techniques, project support, levels of academic collaboration, and authors' language preferences.

RQ1: Which subdisciplines were mostly studied in the communication journals, and what is the percentage of each subdiscipline according to the total number of subdisciplines studied during a five-year period?

RQ2: Which research methods were adopted in communication articles, and what is the percentage of each method according to the total number of methods used?

RQ3: What is the percentage of single-authored and multi-authored articles, as this is a sign of the academic collaboration level?

RQ4: What percentage of the articles received support from projects?

RQ5: What percentage of the articles were published in languages other than Turkish?

Method

A quantitative content analysis of the articles published in the Turkish communication journals was conducted to answer the above-listed research questions. A content analysis is “a research technique for the systematic, objective, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication” (Berelson, 1952, p. 18). It is widely adopted in various disciplines, including communication, and can be applied via a quantitative, qualitative, or mixed approach by using various techniques (White & Marsh, 2006).

Sample

The study sample consisted of all 11 journals that the Turkish communication faculties publish, as listed in the TR Index. The Turkish Academic Network and Information Center, an institute of the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK), developed this national database of academic articles. The 11 journals are as follows: *Akdeniz University Journal of the Faculty of Communication*, *Ankara University İlef Journal*, *Connectist: Istanbul University Journal of Communication Sciences*, *Journal of Erciyes Communication*, *Galatasaray University Journal of Communication İleti-ş-im*, *Gumushane University e-Journal of Faculty of Communication e-GIFDER*, *Journal of Communication Theory & Research*, *Inonu University Faculty of Communication Electronic Journal INIF e-Journal*, *Turkish Review of Communication Studies*, *Moment Journal*, and *Journal of Selcuk Communication*. The issues of these journals between 2016 and 2020 were selected to create the sample. Thus, the study sample consisted of 1682 articles, and they were accessed through the journal database search engine DergiPark. Forty-one articles, including book reviews, translations, and interviews, were eliminated from the code sheet, and 1641 articles were coded in total.

Code Sheet Development

Coding categories based on the names of the journals, publication years, subdisciplines, research methods and techniques, numbers of authors, project support, levels of collaboration, and authors' language preferences were constructed for the code sheet. The subdisciplines were composed in line with the “Science Fields and Keywords” list for the field of communication that the TR Inter-University Council (UAK) developed for career progression to associate professorship in Turkey. These subdisciplines include “internet broadcasting”, “social media studies”, “new media and new communication technologies”, “radio broadcasting”, “TV broadcasting”, “cinema and film studies”, “journalism”, “visual communication design”, “public relations”, “corporate communications”, “advertising”, “marketing”, “interdisciplinary communication studies”, and “media literacy”. The subdisciplines were also classified according to the years from 2016 to 2020.

In terms of research methods and techniques, the researchers decided which method (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed) was applied in each article, and the article was coded accordingly. Then, each article was coded according to its research technique(s): survey, descriptive analysis, content analysis, discourse analysis, film analysis, in-depth interview, semiotic analysis, argumentation, document analysis, case study, and social network analysis, and a limited number of techniques categorized

as “other.” Each article examined in the study could be coded in more than one category in terms of its subdisciplines as well as its research methods and techniques. Therefore, the total frequency numbers and percentages could differ in these categories.

For the purpose of exploring the levels of academic collaboration involved, the articles were coded according to whether they were single-authored or multi-authored. The languages of the articles were coded if they were written in any language other than Turkish. Moreover, if projects supported or funded the articles, they were coded as project-based articles.

Intercoder Reliability

After designing the coding sheet, three researchers discussed the coding and agreed on how to code each variable so that ambiguities were eliminated. Three researchers coded 168 randomly selected articles, which corresponds to 10% of the total 1682 articles, at the same time for intercoder reliability testing (De Swert, 2012). Afterward, three of the researchers coded the remaining articles with the agreed-upon coding sheet. Krippendorff’s alpha reliability was used because it was convenient “for judgments made at any level of measurement, any number of observers, with or without missing data” (Hayes & Krippendorff, 2007, p. 77). Krippendorff’s alpha reliability exceeded .80, and it was 1.00 for the number of authors, language preferences, and project support, which indicates perfect reliability. Meanwhile, it was .91 for subdisciplines, .93 for research methods, and .94 for research techniques.

Limitations

One of the limitations of this study is the index in which the journals are listed. The study was solely based on the TR Index, which is a national database of academic articles that the Turkish Academic Network and Information Center developed. This center is an institute of the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK). The index is a significant source of academic progression criteria at Turkish universities. However, the journals of communication faculties indexed in other databases were not included in the study. Another limitation of the study is the period during which the journals were examined. The analysis of the journal issues was limited to the past five years, from 2016 to 2020, as communication is a rapidly changing field.

Findings

The study data were analyzed via the quantitative content analysis technique using the SPSS program. The findings obtained in accordance with the frequency analyses included in the descriptive statistics were interpreted accordingly. Table 1 shows the number of the analyzed articles published in the journals of communication faculties listed in the TR Index between 2016 and 2020.

Table 1. The Number of Articles Published in the Journals between 2016 and 2020

<i>The name of the journals</i>	<i>The number of the analyzed articles</i>
<i>Akdeniz University of the Faculty of Communication</i>	192
<i>Ankara University İlef Journal</i>	54
<i>Connectist: Istanbul University Journal of Communication Sciences</i>	79
<i>Journal of Erciyes Communication</i>	271
<i>Galatasaray University Journal of Communication İleti-ş-im</i>	105
<i>Gumushane University e-Journal of Faculty of Communication e-GIFDER</i>	251
<i>Journal of Communication Theory & Research</i>	199
<i>Inonu University Faculty of Communication Electronic Journal INIF e-Journal</i>	102
<i>Turkish Review of Communication Studies</i>	101
<i>Moment Journal</i>	84
<i>Journal of Selcuk Communication</i>	203
Total	1641

The subdisciplines most common in the journals, and their percentages by years

For the purpose of addressing the first research question, the subdisciplines mostly studied in the communication journals were coded. These subdisciplines are indicated in Table 2.

Table 2a. The Subdisciplines Determined in the Journals of Communication Faculties (Part 1)

Subdisciplines of the field of communication	Communication Journals											Total coding of disciplines	
	Akdeniz U. Journal	Ankara U. İlef Journal	Connectist	Journal of Erciyes	Galatasaray İleti-ş-im	Gumushane U. e-GIFDER	J. of Com. Theory &Research	INIF e-Journal	Turkish Review of Com. Studies	Moment Journal	Journal of Selçuk Comm.		
	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i>	%
<i>Internet Broadcasting</i>	12 3.25%	2 2.00%	2 1.20%	16 3.05%	8 4.08%	13 2.74%	4 1.09%	4 2.04%	1 0.60%	1 0.68%	6 1.46%	69	2.21%
<i>Social Media Studies</i>	42 11.38%	9 9.00%	19 11.45%	59 11.26%	19 9.69%	63 13.26%	30 8.17%	15 7.65%	15 9.04%	8 5.44%	40 9.76%	319	10.24%
<i>New Media and New Comm. Technologies</i>	64 17.34%	15 15.00%	41 24.70%	95 18.13%	35 17.86%	41 8.63%	56 15.26%	31 15.82%	25 15.06%	25 17,01%	56 13,66%	484	15.53%
<i>Radio Broadcasting</i>	2 0.54%	2 2.00%	0 0%	3 0.57%	2 1.02%	3 0.63%	2 0.54%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 0.24%	15	0.48%
<i>TV Broadcasting</i>	10 2.71%	3 3.00%	4 2.41%	14 2.67%	7 3.57%	18 3.79%	10 2.72%	3 1.53%	4 2.41%	3 2.04%	21 5.12%	97	3.11%
<i>Cinema and Film Studies</i>	41 11.11%	12 12.00%	8 4.82%	44 8.40%	14 7.14%	30 6.32%	24 6.54%	13 6.63%	10 6.02%	16 10.88%	34 8.29%	246	7.89%
<i>Journalism</i>	41 11.11%	11 11.00%	8 4.82%	40 7.63%	24 12.24%	42 8.84%	43 11.72%	27 13.78%	26 15.66%	4 2.72%	32 7.80%	298	9.56%

Table 2b. The Subdisciplines Determined in the Journals of Communication Faculties (Part 2)

Subdisciplines of the field of communication	Communication Journals											Total coding of disciplines	
	Akdeniz U. Journal	Ankara U. İlef Journal	Connectist	Journal of Erciyes	Galatasaray İleti-ş-im	Gumushane U. e-GIFDER	J. of Com. Theory & Research	INIF e-Journal	Turkish Review of Com. Studies	Moment Journal	Journal of Selcuk Comm	n	%
	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n	%
Visual Comm. Design	2 0.54%	0 0%	2 1.20%	6 1.15%	0 0%	3 0.63%	0 0%	1 0.51%	1 0.60%	5 3.40%	6 1.46%	26	0.83%
Public Relations	13 3.52%	2 2.00%	6 3.61%	20 3.82%	5 2.55%	16 3.37%	14 3.81%	7 3.57%	2 1.20%	1 0.68%	25 6.10%	111	3.56%
Corporate Comm.	16 4.34%	1 1.00%	10 6.02%	17 3.24%	8 4.08%	29 6.11%	13 3.54%	11 5.61%	5 3.01%	1 0.68%	17 4.15%	128	4.11%
Advertising	18 4.88%	5 5.00%	7 4.22%	23 4.39%	9 4.59%	23 4.84%	9 2.45%	8 4.08%	5 3.01%	1 0.68%	17 4.15%	125	4.01%
Marketing	20 5.42%	1 1.00%	7 4.22%	17 3.24%	11 5.61%	36 7.58%	6 1.63%	10 4.10%	2 1.20%	1 0.68%	18 4.39%	129	4.14%
Inter-disciplinary Comm. Studies	87 23.58%	37 37.00%	51 30.72%	162 30.92%	54 27.55%	155 32.63%	154 41.96%	65 33.16%	70 42.17%	81 55.10%	134 32.68%	1050	33.70%
Media Literacy	1 0.27%	0 0%	1 0.60%	8 1.53%	0 0%	3 0.63%	2 0.54%	1 0.51%	0 0%	0 0%	3 0.73%	19	0.61%
Total	369 100%	100 100%	166 100%	524 100%	196 100%	475 100%	367 100%	196 100%	166 100%	147 100%	410 100%	3116	100%

As seen in Table 2, interdisciplinary communication studies (n=1050, 33.70%) outnumbered other subdisciplines. New media and new communication technologies (n=484, 15.53%) and social media studies (n=319, 10.24%) followed interdisciplinary communication studies. Although journalism (n=298, 9.56%) and cinema and film studies (n=246, 7.89%) were still popular subdisciplines, marketing (n=129, 4.14%), corporate communication (n=128, 4.11%), advertising (n=125, 4.01%), public relations (n=111, 3.56%), and TV broadcasting (n=97, 3.11%) were less studied communication field subdisciplines. Internet broadcasting (n=69, 2.21%) was surprisingly less common than TV broadcasting was. Meanwhile, visual communication design (n=26, 0.83%), media literacy (n=19, 0.61%), and radio broadcasting (n=15, 0.48%) were the least common subdisciplines within the field.

The past five years of the journals (2016-2020) were coded to determine the percentages of the subdisciplines found in the publications. Table 3 shows the percentages of the subdisciplines within the five-year period.

Table 3. The Percentages of the Subdisciplines Found in the Journals From 2016-2020

Subdisciplines	Years					Total number of coding according to subdisciplines
	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	
	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	
<i>Internet Broadcasting</i>	18 2.52%	12 1.51%	15 2.28%	13 2.61%	11 2.45%	69
<i>Social Media Studies</i>	105 14.68%	82 10.30%	68 10.33%	36 7.23%	28 6.24%	319
<i>New Media & New Comm. Technologies</i>	133 18.60%	134 16.83%	94 14.29%	69 13.86%	54 12.03%	484
<i>Radio Broadcasting</i>	4 0.55%	3 0.38%	2 0.30%	1 0.20%	5 1.11%	15
<i>TV Broadcasting</i>	20 2.80%	27 3.39%	12 1.82%	18 3.61%	20 4.45%	97
<i>Cinema and Film Studies</i>	53 7.42%	68 8.54%	48 7.29%	39 7.83%	38 8.46%	246
<i>Journalism</i>	57 7.98%	73 9.17%	65 9.88%	48 9.64%	55 12.25%	298
<i>Visual Comm. Design</i>	4 0.55%	9 1.13%	5 0.76%	4 0.80%	4 0.89%	26
<i>Public Relations</i>	25 3.50%	25 3.14%	19 2.89%	23 4.62%	19 4.23%	111
<i>Corporate Communications</i>	21 2.94%	20 2.51%	39 5.93%	25 5.02%	23 5.12%	128
<i>Advertising</i>	27 3.78%	45 5.65%	22 3.34%	14 2.81%	17 3.79%	125

<i>Marketing</i>	23 3.22%	42 5.28%	30 4.56%	15 3.01%	19 4.23%	129
<i>Interdisciplinary Comm. Studies</i>	224 31.32%	250 31.41%	231 35.11%	190 38.15%	155 34.52%	1050
<i>Media Literacy</i>	1 0.14%	6 0.75%	8 1.22%	3 0.60%	1 0.22%	19
Total	715 100%	796 100%	658 100%	498 100%	449 100%	

As seen in Table 3, social media studies increased dramatically. Although the percentage of social media studies was 6.24% among all communication subdisciplines in 2016, it has more than doubled since then, reaching 14.68%. The percentage of new media and new communication technologies increased gradually from 12.03% to 18.60% each year. Meanwhile, the percentage of some subdisciplines decreased during the five-year period. These include radio broadcasting (decreasing from 1.11% to 0.55%), TV broadcasting (from 4.45% to 2.80%), journalism (from 12.25% to 7.98%), and corporate communication (from 5.12% to 2.94%).

Research methods applied in the articles published in the communication journals, and their percentages by years

For the purpose of exploring which research methods were predominantly applied in the articles published in the communication journals, each article was coded according to the method(s) employed: qualitative, quantitative, or mixed research. The findings are demonstrated in Table 4.

Table 4. The Research Methods of the Articles Published in the Communication Journals

<i>Communication Journals</i>	<i>ResearchMethods</i>						Total
	Qualitative research method		Quantitative research method		Mixed research method		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
<i>Akdeniz U. Journal</i>	148	13.54%	36	8.41%	8	6.67%	192
<i>Ankara U. İlef Journal</i>	46	4.21%	2	0.47%	6	5.00%	54
<i>Connectist</i>	44	4.03%	23	5.37%	12	10.00%	79
<i>Journal of Erciyes</i>	176	16.10%	73	17.06%	22	18.33%	271
<i>Galatasaray İleti-şim</i>	81	7.41%	20	4.67%	4	3.33%	105
<i>Gumushane U. e-GIFDER</i>	121	11.07%	109	25.47%	21	17.50%	251
<i>Journal of Comm. Theory & Research</i>	132	12.08%	63	14.72%	4	3.33%	199
<i>INIF e-Journal</i>	72	6.59%	18	4.21%	12	10.00%	102
<i>Turkish Review of Comm. Studies</i>	74	6.77%	17	3.97%	10	8.33%	101

<i>Moment Journal</i>	79	7.23%	2	0.47%	3	2.50%	84
<i>J. of Selcuk Comm.</i>	120	10.98%	65	15.19%	18	15.00%	203
Total	1093	100%	428	100%	120	100%	

Table 4 indicates that out of the 1641 articles examined in the communication journals, 1093 (66.61%) articles were based on the qualitative method, which means that the qualitative approach dominated these journals. In addition, the quantitative method (n=428, 26.08%) was preferred more than the mixed methods (n=120, 7.31%) were.

The research methods applied in the communication journals' articles were also analyzed according to the years from 2016 to 2020 as shown in Table 5.

Table 5. The Percentages of the Research Methods Applied in the Articles Published in the Communication Journals from 2016-2020

<i>Research methods</i>	Years					Total
	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	
	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	
Qualitative research method	229 67.75%	284 69.61%	227 62.36%	193 68.20%	160 64.52%	1093
Quantitative research method	76 22.49%	101 24.75%	111 30.49%	68 24.03%	72 29.03%	428
Mixed research method	33 9.76%	23 5.64%	26 7.14%	22 7.77%	16 6.45%	120
Total	338 100%	408 100%	364 100%	283 100%	248 100%	

Table 5 clearly shows that the percentage of the articles employing the mixed research method increased from 6.45% (n=16) to 9.76% (n=33) between 2016 and 2020. One can also see a slight growth in the percentage of the qualitative research method from 64.52% (n=160) to 67.75% (n=229) in five years. On the other hand, the quantitative research method was used the most in 2018 (n=111, 30.49%), and it has decreased since then (n=76, 22.49%).

After the article research methods were coded, the research techniques were also coded. Table 6 illustrates the research techniques applied in the examined articles.

Table 6a. The Research Techniques Applied in the Articles Published in the Communication Journals (Part 1)

Research techniques	Communication Journals											Total coding of research techniques	
	<i>Akdeniz U. Journal</i>	<i>Ankara U. İlef Journal</i>	<i>Connectist</i>	<i>Journal of Erciyes</i>	<i>Galatasaray İleti-ş-im</i>	<i>Gumushane U. e-GIFDER</i>	<i>J.of Comm. Theory & Research</i>	<i>INIF e-Journal</i>	<i>Turkish Review of Com Studies</i>	<i>Moment Journal</i>	<i>Journal of Selcuk Comm</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Descriptive analysis</i>	47 21.17%	13 20.31%	14 15.91%	55 19.30%	22 17.19%	53 19.34%	73 35.44%	34 32.38%	24 20.87%	50 54.35%	49 22.17%	434	24.11%
<i>Content analysis</i>	42 18.92%	6 9.38%	22 25.00%	68 23.86%	21 16.41%	69 25.18%	41 19.90%	27 25.71%	23 20.00%	7 7.61%	41 18.55%	367	20.39%
<i>Survey</i>	26 11.71%	2 3.13%	21 23.86%	60 21.05%	15 11.72%	78 28.47%	32 15.53%	15 14.29%	14 12.17%	2 2.17%	50 22.62%	315	17.50%
<i>In-depth interview</i>	19 8.56%	8 12.50%	8 9.09%	24 8.42%	25 19.53%	25 9.12%	15 7.28%	5 4.76%	3 2.61%	12 13.04%	14 6.33%	158	8.78%
<i>Film analysis</i>	25 11.26%	7 10.94%	4 4.55%	20 7.02%	11 8.59%	11 4.01%	12 5.83%	2 1.90%	9 7.83%	8 8.70%	21 9.50%	130	7.22%
<i>Discourse analysis</i>	13 5.86%	7 10.94%	5 5.68%	22 7.72%	9 7.03%	9 3.28%	6 2.91%	15 14.29%	15 13.04%	1 1.09%	13 5.88%	115	6.39%

Table 6b. The Research Techniques Applied in the Articles Published in the Communication Journals (Part 2)

Research techniques	Communication Journals											Total coding of research techniques	
	Akdeniz U. Journal	Ankara U. İlef Journal	Connectist	Journal of Erciyes	Galatasaray İleti-ş-in	Gumushane U. e-GIFDER	J.of Comm. Theory & Research	INIF e-Journal	Turkish Review of Com Studies	Moment Journal	Journal of Selcuk Comm	n	%
	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n	%
<i>Semiotic analysis</i>	12 5.41%	2 3.13%	4 4.55%	15 5.26%	4 3.13%	13 4.74%	7 3.40%	4 3.81%	4 3.48%	1 1.09%	9 4.07%	75	4.17%
<i>Argumentative analysis</i>	9 4.01%	4 6.25%	0 0%	4 1.40%	10 7.81%	1 0.36%	2 0.97%	0 0%	9 7.83%	0 0%	2 0.90%	41	2.28%
<i>Document analysis</i>	8 3.60%	6 9.38%	1 1.14%	2 0.70%	1 0.78%	3 1.09%	1 0.49%	1 0.95%	3 2.61%	2 2.17%	3 1.36%	31	1.72%
<i>Case study</i>	5 2.25%	1 1.56%	1 1.14%	5 1.75%	2 1.56%	2 0.73%	1 0.49%	0 0%	2 1.74%	1 1.09%	7 3.17%	27	1.50%
<i>Social network analysis</i>	4 1.80%	2 3.13%	3 3.41%	2 0.70%	0 0%	3 1.09%	5 %	1 0.95%	2 1.74%	0 0%	4 1.81%	26	1.44%
<i>Other</i>	12 5.41%	6 9.38%	5 5.68%	8 2.81%	8 6.25%	7 2.55%	11 5.34%	1 0.95%	7 6.09%	8 8.70%	8 3.62%	81	4.50%
Total	222 100%	64 100%	88 100%	285 100%	128 100%	274 100%	206 100%	105 100%	115 100%	92 100%	221 100%	1800	100%

As seen in Table 6, descriptive analysis (n=434, 24.11%) was the most common research technique followed by content analysis (n=367, 20.39%) and survey (n=315, 17.50). One of the noteworthy points about the research techniques examined is the rising attention to social network analysis (n=26, 1.44%), even though it is limited for now, as social media is a popular research area of interest in the field of communication

The numbers of the authors of the articles published in the communication journals

Whether the articles examined were single authored or multi-authored (with two, three, and four or more authors) was also coded, and multi-authorship was evaluated as a sign of academic collaboration. Table 7 shows the numbers of the authors of the articles in the journals reviewed.

Table 7. The Numbers of the Authors of the Articles Published in the Communication Journals

Number of authors	Communication Journals											Total coding of articles according to the numbers of authors	
	<i>Akdeniz U. Journal</i>	<i>Ankara U. İlef J.</i>	<i>Connectist</i>	<i>Journal of Erciyes</i>	<i>Galatasaray İleti-ş-im</i>	<i>Gumushane U. e-GIFDER</i>	<i>Journal of Comm. Theory & Research</i>	<i>INIF e-Journal</i>	<i>Turkish Review of Comm Studies</i>	<i>Moment Journal</i>	<i>Journal of Selcuk Comm</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i> <i>%</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
Single-authored articles	106 55.21%	44 81.48%	42 53.16%	154 56.83%	68 64.76%	137 54.58%	129 64.82%	58 56.86%	53 52.48%	69 82.14%	121 59.61%	981	59.78%
Multi-authored articles (with two authors)	80 41.67%	10 18.52%	31 39.24%	101 37.27%	31 29.52%	102 40.64%	55 27.64%	38 37.25%	42 41.58%	12 14.29%	65 32.02%	567	34.55%
Multi-authored articles (with three authors)	6 3.13%	0 0%	5 6.33%	14 5.17%	3 2.86%	9 3.59%	13 6.53%	5 4.90%	6 5.94%	2 2.38%	16 7.88%	79	4.81%
Multi-authored articles (with four and more authors)	0 0%	0 0%	1 1.27%	2 0.74%	3 2.86%	3 1.20%	2 1.01%	1 0.98%	0 0%	1 1.19%	1 0.49%	14	0.85%
Total	192 100%	54 100%	79 100%	271 100%	105 100%	251 100%	199 100%	102 100%	101 100%	84 100%	203 100%	1641	100%

Table 7 indicates that more than half of the articles (n=981, 59.78%) were single authored. Multi-authored articles with two authors (n=567, 34.55%) were the second-most published articles. However, multi-authored articles with four or more authors (n=14, 0.85%) were published least often; even some journals did not publish any multi-authored articles with more than two authors.

The numbers of the articles in the communication journals that received project support

The articles examined in the communication journals were coded according to whether projects supported them. Table 8 indicates the number of articles that received project support.

Table 8. The Numbers of the Articles that Received Project Support in the Communication Journals

Name of the journals	Project-supported articles		Total number of articles
	n	%	
<i>Akdeniz University Journal</i>	10	% 5.20	192
<i>Ankara University İlef Journal</i>	2	% 3.58	54
<i>Connectist</i>	2	% 2.53	79
<i>Journal of Erciyes</i>	1	% 0.36	271
<i>Galatasaray İleti-ş-im</i>	2	% 1.90	105
<i>Gumushane University e-GIFDER</i>	5	% 1.99	251
<i>Journal of Comm. Theory & Research</i>	5	% 2.51	199
<i>INIF e-Journal</i>	1	% 0.98	102
<i>Turkish Review of Comm Studies</i>	0	0	101
<i>Moment Journal</i>	8	% 9.52	84
<i>Journal of Selcuk Communication</i>	3	% 1.47	203
Total	39		1641

Out of the 1641 articles analyzed in the communication journals, 39 articles (2.38%) received support from projects. *Akdeniz Communication Journal* published the most project-supported articles, whereas *Turkish Review of Communication Studies* did not publish any project-supported articles.

The numbers of the articles published in foreign languages (any languages except for Turkish) in the communication journals

The articles in the communication journals were coded in terms of their publication languages. Table 9 indicates the number of articles published in foreign languages (any languages except for Turkish).

Table 9. The Numbers of the Articles Published in Foreign Languages Except for Turkish

Names of the journals	Numbers of the articles published in foreign languages		Total number of articles
	<i>n</i>	%	
<i>Akdeniz University Journal</i>	10	% 5.20	192
<i>Ankara University İlef Journal</i>	5	% 9.25	54
<i>Connectist</i>	21	% 26.60	79
<i>Journal of Erciyes</i>	17	% 6.27	271
<i>Galatasaray İleti-ş-im</i>	20	% 19.04	105
<i>Gumushane U. e-GIFDER</i>	13	% 5.17	251
<i>Journal of Comm. Theory & Research</i>	11	% 5.52	199
<i>INIF e-Journal</i>	3	% 2.94	102
<i>Turkish Review of Comm Studies</i>	12	% 11.88	101
<i>Moment Journal</i>	16	% 19.04	84
<i>Journal of Selcuk Communicaiton</i>	12	% 5.91	203
Total	140		1641

Out of the 1641 articles in the communication journals 140 articles (8.53%) were published in foreign languages. *Connectist* had the most foreign language articles, whereas *Inif e-journal* had the fewest.

Discussion and Conclusion

Communication research in Turkey has embraced an interdisciplinary approach. New media, new communication technologies, and social media studies were the most common subdisciplines of recent articles. Although social media, new media, and new communication technologies have been increasing dramatically within the past five years, radio broadcasting, TV broadcasting, journalism, and corporate communication have been decreasing since 2016.

This study revealed that the articles employing the qualitative method outnumbered the ones applying the quantitative method in Turkish communication journals. Meanwhile, previous studies worldwide (Cho & Khang, 2006; Cooper, Potter & Dupagne, 1994; Ha & Riffe, 2015; Stafford, 2005) demonstrated the opposite tendency. Some contrary findings are worth mentioning, though, in terms of the method trends for the subdisciplines. The research on social media studies indexed in the Web of Science shows that quantitative methods outnumber qualitative ones (Törenli & Kıyan, 2020). On the other hand, the mixed research method recorded significant growth within the five-year period. Among all of the communication journals examined, the top three techniques were descriptive analysis, content analysis, and survey. Social network analysis, a relatively new research technique, seems to have been embraced in communication studies, although it remains an emerging one in Turkey. Approaches to methodology in the field of communication seem to be affected by the research trends. New research techniques such as social network analysis come along with the new research areas. On the other hand, communication scholars keep adapting traditional methods and techniques of the communication field either via integrating them into trendy methods or pursuing

mainstream analyses. The findings Törenli and Kıyan put forth imply that further subdiscipline-specific research could contribute to mapping the methodology landscape of communications. In that sense, the field of communication strongly needs detailed studies on the methods and techniques utilized in the literature.

In terms of author collaborations, the study also showed that more than half of the articles were single-authored, which indicates that author collaborations were not common in the field of communication in Turkey. Moreover, multi-authored articles with four or more authors were very rare. Collaboration among scholars either from the same or neighboring disciplines has already been an asset in academic circles worldwide. However, the findings of this research on the topic revealed an opposite tendency the reasons for which are waiting to be clarified. Lack of institutional support for academic collaboration, lack of awareness of its potential, or work culture unsuitable for cooperation might be among probable reasons for the prevailing opposite tendency in Turkey. This issue obviously requires further research.

In addition, project-supported articles were not prevalent in the communication journals. This might have resulted from insufficient institutional support provided for studies of social science, or the authors of the project-supported articles might have preferred journals outside of Turkey. Among the communication journals reviewed, *Akdeniz Communication Journal* published the most project-supported articles, whereas *the Turkish Review of Communication Studies* did not publish any project-supported articles.

The language of the published articles is of great importance to increase the widespread impact of Turkish-speaking academic studies. Because some of the journals are listed in international indexes, the articles' publication languages are significant to examine. Less than 10% of the total articles were published in foreign languages, primarily in English. Among the communication journals, *Connectist* had the most foreign language articles, whereas *Inif e-journal* had the fewest. The findings clearly show that the total number of articles published in a foreign language is very limited. Considering that some of the journals examined are listed in international indexes, the remarkable number of Turkish-speaking articles might render the international character of these journals questionable.

To sum up, this study has drawn a picture of the contemporary landscape of Turkey's communication field by covering the analysis of the articles published in the journals of the communication schools listed in the TR Index according to their subdisciplines, research methods and techniques, project support, levels of academic collaboration, and authors' language preferences. Further research might fill the gaps in the literature, raise new questions, and create opportunities to better compare and contrast existing knowledge.

References

- Akgül, M., & Akdağ, M. (2018). İletişim eğitimi ve disiplinlerarasılık: İletişim fakültelerindeki akademisyen profili üzerine bir değerlendirme. *Turkish Review of Communication Studies*, 31, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.17829/turcom.499682>
- Arık, M. B., & Bayram, F. (2011). İletişim eğitimi ve iletişim akademisyenleri: Veriler ışığında genel bir değerlendirme. *Akdeniz University Journal of the Faculty of Communication*, 15, 81-98.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Boz, N., & Gür, B. S. (2021). İletişim Programlarının Kimliği: Üniversiteler ve Alanlar Arası Akademik Hareketlilik. *Ilef Journal*, 8(1), 9-34, <https://doi.org/10.24955/ilef.933195>
- Cho, C.-H., & Khang, H. (2006). The state of internet-related research in communications, marketing, and advertising: 1994–2003. *Journal of Advertising*, 35(3), 143–163.
- Cooper, R., Potter, J. W., & Dupagne, M. (1994). A status report on methods used in mass communication research. *Journalism Educator*, 48(4), 54–61.
- Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory*, 9(2), 119-161. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1999.tb00355.x>
- Curtis, D. B., Winsor, J. L., & Stephens, R. D. (1989). National preferences in business and communication education. *Communication Education*, 38(1), 6-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/036.345.28909378736>
- De Swert, K. (2012). Calculating inter-coder reliability in media content analysis using Krippendorff's Alpha. *Polcomm.org*. Retrieved October 2, 2021 from <https://www.polcomm.org/wp-content/uploads/ICR01022012.pdf>.
- Donsbach, W. (2006). The identity of communication research. *Journal of communication*, 56(3), 437-448. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00294.x>
- Ha, J. H. & Riffe, D. (2015). Crisis-related research in communication and business journals: An interdisciplinary review from 1992 to 2011. *Public Relations Review*, 41, 569-578.
- Hayes, A. F., & Krippendorff, K. (2007). Answering the call for a standard reliability measure for coding data. *Communication methods and measures*, 1(1), 77-89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/193.124.50709336664>
- Jiménez, L. G., & Guillem, S. M. (2009). Does communication studies have an identity? Setting the bases for contemporary research. *Catalan Journal of Communication & Cultural Studies*, 1(1), 15-27. https://doi.org/10.1386/cjcs.1.1.15_1
- Kane, O. (2016). Communication studies, disciplinarity and the ontological stakes of interdisciplinarity: A critical review. *Communication & Society*, 29(3), 87-102. <https://doi.org/10.15581/003.29.3.87-102>
- Kükürer, Ö. (2011). Erol Mutlu'nun iletişim eğitimi üzerine düşünceleri ve katkıları. *Akdeniz University Journal of the Faculty of Communication*, 15, 161-163.
- McCloskey, D. (1994). The neglected economics of talk. *Planning for Higher Education*, 22(4), 11-16.
- Nordenstreng, K. (2007). Discipline or field? Soul-searching in communication research. *Nordicom Review*, Jubilee Issue 2007, 211-222.
- Stafford, M. R. (2005). International services advertising (ISA): Defining the domain and reviewing the literature. *Journal of Advertising*, 34(1), 65–86.
- Tokgöz, O. (2003). Türkiye'de iletişim eğitimi: Elli yıllık bir geçmişin değerlendirilmesi. *Kültür ve İletişim*, 6(1), 9-32.
- Tokgöz, O. (2006). Türkiye'de iletişim araştırmalarında iletişim eğitiminin rolü ve önemi. *Global Media Journal*, 1(1), 1-12.

- Tokgöz, O. (2014). Türkiye'de iletişim arařtırmaları içinde 1970'li yıllarda Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesinde yapılan iletişim konusundaki doktora tezlerinin rolü ve konumu. *Ankara University Ilef Journal*, 1(1), 115-142.
- Törenli, N., & Kıyan, Z. (2020). Sosyal medya eksenli iletişim arařtırmaları: Konular, kuramlar, yöntemler. *Moment Journal*, 7(2), 173-201. <https://doi.org/10.17572/mj2020.2.173201>
- Uzun, R. (2007). İstihdam sorunu bağlamında Türkiye'de iletişim eğitimi ve öğrenci. *Journal of Communication Theory & Research*, 25(2), 117-134.
- Waisbord, S. (2019). *Communication: A post-discipline*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- White, M. D., & Marsh, E. E. (2006). Content analysis: A flexible methodology. *Library Trends*, 55(1), 22-45. doi:10.1353/lib.2006.0053
- Yalçın, H. (2019). Bilimsel iletişim ve literatür kullanım kültürü: Literatür eskimesi üzerinden bir değerlendirme. *Moment Journal*, 6(1), 227-237. <https://doi.org/10.17572/mj2019.1.227237>
- Zelizer, B. (2011). Journalism in the service of communication. *Journal of Communication*, 61(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466>
- Zelizer, B. (2016). Communication in the fan of disciplines. *Communication Theory*, 26(3), 213-235. <https://doi.org/10.1111/comt.12094>