

JOURNALISM EDUCATION IN WEB 2.0: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY ON EDUCATORS IN TURKEY*

Lec. Sinan AŞCI**

Abstract

The information age has massive implications for journalism and journalism education. Journalism in the 21st century has been radically changed through ubiquitous connectivity, and a cultural shift is required for journalism educators to enable engagement and critical reflection upon the use of Web 2.0 into new pedagogical strategies. Educators, namely academics and professionals in academia, have been debating what the future of journalism education will look like. Classrooms and class spaces in Web 2.0 have enabled learners anywhere to acquire information directly from experts. It is so-called fractional learning where a learner can sort an individualized and balanced result from a multitude of views that is inevitable in journalism. This study aims to determine the level of educators, academics and professionals in academia, in the usage of digital tools in their own works and teaching journalism. Another purpose of this study is to determine whether the level in the usage of digital tools changes according to demographic features or not. In this study, a survey was carried out with an online posted questionnaire as data collected at first hand. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. Firstly, educators were asked to provide demographic information about themselves. The second section included a questionnaire used to measure educators' usage of digital tools in Web 2.0 in their own daily lives, works and journalism education, and the academic unit they have been working for. The results of this survey were analyzed using SPSS22.00 (Statistical Package for The Social Sciences). Frequency distribution was administered to analyze the data gathered in this survey.

Key Words: Journalism education, education in Web 2.0, teaching journalism.

* Presented at the 1st International Symposium on Journalism and Journalism Education in Digital Age, Istanbul, Turkey, April 28, 2016.

** Nişantaşı University, New Media Department, sinan.asci@nisantasi.edu.tr; PhD Candidate, Media and Communication Studies, Galatasaray University, sinanasci@gmail.com

WEB 2.0 DÖNEMİNDE GAZETECİLİK EĞİTİMİ: TÜRKİYE'DEKİ EĞİTİMCİLERE YÖNELİK AMPİRİK BİR ÇALIŞMA

Özet

Bilgi çağının gazetecilik ve gazetecilik eğitimi üzerine büyük etkileri olmuştur. 21. yüzyılda gazetecilik her an bağlanabilirlik özelliği ile birlikte kökten bir değişime uğramış ve gazetecilik eğitimcilerinin yeni pedagojik stratejileri arasında Web 2.0'in kullanımına dair uğraş girmiş ve eleştirel düşünmeye olanak sağlamaları adına kültürel bir değişiklik gerekmiştir. Eğitimciler, yani akademisyenler ve akademideki profesyoneller, gazetecilik eğitiminin gelecekte nasıl görüneceğini hala tartışmaktadır. Web 2.0 dönemindeki sınıflar öğrencilerin uzmanlardan doğrudan bilgi edinmelerini sağlamaktadır. Bu durum, gazetecilikte kaçınılmaz olan çok sayıda görüşten bireyselleştirilmiş ve dengeli bir sonuca ulaşılmış bilgi edinme ya da öğrenme olarak adlandırılmaktadır. Bu çalışma eğitimcilerin kendi çalışmalarında ve gazetecilik öğretiminde dijital araçları kullanma düzeyini belirlemeyi hedeflemektedir. Bu çalışmanın diğer bir amacı ise, dijital araçların kullanım düzeyinin demografik özelliklere göre değişip değişmediğini saptamaktır. Çalışma kapsamında, çevrimiçi yayınlanan bir anket uygulanmış ve veriler doğrudan toplanmıştır. Anket iki bölümden oluşmaktadır. İlk olarak eğitimcilerden demografik bilgileri ile ilgili sorular sorulmuştur. İkinci bölümde ise, eğitimcilerin Web 2.0 dönemindeki dijital araçları günlük yaşantılarında, işlerinde, gazetecilik eğitiminde ve çalışmakta oldukları akademik birimde nasıl kullandıklarını ölçen sorular bulunmaktadır. Anketin sonuçları SPSS22.00 kullanılarak incelenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Gazetecilik eğitimi, Web 2.0 döneminde eğitim, gazetecilik öğretimi.

1. Introduction

The buzzword Web 2.0 encompasses major changes that have directly affected the communications environment, but also the social, political, economic and cultural lives of everyone all around the world. The term Web 2.0 was first used in January 1999 by Darcy DiNucci who is an information architecture consultant. DiNucci writes in her article published in the magazine "Fragmented Future" (1999):

"The Web we know now, which loads into a browser window in essentially static screenfuls, is only an embryo of the Web to come. The first glimmerings of Web 2.0 are beginning to appear, and we are just starting to see how that embryo might develop. The Web will be understood not as screenfuls of text and graphics but as a transport mechanism, the ether through which interactivity happens. It will [...] appear on your

computer screen, [...] on your TV set [...] your car dashboard [...] your cell phone [...] hand-held game machines [...] maybe even your microwave oven.”

Web 2.0 describes World Wide Web sites that emphasize user-generated content, usability, and interoperability. It generally refers to a second generation of services available on the World Wide Web that lets people collaborate and share information online. Rather than the old model where the publishers of the data were in control, this is a new paradigm where the information seekers control how the internet grows and improves through their consumption of and interaction with information.

Today, we get most of our information through an interwoven system of media technologies. The ability to read many types of media has become essential in the 21st Century. Media literacy is the ability to access, analyze, evaluate, and create media. Media literate youth and adults are better able to understand the complex messages we receive from television, radio, Internet, newspapers, magazines, books, billboards, video games, music, and all other forms of media (Buckingham, 2007).

By all accounts, literacy requires a new set of skills to manage the technology necessary to translates those bit strings into a display of traditional alphabets and corresponding grammars. Additional skills are required to draw meaning from those electronic symbols. This revolution has redefined what it means to be literate. When compared to the old model, Web 2.0 includes the general and massive digitization of content of all forms, the Internet, and communication devices such as cell phones and personal computers to reach and generate the content ubiquitously. The other effects of this revolution include unrivaled access to information, especially regarding government, non-governmental organizations and public corporations. Such learning and literacy are absolutely vital if a professional is going to meet his/her responsibilities to the commonweal. The individuals associated with Journalism Education in Turkey have been, and are, professional journalists and journalism educators, sometimes both at the same time. The rapid changes in the digital environment are at the root of this prototype investigation.

That being said, there has been no baseline study of how journalism educators started adopting to this new environment. Little research has been done to know whether journalism educators generally implement new technologies into their classrooms or not, but not how and at which level educators use Web 2.0, namely digital tools, in their own works and while teaching journalism.

2. Journalism Education in Turkey

Journalism education as a training zone developed in the USA, and then it spread all around the world as an academic field. Thus, several debates concerning how journalism has been taught in Turkey is not new, though sporadically mentioned in academic literature dated from the early 1980s. As it is generally known, this type of education enlarged the scope of its content for the last 30 years.

In Turkey, the first discussion about founding journalism schools dates back 1930. Because single party system during those years attached credence to the fact that journalists receiving training at least as much as teachers, a provision about the obligation for managing editors to have completed high school or vocational school of higher education was inserted into the Press Code in 1931 (Alemdar and Erdoğan, 1998). Consequently, the intention of founding journalism schools increased firstly in Istanbul; however, the fact that this provision of law was legislated away in 1933 caused the idea of founding a journalism school to fail (Altun, 1999).

In 1948, Fehmi Yahya Tuna opened Istanbul Private Journalism School, which was the first journalism school in Turkey. This educational institution, though it is an institution at the university level, has a historical significance in terms of being the first private school of journalism founded in Turkey (İnuğur, 1988). In 1949, Istanbul University Senate decided on founding a journalism institution in the Faculty of Economics (Abadan-Unat, 1972). This institution was the first vocational-training institution where the students had an opportunity to get diplomas on journalism (Alemdar and Erdoğan, 1998). In the fall term of 1950, students had been admitted to study in this Journalism Institution for two-year cycle. The students who had completed high school and had experience in journalism for 2 years had been accepted to become candidates in journalism profession. Then, the Senate decided on training the students for 3 years under the name of Istanbul University Journalism and Public Relations Vocational School.

These developments experienced in Turkey increased with several related decisions regarding Higher Education, and the schools were founded progressively all around Turkey starting from bigger cities. Nowadays, there are approximately 26 Journalism Departments both in public and charity-founded universities, and more than 400

academics have been working in those departments to teach and carry out some courses according to different angles of journalism education.

As seen in the numbers and academic literature, the increase in the number of journalism departments and developments in the media industry have speeded up the public discussions on journalism education in Turkey, and also all around the world.

Journalism departments remain their roles as a training field of media professionals in accordance with the media industry's demand. According to Mutlu (2005) there is no other possibility in pursuing a training free from scientific and academic work and concerns within the structure of university. In the first place, the tradition of raising the academic staff in Turkey eliminates such a tendency.

Journalism education requires the collection of different skills anywhere in the world, needs a definite field savings, seems expensive in the organization of the foundation, should be always up to date with its dynamic industry and has a force to be new all the time. As a consequence, it requires a very experienced and fulfilled staff and an economically resilient foundation. In the Faculty of Communication, an academic knowledge from both the communication discipline and other disciplines, and also staff are needed for advertising, public relations, journalism, photography, film, television, specialized in graphic and web. Thus, it will not be wrong to say that an accumulation which may occur only in the developed cities of Turkey is necessary for journalism education (Arik and Bayram, 2011). The second point is clear that identity problem of the area, pursuing the goals of journalism education and acting suitably create some obstacles (Terkan and Balcı, 2007).

The other point we should always keep in our minds that the field for competitive industry infrastructure is very hard and many people with their different background education and experience try to get into the field to hold a share. For this reason, we always look at the courses taught without any application into the field, like politics, sociology, etc. The main problem is that getting those courses does not make any sense and hold any meaning for our students without other colors in the context of journalism.

As a result, a well-qualified journalist should be a citizen who knows the main issues in general in the community and in the world where it lives, and acquire a vision about how to interpret them. A journalist, who is not any of the citizens but a citizen having an

important place to set up an institutional communication environment, is the one who has an institutional identity (Terkan and Balcı, 2007). Because this study was prepared as a proof of concept effort, the results reported here need far more research and testing. However, we do believe that the response data described in this article suggest some tendencies related to what journalism educators know about surviving in the digital age and suggest different directions for the long-term investigations.

3. The Study

3.1. Importance and Objectives of Research

Nowadays journalism education in many countries is mostly seen as a training zone. For students who would like to be a media professional, this type of education has become so popular. Similarly, as seen in the previous parts of this paper, university administrations have still opened journalism departments. On the other hand, this educational basis is accepted as an academic field for which conferences, surveys, publications are made. The ultimate objective of this research related to gathering data about what journalism educators and professionals in academia know about making use of digital tools and programmes to find and analyze to produce stories. What do the educators know about using digital platforms to communicate with their students and what they are teaching in their courses to analyze data and communicate the results.

3.2. Procedure and Sample

A questionnaire was conducted in Turkey to determine the level of educators, academics and professionals in academia, in the usage of digital tools in their own works and teaching journalism, and also whether the level in the usage of digital tools changes according to demographic features. The questionnaire was developed by using an online survey application.

According to the statistics declared by Turkey's Council of Higher Education, the total number of journalism educators are 423 in different faculties belonging to both public

and charity-founded the universities¹. The questionnaire was sent to more than 380 educators in Turkey from March 1 till March 30 2016, whose contact information was put on the schools' websites, without defining their background information and student populations. We also received responses from educators at additional schools who received the survey e-mail from original recruitees who had forwarded the e-mail to them. Using the "randomly" recruitment technique, it attracted a total of 123 responses, 4 of whom were not suitable to be included in the survey because of not having any teaching experience, and were opted out. Because all the respondents were all contacted via e-mail, it is believed that those respondents use and represent a greater than average familiarity with digital tools. They probably represent a better informed, e.g. digitally hip, when compared to their colleagues in journalism departments at the same and/or different universities. This suggests our respondents are possibly more sympathetic to our emphasis on teaching digital skills in reporting than most journalism educators. With this approach, 78,9 percent of all the respondents got the survey e-mail at first hand, 10,5 percent were forwarded from one of their colleagues, and 10,5 saw the survey link on the Internet.

47 questions organized in three sub-categories which were not shown in the questionnaire: institutional, instructional and personal questions regarding the usage of and train with digital tools. There were multiple choice questions about the institution: in other words, school's type, size, special admission requirements, student-academic characteristics, technological infrastructure. There were multiple choice questions in 5 point Likert scale and short-answer questions about making use of digital technology and tools to teach journalism and manage courses, availability and type of courses for learning how to use digital tools for journalism inside or outside the department, detailed questions about skills and tools taught, and views on the ways to teach such skills. There were multiple choice questions about the reporting educator's personal characteristics. These questions covered gender, age, personal technology habits, current work status, length of time as an educator and/or professional, university rank, university training, experience in the field of teaching and/or reporting.

¹ The statistics were declared on 05.08.2016 on the website of Turkey's Council of Higher Education.

3.3. Limitations of Research

The fact that data used in this research was gathered with snowball recruitment technique, which does not select units for inclusion in the sample, is impossible to determine the possible sampling error and make statistical inferences from the sample to the population because all the universities carrying out journalism studies were taken into consideration at the same level within the findings.

3.4. Method and Data Gathering Technique

A questionnaire consisting of 47 questions was designed in order to put forward the views and expectations of Journalism Department educators on journalism education in Web 2.0. The questionnaire to be understood by the respondents was prepared by using the research made on the subject all around the world. Opinions and requests of the respondents were questioned about journalism education in Web 2.0 with a scale consisting of questions prepared in 5 point Likert scale, multiple choice questions and some short-answer questions in the questionnaire.

The survey was carried out by emailing the respondents. The obtained data electronically processed using SPSS22.0 statistical program². Analysis of data, respectively; an evaluation was made in order to determine the respondents' thoughts and experience about journalism education in Web 2.0 period.

3.5. Reliability and Validity

A Cronbach's alpha value of 1.0 is considered high reliability. Whereas, the value of below 0.60 is considered as weak. Thus, the value of 0.70 is often used to determine the reliability and is considered as an acceptable reliability value (Sekaran, 2004). Within all 47 items, for the data gathered based on journalism education in Web 2.0 in Turkey, the Cronbach's alpha value is .698 to determine the reliability of the questionnaire.

² Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) is a software package used for statistical analysis.

To estimate the content validity of this study, we clearly defined the concepts by undertaking a thorough literature review and seeking expert opinion.

3.6. Findings

In this research, both qualitative and quantitative analysis were conducted. There was one level of quantitative analyses because the research focused on providing basic descriptive information about frequency and distribution of instruction in digital skills. Qualitative analysis by reviewing and organizing a set of short-answer responses according to the respondents. The responses were coded according to the level of attention and support expressed for providing digital skill instruction in a journalism department. These analyses enabled us to characterize the educator's perspectives of the quality of their digital course offerings and to describe specific instructional or institutional challenges and/or successes.

3.6.1. Characteristics and Competencies of Respondents

Some data related to socio-demographic characteristics of educators participated in the survey has been presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Findings about Socio-Demographic Features of Respondents.

	Choices	Percent (%)
Gender of Educators	Female	63,2
	Male	36,8
Age of Educators	18 - 24	NA
	24 - 34	15,8
	35 - 44	57,9
	45 - 54	10,5
	55 - 64	15,8
	65 and more	NA
Marital Status	Single	47,4
	Married	52,6

63,2 percent of respondents were female and 36,8 percent were male, as opposed to the statistics of Turkey's Council of Higher Education because male educators are a bit more than female educators: in other words, the numbers of male and female educators are 219 and 209, respectively. Rates are not totally and effectively suitable to make comparison

in terms of gender of the respondents, but it can be concluded that gender differences in academia based on journalism education are high. When descriptive statistics of age distribution were examined, it was clear that minimum 24, maximum 64 years of respondents completed the questionnaire.

Table 2. Findings about Educational Background & Present Ranks of Respondents.

	Choices	Percent (%)
Highest Earned Educational Degree	Bachelor	5,3
	Masters	5,3
	Doctorate	84,2
	Other	5,3
University Rank	Professor	26,3
	Associate Professor	21,1
	Assistant Professor	42,1
	Lecturer	NA
	Adjunct	NA
	Other	10,5

Journalism educators responding to the survey have worked totally in undergraduate institutions granting bachelor's degrees. Off all respondents, 100 percent have been full-time educators and none of them has continued to work as a professional journalism. Mostly they got their bachelor degree in Journalism, Communication Sciences, or Informatics: however, some got in other social sciences departments like Public Administration, Foreign Languages Teaching, Sociology, Economics, or Tourism Management. When compared to their Bachelor Degree, their Masters and Doctorate were based on Media Studies in different angles.

Table 3. Findings about Field Experience of Respondents.

	Never	0 – 3 Years	4 – 6 Years	7 – 10 Years	11 Years +
Experience in Journalism Teaching	NA	21,1	15,8	15,8	47,4
Experience in Journalism Practicing	57,9	26,3	10,5	NA	5,3

The years when the respondents have experienced in teaching and/or as a professional were seen in Table 3. Off all respondents (n=123), 4 were opted out because non-experience in journalism teaching is not applicable in this survey even if the other way around is found suitable.

As a result of the questions related to the digital tools and activities that are part of the educators' regular work, 89,5 percent of respondents have used Internet Search Engines for any reason. The rest 10,5 percent have focused on just searching their hard drive. 84,2 percent of respondents totally and/or just agreed on their own confidence in teaching how to apply digital skills to journalistic practices, the rest was not sure about it. As a proof of diversity and prevalence of the respondents' ideas and experiences, 36,8 percent of the respondents were from Marmara Region, 15,8 percent from Aegean Region, 10,5 percent from Black Sea Region, 5,3 percent from Mediterranean Region, 26,3 percent from Central Anatolia Region, 5,3 percent from Eastern Anatolia Region. No respondents from Southeastern Anatolia Region.

3.6.2. Features and Competencies of Institutions

Some data related to features and competencies of the institutions which respondents have been working for has been presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Features and Competencies of Institutions.

	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)
The Overall Quality of Technological Infrastructure in the Academic Unit	NA	21,1	26,4	36,8	15,7
The Level of Financial Support in the Academic Unit for Improving Digital Instruction	5,3	26,4	21,1	21,5	15,7
The Students Having Enough Knowledge to Use Digital Platforms in the Courses	15,7	21,1	15,7	26,4	10,5
The Level of Students' Learning Being Suitable to Make Use of Digital Platforms	NA	21,1	31,6	36,8	10,5

(1- Totally Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Not Sure, 4- Agree, 5- Totally Agree)

3.6.3. Views, Applications and Experiences on Educational Practices

There are many ways to teach journalism and its practices, and the success or failure of the students to understand the way how to carry out journalistic practices will depend on the teaching method used. The methods titled as “Reasoning” to teach different skills have been proven to be easy for the student to grasp, and easy for every social sciences educator to implement. As many educators know, learning various fractions can be difficult for the students in social sciences departments. Because of this reason, we asked respondents’ views, experiences and applications on educational practices. Almost all the respondents agreed on teaching journalistic and/or digital skills with reasoning because the production including content, technological infrastructure, reporting, etc. consists of several angels from the field.

When seen (Table 5) the respondents’ students numbers in the last semester to teach, it can be proposed that they somehow attract the crowd with what they have done and achieved. The question, we thought, would cover anything from attending any workshops and/or any professional development program in the last 12 months. Of all the respondents, 68,4 percent indicated they had attended such educational activities. Yet barely 31,6 percent of all the respondents were negative on this issue, somewhat discouraging and even threatening to journalism in a rapidly changing information environment.

Table 5. Numbers of Students in the Department.

	0 – 25	26 – 75	76 – 100	101 – 150	151+
Students Taught by the Respondents	10,5	10,5	26,3	15,8	36,8

Off all the respondents, 57,9 percent approved that their academic unit requires that faculty members make their syllabi and course calendars available online. In addition to this, 31,6 percent have not had a requirement to do this, and 10,5 percent have had no idea on making the syllabi and course calendar online. When compared to the students’ numbers in the departments, reaching at the highly-numbered students offline seems hard and there is no space to make the students use of digital tools even for some general information regarding their courses.

As seen in Table 6 given below, mostly respondents daily and weekly use digital tools for any reason: however, the samples given to be able to be used in the courses are mostly used occasionally even if the given samples could be applicable and adaptive for any topic related to the department.

Table 6. Digital Tools Usage in the Courses.

	1	2	3	4	5
How often did or do you use digital skills and methods in your past or current work as a journalist?	5,3	5,3	15,7	26,4	47,3
How often do you make use of digital tools such as word processing techniques, spreadsheets, databases, GIS or blogs into the course(s) you teach?	15,7	21,1	21,1	10,5	31,6

(1 - Never, 2 - Occasionally, 3 – Every Month, 4 – Every Week, 5 - Everyday)

In Tables 7, 8 and 9, it is shown that teaching methods by using digital tools, how often educators use online resources during their teaching hours, and how often they use digital tools. The distribution and connection between those items seem to be used mainly for production. The reluctance to teach such deeper skills seems very little. Many showed strong proficiency to do so, but they do not engage their students by using their knowledge of computer applications even if they did give their students fairly high ratings regarding their computer and digital knowledge.

Table 7. Teaching Methods by Using Digital Tools.

	1	2	3	4	5
Students taught how to do research on the Internet...	5,3	21,1	15,8	31,5	26,3
Student work submitted as digital file(s)...	10,6	15,8	15,8	31,5	26,3
Teacher feedback provided as digital file(s)...	5,3	15,8	10,6	26,3	42
Student works stored as digital files...	10,6	10,6	NA	47,3	31,5
Educators use different digital tools and platforms...	5,3	5,3	15,8	31,6	42

(1 - Never, 2 - Occasionally, 3 – Every Month, 4 – Every Week, 5 – Everyday)

Table 8. How Often They Make Use of Online Resources.

	1	2	3	4	5
Online course programs	21,1	15,8	5,3	36,8	21
Blogs	26,3	26,3	10,6	15,8	21
Newsgroups	21,1	26,3	5,3	15,8	31,5
Listservice	26,3	26,3	15,8	15,8	15,8
Web-based reporting resources	5,3	10,5	NA	42,1	42,1
E-mail group for students and faculty	NA	31,6	15,8	26,3	26,3

(1 - Never, 2 - Occasionally, 3 – Every Month, 4 – Every Week, 5 – Everyday)

We compared the percentages of educators reporting that their programs offered quantitative courses, such as including some use of spreadsheets and databases, compared to the journalistic courses focused on digital news production. As seen in the tables, journalism students have notably weaker opportunities to develop their digital production skills than they do their traditional skills in most journalism programs.

Table 9. How Often They Use Digital Resources.

	1	2	3	4	5
A computer lab	52,6	21,1	10,5	15,8	NA
PDA or handheld computers	5,3	NA	5,3	15,8	73,6
Graphics or image-editing programs	NA	10,6	26,4	31,5	31,5
Publications or page design software	15,8	31,5	5,3	26,4	21
Database and spreadsheet software	15,8	36,8	NA	21,1	26,3

(1 - Never, 2 - Occasionally, 3 – Every Month, 4 – Every Week, 5 – Everyday)

While this survey did not generate any statistical evidence about why journalism educators apparently employ a limited set of digital tools, perhaps future researchers can find a connection between those limitations and the failure of journalism departments to invest in their own ongoing development.

According to educators' comments on their achievement, outstanding features and limitations inside the institution, many said that they did achieve to use digital tools in the department, and also to generate some tools with their students. Some claimed that

educators in the department do not want to be engaged with the technology not just used for journalistic practices, but also their institutions' requirements. Basically, the failure of technological infrastructure keeps them away from their intention to make use of digital platforms in the classrooms. Some comments are totally opposite because they are totally engaged with the technological developments to implement into their courses within any angle. In addition to this, they are positive to directly use digital tools and platforms in the classrooms, even one or two applications, even if their students do not show any success.

Table 10. Types of Courses Engaging Students to Use Digital.

	Percentage Educators Reporting
Taking elective courses outside our academic unit	15,8
Taking elective courses inside our academic unit	47,4
Taking required courses outside our academic unit	NA
Taking required courses inside our academic unit	26,3
Not sure	5,3
Other	5,3

Educators acknowledge it is difficult for journalism students to be exposed to use digital tools because the courses provided by the institution are highly elective, but they report students have more access to using digital tools for any reason required digital use in journalistic practices. Despite the opportunity for the students to take courses outside the department, educators prefer stronger focus on “inside or outside elective” system. The students in Journalism departments usually learn digital skills primarily in quick-hit classes rather than via an integrated curricular approach.

Conclusion and Discussion

From the very beginning of this survey, the question “how and whether journalism educators implement their knowledge on Web 2.0 to their whole works?” was definitely discussed and spent efforts to find an appropriate solution to be adaptive to the new situations we have experienced for years. This discussion has different parties such as

faculty members, professionals, students and the sector. This research has been designed to bring out the thoughts and experience of the educators, one of the main actors in journalism education, in the department of journalism in Turkey on journalism education in Web 2.0.

According to the results of the research, respondents demand more digital-based classrooms and courses, supports especially for practice-oriented courses, have a strong and conscious desire on the part of profession. Even when they explain their limitations and successes, it can be concluded that the respondents have tried to develop to organize digital skills in their own journalism departments. According to Terkan and Balcı (2007), the tendencies are closely related to the students' concerns about employment after graduation. It is clear that developments after 1980 have strengthened these concerns in the media sector in Turkey. As a reality of Turkey, media industry not only creates enough employment, but acts highly selective for the need of the few elements.

This research indicated that journalism departments in Turkey offer fewer departmental opportunities and providing courses or applications for digital skills education. This finding offers some support for the view that there is a cultural resistance among educators toward formalizing any course requirements for digital skills training as it was mentioned by the respondents in the question about their limitations and successes. It was seen ample qualitative evidence about this resistive mind-set: some concerns about making properly trained and ambitious faculty.

The interpretation of the whole data shown in the sections of this article indicates that journalism educators are somehow involved – and probably quite good – at teaching students how to make use of digital tools, online platforms, etc. for their journalistic practices, but teaching someone only how to make use of it does not mean the students have anything to say of import or value.

Journalism departments are not aggressively using digital technologies to communicate with their aspiring or current students about basic matters: graduation requirements, course syllabi, department calendars. They do not show any tendency to carry out the same good job of requiring, teaching or integrating digital skills with other traditional skills. In short, journalism educators are themselves not fully engaged in addressing the

changes in content and methods inherent in the Digital Revolution, so-called Web 2.0 period.

References

Abadan, U.N., (1972). *Batı Avrupa ve Türkiye’de Basın Yayın Öğretimi*, Ankara: Sevinç Publishing.

Alemdar, K. ve Erdoğan, İ., (1998). “İletişim”, *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkiye’de Bilim: Sosyal Bilimler II*, Ankara: TÜBA.

Altun, A., (1999). *Türkiye’de Gazetecilik Eğitimi. Medya Gücü ve Demokratik Kurumlar*, Korkmaz Alemdar (Ed.), İstanbul: Alfa Publishing.

Arık, M.B. & Bayram, F., (2011). “İletişim Eğitimi ve İletişim Akademisyenleri: Verilerin Işığında Genel Bir Değerlendirme”, *Akdeniz Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15.

Buckingham, D., (2007). *Media Education: Literacy, Learning and Contemporary Culture* (Reprinted. ed.), Cambridge: Polity Press.

DiNucci, D., (1999). "Fragmented Future", *Print*, 53 (4).

İnuğur, M. N., (1988). *Türk Basınında “İz” Birakanlar*, İstanbul: Der Publishing.

Mutlu, E., (2005). *Globalleşme, Popüler Kültür ve Medya*. D. Beybin Kejanlıoğlu & Aytaç Yıldız (Yay. Haz.), Ankara: Ütopya Publishing.

Sekaran, U., (2004). *Research Methods for Business*, (3rd. ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Terkan, B. & Balcı, Ş., (2007). “Gazetecilik Eğitiminin Aktörlerinden Biri Olan Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Gazetecilik Eğitimine İlişkin Düşünce ve Beklentileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma”, M. Bilal Arık & Mustafa Şeker (Eds.), *Bir Sorun Olarak Gazetecilik*, Konya: Tablet Publishing.