



Determining media use competencies in media literacy curriculum design for the digital society: A modified 2-Wave Delphi method

* Sabariah Mohamed Salleh
sabariah@ukm.edu.my
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

Rosya Izyanie Shamshudeen
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Wan Anita Wan Abas
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Ezhar Tamam
Universiti Putra Malaysia

ABSTRACT

Media literacy is vital for the proper functioning and well-being of individuals in a democratic society. However, an equally important consideration which has not been adequately addressed is ensuring that the media literacy course syllabus in schools and universities are relevant to the needs and challenges of the contemporary society. A modified two-wave Delphi study was carried out to gauge the opinions of stakeholders pertaining to the important aspects of media-related knowledge that young people in a digital society should be well-versed in. A total of 75 and 44 respondents participated in the 1st wave and 2nd wave respectively, representing different relevant stakeholders in the media industry and education sector. The study employed one-on-one and face-to-face interviews, using structured questionnaires. Findings of the study suggest that, from a Malaysian sociocultural perspective, media competence comprises not only understanding about media behaviour (media communication function, biasness, representation, influence, and credibility) but also encompasses moral and legal obligations in media use. In addition, understanding the normative dimension of responsible and accountable media culture is the path towards empowering and emancipating young people in using and experiencing the media for a positive self and societal development.

Keywords: *media literacy, media competency, Delphi study, curriculum design, digital society*

INTRODUCTION

It is widely recognised that media literacy is imperative in an increasingly dynamic mediated and digitalised society. Though there are several perspectives in defining media literacy, a commonly accepted definition is the ability to critically and responsibly access, analyse, evaluate and create mediated communication (Livingstone, 2008; Martens, 2010; O'Neill, 2010). According to Toepfl (2014), the current heavily mediated and digitalised society needs to be more competent in using the media. This can be done by equipping the digital age citizens with a wider range of skills and knowledge pertaining to media literacy to cope with the changing needs (Stehr, 1994; Adolf & Stehr, 2008).

Taking the premise that media literacy is vital for the proper functioning and well-being of individuals in a democratic society (Mihailidis & Thevenin, 2013), educating citizens to be media literate has become an important capacity building agenda across the globe. Malaysia is of no exception. Currently, Malaysia is participating in an Erasmus+ capacity building project entitled “International Media Studies: Media Literacy as Media Competence Program for Social Change,” funded by the European Union. One of the planned outcomes of the project is the development of e-learning materials on media literacy for young people.

An important consideration taken in developing the e-learning materials is to design a syllabus which is relevant to the needs and challenges of the contemporary society (Moore, 2016; Andharini Dwi, Ari Basuki, Eka Mala Sari, & Kustivahningsih, 2015) and ensuring that it is situated within the country's sociocultural context. Understanding the media within the sociocultural context is believed to be important because, as pointed out by Lewis and Jhally (1998, p.112), “The media is determined by a set of social and economic conditions that involve the key dividing lines of our culture, whether they be race, class, gender, sexuality, age, or mobility.”

Studying media literacy in the interest of developing curricular on media literacy course can be approached from a number of theoretical perspectives (Hobbs, 2011; Real, 1996). One such theoretical perspective is media culture. This theoretical approach is appropriate given the centrality of the media in contemporary culture and how it permeates everyday life. The perspective focuses on how the media culture comes to be and subsequently, shapes the way people communicate and how people are situated within the societal discourse. Within this theoretical perspective, there are three dimensions to media culture, namely phenomenon, epistemic, and norms and values.

At the phenomenon level of media culture, understanding about the media system provides insights into the particularities of a nation's media. At the epistemic level, the guiding question is how media contributes to the creation of social reality. Understanding on the epistemic facet of media literacy provides insights into ways and mechanisms utilised by the media in the construction of social reality/realities (Fong Yang Lai & Md. Sidin, 2015), and how it impacts not only upon individuals but on the society as a whole (Adolf, 2006).

At the norms and values level, there is the question about how and why cultural dispositions orient the process and outcome of mediated communication. Understanding of the norms and values provides insights into meaning of things and ideas in environment and society, and the normative setting in which communication practices occur. In other words, media culture cannot be studied without explicating the aesthetic, ethical and political implications of mediated communication (Wallner, Alpen, Adolf & Zita, 2017).

Within the context of Malaysia's sociocultural and political setting, this study addresses the following research question: What aspects of the media system and media culture are vital for the enhancement of media literacy among the young, particularly those in tertiary education? Accordingly, the objective is to determine the types of media-related knowledge

that stakeholders in the media industry and education sector consider as important for inclusion in entry-level media literacy online courses in institutions of higher learning.

METHODOLOGY

The Delphi technique or Delphi method is a method in which researchers seek informed judgement from experts (Sommerville, 2008). They will judge, rank and weigh certain problems individually (Cuhls, 2005; Dalkey & Helmer, 1963; Linstone & Turoff, 2002; Sommerville, 2008). As Sommerville (2008, p.9) states, “(...) they have the opportunity to consider the opinions of others, reconsider their own opinions, and assess the relative importance of each opinion presented.”

For the purpose of this research, a 2-wave Delphi Study, which utilises the face-to-face and one-to-one interview approach, was conducted. The method was chosen because of its capability to facilitate an in-depth examination (Maxey & Kezar, 2016) of the potential areas and subject matter which can be included in an entry-level media literacy curriculum.

The study, which involved several phases such as questionnaire development, preliminary and pre-testing phase, 1st wave Delphi, and 2nd wave Delphi, was conducted between March 2016 and February 2017.

Sampling

A total of 75 respondents participated in the 1st wave of the Delphi study, representing different relevant stakeholders : (1) academics from institutions of higher learning, (2) media practitioners in news/media organisations, (3) media practitioners in government agencies, (4) social activists from non-government agencies, (5) media practitioners or opinion leaders in professional associations, (6) media-related practitioners from telecommunication/ advertising/ production companies, and (7) others which included politicians, motivational speakers, and business people.

Table 1. Stakeholders Interviewed

Stakeholder	1st wave	%	2nd wave	%
Educator	16	21.3	5	11.4
News/Media organisation	14	18.7	12	27.3
Government agency	8	10.7	8	18.2
Politician	3	4	4	9.1
NGO	14	18.7	4	9.1
Professional association	10	13.3	6	13.6
Students	-	-	5	11.4
Others (e.g. motivational speakers, business people)	10	13.3	-	-
Total	N1=75	100	N2=44	100

As for the 2nd wave, a total of 44 individuals were interviewed, of whom 35 were stakeholders who had been interviewed in the 1st wave. In addition, nine new respondents were also interviewed. These included four who were selected to replace original respondents who couldn't be interviewed again and five first-time respondents representing a newly established category — students. The substitutes were comparable representatives of the intended stakeholders; they were of the same intended category, from the same organisation and of the same level. Of the five students interviewed, three were final year students who

were student leaders and two were graduate students. There were more male (68%) than female (32%) respondents. The age of the respondents ranged from 22 to 68 years old with a mean of 47 years, thus they were all able respondents who could provide the required data.

Validation Process

In the preliminary study, an analysis was carried out by arbiters prior to the pretest of the questionnaire for the 1st wave Delphi. The aim was to determine the clarity and face validity of the questionnaire items/questions by facets and dimensions of media literacy constructed specifically for the study. Four academics (one professor, one associate professor, and one senior lecturer) were involved as arbiters.

Researchers went through each item and requested the arbiters to evaluate and make comments on those items with regard to the appropriateness of the items/questions by facets and dimensions of media literacy as conceptualised in the study. The arbiters rated the items as appropriate, appropriate but need modification, or inappropriate for research purpose, and wrote comments where applicable. Based on the arbiters' comments and suggestions, changes were made on the items rated as "appropriate but need modification".

Next, the questionnaire for the 1st wave was pretested prior to actual data collection. The pretest was done from May 27 to June 3, 2016 which involved 21 respondents. A minor modification was made to the questionnaire based on outcomes of the pretest. The modifications made included (1) providing definitions to certain words (e.g. empowering, social change), (2) rephrasing one open-ended question, and (3) deleting certain word(s) in some of the closed-ended questions to avoid double-barrelled questions. No question was dropped from the questionnaire.

The 1st Wave

The questionnaire for the 1st wave had 50 questions grouped into three sections. In the first section, respondents were asked 10 open-ended questions to seek their opinion on media's role in bringing about social change and in empowering people, media culture, and aspects of media use that constrained or limited participation in social change.

In the second section, the respondents were asked to rate on a 6-point response scale the importance of knowledge items considered relevant for media literacy education at the university level. A 6-point Likert scale was selected because it is found to be reliable and reduces the risk that deviates one's personal decision-making (Chomeya, 2010). In addition, Cadorin, Bagnasco, Tolotti, Pagnucci, & Sasso (2017) asserted that the 6-point response scale can help researchers obtain a clear measure of the degree of agreement or disagreement. There were a total of 38 items in this section. The response options ranged from (1) not important at all, (2) not important, (3) somewhat not important, (4) somewhat important, (5) important, to (6) very important for media literacy education. Lastly, the third section contained 4 demographic questions.

The duration of the face-to-face interviews varied between 40 to 70 minutes. In general, the respondents took between 25 to 50 minutes to respond to the open-ended questions and 15-20 minutes for closed-ended questions. The respondents were first briefed on the purpose and significance of the study as well as the definition of media literacy as understood in the study. Responses to the closed-ended questions, formatted in a Likert-type item, were subjected to a factor analysis, resulting in four clusters of knowledge items, representing different facets/dimensions of media literacy. In the quantitative analysis of the 1st wave data, each item in the cluster was ranked in terms of degree of importance based on the item's mean score. In the qualitative analysis, the data were analysed for emerging concepts/themes deemed relevant and significant for inclusion in media literacy education.

The findings of the 1st wave provided the basis and framework in formulating items/questions and designing the questionnaire for the 2nd round of the Delphi Study.

The 1st wave data were gathered over a period of six weeks, from the fourth week of July to the first week of September 2016.

The 2nd wave: Modified Delphi

The purpose of the 2nd wave of the Delphi study was to validate the findings from the 1st wave. It was carried out from the first week of December 2016 to the first week of January 2017.

As in the 1st wave, the questionnaire for the 2nd wave was administered in face-to-face interviews. However, taking a pragmatic approach, the structure of the closed-ended Likert-type items were not the same as those in the 1st wave. This is based on the assumption that asking the same respondents with the same questions in the same structure would not work well in the Malaysian culture. Accordingly, the structure was modified and the questions were reworded without losing the meaning and intention, thus making this a modified Delphi method. Table 2 summarises the changes in the questionnaire from the 1st wave to the 2nd wave.

Table 2. Changes in the questionnaire from the 1st wave to the 2nd wave

Changes in terms of ...	1 st Wave	2 nd Wave
Structure	Closed- and open-ended	Primarily closed-ended & a few open-ended on changes in ranking of items
Number of questions	11 open-ended & 39 closed-ended on 6-point response option; 4 demographic questions	55 closed-ended (22 items on ranking and 30 on rating of importance on 6-point response option); 4 open-ended for changes in rank order of the items; 4 demographic questions
Questions deleted/added	A total of 50 questions	Deleted 17 questions from the 1 st wave & added 30 questions based on responses to open-ended questions.
Ordering of the questionnaire	Likert-type items in random order	For each facet of media literacy, questions were ordered by ranking on; questions on rating of importance of concepts/ themes relevant to media literacy were ordered randomly

To ensure that the questionnaire would work well in the actual data collection, the questionnaire was pretested with two respondents who participated in the pretest phase of the 1st wave. The respondents had no problem with the questionnaire both in how the questions were structured and in responding to the questions.

The 2nd wave questionnaire contained a total of 46 questions grouped into three sections. The first section were questions that ranked media-related knowledge items. The second section looked at the importance rating of a set of concepts/themes associated with the media system and culture. It is important to note that all concepts/ themes were derived from responses to the open-ended questions in the 1st wave. The last section concentrated on demographic questions.

There were four clusters of closed-ended knowledge items in the first section. All the items were ranked in descending order which was formulated based on the findings from the first wave. The first cluster consisted of seven items belonging to the epistemic facet related to the media role and reception dimension. The second cluster consisted of five epistemic facet items related to media reality and trustworthiness. The third cluster was the normative understanding facet (market structure, media regulations and cultural values dimension), while the last cluster, consisting of three items, was the normative understanding facet items (communication values dimension). For each cluster, respondents were asked to rank the order of importance of the items.

In the second section, on a 6-point scale, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which the 34 concepts and themes identified in the 1st wave are important for inclusion in a media literacy education.

In the interviews, the respondents were also informed or reminded of the definition of media literacy as used in the 1st wave. In most instances, interviewers went through the questions together with the respondents. The interviewer read the instruction, and then let the respondents respond to the items or questions. They were encouraged to seek clarification if they had any questions or encountered difficulties in responding to the questions. The duration of interviews varied between 35 to 60 minutes. Most of the interviews took place at the respondent's workplace.

RESULTS

The media-related knowledge items within each facet/dimension of media literacy were prioritised in order of importance based on the item mean. Similarly, the concepts/themes were also prioritised in order of importance based on the item mean. Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations of items ranking of the epistemic facet of media literacy (dimension: media role and reception).

Ranking of the items in the 2nd wave did not differ much from the ranking found in the 1st wave. The top four items remained the same. The item "How to think critically about media biasness, manipulation and propaganda for evaluating media content" ($M= 1.53$) topped the list across all categories of stakeholder. The item "Why and how media producers can manipulate content to create and present reality" ($M= 2.64$) was ranked second; the item "Why and how people are influenced by the media in order to evaluate how media affect individuals and society" ($M= 3.16$) was third, and the item "Role of news framing in shaping public opinion" ($M= 3.64$) was fourth in importance.

Table 4 presents the means and standard deviations of items ranking, also on epistemic facet but of another dimension (media reality and trustworthiness). The ranking of the items in the 2nd wave is similar to that of the 1st wave except for the first two. For the overall sample, the item "Understand the different types of information in the media in order to differentiate what are news, opinion, arguments, propaganda, and fiction" was ranked top ($M= 1.75$) in the 2nd wave but second in the 1st wave. This was the view of respondents from government agencies, political bodies, NGOs and professional associations. The item "How to identify a reliable website to access information that is well-sourced," on the other hand, was ranked second ($M= 1.79$) in the 2nd wave but first in the 1st wave. The order of ranking for the rest of the items remained the same. Interestingly, the order in items ranking for the student categories is similar to that of the overall sample in the 1st wave.

Table 5 presents the means and standard deviations of items ranking on normative understanding facet (dimension: market structure, regulation, and cultural values) of media literacy. The order in the ranking of the 2nd wave for the overall sample is similar to that of

the 1st wave for all the items. However, analysis by stakeholder category showed a little variation. For the educator and politician categories, the item “Media laws and regulations to create media content” was rated the most important ($M= 2.20$; $M= 2.50$, respectively). Educators ranked the item “Communication ethics is important in order to create mutual respect and responsible media use” second ($M= 2.80$); but politicians ranked this item third ($M= 3.00$). Nevertheless, based on the overall sample, the item “Communication ethics is important in order to create mutual respect and responsible media use” was rated the most important ($M= 1.75$). The item “Malaysian cultural values are important in order to analyse, create and disseminate culturally sensitive media content,” was ranked second. Third rank was “Media laws and regulations to create media content” ($M= 2.86$). The order of ranking for these four items is similar to that of the 1st wave.

The items shown in Table 6 are also on the normative understanding facet of media literacy but of a different dimension which is communication values. The findings are straightforward. Almost all the categories of stakeholder ranked the item “Communication as human rights (e.g., concept of freedom of information and free speech) in order for one to voice opinion and argument responsibly” first ($M= 1.05$); this is followed by the item “Communicator's rights and responsibility in order to create a responsible media content,” ($M= 1.98$), and the item “How media entertainment presents reality in order to evaluate media content” ($M= 2.89$). The order of ranking of the three items is similar to that found in the 1st wave.

Table 3. Means¹ and SDs of ranking of epistemic facet items of media literacy education (dimension: media role and reception)

Dimension: Media role and reception	1 st wave	2 nd wave							
	Rank	All (n= 44)	E (n= 5)	GA (n= 8)	NA (n= 12)	P (n= 4)	NGO (n= 4)	PA (n= 6)	S (n= 5)
How to think critically about media biasness, manipulation and propaganda for evaluating media content	[1]	1.53 <i>1.190</i> [1]	1.40 <i>.894</i> [1]	1.63 <i>1.187</i> [1]	1.67 <i>1.614</i> [1]	1.25 <i>.500</i> [1]	1.00 <i>.000</i> [1]	1.17 <i>.408</i> [1]	2.20 <i>1.788</i> [1]
Why and how media producers can manipulate content to create and present reality	[2]	2.64 <i>.865</i> [2]	2.60 <i>.894</i> [2]	3.00 <i>1.195</i> [2]	2.75 <i>.965</i> [2]	2.75 <i>.957</i> [3]	2.50 <i>.577</i> [2]	2.17 <i>.408</i> [2]	2.40 <i>.547</i> [2]
Why and how people are influenced by the media in order to evaluate how media affects individuals and society.	[3]	3.16 <i>1.274</i> [3]	3.00 <i>1.412</i> [3]	3.38 <i>1.407</i> [3]	3.17 <i>1.414</i> [3]	3.75 <i>.957</i> [4]	2.50 <i>.577</i> [2]	3.17 <i>.408</i> [3]	3.00 <i>1.870</i> [3]
Role of news framing (i.e., news media promote particular definitions, interpretations, evaluations. and recommendations) in shaping public opinion.	[4]	3.64 <i>1.221</i> [4]	3.80 <i>1.095</i> [4]	3.86 <i>1.553</i> [4]	3.42 <i>1.505</i> [4]	2.50 <i>1.291</i> [2]	4.00 <i>.000</i> [4]	5.67 <i>1.032</i> [6]	3.60 <i>.894</i> [4]
How and why people see the same news story but get different information from it.	[5]	5.02 <i>1.130</i> [6]	5.60 <i>.894</i> [6]	4.75 <i>.707</i> [6]	4.75 <i>1.215</i> [5]	6.25 <i>.957</i> [7]	5.00 <i>.000</i> [5]	4.50 <i>1.761</i> [4]	5.20 <i>.837</i> [6]
Role of media in agenda setting (i.e., what the public thinks about is set by the media).	[6]	4.77 <i>1.492</i> [5]	4.40 <i>1.516</i> [5]	3.88 <i>1.959</i> [5]	4.83 <i>1.267</i> [6]	5.25 <i>1.259</i> [5]	6.00 <i>.817</i> [6]	5.17 <i>.408</i> [5]	4.60 <i>2.191</i> [5]
How and why about people select media content in order to evaluate motives for media use.	[7]	5.55 <i>1.021</i> [7]	6.00 <i>1.000</i> [7]	5.00 <i>1.414</i> [7]	5.42 <i>.900</i> [7]	5.50 <i>.577</i> [6]	6.25 <i>.957</i> [7]	5.67 <i>1.032</i> [6]	5.60 <i>.894</i> [7]

Note:

¹ Items on a 6-point scale: (1) not important at all, (2) not important, (3) somewhat not important, (4) somewhat important, (5) important or (6) very important.

Figures in italic are standard deviations; Figures in [bracket] refer to rank in descending order of importance.

E= Educator; GA= Government agency; NA= News/media agency; P= Politician; NGO= Non-governmental organisation; PA= Professional association; S= Student

Table 4. Means¹ and SDs of ranking of epistemic facet item of media literacy education (media reality and trustworthiness)

Dimension: Media reality and trustworthiness	1 st wave	2 nd wave							
	Rank	All (n= 44)	E (n= 5)	GA (n= 8)	NA (n= 12)	P (n= 4)	NGO (n= 4)	PA (n= 6)	S (n= 5)
How to identify a reliable website to access information that is well-sourced.	[1]	1.79 <i>1.230</i> [2]	1.60 <i>.894</i> [1]	2.00 <i>1.309</i> [2]	1.67 <i>1.303</i> [1]	2.75 <i>2.061</i> [2]	2.00 <i>1.154</i> [2]	1.67 <i>1.211</i> [1]	1.20 <i>.447</i> [1]
The different types of information in the media in order to differentiate what are news, opinion, arguments, propaganda, and fiction.	[2]	1.75 <i>.576</i> [1]	1.80 <i>.836</i> [2]	1.63 <i>.744</i> [1]	1.91 <i>.520</i> [2]	1.50 <i>.577</i> [1]	1.75 <i>.500</i> [1]	1.67 <i>.516</i> [1]	1.80 <i>.447</i> [2]
Online opportunities and risks in using new media.	[3]	2.57 <i>1.169</i> [3]	3.20 <i>1.643</i> [3]	2.50 <i>1.195</i> [3]	2.50 <i>1.243</i> [3]	3.25 <i>.957</i> [3]	2.00 <i>.817</i> [2]	2.50 <i>1.224</i> [3]	2.20 <i>.836</i> [3]
Why and how news gets selected and reported to evaluate newsworthiness.	[4]	3.20 <i>.764</i> [4]	3.20 <i>.836</i> [3]	2.88 <i>.991</i> [4]	3.33 <i>.493</i> [4]	3.50 <i>1.290</i> [4]	3.75 <i>.500</i> [4]	2.83 <i>.408</i> [4]	3.20 <i>.837</i> [4]
Roles and functions of media professionals to evaluate what gets published or broadcasted on news media.	[5]	4.09 <i>.603</i> [5]	3.80 <i>.447</i> [5]	4.00 <i>.534</i> [5]	4.25 <i>.543</i> [5]	4.00 <i>1.154</i> [5]	4.75 <i>.500</i> [5]	3.83 <i>.408</i> [5]	4.00 <i>.707</i> [5]

Note:

¹ Items on a 6-point scale: (1) not important at all, (2) not important, (3) somewhat not important, (4) somewhat important, (5) important or (6) very important.

Figures in italic are standard deviations;

Figures in [bracket] refer to rank in descending order of importance.

E= Educator; GA= Government agency; NA= News/media agency; P= Politician; NGO= Non-governmental organisation; PA= Professional association; S= Student

Table 5. Means¹ and SDs of ranking of normative understanding facet items of media literacy (market structure, regulation, and cultural values)

Dimension: Market structure, media regulations and cultural values	1 st wave	2 nd wave							
	Rank	All (n= 44)	E (n= 5)	GA (n= 8)	NA (n= 12)	P (n= 4)	NGO (n= 4)	PA (n= 6)	S (n= 5)
Communication ethics is important in order to create mutual respect and responsible media use.	[1]	1.75 <i>1.314</i> [1]	2.80 <i>1.788</i> [2]	1.87 <i>1.726</i> [1]	1.17 <i>.577</i> [1]	3.00 <i>2.160</i> [3]	1.00 <i>.000</i> [1]	1.50 <i>.547</i> [1]	1.80 <i>.836</i> [1]
Malaysian cultural values are important in order to analyse, create and disseminate culturally sensitive media content.	[2]	2.38 <i>1.401</i> [2]	3.20 <i>2.387</i> [3]	2.13 <i>1.246</i> [2]	2.42 <i>.792</i> [2]	2.75 <i>2.872</i> [2]	2.25 <i>.500</i> [2]	2.17 <i>1.169</i> [2]	2.00 <i>1.225</i> [2]
Media laws and regulations to create media content.	[3]	2.86 <i>.851</i> [3]	2.20 <i>.836</i> [1]	2.75 <i>.886</i> [3]	3.17 <i>.792</i> [3]	2.50 <i>.577</i> [1]	3.50 <i>.577</i> [4]	2.83 <i>.983</i> [3]	2.80 <i>1.095</i> [3]
Media ethics to create culturally sensitive media content (respect, cultural and religious sensitivity).	[4]	3.57 <i>1.043</i> [4]	4.00 <i>1.224</i> [5]	3.50 <i>1.195</i> [4]	3.25 <i>.965</i> [4]	4.25 <i>.500</i> [5]	3.25 <i>.957</i> [3]	4.17 <i>.983</i> [4]	3.00 <i>1.000</i> [4]
Media laws and regulations in order to analyse media contents.	[5]	4.66 <i>1.119</i> [5]	3.80 <i>1.789</i> [4]	4.63 <i>.517</i> [6]	5.08 <i>.900</i> [5]	4.00 <i>1.155</i> [4]	5.25 <i>.500</i> [5]	5.00 <i>.000</i> [5]	4.20 <i>1.923</i> [6]
Media laws and regulations in order to determine what is appropriate to publish/broadcast.	[6]	4.79 <i>1.132</i> [6]	4.60 <i>1.140</i> [7]	4.62 <i>.916</i> [5]	5.17 <i>1.193</i> [6]	4.50 <i>1.290</i> [6]	5.25 <i>.500</i> [5]	5.17 <i>.408</i> [6]	3.80 <i>1.789</i> [5]
Intellectual property rights in order to ethically use and create media content.	[7]	5.41 <i>1.647</i> [7]	4.40 <i>2.701</i> [6]	5.37 <i>1.505</i> [7]	5.83 <i>.717</i> [7]	4.75 <i>2.629</i> [7]	6.50 <i>.577</i> [7]	5.33 <i>1.751</i> [7]	5.20 <i>1.923</i> [7]

Note:

¹ Items on a 6-point scale: (1) not important at all, (2) not important, (3) somewhat not important, (4) somewhat important, (5) important or (6) very important.

Figures in italic are standard deviation; Figures in [bracket] refer to rank in descending order of importance.

E= Educator; GA= Government agency; NA= News/media agency; P= Politician; NGO= Non-governmental organisation; PA= Professional association; S= Student

Table 6. Means¹ and SDs of ranking of normative understanding facet items of media literacy education (dimension: communication values)

Dimension: Communication values	1 st wave	2 nd wave							
	Rank	All (n= 44)	E (n= 5)	GA (n= 8)	NA (n= 12)	P (n= 4)	NGO (n= 4)	PA (n= 6)	S (n= 5)
Communication as a human right (e.g., concept of freedom of information and free speech) in order for one to voice opinion and argument responsibly.	[1]	1.05 <i>.301</i> [1]	1.00 <i>.000</i> [1]	1.00 <i>.000</i> [1]	1.17 <i>.577</i> [1]	1.00 <i>.000</i> [1]	1.00 <i>.000</i> [1]	1.00 <i>.000</i> [1]	1.00 <i>.000</i> [1]
Communicator's rights and responsibility in order to create a responsible media content.	[2]	1.98 <i>.150</i> [2]	2.00 <i>.000</i> [2]	2.00 <i>.000</i> [2]	1.92 <i>.288</i> [2]	2.00 <i>.000</i> [2]	2.00 <i>.000</i> [2]	2.00 <i>.000</i> [2]	2.00 <i>.000</i> [2]
How media entertainment presents reality in order to evaluate media content.	[3]	2.89 <i>.442</i> [3]	3.00 <i>.000</i> [3]	3.00 <i>.000</i> [3]	2.67 <i>.778</i> [3]	3.00 <i>.000</i> [3]	3.00 <i>.000</i> [3]	2.83 <i>.408</i> [3]	3.00 <i>.000</i> [3]

Note:

¹ Items on a 6-point scale: (1) not important at all, (2) not important, (3) somewhat not important, (4) somewhat important, (5) important or (6) very important.

Figures in italic are standard deviations;

Figures in [bracket] refer to rank in descending order of importance.

E= Educator; GA= Government agency; NA= News/media agency; P= Politician; NGO= Non-governmental organisation; PA= Professional association; S= Student

Table 7 contains the summarised results of concepts/themes related to media's role in empowering society which were identified in the 1st wave and ranked according to importance in the 2nd wave, to be included in a media literacy curriculum design. Of the 19 concepts/themes, on a 6-point scale, 12 had a mean of 5.00 or above, indicating that they are important for inclusion. The top five items, in descending order, are (1) credible and trustworthy news/information; truthful and accurate information ($M= 5.73$), (2) responsible and responsive reporting; analytical and critical reporting ($M= 5.57$), (3) critical thinking, critical mind, and creative thinking ($M= 5.53$), (4) knowledge-, information- and value-based society ($M= 5.47$), and (5) informed citizenry, informed society ($M= 5.45$). Comparison across the stakeholder categories shows that for the educators, there was a consensus in the rating of importance for the first-three items—all the three items were rated very important ($M= 6.00$). For the politicians, a consensus was achieved only for the first item. For the social activists, there was consensus indicating that the second and third items are very important. For the stakeholders from professional associations, there was a consensus on the second item as very important.

Table 8 presents concepts/themes related to media use and consequences for possible inclusion in media literacy education. Of the 13 concepts/themes listed in Table 6, three have means above 5.00 and no item has a mean of 6.00 (possible maximum). The three concepts/themes are (1) reliable real-time news/ information (i.e., breaking news, and latest news.); infotainment ($M= 5.28$), (2) positive/negative social networking ($M= 5.11$), and (3) media addiction and self-isolation due to too much time spent on media/communication technology ($M= 5.11$). Items with lower means imply they are not critical for inclusion in a media literacy curriculum.

Table 7. Means¹ and SDs of importance rating of concepts/themes about media's role in empowering society for inclusion in media literacy education by stakeholders

Concept/Theme	2 nd wave							
	All (n= 44)	E (n= 5)	GA (n= 8)	NA (n= 12)	P (n= 4)	NGO (n= 4)	PA (n= 6)	S (n= 5)
Credible and trustworthy news/information; truthful and accurate information	5.73 .585	6.00 .000	5.67 .651	5.75 .707	6.00 .000	5.75 .500	5.83 .408	5.20 .836
Responsible and responsive reporting; analytical and critical reporting	5.57 .661	6.00 .000	5.63 .744	5.50 .797	5.25 .500	6.00 .000	5.50 .547	5.20 .836
Critical thinking, critical mind, and creative thinking	5.53 .821	5.80 .447	5.75 .462	5.17 1.268	5.50 .577	5.75 .500	6.00 .000	5.00 .707
Knowledge-, information- and value-based society	5.47 .792	5.40 .547	5.42 .668	5.75 .462	4.75 1.250	5.75 .500	5.67 .817	5.40 1.341
Informed citizenry, informed society	5.45 .791	6.00 .000	5.62 .744	5.08 1.164	5.75 .500	5.50 .577	5.33 .516	5.40 .547
Balanced and fair journalism	5.43 .846	5.80 .447	5.25 .707	5.08 1.240	5.75 .500	6.00 .000	5.33 .816	5.60 .540
Media responsibility and media openness	5.30 .701	6.00 .000	5.00 .756	5.50 .522	4.75 .500	5.25 .957	5.00 .894	5.40 .547
Positive citizen journalism	5.27 .727	5.40 .894	5.50 .756	5.08 .669	4.50 .577	5.75 .500	5.67 .516	5.00 .707
Empowerment of people	5.23 1.008	5.80 .447	5.37 .916	4.67 1.370	5.00 .816	6.00 .000	5.50 .547	5.00 1.00
Public interest	5.20 .481	5.60 .547	5.63 .744	4.90 .996	5.00 1.155	5.25 .957	5.16 .752	5.00 .707

Cybersecurity	5.14 <i>1.047</i>	5.40 <i>.894</i>	5.13 <i>.991</i>	5.17 <i>1.193</i>	3.50 <i>.557</i>	5.75 <i>.500</i>	5.17 <i>.983</i>	5.00 <i>.547</i>
Sources of information and information-seeking strategy	5.06 <i>8.18</i>	5.20 <i>.836</i>	5.38 <i>.744</i>	4.75 <i>.860</i>	4.75 <i>.957</i>	5.25 <i>.957</i>	5.50 <i>.547</i>	4.80 <i>.836</i>
Independent, not easily influenced by the media	4.97 <i>8.18</i>	5.40 <i>.894</i>	5.13 <i>.641</i>	4.58 <i>.900</i>	4.75 <i>.957</i>	5.50 <i>.577</i>	5.33 <i>1.032</i>	4.60 <i>1.140</i>
Social construction of reality, offline and offline reality	4.84 <i>.805</i>	4.80 <i>.836</i>	5.13 <i>.641</i>	4.83 <i>.834</i>	4.00 <i>.816</i>	5.25 <i>.957</i>	5.00 <i>.632</i>	4.60 <i>.894</i>
Media democratisation	4.72 <i>1.086</i>	5.00 <i>1.414</i>	4.75 <i>.443</i>	4.67 <i>1.435</i>	5.00 <i>.816</i>	4.75 <i>.957</i>	4.17 <i>1.329</i>	5.00 <i>.707</i>
Continuum of media role: propaganda, surveillance, control and mobilisation	4.64 <i>.891</i>	4.60 <i>.894</i>	4.38 <i>.916</i>	4.92 <i>.668</i>	5.00 <i>.816</i>	4.50 <i>.577</i>	5.17 <i>.752</i>	3.60 <i>1.140</i>
Media ownership	4.63 <i>1.295</i>	4.20 <i>2.094</i>	4.25 <i>1.581</i>	5.17 <i>.717</i>	3.75 <i>.500</i>	4.50 <i>1.000</i>	4.67 <i>1.366</i>	5.20 <i>1.094</i>
Biasness in media role	4.61 <i>1.204</i>	4.80 <i>1.308</i>	4.13 <i>1.642</i>	4.75 <i>1.055</i>	5.00 <i>.816</i>	4.50 <i>.577</i>	4.17 <i>1.471</i>	5.20 <i>1.095</i>
Regulated media/communication environment	4.43 <i>1.043</i>	4.20 <i>1.303</i>	4.63 <i>1.060</i>	4.83 <i>.834</i>	5.00 <i>.816</i>	4.25 <i>1.258</i>	4.00 <i>1.264</i>	3.60 <i>.547</i>

Note.

¹ Items on a 6-point scale: (1) not important at all, (2) not important, (3) somewhat not important, (4) somewhat important, (5) important or (6) very important.

Figures in italic are standard deviations.

E= Educator; GA= Government agency; NA= News/media agency; P= Politician; NGO= Non-governmental organisation; PA= Professional association; S= Student

Table 8. Means¹ and SDs of importance rating of concepts/themes about media use and consequences for inclusion in media literacy education by stakeholders

Concept/Theme	2 nd wave							
	All (n= 44)	E (n= 5)	GA (n= 8)	NA (n= 12)	P (n= 4)	NGO (n= 4)	PA (n= 6)	S (n= 5)
Reliable real-time news/ information (i.e., breaking news, and latest news.); infotainment	5.28 .868	5.80 .447	5.25 1.165	5.42 .792	4.75 1.258	5.25 .957	5.50 .836	5.60 .547
Positive/negative social networking	5.11 .920	5.40 .547	4.88 .991	5.17 1.267	4.50 1.000	5.75 .500	5.00 .632	5.20 .447
Media addiction and self-isolation due to too much time spent on media/communication technology	5.11 .920	5.40 .547	5.00 .756	5.42 .793	4.75 .500	5.50 1.000	4.50 1.378	5.00 1.224
Communication needs, news genre (i.e., the different type of news)	4.98 .844	4.60 1.140	5.37 .744	5.08 .792	4.0 .816	5.25 .500	5.17 .753	4.80 .836
Media gratification	4.91 .960	5.20 1.303	5.00 1.414	5.17 .717	4.50 1.000	4.75 .500	4.50 .836	4.80 .836
Instant gratification/self-serving gratification for own satisfaction	4.89 .841	4.80 1.303	5.13 .353	5.00 .738	4.00 .816	5.00 .816	5.00 1.095	4.80 .836
Derail of moral compass/social conscience in media use; civility	4.77 .886	4.60 1.140	4.63 .916	5.17 .717	3.75 .560	5.25 .957	4.67 .816	4.80 .836
Disengagement/detachment from community	4.75 .991	5.40 .894	5.00 1.069	4.75 .866	4.25 1.258	5.25 .957	4.17 1.170	4.40 .547
Ubernisation or Uberification	4.61 .945	4.20 1.483	5.00 .744	4.42 .900	4.25 .957	5.00 .816	4.83 .752	4.00 .000
Atomization	4.52 .927	4.40 .894	5.00 .535	4.25 1.288	4.50 1.000	4.75 .957	4.83 .752	4.00 .000
Personalization of media contents	4.47 .976	4.40 1.581	5.0 .926	4.75 .754	3.75 .954	4.50 1.290	4.50 .548	4.0 .707

Note. ¹ Items on a 6-point scale: (1) not important at all, (2) not important, (3) somewhat not important, (4) somewhat important, (5) important or (6) very important. Figures in italic are standard deviation.

E= Educator; GA= Government agency; NA= News/media agency; P= Politician; NGO= Non-governmental organisation; PA= Professional association; S= Student

DISCUSSION

Using a modified Delphi method, this study set out to detect aspects of the media system and culture which are pivotal in designing an entry-level online media literacy course for young people — a syllabus that is relevant to the needs and challenges of a contemporary mediated society. From the 2-wave Delphi study, media-related knowledge for inclusion in media literacy education was identified.

Understanding media role and reception is an aspect of the media system and culture which has been identified as necessary knowledge. This includes knowledge about media communication function, biasness, manipulation, representation, and influence. This aspect of knowledge is essentially related to the issue of “what media does to people” and “what people do with the media”. It also jives with the core idea of media literacy education which is to better understand how the media works, how it produces meaning, how it is organised, and how it constructs reality (Duncan, 2006).

If this media-related knowledge is prioritised in terms of importance, first being the most important, the order is as follows: (1) how to think critically about media biasness, manipulation and propaganda which is important for evaluating media content, (2) why/ how media producers can manipulate content to create and present reality, (3) why/ how people are influenced by the media in order to evaluate how the media affects individuals and society, (4) role of news framing in shaping public opinion, (5) role of media in agenda setting, (6) how/why people see the same news story but get different information from it, and (7) how/why people select media content in order to evaluate motives for media use. The finding clearly suggests one leading objective of media literacy education is to heighten the ability to critically evaluate media content (with regard to biasness, manipulation, and representation), and understand how/why people are affected by the media. Thus, knowledge that enhances the ability to critically evaluate media should be a core theme of any media literacy course.

In addition to the above necessary knowledge, we found that identifying different types of information (news, opinion, argument, propaganda, fiction), and spotting reliable and credible information sources are also important. We believe that while learning materials on what/how to evaluate source/media credibility are readily available, those on how/why to navigate information is scanty. A quick review of the learning resources available with Malaysian Communications and Multimedia Commission supports or attests to our concern. Therefore, topics on differentiating the different types of information/news and evaluating information/media source is significant and should also be the core theme of a media literacy syllabus.

Communication ethics, cultural values and media regulation are definitely important. We found that knowledge about communication ethics topped the list, followed by understanding of Malaysian cultural values, and media regulation. In fact, in the 1st wave of the Delphi study, out of the pool of knowledge items rated as important by the respondents, communication ethics topped the list. The findings of the 2nd wave endorsed the findings from the 1st wave. The significance of knowing communication ethics, cultural values and media regulation is expected, given the nature of the Malaysian society and the stringent regulation of the media system in the country (Mohamed Salleh, 2012; Tai, 1997). Culture is a part of how people communicate. It involves not only how people say something but also the tools used to send and receive messages. Malaysians exhibit cultural traits that emphasise modesty, consensus, non-confrontation, respect for seniority and authority, certainty, and harmonious relationships—and avoid confrontation, outspokenness, and aggressiveness (Tamam, Hassan, Azarian, 2014; Mohamed Salleh, 2013). Thus the media is highly

regulated to ensure that media contents are culturally sensitive and not detrimental to the socio-political stability of the multicultural, multi-religious society.

Interestingly, the study also shows that the moral aspect of media use is as equally important as its legal aspect. Perhaps the rise in the number of incidences where mediated information/news heightened tension across ethnic and political differences, and members of the general public and journalists were charged for sedition and defamation, explain the moral and legal considerations of media use. Hence, a media literacy education must sufficiently address the topics on communication ethics, cultural values and media regulations. Within the Malaysian socio-political context, the findings indicate that the source of norms, values and principles and the basis of ethical evaluation of media use does not lie with individuals but rather with a society and a nation.

In addition to the norm/ethic-based approach to media literacy, understanding communication as a human right and rights of a communicator is also necessary knowledge to develop media literacy competence, and thus must be a part of the media literacy syllabus. As O'Neill (2010) and Mihailidis, and Thevenin, (2013) argued, a right-based approach to media literacy is essential because knowledge and awareness of communication rights can encourage the use of media for active civic participation.

We have also identified a number of concepts/themes associated with media's role and empowerment of the society that are deemed necessary to develop literacy and competency in media use. The concept of news credibility/trustworthiness and information accuracy/truthfulness emerged as important. In fact, knowledge about news credibility/trustworthiness and information accuracy/truthfulness tops the list of concepts/themes. Next is the concept of responsible, analytical and critical reporting. This is reasonable given today's societies live in an environment rich with mediated information and where anyone can be a content producer. Interestingly, understanding of what constitutes informed citizenry/society and information- and value-based society is also important. These concepts, from a media literacy angle, should be well understood by Malaysians.

As such, it implies that one important goal of media literacy education is to facilitate the development of informed citizenry/society in which people use media reasonably and responsibly to navigate the contemporary society and make careful decisions about their economic, social and political lives. Understanding of the notion of balanced and fair journalism, media responsibility and openness, and positive public journalism are other pertinent concepts/themes worth considering in deciding on the topics to be included in a introductory-level media literacy course.

We view media literacy as a media competence for social change. Therefore, discerning aspects of media use that might constraint or limit people participation in social change is a cogent question. Although there could be many constraining factors, four factors emerged from the study. Of the four, a repressive communication and media environment (that instigates fear in voicing critical and opposing opinions), and censorship including self-censorship habits stood out. Thus a media literacy education that emphasises active participation in public discourse and social change must address this problem. Media-related knowledge that reduces mediated communication anxiety and fear associated with repressive or highly regulated media should be stressed. Knowing what is culturally and legally appropriate in media use might help in removing this mediated communication anxiety and fear.

Media literacy education must also adequately deal with uncritical attitude and behaviour in media use. Another necessary component identified to develop media literacy competence within the Malaysian cultural context is knowledge about censorship and self-serving bias in media use including awareness, mindfulness and implications of self-interest and censorship practices (including self-censorship) in media use.

While our study has provided insights on the kind of contents necessary for developing an introductory-level online course on media literacy for young people in the tertiary education, we also noted some limitations of the study. These limitations in a way serve as a methodological lesson learned from the study. We learned that it was very difficult to go back to the same respondents for the Delphi study. Therefore, the quality of a Delphi study is heavily dependent on the researcher's ability to select respondents who can be interviewed or surveyed more than once.

We also learned that getting a large sample size for a Delphi study that involves face-to-face interviews is difficult, even more so to interview experts who are busy. Compromising for a small sample size, we have learned that selecting the right person to be interviewed (one who is really an expert in the subject and has a strong interest in social issues affecting the society) is very critical for a Delphi study, particularly if it is a typical Delphi study. Similar to a typical Delphi study, our study involved two rounds of data collection. The richness of the data could be further improved with more rounds of data collection.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, what are the competencies required in media use for navigating contemporary societies and participating in social change within the Malaysian sociocultural and political context? The findings provide useful insights to course designers in deciding what media-related knowledge to emphasise in an online introductory media literacy course for the young in tertiary institutions. The required competencies go beyond technical skills for reasonable, responsible and creative use of media.

From a Malaysian sociocultural perspective, media literacy as a media competence comprises not only understanding about media behaviour (media communication function, biasness, representation, influence, and credibility) but also include moral and legal obligations in media use. This moral commitment and legal consideration in media use is expected given that Malaysia is a collectivistic society, its media system is highly regulated, and sustaining the socio-political harmony and stability of its pluralistic society is an important nation-building agenda.

The moral and ethical emphasis should not be construed as a protective framework for a media literacy education; instead, understanding the normative dimension of a responsible and accountable media culture is the path towards empowering and emancipating young people in using the media for positive self- and societal development. The kind of media literacy education that the public expects is a programme that develops critical thinking, promotes good citizens who are alert of the media, educates the mind about integrity, and instils mindfulness of the role and effect of media on people.

Acknowledgment

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission through the Erasmus+ Capacity Building for Higher Education Grant. This publication reflects the views of the authors only, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein. The study in Malaysia was done in collaboration with Universiti Malaysia Kelantan.

Open Access: This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY 4.0) which permits any use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

References

- Adolf, M. (2006). *Die unverstandene Kultur Perspektiveneinerkritischen Theorie der Mediengesellschaft*. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Adolf M., & Stehr, N. (2008). *Medien in der Wissensgesellschaft. Auf der Suche nach Schnittstellen*. In Raabe, J., Stöber, R., Theis-Berglmair, A., K. Wied (Eds.): *Medien und Kommunikation in der Wissensgesellschaft. Schriftenreihe der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Publizistik- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*, Band 35. (pp. 62–73). Konstanz: UVK.
- Andharini Dwi, C., Ari Basuki, E. Eka Mala Sari & Kustivahningsih, Y. (2015). Design an adaptive e-learning application architecture based. *IEEE LTSA Reference Model Telkomnika*, 13(1), 284–289.
- Cadorin, L., Bagnasco, A., Tolotti, A., Pagnucci, N. & Sasso, L. (2017) Developing an instrument to measure emotional behaviour abilities of meaningful learning through the Delphi technique. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 73(9), 2208–2218.
- Chomeya, R. (2010). Quality of psychology test between Likert scale 5 and 6 points. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3), 399–403.
- Cuhls, K. (2005). Delphi method. In K. Cuhls (Ed.), *Delphi survey, teaching material for UNIDO foresight seminars* (pp. 93-112). Wien: United Nations Industrial Development Organization.
- Dalkey, N. C., & Helmer, O. (1963). An experimental application of the Delphi method to the use of experts. *Management Science*, 9(3), 458-467.
- Duncan, B. (2006). Essential survival skills for the new millennium. *School Libraries Canada*, 24(4), 31–34.
- Fong, Y. L. & Md. Sidin, A. I (2015). Gatekeeping in the coverage of interethnic conflicts: An analysis of mainstream and alternative newspapers in Malaysia. *SEARCH: The Journal of South East Asia Research Centre* 7(1), 23–51.
- Hobbs, R. (2011). What a difference ten years can make: Research possibilities for the future of media literacy education. *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, 3, 29–31.
- Lewis, J., & Jhally, S. (1998). The struggle over media literacy. *Journal of Communication*, 48(1), 109–120.
- Livingstone, S. (2008). Engaging with media—A matter of literacy? *Communication, Culture and Critique*, 1(1), 51–62.
- Martens, H. (2010). Evaluating media literacy education: Concepts, theories and future directions. *The Journal of Media Literacy Education*, 2(1), 1–22.
- Maxey, D & Kezar, A. (2016). Leveraging the Delphi technique to enrich knowledge and engage educational policy problems. *Educational Policy*, 30(7), 1042–1070.
- Mihailidis, P., & Thevenin. B. (2013). Media literacy as a core competency for engaged citizenship in participatory democracy. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(11), 1611–1622.
- Mohamed Salleh, S. (2012). *Adolescents' engagement with the media: A process of negotiating meanings and constructing cultural identities* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Vienna, Austria.
- Mohamed Salleh, S. (2013). Westernization and Malaysian television. In M. Kohler (Ed.), *The phenomenon of globalization: A collection of interdisciplinary globalisation research essays* (pp. 237-250). Germany: Peter Lang Publishing House.
- Moore, R. (2016). Developing distance education content using the TAPPA process tech trends. *Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning*, 60(5), 425–432.
- O'Neill, B. (2010). Media literacy and communication rights. *The International Communication Gazette*, 72(4–5), 323–338.
- Real, M. R. (1996). *Exploring media culture: A guide*. London: Sage
- Sommerville, A. J. (2008). *Effective use of the Delphi process in research: Its characteristics, strengths and limitations*. Retrieved from <http://jasomerville.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/DelphiProcess080617b.pdf>
- Stehr, N. (1994). *Knowledge societies*. London: Sage.
- Tamam, E., Hassan. Md. S., & Azarian, Z. S. (2014). Social media and political participation in Malaysia. In Lars Willnat & Annette, Aw (Eds.), *Social media, culture and politics in Asia* (pp. 143-167). New York: Peter Lang.
- Tai, S.Y. (1997). Protecting our culture: A comparative study of broadcasting content regulation in Malaysia and Canada. *Singapore Journal of International & Comparative Law*, (1), 468–506.
- Toepfl, F. (2014). Four facets of critical news literacy in a non-democratic regime: How young Russians navigate their news. *European Journal of Communication*, 29(1), 68–82.

- Turoff, M & Linstone, H. (Ed.). (2002). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Boston. Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Wallner, C., Alpen, S., Adolf, M., & Zita M.-B. (2017). Fostering media literacy competencies for navigating digital media cultures: Findings of a comparative study in Southeast Asia. Paper presented at ICA Asian Regional Conference 2017, “Communications Research in the Digital Age”, 14–16 December 2017, Mumbai, India.

Dr. Sabariah Mohamed Salleh

is a senior lecturer at Centre of Communication and Digital Societies, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM). Her area of specialization is young people and media.

Dr. Rosya Izyanie Shamshudeen

is a senior lecturer at the Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM). Her research expertise is media studies, broadcasting, popular culture and cultural studies.

Dr. Wan Anita

is a senior lecturer at the Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM). Her teaching and research interest is on human communication and media usage.

Prof. Dr. Ezhar Tamam

specializes in Media Studies and Intercultural Communication. His teaching and research focuses on media, communication and culture, and the role of communication/media in development at the individual and societal level.
