

**ISTANBUL BILGI UNIVERSITY**  
**INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF MEDIA AND COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS**

**THE EFFECTS OF THE DIVERSIFICATION OF MEDIA CAPITAL ON  
EDITORIAL POLICY IN TURKEY:  
A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF NEWS IN MİLLİYET**

**Güneş Doğan**

**ISTANBUL, JUNE 2013**

**ISTANBUL BILGI UNIVERSITY**  
**INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF MEDIA AND COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS**

**THE EFFECTS OF THE DIVERSIFICATION OF MEDIA CAPITAL ON  
EDITORIAL POLICY IN TURKEY:  
A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF NEWS IN MİLLİYET**

**Approved by :**

**Prof. Dr. Galip İsen**

**Güneş Doğan**

**ISTANBUL, JUNE 2013**

MEDYA SERMAYESİNDEKİ ÇEŞİTLİLİĞİN EDITORYAL POLİTİKA ÜZERİNDEKİ  
ETKİLERİ: MİLLİYET HABERLERİ İÇERİK ANALİZİ

THE EFFECTS OF THE DIVERSIFICATION OF MEDIA CAPITAL ON EDITORIAL  
POLICY IN TURKEY:  
A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF NEWS IN MİLLİYET

Güneş DOĞAN  
109680007

Prof. Dr. Galip Beygü İSEN :  
Yrd. Doç. Dr. İtr ERHART :  
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Güneş Ekin AKSAN :  
Tezin onaylandığı tarih :  
Toplam sayfa sayısı :



Anahtar kelimeler (Türkçe)

- 1) Medya
- 2) Editoryal politika
- 3) Medya sermayesi
- 4) Türk basını
- 5) Milliyet

Anahtar kelimeler (İngilizce)

- 1) Media
- 2) Editorial policy
- 3) Media capital
- 4) Turkish press
- 5) Milliyet

## **Acknowledgments**

I take this opportunity to express my profound gratitude and deep regards to my dissertation adviser Prof. Dr. Galip Beygü İsen for his exemplary guidance, monitoring and constant encouragement throughout the course of this thesis. The help and guidance given by him provided me the possibility to constitute this study.

I also take this opportunity to express my appreciation to our Program Coordinator Aylin Dağsalgüler for her cordial support, valuable information and guidance, which helped me in completing this task through various stages.

I would also like to acknowledge with much appreciation the crucial role of my dear friend Mehmet Filođlu whose contribution in stimulating suggestions helped me to coordinate my study especially in writing process. I thank him for his kind concern and consideration. It would not have been possible to complete this dissertation without his steadfast encouragement.

Güneş Dođan

## Table of Contents

### Chapter I

Acknowledgments.....	4
Abstract.....	7
I.1 Introduction : The Historical Structure of Media Ownership and Journalism..	8
I.2 The Media Capital In Turkey.....	12
I.3 Milliyet In The Turkish Press.....	14
I.4 Abdi İpekçi's Milliyet.....	16
I.5 The Political Economy of Media Capital In Turkey.....	17
I.6 Chomsky's Approach: The Factors That Shape News.....	22
I.7 The Models of Media Power.....	24
I.8 Who Owns What?.....	27
a) Doğan Holding Companies.....	28
b) Demirören Holding Companies.....	29
c) Ciner Holding Companies.....	31

**Chapter II**

II.1 Methodology

a) Research Question.....33

b) The General Weekly Circulation Rates of Best-Selling Newspapers.....34

II.2 Analysis and Findings.....37

**Chapter III**

Conclusion.....56

Bibliography.....59

Appendix.....62

## **Abstract**

This study is prepared in order to investigate and display the effects of the diversification of media capital on editorial policy in Turkish Newspaper Milliyet. The most important aim of the project is to discover how editorial policies depend on and are able to be altered by the ownership interests and divergent capital establishments. By using classical content analysis method, front page news of Milliyet are analysed with 13 content analysis questions in the time period between 1972-2012.

After the theoretical framework chapter of media and ownership relations, an outline of the content analysis to follow, the findings of the analysis and discussion. This project intends to conceive whether editorial policies and agenda making decisions are dependent on to the newspaper owners' diverse capital enterprises.

## **CHAPTER I**

### **I.1 Introduction: The Historical Structure of Media Ownership and Journalism**

On the impact of media commercialization on journalism, dominant academic literature suggests that there has been a process of convergence among global media systems and journalistic practices, regardless of their ‘parochial particularities’, yet these peculiarities should not be ignored, since media organizations reflect the differences between political systems, political philosophies, cultural traits and economic conditions. For Hallin (2002), the key reason for the reduction of national, regional or local factors is the presence of a simplistic dichotomy on the media in general and the news media in particular:

“...the dichotomy between the liberal perspective, for which democratization of the media is purely a matter of the elimination of state interference, and the critical political economy perspective, which has focused on the control of media by private capital, but has until now not been very sophisticated in its analysis of variations in the relation of capital to the state, political parties and other institutions. Political and economic institutions do not develop separately, and it is crucial that analytical tools are developed that cut cross this dichotomy.”  
(2002: 184-5)

On the subject of the relationship between politics and media, the historical development of Turkish media, its societal role and relationship with the state has remained rather undertheorized. Although there are similarities in the issues concerning media systems around the globe, each national system still differs in many respects when compared to others. The same applies to journalism; its practices and professional culture faces the issues of deregulation, privatization, commercialization and concentration of ownership in this globalized era.

After the military coup of 12 September 1980, a major depolitization process ended all political activities, organizations and restricted freedom of expression in Turkey. The public were discouraged from discussing politics and encouraged to focus more on religion and popular culture, especially football and the sensationalist press. These were considered to be the antidote to the leftist militancy. (Bek, 2004: 374) In this respect, economy-politics and literature of Turkish media history and development can not be entirely understood and analysed without examining the issues of authoritarian rule, military coups, economic fluctuations, heavy media censorship, state control and rapid liberalization.

After the 1980s, a number of key issues emerged in Turkish media corporations due to the rapid, sometimes uncontrolled spread of free market policies and ideologies; which is a process refers to a link between the free market and democratization in the general perception of the population, the development of and the changed within journalism and the mass media before, during and after the advent free market policies and the importance of the notion of 'clientelism'. Clearly, the shift to free market policies was a core element of the broader changes that took place in Turkey after 1980s and the transition from a highly centralized economy, heavy military influence and a state-run media to a more free market economy with privately owned newspapers and television stations was seen by some people as a moment of hope. As Machin and Papatheodorou state; in the Southern European version of neo-liberal ideology, the free market came to be perceived as the sole option for truly democratic publishing and broadcasting, while intensified competition was presented as safeguarding the rights, not of the sovereign consumer but the informed citizens (2002: 32) Despite the general failure of the free market on both of these fronts, providing 'democratic publishing, broadcasting and creating 'informed citizens', the present situation in Turkish journalism can only be understood within this context.

The early years of Turkish commercial media projected some features of critical and investigative journalism . As Karaman and Aras (2000: 46) have noted, during the 1990s, the development of private media systems in Turkey led to a number of changes on oppressive legal norms established earlier on under the monopoly of state control. However, the rapid commercialization of the Turkish economy following the Özal neo-liberal revolution of the 1980s led to a process of populist ‘anti-politics’ in which engaged civil society was replaced by the utopia of the free market and consumption. Cizre-Sakallıoğlu and Yeldan (2000) argue that during the 1990s, the Turkish media became little more than cheerleader of this process:

“The ways in which the mass media articulate with politics reinforces the hollowing out process by either trivializing the real political issues that underlie the rhythms of daily life or by dramatizing and publicizing the trivial/unpolitical/private. The mass media, on the whole, contributes to the detachment of political demands from appreciations of socio-economic conditions.” (Cizre-Sakallıoğlu and Yeldan, 2000: 503)

This situation in Turkey was short lived and the speed with which the Turkish business world recognized the countless economic and political possibilities offered through the control of profitable media did not match with the effective action on the part of Turkish government to regulate an increasingly hyper-commercialized market, oligopolistic system (Catalbas, 2000, Pekman, 2002). The inability or the unwillingness of the Turkish administrations to restrain the power of media owners and while at the same time introducing restrictive legislations, restraining the ability of journalists to engage in critical reporting had a number of effects on journalism in Turkey: A shift away from ‘hard’ news such as political, foreign news, investigative stories to a convergence with a tabloid agenda including police and crime news and more features focused on the problems encountered in everyday life. (Papathanassopoulos, 2001a: 510) Similarly, according to Bek, the tabloidization of the news

media in Turkey is the result of high competition between big media groups for circulation rates, the low investment in experienced employees and the consequent decrease in investigative reporting (2001: 376).

The situation facing journalists in Turkey is a combination of hyper-commercialization of the media sector with a traditionally 'clientelist' and 'patrimonial' relationship between media and state. 'Clientelism' is defined as; "a pattern of social organization in which access to social resources is controlled by patrons and delivered to clients in exchange for deference and various kinds of support. It is a particularistic and asymmetrical form of social organization, and is typically contrasted with forms of citizenship in which access to resources is based on universalistic criteria and formal equality before the law." (Hallin and Papathanassopoulos, 2002: 184-5).

According to Hallin, the combination of market and state power in a clientelist/patrimonial state is not a paradox. In fact, the rise of commercial media sector in Turkey led to a situation where market relations between state and media has not been broken, but inverted. The state wielded enormous power over the content in commercial media and journalism. However, after the deregulation of the media markets, newspaper owners began to utilize the pressure placed on politicians through their media organs, thus leading to the inversion of the relationship. Corporate involvement in the media sector had more to do with the indirect benefits of the ownership.

As Finkel mentions, the greatest problem that the Turkish media struggling is the pressure based on the financial interests of its proprietors. While no newspaper can afford to be discredited, some run unacceptable risks by bartering political support for financial advantage. In addition, industrialists and financiers are attracted to the newspaper and television ownership not just as businesses but as 'loss leaders' for their other commercial activities.

Dedicated media owners see the advantage of moving into non-media fields. Finkel notes that capital owners are prepared to peddle influence in return for credits, incentives and other advantages. (Finkel, 2000: 155-6)

Another result of this abuse of media power was and continues to be is the 'instrumentalization of reporting', merging 'journalistic logic' with the logic of the party politics and family (i.e. owner) privilege and as a consequent, the professional weakness of journalists in the face of corporate and state power, particularly as a result of unorganized labor movement, and the use of legislation to silence or intimidate journalists.

## **I.2 The Media Capital In Turkey**

After 1980s, the ownership structure in the media of Turkey changed radically. Traditional ownership structure was replaced by a new ownership structure of which almost every journalist has complained about the negative influences. This new ownership structure represents extreme commercialization and is seen to be directly influencing both the communication process and individual journalists. Interviews with journalists indicate that the editors-in-chief are running media institutions as managers whose power are legitimized by their connection to the property owner. (Tilic, 2000: 1) While it is perhaps an overstatement to say that almost every journalist in Turkey has complained about this new ownership structure, but it is not an overstatement to say that most of the media companies in Turkey are in the hands of an ever-decreasing number of owners. The true shift in media ownership in Turkey came in the mid-1980s, as family-owned media outlets were bought by larger conglomerates (Finkel, 2000, 2005; Tilic, 2000, 2001; Tunç, 2002, 2003). What made this shift significant was that the new owners were a different breed, more interested than their predecessors in instilling a corporate mentality into operations. In addition, the news owners often had little

experience in the media world and used their media companies for ulterior motives (Tunç, 2003).

It is important to recognize that these media owners wield and exercise an enormous amount of power both inside and outside of the newsroom. The following publication about Turkey's most powerful media baron Aydın Doğan, who is the head of the Doğan Media Group, illustrates this point:

“Few people who have crossed swords with Mr.Doğan have survived unscathed. Consider Sadettin Tantan, a former interior minister who campaigned against corruption. Shortly after he dared to suggest, last March, that Dışbank, a financial institution owned by Mr.Doğan, may have been tainted by irregularities, Mr.Tantan was forced to resign. Or there is Nazlı Ilıcak, a former member of parliament who wanted to probe claims that Mr.Doğan was exploiting his media muscle to bully governments into extending him commercial favors. She was banned from politics last June on charges – widely echoed in Mr.Doğan's newspapers – of promoting anti-secularism.” (The Economist; 2002:65)

This level of political influence is the result of Doğan's control over a broad cross-section of media companies. The core of his media stable lies in the field of print journalism and his media group controls a significant portion of the overall circulation, as well as a dominant share of the circulation of Turkey's leading newspapers.

### **I.3 Milliyet In The Turkish Press**

In this section, the main attempt is to trace the factors that shape journalism practices and editorial policies in Milliyet into an instrumentalized tool to act in accordance with the economical and political interests of the perquisitor company, Doğan Media Group.

Turkish media market is dominated by a limited number of actors and therefore, highly concentrated corporate media power becomes even more noticeable when the following additional factors are considered; the weakness of journalists and other employees in the face of the power of corporate owners and the fact that corporate power is combined with restrictive state regulations on the issues of freedom of expression. The purchasing process of the newspaper Milliyet by Doğan Group stands as an appropriate instance for the limitations on journalistic rights and for the alternation on editorial policies. The descriptive portrait below was given by a Doğan Media Group employee of the first days at the newspaper Milliyet following the takeover by Aydın Doğan.

“The new owner called each journalist one by one after buying the newspaper and asked them to leave the syndicate (trade union). Journalists were forced either to sign their resignation from the syndicate or to leave the job. On the first day, no syndicate member signed the resignation from the syndicate. The second day, all of them lost their jobs. The next day, everyone resigned from the syndicate. The notary was brought to the newspaper and there they made a line in front of him to leave the syndicate. It was in 1990.” (Tilic, 2000: 4)

From the early years of the commercial media capital formation in Turkish media, trade unions were under attack by corporate owners. Doğan was by no means the only anti-union owner. Prior to the 1990s, many journalists were member of the Journalists’ Union of Turkey (TGS), which protected their rights and negotiated collective bargaining agreements with the

Turkish Newspaper Owners Trade Union on behalf of its members. Since the start of the 1990s, memberships in the TGS has collapsed to the point where there is not a single newspaper where journalists are represented by the union. This situation left nearly all journalists vulnerable to all kinds of economic and social crises. Because of the severe financial crisis in the late 2000 and early 2001, between 3000 and 5000 journalists and media workers in Turkey lost their jobs. Researchers such as Tilic and Tunç claimed that the media owners used the financial crisis to rid themselves of unwanted or ‘troublesome’ staff under the guise of economic necessity. As Tunç writes with specific reference to Doğan:

“Undoubtedly, the financial crisis played a significant role but this is too simple of an excuse. It was a perfect time to get rid of some of the journalists who had become longtime opponents to corruption in Turkish politics and an obvious threat to their boss, media tycoon Aydın Doğan.” (Tunç, 2003: 9)

This situation, rather than weakening the hand of media owners, but the financial crash of 2001 actually intensified their control. Savage cut-backs in staffing levels mean that jobs are even harder to find than before and with much lower salaries. Journalists and other media workers, therefore, are cautious of crossing their corporate bosses since these owners often control more than one media enterprise. In other word, getting fired from one newspaper can mean losing all chance of working at many others under the same corporate umbrella. Together with the lack of any union or labor support, this means that journalists are in a weak position in terms of their professional independence.

#### **I.4 Abdi İpekçi's Milliyet**

İpekçi was born in Istanbul in 1929 and started his journalistic career as a reporter for the daily newspaper Yeni Sabah. He worked on the news staff of the daily Yeni Istanbul and then moved to Istanbul Ekspres in 1961, an afternoon paper, where he was soon named editor. At just 25-years-old, he became editor in chief of the recently established daily Milliyet and helped build the newspaper into one of Turkey's most successful and influential. A respected journalist, he was a proponent of the separation of religion and state, and an advocate of dialogue and conciliation with Greece, as well as of human rights for the various minorities in Turkey.

His column, "Durum," tremendously impacted both public opinion and the government. He was a political moderate and powerful voice for democracy in a country bedeviled by violent polarization. Although political assassinations happened daily, İpekçi spoke ceaselessly for national unity and reconciliation and against violence and terrorism. İpekçi was instrumental in arranging a breakthrough meeting between Greek and Turkish journalists under IPI's auspices in London in November 1978. At the time, there was still intense bitterness between the two countries over the partition of Cyprus. It was due to his efforts that leading editors from Turkey visited Greece, where they met the Greek prime minister, and Greek editors visited Turkey, where İpekçi's close personal friend, Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit, addressed them. As a sign of respect for his efforts in this area, the biannual Abdi İpekçi Awards, honoring persons and nongovernmental organizations for their contributions to the promotion of peace and friendship between Turkey and Greece, were established upon a Greek initiative shortly after his death.

An active member of IPI, İpekçi was elected to its executive board in 1964 and became a vice chairman in 1971. He was also a president of the Istanbul Journalists Union and a lecturer at

Istanbul University's Institute of Journalism from 1968 until his untimely death. İpekçi was organizing an international conference on political extremism and the media in Turkey when he himself fell victim to political extremism. He was gunned down as he drove home from work on Feb. 1, 1979, by Mehmet Ali Ağca, a right-wing militant who later escaped from jail and attempted to assassinate Pope John Paul II. İpekçi was the most prominent of some 600 Turkish victims of terrorist violence in 1979 alone. "The bullets which killed him were intended for Turkey's democracy and constitutional order." said Ecevit.

On the day of his funeral, the country's newspaper offices interrupted work to pay homage to his memory, and the day's editions appeared with black borders. The funeral turned into one of Istanbul's largest public gatherings with thousands of people lining the route of the cortege to pay a final tribute to this highly respected journalist who stood up for democratic rights and freedoms.

### **I.5 The Political Economy Of Media Capital In Turkey**

The history of Turkish journalism depends on the political and economical factors as other countries. Until 1970s Turkish journalism was directed by the publishers who were often journalists themselves and as a profession, they were interested in nothing but journalism. As of 80s, journalism became a business needing huge amount of capital and the profession of journalism became impossible for the newspaper owners who has no capital and then monopolism emerged in this field. (Odyakmaz, 2002)

The content of a daily newspaper is discussed and determined during the routine daily meeting to which the chief editor, managing editor, news services chiefs and secretarial staff are expected to attend. However, ordinarily, reporters do not participate in these meetings. The act of deciding the news agenda without the opinion participation of the correspondents is a

significant representation of how the news gathering process is detached from its core element and how the agenda setting is controlled by a group of people attached to the capital umbrella of the corporation. Any controversial news, investigating or opposing one of the media owners' other businesses or enterprises is genuinely impracticable. Therefore, the media's choices and decisions on the agenda setting inevitably depends on the owners' political, economical or even social interests.

The notion that politics has become mediated and mediatized has gained currency over the last couple of decades. Mediatization refers to the meta-process by which everyday practices and social relations are historically shaped by mediating technologies and media organizations.

Although there is still not one authoritative definition, mediatization of politics refers to media-induced changes in the public representation of politics and the adaptive behaviors of political actors and institutions. In this process, the role of the news media is central. Theoretically, the process of mediatization of politics gains pace when the news media increase their independence from politics and when news journalism increasingly is shaped by the news media's own logic and standards of newsworthiness. Since the news media have become the most important communicative link in political circles and to the public, the incentives to adapt to the operating logic of media become stronger, to the extent that media logic may eventually subsume political logic. Hence, on a theoretical level of analysis the news media and news journalism both shape and are shaped by processes of mediatization.

This chapter will thus focus on the role of the news media and of news journalism in the processes of the mediatization of politics.

At its core, mediatization is a process-oriented concept that is about “changes associated with communication media and their development” (Shulz 2004, p.88) or Asp and Esaiasson (1996, pp. 80-81) similarly note that mediatization is a process “in which there is a development toward increasing media influence.” In this context, the media should be understood not only as single operations, formats or outlets, even though all these aspects are important. The media should rather be understood as an ever-present social and cultural system of production, broadcast, circulation and dissemination of symbols, signs, messages, meanings and values. The media should be understood as an institution (Cook, 2005).

As the media become increasingly important, different social actors such as political actors have to adopt to and alter their behaviours to accommodate the media’s logic and standards of newsworthiness. (Shulz 2004; Strömback 2008). Media logic can be understood as a particular way of seeing, covering and interpreting social, cultural and political phenomena. Selection and production of news items (agenda setting) carries significance in order to grasp the editorial and ideological stand points, news values and standards of newsworthiness of a particular newspaper. The concept of media logic also overlaps with the notion of commercial logic and highlights that media are run as commercial businesses (Mazzoleni 2008c; Hamilton 2004; McManus 1994). In other words, the media have certain formats, processes and routines which need to be competitive in the struggle to capture people’s attention. This shapes what the media cover and how they cover it. For example, favoring stories that include conflict, as conflict lends itself to more dramatic storytelling (McManus 1994) or framing politics as a horse race / strategic game and focusing on scandals to apply episodic and concrete frames rather than thematic and abstract frames. (Iyengar 1991)

According to S. Iyengar, there are two types of news framing: Episodic and thematic framing of news. Episodic news frame forms the news as a case study. It is not possible to bind the news with the contemporary political conjuncture. The episodic news framing edits news as a one time event, not points to responsible officials for the incident. Thematic news frame differs from episodic framing by pointing out the solution, thematic news attributes the responsibility to accountables. Thematic news places public issues in a more general or abstract context, gives the incident a perspective of history and binding with today. It reports the general outcomes and conditions. While episodic framing diverts attention from societal responsibility and political accountability, thematic framing discusses the possible solutions to the particular issue. As Iyengar points out :

“By diverting attention from societal and governmental responsibility, episodic framing glosses over national problems and allows public officials ignore problems whose remedies entail burdens to their constituents.” (Iyengar, 1991, p.7-11, 26-47)

Attribution of responsibility for personal situations influence political attitudes. Individuals attributing responsibility for personal economic problems to themselves are significantly more approving of government than those attributing responsibility to society.

As a meta-process mediatization, in almost all democratic countries, has taken different shapes and developed at different speeds. However, the negative consequences of mass media power is practically agreed on; according to critics, episodic framing of news coverage of politics have been distorted/manipulated by the media’s representation of politics as “show-biz” based on battles on images, conflicts between political leaders. As the fourth estate, mass media’s duty is to attribute responsibility to the public officials. However, advertisement oriented mass media itself lacking accountability lead to treat citizens as just passive consumer-audiences of the mediated politics. Moreover, media organizations possess their

own rules, aims, production logics and constraints that political communicators have to respond to. In this respect, politicians who need to meet with the citizens-audiences must negotiate with the media's preferred timing, formats, language and even the content of the communication. As Andrea Shrott asserts, the core of mediatization consists in the mechanism of the institutionalization of "*media logic*" in other societal subsystems. This article aims to discuss how media logic has changed the societal sphere of citizenship in terms of participation to democratic processes and how the behavior, attitudes and tendencies of the individual are shaped while attending these processes.

Modern democratic states are characterized by mediatized participation. Mass media sets the agenda, produces the political content and constructs the public sphere of information and opinion. However, mass media filters the news as according to its newsworthiness which is also based on the particular production routines. Events that are identified as including news value, selectively reported by mass media defines what appears to be the only reality for most of the citizens and particularly for many people who have no direct access to what has happened. Furthermore, news value criteria such as proximity, conflict, drama and personalization not only determine what events come to the attention of the citizens, these criteria also impose a discursive ideology, systematic bias upon the media reality of politics (Galtung & Ruge, 1965). It is the media's choice what to broadcast or to press. By selecting, emphasizing certain issues and ignoring others, a media-constructed informational sphere is built. The mass media's attention rules, production routines, selection criteria, framing of the message are the main factors that constitute its logic and mediatization of politics occurs when political logic is displaced by media logic.

## **I.6 Chomsky's Approach: The Factors That Shape News**

Chomsky argues that news filters are influential on the relation between media and democracy. According to Chomsky, in countries where the levers of power are in the hands of political elites, the monopolistic control over the media, makes it clear that the media serve for the benefits of a dominant elite. Chomsky's propaganda model focuses on the inequality of wealth and power and its multilevel effects on the mass media interests and choices.

“The mass media serve as a system for communicating messages to the general populace. It is their function to amuse, entertain, and inform, and to inculcate individuals with the values, beliefs, and the codes of behaviours that will integrate them into the institutional structures of the larger society. In a world of concentrated wealth and major conflicts of class interest, to fulfill this role requires systematic propaganda.” (Chomsky, 1994, p.1-6)

This model traces the routes by which money and power are able to filter out the news fit to print, marginalize dissent, and allow the government and the dominant private interests to get their messages across to the public. (Manufacturing Consent, p.2) The essential ingredients of manufacturing consent or set of news “filters” are under the following headings :

1. The size, concentrated ownership, owner wealth, and profit orientation of the dominant mass media firms.
2. Advertising as the primary income source of the mass media.
3. The reliance of the media on the information provided by government, business, and “experts” funded and approved by these primary sources and agents of power.
4. “Flak” as a means of disciplining the media.
5. “Anticommunism” as a national religion and control mechanism.

According to the propaganda model, the raw material of news must pass through these filters, become ready to print and news filters occur so natural that journalists convince themselves that they are objective in terms of professional values. However, these limitations are so strongly built in the system that other alternative news coverages are hardly imaginable.

It is possible to argue that there are five functions of the communication media in democratic societies. First, citizens must be informed about what is happening around them. This is also called as the “surveillance” or “monitoring” function of the media. Second, media must be kind of an educator to citizens about the meaning and the significance of what is happening, the “facts”. This function requires the protection of objectivity and a professional detachment from the issue being analysed by journalists. Third, media must be a public debate arena for the formation of “public opinion” and provide the place to the creation of public political discourse. Fourth, media must give citizens access to the information of governmental and political institution’s activities. This function is called the “watchdog” role of journalism. This means, media must check and control the political processes for citizens. It is the most significant reason why media is called the “fourth estate”. Fifth, media must serve as a channel for the representation of the political viewpoints. (McNair, 2007, p.15-20)

However, as it will be discussed in the next chapters, the role of media can not be understood without the concept of “power” : in two dimensions; first, the power of media itself and second, the power over media. Media has the power to set the agenda, influence and change the political process, deceive, persuade, represent as, creating stereotypes about, making hypes and myth, articulate memories...

## **I.7 The Models of Media Power**

The literature about media is concerned with two perspectives towards the relationship between media and democracy. Those are dominant and pluralist models. In dominant model, media is seen as key element in maintaining a dominant order. Political scientist Antonio Gramsci defines “hegemony” as the dominance of one social class over other social classes in a society by controlling the means of power with political goals, without direct physical force. (Gramsci, 1930, Hegemony) This power can be understood as the cultural hegemony within the institutions of civil society such as popular media. Karl Marx also points out that the dominant ideology of the ruling class owns the means of production. (Marx, 1848) Besides Louis Althusser says that the elite class secures and maintains the ideological, political, social institutions by the mass media. (Althusser, 1970)

Dominant order refers to a class stratification according to the properties, richness and monthly salary of an individual. According to the dominance perspective, media serve as the protector of those people’s rights with “high” status in the society. The first aim of news to be made is to keep “lower” class with false consciousness and not complain about the unequal sharing of money and labor. Ruling class, i.e. dominant elite owns the means of production, so the information to be published. Corporate media companies are due to the standardized production which is reflecting one dimension of political view point and consequently the content of the news are decided from “above” to control knowledge.

According to this dominance perspective, citizens are conditioned to accept what is written. The purpose of the media institutions is to reinforce and legitimate the existing of ideological power. In contrast, in pluralist model of media, media is one of many elements in a complex and constantly changing social, cultural and political order. Media provides place for competing political, social, cultural interests and groups.

As a consequence of the societal influential power of media, politics do need to participate in or interact with media in order to be recognized by citizens. However the concept of this relationship between media and politics is not a one directional road. The media ownership also hooked with the politics in terms of ideological and economical factors. As much as the politician desires to gain the authority of governing, the owner of media corporation intends to own more capital and the power to conduct the sector of the market. So, both sides seem to bind and influence each other with consensus of interests.

Media has the power to set the political agenda and the ability to select what to broadcast. This includes limiting the variety of political views or parties with correlation of the mediums' ideological, economical choices mostly aiming at protecting of interest of the owner. By these factors the duties of a reporter for informing citizens is quite condemned to be manipulated. For the future interests for a group of companies to grow bigger, in order to create a positive public opinion about a political party, opinion or an institution, a newspaper can make news serving within the frame of the particular political view. In order to achieve the support of the majority in a society , the qualification of the political news has great significance on influencing the decision making process of citizen-voters.

It is important to mention that the owners of the capital of media companies do not only own mediums in communication sectors. Yet, mostly the capital owners “use” their media organs to assist their other companies. This is called conglomeration. As politicians need to have the authority, the holdings need to be supported by state credit, law making process and advertising revenues. The final agreement of this relation between media and politics shows itself in the reinforcing ideological structure of the news. The ability to criticise or digging the corruptions of the governmental activities or officials is almost impossible for a reporter.

In Turkey, 80 percent of the media sector belongs to the several corporate companies. This causes monopolistic predisposition of diversities. For a democratic system to occur the competition of different views and the equivalence of opportunity should be maintained. The most powerful media company in Turkey is Doğan Media Group. In addition to its media organs, Doğan Media Group also has many different sectoral companies, such as partnership in İş Bankası and Petrol Ofisi with a percentage of %60. (arşiv-ntvmsnbc)

There are some considerable incidents that indicate the corruption in the relationship between media ownership and politics. It is possible to claim that a politician's relative owning a TV channel provides the politician an arena to duplicate his/her political perception. Atv belongs to Çalık Media Group. The prime minister's son in law is a partner of this group. Consequently, the independence and impartiality of reporting in Atv is arguable. Another incident is "Deniz Feneri" case. Deniz Feneri is a charity organization that servers for poor people. All around Turkey, announcements of this organization are done and huge amount of money is collected to deliver to the poverty stricken. However the base of the organization in Germany, where many Turkish people live, is accused of corruption by not delivering money regularly but using it for the benefit of AKP, including the manager of RTÜK ( Radio Television Committee ). The reason why this incident was not recovered in Turkey in the first place is quite clear. Because eventhough the accusations are eventuated in Germany, Turkish government did not follow the judicial processes, simply tried to cover it up . However, some TV channels such as Star TV, Kanal D, CNN Türk made news about the incident. This created a crisis between Aydın Doğan and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan. The most important situation of the crisis was the speech of Erdoğan saying that Doğan Media Group would not be supported anymore.

In addition to that specific example, politicians generally call or classify newspapers and journalists as supporter or opponent. If the channel criticises the governmental activities, it is so called biased. As it is sure that the policy makers do not even have a tendency to keep this irregular intention secret. Even, citizens are being directed to read newspapers which are approved as supporters of the government.

In an age of conglomeration, there is no doubt that reporters, journalists of a corporate media organ are tied by many economical, ideological factors.

### **I.8 Who Owns The Means of Communication In Turkey?**

Milliyet came to publishing life at the Nuri Akça press in Babıali, Istanbul as a daily private newspaper on 3 May 1950. Its owner was Ali Naci Karacan. For a number of years the person who made his mark on the paper as the editor in chief was Abdi İpekçi. İpekçi managed to raise the standards of the Turkish press by introducing his journalistic criteria. On February 1, 1979, İpekçi was murdered by Mehmet Ali Ağca, who would later attempt to assassinate the Pope John Paul II. On October 6, 1980, the Karacan family relinquished the paper to Aydın Doğan, the foremost media mogul in Turkey. The paper was purchased by DK (Demirören & Karacan) Corporation on April 2011. Doğan's company became a publisher with the acquisition of the daily newspaper Milliyet in 1979. With the addition of the prestigious daily newspaper Hurriyet in 1994, he intensified his presence in the media. Between 1986 and 1996, he served as the head of the Association of Turkish Newspaper Publishers. In 2004, Doğan became the first elected Turkish Deputy Chairperson of World Association of Newspapers (WAN). The Doğan Media Holding he founded incorporates the newspapers Posta, Hürriyet, Radikal, Fanatik and Turkish Daily News, and 21 TV channels in Turkey and abroad. Today, Doğan Holding is active in the fields of energy, media, industry, trade and

tourism. Doğan Holding is a public company quoted in Istanbul Stock Exchange. Its ticker symbol is DOHOL.

**a) Doğan Holding Companies**

<b>Trade Name</b>	<b>Field of Activity</b>	<b>The Capital Share of The Company</b>
DOĞAN YAYIN HOLDİNG A.Ş.	HOLDING COMPANY	75,59
HÜRRİYET GAZETECİLİK VE MATBAACILIK A.Ş.	PUBLICISM	11,09
ÇELİK HALAT VE TEL SAN. A.Ş.	GUY AND FIBRE MANUFACTURING	78,69
DİTAŞ DOĞAN YEDEK PARÇA İM. VE TEK A.Ş.	AUTO REPLACEMENT PARTS MANUFACTURING	73,59
MİLPA TİCARİ VE SİNAİ ÜR. PAZ. SAN. VE TİC. A.Ş.	TRADE	86,27
DOĞAN ENERJİ YATIRIMLARI SAN. VE TİC. A.Ş.	ENERGY	99,99
MİLTA TURİZM İŞLETMELERİ A.Ş.	TOURISM	100,00
MİLLİYET VERLAGS UND HANDELS GMBH (in liquidation)	PUBLICISM	25,06
DOĞAN HABER AJANSI A.Ş.	BROADCASTING	0,02
DOĞAN FAKTORİNG A.Ş.	FACTORİNG	1,00
DD KONUT FİNANSMAN A.Ş.	REAL ESTATE FINANCING	47,00
ASLANCIK ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş.	ELECTRICITY GENERATION	25,00
MARBLETON PROPERTY FUND LP	REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT	9,74
D TES ELEKTRİK ENERJİSİ TOPTAN SATIŞ A.Ş.	ELECTRICITY BULK SALE	24,71
OMV PETROL OFİSİ A.Ş.	FUEL PRODUCTS DISTRIBUTION	0,03
DOĞAN OTOMOBİLCİLİK TİC. VE SAN. A.Ş.	RETAIL AND GROSS TRADE	99,80
DOĞAN ORGANİK ÜR. SAN. VE TİC. A.Ş.	LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION	100,00

SC D YAPI REAL ESTATE	REAL ESTATE	50,00
D STROY LTD	REAL ESTATE	100,00
DHI INVESTMENT BV	HOLDING COMPANY	100,00
TASFİYE HALİNDE İSEDAŞ ELEKTRİK DAĞITIM A.Ş.	ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION	40,00
ZİGANA ELEKTRİK DAĞITIM A.Ş.	ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION	65,00
DOĞAN MÜZİK KİTAP MAĞAZACILIK PAZ. A.Ş.	RETAIL SALE AND STORE	100,00
DOĞAN TV HOLDİNG A.Ş.	TV BROADCASTING	2,49

## b) Demirören Holding Companies

### Energy Group

- M Oil Petrol Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş. <sup>[2]</sup>
- Milangaz LPG Dağıtım Tic. ve San A.Ş.
- Milangaz A.Ş.
- Likidgaz A.Ş.
- Mutfakgaz A.Ş.
- Güneşgaz A.Ş.
- Demirören Axpo Enerji Toptan Ticaret A.Ş.
- Demirören Axpo Gaz Toptan Ticaret A.Ş.
- Demirören Jeotermal Enerji San.Tic. A.Ş.

### Industry Group

- Demirören Tüp İmalat A.Ş.
- Demirören Ağır Metal A.Ş.
- Parsat Piston A.Ş.
- Azerelektroterm Açık Şehmdar Cemiyeti (Azerbaycan)

## **Shopping Center Group**

- Demirören Gayrimenkul Proje ve Yön. Tic. San. A.Ş.
- Demirören Gayrimenkul Yat. Geliş. ve İşl. A.Ş.
- Demirören İstiklal A.V.M.
- Taksim Gayrimenkul Geliştirme ve Tic. A.Ş.
- Taksim Gayrimenkul Yatırımı Geliş. ve İşl.Tic. A.Ş.

## **Education Group**

- Ata Eğitim A.Ş

## **Media Group**

- DK Gazetecilik ve Yayıncılık A.Ş.
- Milliyet Gazetesi <sup>[3]</sup>
- Vatan Gazetesi <sup>[4]</sup>

## **Construction Group**

- Demirören İnşaat Sanayi ve Tic. A.Ş.
- Lidya Yapı Sanayi ve Tic. A.Ş. <sup>[5]</sup>

## **Tourism Group**

- Kemer Yapı - Kemer Country

## **Retail**

- Virgin Megastore Türkiye

## **Affiliates**

- Toprak Mermer Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş
- DEM-AL Otogaz Sanayi ve Tic. A.Ş
- Kolbenschmidt İstanbul
- Azpetrol Ltd. Azerbaycan

## **Mining Company**

- KG Madencilik Turizm İnşaat Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.
- GK Madencilik Turizm İnşaat Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.

## **c) Ciner Holding Companies**

### **Energy and Mining**

- Park Thermic
- Park Technique
- Eti Soda
- Park Energy
- Park Electric
- Silopi Electric
- Park Wholesale Electric
- Riotur Madencilik
- Konya İlgin Electric
- Kazan Soda Electric

### **Media**

- Ciner Publishing Holding
- Haberturk Newspaper
- Ciner Media Investments
- HaberTurk Newspapering and Printing
- C Production Film Industry

- Haberturk
- Bloomberg HT

### **Commerce, Industry and Service**

- Park Holding
- Ciner Aviation
- Park Medical Health
- Havas Tourism
- Lares Park Hotel (İstanbul)
- Park Navigation
- Denmar Warehousing
- Park Insurance
- Park Construction
- Park Cam
- Ciner Navigation
- Ciner Gemi
- Lares Tourism

## **CHAPTER II**

### **II.1 Methodology**

#### **a) Research Question : How Does The Diversifications of Media Capital Effect Editorial Policies In Milliyet?**

The main aim of the thesis is to investigate and display the effects of the diversification of media capital on editorial policies in the Turkish Newspaper Milliyet. This study is prepared in order to discover how editorial policies depend on and are able to be altered by the ownership interests and divergent capital establishments. By using classical content analysis method, front page news of Milliyet are analysed with 16 content analysis questions and in the time period between 1972-2012.

To research the effects of diversification of media capital on editorial policies one of the oldest and reputable newspaper in Turkey, Milliyet is going to be examined by the questions asked to each news item for the 7 days of 5 randomly selected weeks in the 10 yearly time period of 1972-2012. The time frame for the sampling is not specially selected. Because that the research weeks are random and routine, the natural and usual condition of newspaper can be recognised. The thesis is not focused on a case study. The front-page news of Milliyet which are going to be examined and analyzed.

**b) The General Weekly Circulation Rates of Best-Selling Newspapers (medyatava.com)**

13.06.2011 - 19.06.2011 Weekly Circulation Rate Table

Newspaper	Sales	Last Week	Odds
ZAMAN	938.080	950.370	↓-12.290
POSTA	473.937	463.750	↑10.187
HÜRRİYET	452.073	439.115	↑12.958
SABAH	366.686	356.605	↑10.081
SÖZCÜ	254.026	266.050	↓-12.024
HABERTÜRK	243.649	238.645	↑5.004
PAS FOTOMAÇ	216.898	214.568	↑2.330
FANATİK	194.603	186.830	↑7.773
MİLLİYET	155.811	145.528	↑10.283
STAR	152.745	151.541	↑1.204

### 16.04.2012 - 22.04.2012 Weekly Circulation Rate Table

Newspaper	Sales	Last Week	Odds
ZAMAN	1.057.486	1.039.805	↑17.681
POSTA	456.386	455.476	↑910
HÜRRİYET	408.821	417.849	↓-9.028
SABAH	330.228	327.413	↑2.815
HABERTÜRK	225.458	231.743	↓-6.285
SÖZCÜ	217.724	217.283	↑441
PAS FOTOMAÇ	212.233	210.080	↑2.153
FANATİK	197.528	187.881	↑9.647
STAR	161.836	164.335	↓-2.499
TÜRKİYE	130.802	130.457	↑345
MİLLİYET	116.960	113.082	↑3.878

14.04.2013 - 20.04.2013 Weekly Circulation Rate Table

Newspaper	Sales	Last Week	Odds
ZAMAN	1.078.230	1.049.776	↑28.454
POSTA	442.725	444.390	↓-1.665
HÜRRİYET	401.999	410.003	↓-8.004
SABAH	313.539	316.626	↓-3.087
SÖZCÜ	288.561	290.239	↓-1.678
PAS FOTOMAÇ	208.299	221.571	↓- 13.272
HABERTÜRK	203.041	205.704	↓-2.663
FANATİK	189.584	203.556	↓- 13.972
MİLLİYET	182.079	184.377	↓-2.298
TÜRKİYE	179.690	178.905	↑785

## II.2 Analysis Tables and Findings

In this study, in order to research the effects of the diversification of media capital on editorial policy, analysis of front-page news in Milliyet is established by 13 content analysis questions. Between the time period of 1972-2012, 5 weeks in every ten year period are randomly selected and 456 news items are analysed. The content analysis questions are formed in order to measure the qualifications of the news. The randomly selected analysis weeks are as follows: 08-14.05.1972, 19-25.04.1982, 20-26.04.1992, 22-28.04.2002, 16-22.04.2012. In this section, the analysis tables and the findings are shown below.

### On which year is the news item published?

	Groups	Frequency	Percent (%)
On which year is the news item published?	1972	97	21,3
	1982	115	25,2
	1992	83	18,2
	2002	69	15,1
	2012	92	20,2
	Total	456	100,0

In this table, it is seen that 25,2 % of total 456 analysed news items is consisted of the front page news published in the selected week of 1982. Compared to the other years shown in table, this indicates that the front page news items published in 1982 are more in numbers. In 2002, in 7 days, 69 news items are published in the front page, which is the lowest number of news within the time period of analysis. The frequency distribution of front page news published in 1972 and 2012 are close according to the number of news items. In the selected 7 days week period in 1972, 97 news items are published and in 2012, 92 news items are published.

By the high percentage of front page news published in 1982, it is important to mention that the agenda of 1982 was quite loaded and intense. Another significant data that the analysis table points out is the similarity between the numbers of front page news items in 1972 and 2012. This leads to the idea that the page layouts and consequently the editorial selection of news columns of both years are also similar.

**On which day of the week is the news item published?**

	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
On which day of the week is the news item published?	Monday	57	12,5
	Tuesday	60	13,2
	Wednesday	73	16,0
	Thursday	72	15,8
	Friday	68	14,9
	Saturday	70	15,4
	Sunday	56	12,3
	Total	456	100,0

Within the total of 456 analyzed news items published in the front page of Milliyet in the time period of 1972-2012, 12,5% of the news items are published in Monday, 13,2% on Tuesday, 16,0% on Wednesday, 15,8% on Thursday, 14,19% on Friday, 15,4% on Saturday and 12,3% on Sunday. In this table, the general weekly distribution rate of front page news items are able to be observed. Considering the changes and the intensity of the agenda, it is seen that on Wednesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, front pages include more news items than the rest of the days. However, this statistic may also be explained by the priority and column size of the headline news or the importance of particular news coverages which decreases the amount of news on the front pages, for instance on Mondays.

**How many news items does the front-page contain?**

	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
How many news items does the front-page contain?	5-10	62	13,6
	11-15	236	51,8
	16-20	158	34,6
	Total	456	100,0

As it is seen in the table, the number of news items published in the front-pages of Milliyet are generally between 11-15 and its percentage is 51,8%. 34,6 percent of the front-pages are consisted of 16-20 news items. The quantity of news items per page is between 5-10 with the percent of 13,6. This table shows that, during the time period of analysis, the layouts of the analyzed front-pages of Milliyet contain between 11-15 news items with 51,8 percent.

**How many business news item does the front-page include?**

	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
How many business news item does the front-page include?	0	127	27,9
	1-2	260	57,0
	3-4	51	11,2
	6 And More	18	3,9
	Total	456	100,0

Business news refers to the company and market news. This type of news may also involve the news topics of financial development and investment opportunities in Turkey. Within the total of 456 analyzed news items during the analysis period of 1972 to 2012, 57% of front-pages of Milliyet contain 1 or 2 business news items. This is a quite high percentage for business news to be published in the front-page. In 27,9 percent of the front-pages, there are

not any business news items. However, in the overall, the containment of business news items is 72,1%. This data points out a significant evidence of how commercialization and free market relations are able to effect editorial policies. Even it is still hard to prove the correlation between the ownership and capital relations directly by this table, the data shows that business news items are one of the most indispensable and usual news production sources. Yet, considering the number of news items published in the front-pages of Milliyet, in the 11,2% of front-pages, there are 3 or 4 business news out of 11-15 news items.

**Does the news item contain any information about its publisher or his/her enterprises?**

	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Does the news item contain any information about its publisher or his/her enterprises?	Yes	2	0,4
	No	454	99,6
	Total	456	100,0

Besides the usage of the business news in the front-page, it was obligatory to analyze the percentage of the news items that include information about the publisher of the newspaper and/or about other enterprises belonging to the publisher. The analysis shows that out of 456 news items, only 2 of them evidently contain these kind of information. However, this percentage may also lead to the idea of how the publisher of the newspaper has a control over what is not to be taken into the agenda, especially about his/herself. Moreover, it is controversial to claim exactly which other enterprises or economic/ financial profit resources that the publisher benefits from. In other words, the knowledge about which news is beneficial for the publisher's interests is limited with the common knowledge of his/her establishments and assets.

**How is the news item placed on the front page?**

	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
How is the news item placed on the front page?	Headline	35	7,9
	Above Headline	29	6,1
	Next To Headline	63	13,8
	Middle Of The Page	128	28,1
	Bottom Of The Page	201	44,1
	Total	456	100,0

This table shows the distribution of the news items on the front-pages. As it is seen, 201 news items are placed at bottom of the front-pages. This result is directly related with the column size of the particular new items. Another significant point is that in the analysis weeks of 1972 and 1982, there are not any news items taking place above the headline. As of 1992, the placement of news items and also advertisements above the headline is more common to be seen.

**In which size is the news item published in the page?**

	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
In which size is the news item published in the page?	Single Column	148	32,5
	Two Three Columns	200	43,9
	Four Five Columns	74	16,2
	Six Seven Columns	19	4,2
	Eight Nine Columns	15	3,3
	Total	456	100,0

According to the table, 43,9% of the news items are published in 2 or 3 column sizes. This percentage almost applies to half of the total analyzed news. The news items which are published in 6 or 7 and 8 or 9 column sizes consist of the headlines and their percentage is 7,5%. During the analysis period of the selected weeks from 1972 to 2012, 15 headlines are published in the 8 or 9 column size. In a total of 456 news items, 128 news items are single column and 74 news items are 4 or 5 columns.

**Does the news item include any photography?**

	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Does the news item include any photography?	Yes	228	50,0
	No	228	50,0
	Total	456	100,0

In the front-pages of Milliyet, photography is used in 228 news items within a total of 35 front-pages in 5 analysis weeks. It is notable that in 50 percent of the front-page news of Milliyet photography is not used. However, during the content analysis process, it is observed that in 1972 and 1982, photography is used less than 1992, 2002 and 2012. In addition, especially in 1972, the headline does not often include photography. Therefore, it would be suitable to claim usage of photography increases that from 1972 to 2012.

**What is the news type?**

	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
What is the news type?	Domestic Politics	196	43,0
	Foreign Policy	28	6,1
	International News	49	10,7
	Human Interest	43	9,4
	Economics	53	11,6
	Social Life	39	8,6
	Sports	8	1,8
	Army News	8	1,8
	Other	10	2,2
	Terror	15	3,3
	Corruption	7	1,5
	Total	456	100,0

In this table it is seen that 43% of analyzed news is consisted of domestic politics within 35 analyzed front-pages of Milliyet. Another important data in the table is 9,4 % of the news is consisted of human stories. These stories mostly cover tragic events or people mostly suffering from poverty and violence. On the other hand, the news about foreign policy takes place in the news bulletins with a percentage of 6,1 which is less than international news. This shows that citizens are not informed enough about the policies that Turkey is leading. Besides the percentage of news of economics take almost as same amount of place as social life. Yet economy news may be called as sustaining instead of informing.

**Is the news about a social / political / economical problem or conflict?**

	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Is the news about a social / political / economical problem or conflict?	Yes	291	63,8
	No	165	36,2
	Total	456	100,0

This table shows that 63,8 % of the news published in Milliyet is about a social or political or an economical problem or conflict. This does not lead any significant conclusion. Because the most important issue here is the construction of the news of conflict or problem.

**How is the news framed?**

	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
How is the news framed?	Episodic	282	61,8
	Thematic	174	38,2
	Total	456	100,0

Here it is seen that the framing of the news are mostly episodic. This data tells most of the social, political, economical news is covered by episodic framing, lack of attributing responsibility to the public officials or the government. Thematic news takes place in Milliyet with a percentage of 38,2. However, these thematic news is not produced to give the citizens a wider and deeper perspective about the issue examined, but to denounce the opposition as guilty of chaos.

**Does the news attribute responsibility to officials?**

	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Does the news attribute responsibility to officials?	Yes	161	35,3
	No	295	64,7
	Total	456	100,0

In 456 analysed news, 295 news does not attribute responsibility to officials. More than the percentage of the domestic politics news (43,0), 64,7% news does not attribute responsibility. More than half of the news does not point out the accountables.

**Is the news source constituted of any government official's declaration?**

	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Is the news source constituted of any government official's declaration?	Yes	131	28,7
	No	325	71,3
	Total	456	100,0

In the table above, it is seen that 28,7% of the news sources are constituted of government official's declarations. This situation has high significance in terms of the coverage of the news story. Because, this brings out the fact the journalist does not add any perspectives or any different point of views to the news coverage. In other words, declarations of government officials can be used as a reference in the news story, not the source.

**How many news items does the front-page contain? \* On which year is the news published?  
Crosstabulation**

How many news items does the front-page contain?	On which year is the news published?												χ <sup>2</sup> /p
	1972		1982		1992		2002		2012		Total		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
5-10	0	%0,0	0	%0,0	27	%32,5	35	%50,7	0	%0,0	62	%13,6	χ <sup>2</sup> =235,931 p=0,000
11-15	47	%48,5	39	%33,9	40	%48,2	34	%49,3	76	%82,6	236	%51,8	
16-20	50	%51,5	76	%66,1	16	%19,3	0	%0,0	16	%17,4	158	%34,6	
Total	97	%100,0	115	%100,0	83	%100,0	69	%100,0	92	%100,0	456	%100,0	

The data in the table above can be examined as follows:

a. Between the analysis week period, from 8 May to 14 May 1972, 48,5% of the front-pages of Milliyet contain 11-15 news items, 51,75% of the front-pages contain 16-20 news items and none of the front-pages contain 5-10 news items. The total number of front-page news items published in the analysis week of 1972 is 97.

b. Between the analysis week period, from 19 April to 25 April 1982, 33,9% of the front-pages of Milliyet contain 11-15 news items, 66,1% of the front-pages contain 16-20 news items and none of the front-pages contain 5-10 news items. The total number of front-page news items published in the analysis week of 1972 is 115.

c. Between the analysis week period, from 20 April to 26 April 1992, 32,5% of the front-pages of Milliyet contain 5-10 news items, 48,2% of the front-pages contain 11-15 news items and 19,3% of the front-pages contain 16-20 news items. The total number of front-page news items published in the analysis week of 1992 is 83.

d. Between the analysis week period, from 22 April to 28 April 2002, 50,7% of the front-pages of Milliyet contain 5-10 news items, 49,3% of the front-pages contain 11-15 news items and none of the front-pages contain 16-20 news items. The total number of front-page news items published in the analysis week of 2002 is 69.

e. Between the analysis week period, from 16 April to 22 April 2012, 82,6% of the front-pages of Milliyet contain 11-15 news items, 17,4% of the front-pages contain 16-20 news items and none of the front-pages contain 5-10 news items. The total number of front-page news items published in the analysis week of 2012 is 92.

As it is seen in the table, the number of the news items published in the front-pages in 1972 and 1982 are exceeding in numbers compared to the news items in the analysis weeks of 1992 and 2002. The most important reason of this change is the increase of photography usage. Another notable point is that as of 1992, the rise of the sensational news and episodic news coverage got its place publishing environments. In addition usage of advertorials as news, as consequents of free market strategies and conglomeration also became visible.

**How many business news items does the front-page include? \* On which year is the news item published? Crosstabulation**

How many business news items does the front-page include?	On which year is the news item published?												X <sup>2</sup> /p
	1972		1982		1992		2002		2012		Total		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
0	11	%11,3	0	%0,0	18	%21,7	47	%68,1	51	%55,4	127	%27,9	X <sup>2</sup> =279,923 p=0,000
1 2	86	%88,7	60	%52,2	65	%78,3	22	%31,9	27	%29,3	260	%57,0	
3 4	0	%0,0	37	%32,2	0	%0,0	0	%0,0	14	%15,2	51	%11,2	
6 And More	0	%0,0	18	%15,7	0	%0,0	0	%0,0	0	%0,0	18	%3,9	
Total	97	%100,0	115	%100,0	83	%100,0	69	%100,0	92	%100,0	456	%100,0	

In this table, it is observable that the usage of business news increases from 1972 to 2012. This fact is a self-evident proof of the effects of concentration of ownership and media capital diversifications on editorial policies. In 1972, there is no usage of business news items in 11,3% of the front-pages. However, in 1982, 52,2% of the front-pages includes 1 or 2 business news items, 32,2% includes 3 or 4 and 15,7% includes 6 and more business news items. This is certainly the result of the rapid period of privatization in 1980's. In 1992, 78,3% of the front-page news includes 1 or 2 business news items. This is a quite high percentage considering the total number news published in the analysis week of 1992. However, in 2002, it is seen that the usage of business news declines, 68,1% of the front-pages does not include any business news items. This is the result of the decline in the number of news items published in the front-pages and the shift of the attention from finance to politics. In 2012, 29,3% of the front-pages includes 1 or 2 business news items and 15,2% of the front-pages includes 3 or 4 business news items.

**How is the news item placed on the front page? \* On which year is the news published?**  
**Crosstabulation**

How is the news item placed on the front page?	On which year is the news published?										Total		X <sup>2</sup> /p
	1972		1982		1992		2002		2012				
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Headline	7	%7,2	7	%6,1	7	%9,6	7	%10,1	7	%7,6	36	%7,9	X <sup>2</sup> =67,499 p=0,000
Above Headline	0	%0,0	0	%0,0	4	%3,6	5	%7,2	20	%21,7	29	%6,1	
Next To Headline	20	%20,6	12	%10,4	13	%15,7	8	%11,6	10	%10,9	63	%13,8	
Middle Of The Page	22	%22,7	42	%36,5	29	%34,9	16	%23,2	19	%20,7	128	%28,1	
Bottom Of The Page	48	%49,5	54	%47,0	30	%36,1	33	%47,8	36	%39,1	201	%44,1	
Total	97	%100,0	115	%100,0	83	%100,0	69	%100,0	92	%100,0	456	%100,0	

The significance of this table is the observable increase of the news items that are placed above headlines. As it is seen, there is not any news items above the headline in 1972 and 1982. However, the number of news items placed above the headline increases from 1992 to 2012. In 1992, the number of the news items above headline published in a week is 4, in 2002, it goes up to 5 and in 2012, it increases to 20 news items. It should not be overlooked that the news items placed above headlines are generally about social life, sports or human interests.

**In which size is the news published in the page? \* On which year is the news published?**  
**Crosstabulation**

In which size is the news published in the page?	On which year is the news published?											X <sup>2</sup> /p	
	1972		1982		1992		2002		2012		Total		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n		%
Single Column	41	%42,3	62	%53,9	27	%32,5	10	%14,5	8	%8,7	148	%32,5	X <sup>2</sup> =83,756 p=0,000
Two Three Columns	42	%43,3	36	%31,3	33	%39,8	37	%53,6	52	%56,5	200	%43,9	
Four Five Columns	9	%9,3	16	%13,9	13	%15,7	12	%17,4	24	%26,1	74	%16,2	
Six Seven Columns	1	%1,0	0	%0,0	7	%8,4	4	%5,8	7	%7,6	19	%4,2	
Eight Nine Columns	4	%4,1	1	%0,9	3	%3,6	6	%8,7	1	%1,1	15	%3,3	
Total	97	%100,0	115	%100,0	83	%100,0	69	%100,0	92	%100,0	456	%100,0	

It is an important point that from 1972 to 2012, column sizes of the news items becomes larger and the number of news items published in the front-pages consequently declines. For instance, in 1972 and 1982, the number of single column sized news items are in the order of 41 and 62. However, this number declines in 1992 to 27, in 2002 to 10 and in 2012 to 8. In addition, the number of 4 or 5 column sized news items increases in the front-pages; in 1972 it is 9, in 1982 increases to 16, in 2012 it increases to 24.

**Does the news item include any photography? \* On which year is the news published?**  
**Crosstabulation**

Does the news item include any photography ?	On which year is the news published?												x <sup>2</sup> /p
	1972		1982		1992		2002		2012		Total		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Yes	29	%29,9	26	%22,6	36	%43,4	60	%87,0	77	%83,7	228	%50,0	X <sup>2</sup> =131,13 0 p=0,000
No	68	%70,1	89	%77,4	47	%56,6	9	%13,0	15	%16,3	228	%50,0	
Total	97	%100,0	115	%100,0	83	%100,	69	%100,0	92	%100,	456	%100,	

The table above shows that the usage of photography evidently increases from 1972 to 2012. In the front-pages of 1972, 70,1% of the news items does not include any photography and in 1982, the percentage of photography usage is 22,6. However, in 1992, compared to 1982 photography usage increases to 43,%4 and in 2002, the percentage of photography usage becomes 87. In 2012, the front-page news items include photography with the percentage of 83,7.

**What is the news type? \* On which year is the news published? Crosstabulation**

What is the news type?	On which year is the news published?												X <sup>2</sup> /p
	1972		1982		1992		2002		2012		Total		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Domestic Politics	60	%61,9	40	%34,8	32	%38,6	30	%43,5	34	%37,0	196	%43,0	X <sup>2</sup> =110,685 p=0,000
Foreign Policy	3	%3,1	6	%5,2	8	%9,6	4	%5,8	7	%7,6	28	%6,1	
International News	8	%8,2	17	%14,8	7	%8,4	7	%10,1	10	%10,9	49	%10,7	
Human Interest	8	%8,2	11	%9,6	8	%9,6	6	%8,7	10	%10,9	43	%9,4	
Economics	8	%8,2	23	%20,0	8	%9,6	5	%7,2	9	%9,8	53	%11,6	
Social Life	6	%6,2	7	%6,1	5	%6,0	11	%15,9	10	%10,9	39	%8,6	
Sports	0	%0,0	0	%0,0	0	%0,0	2	%2,9	6	%6,5	8	%1,8	
Army News	2	%2,1	4	%3,5	1	%1,2	0	%0,0	1	%1,1	8	%1,8	
Other	1	%1,0	6	%5,2	2	%2,4	1	%1,4	0	%0,0	10	%2,2	
Terror	1	%1,0	0	%0,0	12	%14,5	1	%1,4	1	%1,1	15	%3,3	
Corruption	0	%0,0	1	%0,9	0	%0,0	2	%2,9	4	%4,3	7	%1,5	
Total	97	%100,0	115	%100,0	83	%100,0	69	%100,0	92	%100,0	456	%100,0	

In the table the news types that Milliyet front-pages include are seen for the time of content analysis period between 1972-2012. In a total of 456 news items, there are 196 domestic political news, 28 foreign policy news, 49 international news, 43 human interest, 53 economics, 39 social life, 8 sports, 8 army news items, 10 other news, 15 terror and 7 corruption news items.

The distributions of the news items according to their news types as per years are listed in the table above. If the numbers are compared with each other according to the newsworthiness, the data can be interpreted as follows;

In the analysis week period of 1972, 61,9% of the front-page news is consisted of domestic politics. However, as it is seen in the table, the percentage of domestic politics news declines to 34,8 in 1982 and in 2012, 37% of the front-page news in Milliyet is consisted of domestic politics. In contrast to domestic politics news, the percentage of economy news grows up to 20,0 in 1982. This is the result of rapid privatization period during former Prime Minister Turgut Özal. Another important data is that in 1992, terror news percentage is 14,5% which is the highest percentage in the analysis period from 1972 to 2012. The percentage of corruption news get to its highest level in 2012 among all other analysis years.

**How is the news framed? \* On which year is the news published? Crosstabulation**

How is the news framed?	On which year is the news published?										X <sup>2</sup> /p		
	1972		1982		1992		2002		2012			Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%
Episodic	46	%47,4	85	%73,9	55	%66,3	33	%47,8	63	%68,5	282	%61,8	X <sup>2</sup> =23,797 p=0,000
Thematic	51	%52,6	30	%26,1	28	%33,7	36	%52,2	29	%31,5	174	%38,2	
Total	97	%100,0	115	%100,0	83	%100,0	69	%100,0	92	%100,0	456	%100,0	

Episodic news frame forms the news as a case study. It is not possible to bind the news with the contemporary political conjuncture. Because the episodic news framing edits news as a one time event, not pointing to responsible officials for the incident. Thematic news frame differs from episodic by pointing out the solution, thematic news attributes the responsibility to

accountables. Thematic news places public issues in a more general or abstract context, gives the incident a perspective of history and binding with today. It reports the general outcomes and conditions. While episodic framing diverts attention from societal responsibility and political accountability, thematic framing discusses the possible solutions to the particular issue.

According to the table above, the framing of the news is mostly episodic with the percentage of 61,8%. However, in total 38,2 % of the news is made by thematic framing. 1982 and 2012 is the least sufficient years within the five analysis years.

**Does The News Attribute Responsibility To Officials / Responsibles? \* On Which Year Is The News Published? Crosstabulation**

Does The News Attribute Responsibility To Officials / Responsibles ?	On Which Year is The News Published?												χ <sup>2</sup> /p
	1972		1982		1992		2002		2012		Toplam		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Yes	40	%41,2	25	%21,7	32	%38,6	33	%47,8	31	%33,7	16	%35,3	χ <sup>2</sup> =15,98 4 p=0,003
No	57	%58,8	90	%78,3	51	%61,4	36	%52,2	61	%66,3	29	%64,7	
Toplam	97	%100,0	115	%100,0	83	%100,0	69	%100,0	92	%100,0	45	%100,0	

As supporting the framing table, 1982 and 2012 has the highest percentages of not attributing of responsibility. In 1982, 78,3% of front-page news items does not attribute responsibility. Similarly, in 2012, 66,3% of the front-page news items does not attribute responsibility to public official or the government. In 2002, it is seen that percent of attribution of

responsibility is 47,8%. However, the news that do not attribute responsibility in total is 64,7, that is more than half of the news. It should be noted that in 1992, Milliyet front-pages have an aim not to point out accountables as it is seen by the percentage of 61,4.

**Is The News Source Constituted Of Any Government Official's Declaration? \* On Which Year is The News Published? Crosstabulation**

Is The News Source Constituted Of Any Government Official's Declaration?	On Which Year is The News Published?										X <sup>2</sup> /p		
	1972		1982		1992		2002		2012			Toplam	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%
Yes	28	%28,9	29	%25,2	31	%37,3	10	%14,5	33	%35,9	131	%28,7	X <sup>2</sup> =12,827 p=0,012
No	69	%71,1	86	%74,8	52	%62,7	59	%85,5	59	%64,1	325	%71,3	
Toplam	97	%100,0	115	%100,0	83	%100,0	69	%100,0	92	%100,0	456	%100,0	

The data above shows that in 2012, 35,9% of the news sources of Milliyet are constituted of government officials' declarations, which is higher than the percentage of 1982.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **Conclusion**

In this thesis, the main aim is to investigate and display the effects of the diversification of media capital on editorial policies in the Turkish Newspaper Milliyet. This study is prepared in order to discover how editorial policies depend on and are able to be altered by the ownership interests and divergent capital establishments. By using classical content analysis method, front page news of Milliyet are analysed with 16 content analysis questions and in the time period between 1972-2012.

To research the effects of diversification of media capital on editorial policies one of the oldest and reputable newspaper in Turkey, Milliyet is going to be examined by the questions asked to each news item for the 7 days of 5 randomly selected weeks in the 10 yearly time period of 1972-2012. The time frame for the sampling is not specially selected. Because that the research weeks are random and routine, the natural and usual condition of newspaper can be recognised. The thesis is not focused on a case study. The front-page news of Milliyet which are going to be examined and analyzed.

Because that media is called the fourth estate it should attach the responsibility to inform citizens about their political rights in order to enact them to participate democratic processes consciously. This function requires the qualified news making, editing values and reporting ethics. Yet, the free will for decision making by citizens is only able to occur unless biased news is made. To achieve this goal, different varieties of political views should be represented without any opinion addition to the news.

However, to change the continuous mainstream media perspective, first of all the political economy of media ownership should be reformed. The relationship between political actors

and media owners should be at least declared, underlined in news. The strongest income source of media organs is advertisements. So the advertisers have magnificent influence on news and so decision making process with free will. As long as the news is filtered, it is impossible to claim that making objective, truthful news is in the hands of reporters. Reporters seem like a sand grain in the age of conglomeration.

In addition, the ideology of the newspaper owner or the media group such as Doğan and Demirören Groups, should not have an influence on reporting.

By using classical content analysis method, this study tried to reveal data to measure the newspapers' duty to attribute responsibility in order to be called the fourth estate. The way the news produced are examined. If the results are analyzed, 2012 occurs to be the most AKP favoring year, 2002 seems not to have a definite discourse and in 1992 Milliyet does not favor the party in power. However, the framing of the political news, if the attribution of responsibility is considered, does not match with the ideal way of news making. Because the thematic news which take few place in Milliyet, lacks the attribution of responsibility to government . Another point that analyzed channels sometimes accuse each other for not paying taxes or relating with criminal, judicial cases or for confronting government.

The economy news also has an aim to be made by episodic news framing. The most obvious example for this is unemployment news. These news almost never attribute responsibility to government, mostly consisted of how people suffer from poverty with tragic human stories. Citizens are not able to find out why the unemployment grows higher and what could be the possible solutions.

The framing of news in human stories does not include any thematic framing news. It would not be wrong to say that these human stories generally cover sad events and solution seeking events. However, newspapers only pay attention on the striking images which will sell more advertisements.

All of these factors that keep news away from informing citizens. However, this can be changed by creating a media law literature, ownership limitations, the obligation to declare the economical interest relationships between media companies and politicians.

Democracy is able to function when the transparent media environment occurs. If the information about politics and economy does not flow freely and unmanipulated, citizens can not participate democratically.

The means of communication belongs to several wealthy media groups which do not have diverse point of views. Consequently, if the number of the different political party coverages in the newspapers are counted, the numbers only goes up to four. Yet, to maintain this situation of wealth, these media group have to reinforce the capitalist system. So, it would be ridiculous to expect otherwise. The mainstream media serves for consumerism culture.

The result of this study reveals that concentration of ownership and diversification of media capital result in poor contribution to the functioning of democracy and therefore, media can not be called as forth estate media. Because ownership relations serve for economical interests and do not intent the creation of conscious democratic participation. Besides, democracy becomes meaningful with elections between the competition of different political views. However media does not include those different competing views, just reinforce the maintaining system in order to keep the economical benefits rising.

## **Bibliography**

Althusser, L. (1970), "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses".

Bek, M. (2004) 'Tabloidization of News Media: An Analysis of Television News in Turkey',  
European Journal of Communication 19(3): 371-86.

Çatalbaş, D. (2000) 'Broadcasting Deregulation in Turkey: Uniformity Within Diversity', in  
J. Curran (ed.) Media Organisations in Society, pp. 126-48. London: Arnold.

Çatalbaş, D. (2003) 'Glocalization' – A Case History: Commercial Partnerships and  
Cooperation Between Turkish and American Satellite Broadcasters', Transnational  
Broadcasting Studies 10, URL (consulted Sept. 2005):  
<http://www.tbsjournal.com/catalbas.html>.

Chomsky, N. (1988) 'A Propaganda Model in Manufacturing Consent the Political Economy

of the Mass Media' London: Vintage.

Christensen, C. (2007) 'Concentration of ownership, the fall of unions and government legislation in Turkey', *Global Media and Communication* 2007; 180-199

Cizre-Sakallıoğlu, U. and Yeldan, E. (2000) 'Politics, Society and Financial Liberalization: Turkey in the 1990s', *Development and Change* 31: 481-508.

Duran, R. (2002) *Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Medya Etiği*.

*Economist* (2002) 'A Turkish Rupert Murdoch', 362 (8260): 65.

Finkel, A. (2000) 'Who Guards the Turkish Press? A Perspective on Press Corruption in Turkey', *Journal of International Affairs* 54(1): 147-66.

Finkel, A. (2005) 'Fighting the Enemy Within', *IPI Global Journalist* 3: 24-5.

Gramsci, A. (1930) *Hegemony*.

Hallin, D. and Papathanassopoulos, S. (2002) 'Political Clientelism and the Media: Southern Europe and Latin America in Comparative Perspective', *Media, Culture & Society* 24: 175-95.

Iyengar, S. (1991) 'Is Anyone Responsible?', Chicago Univ.

Karaman, M.L. and Aras, B. (2000) 'The Crisis of Civil Society in Turkey', *Journal of Economic and Social Research* 2(2): 39-58.

Machin, D. and Papatheodorou, F. (2002) 'Commercialization and Tabloid Television in Southern Europe: Disintegration or Democratization of the public Sphere?', *Journal of European Area Studies* 10(1): 1-18.

Marx, K. (1848) 'The Communist Manifesto'.

- McNair, B. (2007) 'Politics, Democracy and the Media in An Introduction to Political Communication', London : Routledge.
- Odyakmaz,N. (2002) 'Sermayenin Gelişimi ve Bir Üstyapi Ögesi Olarak Medya', İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Hakemli Dergisi
- Önis, Z. (2004) 'Turgut Özal and his Economic Legacy: Turkish Noe-Liberalism in Critical Perspective', Middle Eastern Studies 40(4): 113-34.
- Pekman, C. (2002) 'Audiovisual Policy on the Way to the EU: The Turkish Case', inP. Xuereb (ed.) Euro-Meditettanean Integration: The Mediterranean's European Challenge, Volume III, pp. 346-63. Malta: European Documentattion & Research Center.
- Tılıç, D. (2000) Media Ownership Structure in Turkey, Ankara: Progressive Journalists Association.
- Tılıç, D. (2001) Turkey 2001: Crisis of the Country, Crisis of the Media. Brussels: Association of European Journalists.
- Tunç, A. (2002) 'Pushing the Limits of Tolerance. Functions of Political Cartoonists in the Democratization Process: The Case of Turkey', Gazette: The International Journal For Communication Studies 64(1): 47-62.
- Tunç, A. (2003) 'Faustian Acts in Turkish Style: Structural Change in National Newspapers as an Obstacle to Quality Journalism in 1990-2003', in O. Spassov (ed.) Quality Press in Southeast Europe. Sofia, Bulgaria: SOEMZ/Sofia University.
- Wheeler, M. (1997) 'The Traditional Paradigms: Political Theories of the Mass Media in Politics and the mass Media', Oxford : Blackwell.

<http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/iw/home/aboutus/sourcepapers/turkey/milliyet.html?begin92bf006-5d67-487a-9fff-9fad71416b50=160&end92bf006-5d67-487a-9fff-9fad71416b50=169&pagesize92bf006-5d67-487a-9fff-9fad71416b50=10&#ixzz2V8KKX4OF>

<http://www.demiroren.com.tr/Default.aspx>

<http://www.cinergroup.com.tr/sectorlist>

<http://www.freemedia.at/awards/abdi-ipekci.html>

<http://kap.gov.tr/bildirim-sorgulari/bildirm-sorgu-sonuc.aspx?tarihtipi=-1&sirketgrubu=0&SirketAraciKurumList=919&bildirimtipi=-2&secimler=#0>

<http://arsiv.ntvmsnbc.com/news/339819.asp>

<http://www.medyatava.com/tiraj>

## **Appendix**

### **Content Analysis Questions For Front-Page News Items of Milliyet**

#### **1) On which year is the news published?**

- 1- 1972
- 2- 1982
- 3- 1992
- 4- 2002
- 5- 2012

#### **2) On which day of the week is the news item published?**

- 1- Monday
- 2- Tuesday
- 3- Wednesday
- 4- Thursday

- 5- Friday
- 6- Saturday
- 7- Sunday

**3) How many news items does the front-page contain?**

- 1- 5-10
- 2- 11-15
- 3- 16-20
- 4- 21-25
- 5- 26 and more

**4) How many business news items does the front-page include?**

- 1- 0
- 2- 1-2
- 3- 3-4
- 4- 5
- 5- 6 and more

**5) Does the news item contain any information about its publisher or his/her enterprises?**

- 1- Yes
- 2- No

**6) How is the news item placed on the front page?**

- 1- Headline
- 2- Above headline

- 3- Next to headline
- 4- Middle of the page
- 5- Bottom of the page

**7) In which size is the news item published in the page?**

- 1- Single Column
- 2- Two-Three Columns
- 3- Four-Five Columns
- 4- Six-Seven Columns
- 5- Eight-Nine Columns

**8) Does the news item include any photography?**

- 1- Yes
- 2- No

**9) What is the news type?**

- 1- Domestic Politics
- 2- Foreign Policy
- 3- International News
- 4- Human Interest
- 5- Economics
- 6- Social Life
- 7- Sports
- 8- Army News
- 9- Other
- 10- Terror
- 11- Corruption

**10) Is the news about a social / political / economical problem or conflict?**

- 1- Yes

2- No

**11) How is the news framed?**

1- Episodic

2- Thematic

**12) Does the news attribute responsibility to officials / responsables?**

1- Yes

2- No

**13) Is the news source constituted of any government official's declaration?**

1- Yes

2- No