Chapter 4

The individual as an active subject related to agenda setting

SERGÜN KURTOĞLU
Istanbul University, Turkey

Abstract: The agenda setting theory assumes the fact that the agenda of the media has an active role in determining the public agenda and explains it by basing it on a causal relationship. Thus, this theory accepts the relative superiority of the media during the establishment of the public agenda. The fact that the relationship is only based upon the connection between the media agenda and the public agenda weakens the theory. It would be much more democratic if an explanation was made that allowed for individuals who are either affected/not affected and dependent on their own interior organization, in other words, by accepting the individual as an active subject, then the media would not be positioned as an authority but it could be shown how the media can become an authority. A causal relationship should be able to explain the results based on the cause; however, the theory explains in what way the public is affected by the media according to their socio-demographic structure but does not explain why they remain under the influence of the media.

Keywords: agenda setting theory, framing, the individual as an active subject, analytical and critical attitude, perceptive grouping/patterning.

Introduction

The individual as a passive or active subject and the public

The most general way to describe the relationship between the media and the public can be expressed by focusing on the attention people give to media messages, as stated in agenda setting theory. Is it enough to explain the effect of the media on individuals when only certain individuals within a specific socio-demographic structure accept certain media messages as they are framed in the media? Agenda setting theory does not determine how the media affects the individual; rather it states what the effect is. Thus it positions the individual as the object and the media as the subject.

Whatever influences the individual may be under; the problem of internalizing the effect is dependent on the individual perception. The fact that individuals

attach a certain value to stimulus coming from the environment and give them meaning is not independent from the context they are in. The researches that the theory is based on, are carried out within certain socio-demographic structures. However, the context, that is to say, the relationship web is not only connected to the socio-demographic structure. It is also connected to other structures that remain outside that structure and which also affects individuals. The entry of any media subject into the agenda of individuals is first of all related to how the subject is structured by individuals. In other words, it is insufficient to discuss the subject of agenda setting independently of the psychographic structure of individuals. For this reason, the interconnected nature of the social and psychological context that surrounds the individuals should be taken into consideration and the same attention should be given to the psychological context as well as the social context. While the research results of the theory allow for "the way to understanding the larger social context of mass communication" (McCombs, 2004: xiv), this understanding prioritizes the media and social context but fails to take into consideration the individual and their psychological context and only considers the individual as part of the social context. Thus the theory positions the individual as passive.

When it is asserted, as it is in this study, that the public is actively and not passively positioned with regards to the formation of the public agenda, a few explanations are necessary in order to have the individuals focus on a common agenda-generated media with respect to public characteristics. Bektaş states that the public is a group that comes together when faced with a problem or a situation (2000: 48). This definition comes from the modern world and its importance comes from the fact that it emphasizes the individual consciousness in the modern world. As a result, if the media agenda does not incorporate any quality that would require the individual to interact, in other words, if the media agenda does not awaken public consciousness, there can be no discussion of a public agenda. For these reasons, the meaning of public that encompasses the public agenda that is established via the media agenda is ironically the opposite of the modern meaning of public. When the media influenced public agenda is considered, essentially, the individuals that have been united by the media's own agenda are being emphasized. However, studies conducted regarding the relationship between the media agenda and the public agenda have aimed to analyze the media content that has already been discussed among people with public interest, or have shown individual interest and not in terms of people who have come together as a result of a specific media agenda topic or are in communication in some way nor these individuals' dialogues regarding the media agenda, that is to say, not to analyze the condition of the public consciousness with regards to the media agenda. In conclusion, the claim that the public agenda is determined by the media agenda, in fact with the acceptance that the media agenda has the ability to unite individuals publicly, the ideological power of the media is validated.

In any scientific study that incorporates individuals, whether the individual carries any public importance or not, they must be considered as active and not passive subjects. Agenda setting theory is concerned with agenda topics that are transferred from the media to the public. Despite the fact that the media has developed group codings, decoding is still an individual job (Schramm, 1973: 128). When the fact that decoding of media content is accomplished as an individual action and as a result there cannot be any decoding done that is removed from the individual's psychology, the need to define individuals that accept certain media content into their agenda as active instead of passive can be further understood.

Public agenda

Agenda setting theory also explains the psychological state of individuals that accept certain media content into their agenda. In fact, statements that take the individuals' psychological state into consideration begin with arguments of Lippmann, who many consider to be the father of agenda setting theory: "... public opinion, argued Lippmann, responds not to the environment, but to the pseudo-environment constructed by the news media" (McCombs, 2004: 3). "Lippmann pointed out that the media dominates over the creation of a picture in our head, he believed that the public reacts not to actual events but to the pictures in our head" (Sanchez, 2002: n. pag.). By stating that the media influences the public by use of pseudo-environments that are compatible with public consciousness, he has passively positioned the public within mass communication. This approach regarding mass communication which has made it until today is partially contradictory. When the mental structure of individuals is taken into consideration, it is obvious that pseudo-environments in media messages that are consistent to a certain degree can be formed. In order for the media to determine the public agenda, an understanding that firstly emphasizes the consideration of the individuals' mental structure is very important. However, because it only provides a one-way explanation of the formation of the effect, it can only give a limited perspective.

The media gets its ideological power, as Hall previously stated, from its capability to define a situation (Shoemaker & Reese, 1997: 103). However, it is necessary to clearly outline the definition made by the media for its receivers. As a result, "it is necessary to take into account the values at stake, and the identity of the group whose position is being examined by the mass media" (Lasswell, 1967: 189). On the other hand, even though the media appropriately frames its messages for their receivers, this does not ensure that the receivers will always assign the same meaning to these messages. In order for such a straightforward relationship to exist, in other words, for the meaning of message to be received as it was intended to be, the receivers must not notice the organized social order that the message has come from (Şerif, 1985: 91). There is another possibility, in that the receivers are aware that the message has been framed by the media, but

they mostly ignore this situation. Does the realization of any one or both of these possibilities either emphasize the power of the media in the formation of the public agenda or emphasize individual/public determination that is caused by their own psychological or socioeconomic context? The receivers' self reference with regards to messages from the media, their attitude towards the media as an institutional structure and their grasping of the connection between the message and the media or the organized social order are effective in the interpretation of the message. As a result, it does not appear to be possible to explain the relationship between the media agenda and the public agenda by disregarding the psychology of perception.

This study tries to explain that the relationships between the media agenda and the public agenda cannot be taken into consideration independently from individuals' own self context and if such a consideration is made, the so called public agenda created by the media will not carry a true public agenda quality and can only be defined in theory as a public agenda. On the other hand, even if the relationship between individuals and the media's message is explained by the psychology of perception, to be able to talk about the public agenda as stated before, appears to be very difficult since the bringing of individuals together by the media agenda is such a difficult proposition.

This study does not include research containing the psychology of perception. However, this study will contain a table of possibilities that is based upon perceptive grouping that determines how the individuals internalize the media agenda.

Literature review

The individual as an active subject: is it a media agenda that sets the public agenda or a media agenda that is transformed into the public agenda?

"One of the early theories, developed by Paul Lazarsfeld and Elihu Katz, contends that media content sets the agenda for public discussions" (Wilcox et al., 2003: 213). Lazarsfel and Katz explained the media's power to form public opinion by stating that the media content sets the agenda for public discussions. According to Blumer, "the effectiveness of public discussion depends on the availability and flexibility of the agencies of public communication, such as the press, the radio and public meetings" (1967: 50). Both of these approaches, like many other studies conducted in the field of mass communication until today, try to explain the interaction between the media and the public by focusing on how the process develops rather than focusing on how the process forms. They have just as many different characteristics as they have similar ones. A media agenda that brings

individuals together for public discussions and a media agenda that provides or takes away momentum from the interaction of individuals during public discussions do not necessarily mean the same thing in terms of the relationship between individuals and the media agenda. Studies conducted in recent years reflect this. The study of Wanta and Wu that is titled as *Interpersonal Communication and the Agenda Setting Process* states the public will not easily show interest to a media agenda that is not connected to problems discussed during the interpersonal communication process (Irvan, 2001: 89). As a result, it can be understood that the media agenda will not transform into the public agenda directly.

Another study regarding the influence of the media content on the public agenda belongs to Irvan. Irvan states that the media's agenda setting power increases to set the public agenda during problems that are not within people's area of experiences (2001: 98). From this we can draw the conclusion that when the public cannot access information regarding the media agenda from close contact, then they allow the media agenda to become their own personal agenda. When this study is taken into consideration along with Wayne and Wu's study, it can be said that the media agenda may conduce to bring individuals together for public interaction or influence individuals who have already united with public interest related to that agenda, if the media agenda is in harmony with individuals' own context. When a media agenda in harmony with the individual's socio-demographic and psychographic context is discussed in the public agenda, does this mean that the media's message is now forming the public agenda? Does the media determine the public agenda or does the public allow the media agenda to become their own agenda?

An interesting study that attaches an active role to individuals in their interactions with the media agenda is the article called "Effects of news frames and schemas on individuals' issue interpretations and attitudes" (2004) by Fuyuan Shen. Shen states that people's attitudes cannot be influenced by the media as easily and meekly as thought, otherwise the trustworthiness of public opinion would have to be reconsidered (2004: 401).

Priming, framing, first-level and second-level agenda setting

In order for the media agenda to become the public agenda, the agenda must be first noticed and then discussed within a certain frame. The media first makes certain content noticeable. The fact that certain subjects become dominant, in other words, thanks to the priming function of the media, attention is directed towards the desired subject.

> When making decisions about political actors or public figures, Iyengar and Kinder argued, audience members rely on those issues as a basis for evaluation which are most salient

> to them at the time they make the decisions. This process is commonly referred to as priming. (Kim et al., 2002: 8)

But this is not enough to set a public agenda related to the media subject. In order to strengthen the attention given to the subject, it must be adapted to the minds of the individuals, that is to say, it must be transitioned into a structured stimulus. This function of the media is called framing. "Rather, framing assumes that it is terminological or semantic differences in how an issue is described rather than the salience of an issue itself that evoke audience responses" (Kim et al., 2002: 8). Golan and Wanta's statement, as quoted from Gamson and Modigliani, "a frame is a central organizing idea for making sense of relevant events and suggesting what is at issue" (2001: 248) overlaps with the explanations provided by Mills regarding the functions of mass media. Mills states that the media reaches an individual in the mass by telling them who he is, what he wants to be, how to get that way, and how to feel that he is that way even when he is not and thus by making use of the formula of a pseudo-world explains that the media forms its own basic psychological formula (2000: 217). Framing interacts with the individual's psychographic characteristics and creates an effect and/or continues it.

The effect the media has on people is explained on two levels:

> While the first level focuses on the transfer of object salience from the media agenda to the public agenda, the second level deals with attribute salience in the media and its impact on both object salience and attribute salience among the public. (Chyi & McCombs, 2004: 23)

Attitudes regarding the second level of agenda setting incorporate cognitive and affective attitudes. The cognitive ones contain information about subjects/people and their characteristics that are the subjects of the media content, while the affective ones state opinions about these subjects/people (Golan & Wanta, 2001: 249). Shen states that a subject which has been given certain value by the news media has been decoded within different cognitive and attitudinal reactions due to the various dispositions of the individuals (2004: 411).

Even though the concepts regarding the agenda setting in essence emphasize the psychological factors, because the media holds a central position in the studies of agenda setting, the psychographics of individuals must be taken into consideration in an indirect or peripheral manner. Even though setting the agenda is dependent on certain psychological concepts such as mental schemas/pseudo-environment related to framing function, because how the individual places the subject of media into the psychological grouping process is expressed by positioning the subject of media in the center or as the starting point, an agenda perception process that actively places the people's own psychography in the center was not put forward. When the transfer of the agenda is expressed in the direction of from the media to the public, the public is viewed as passive and as a result of this, the

psychologic processes during the transfer are tried to be understood with the effectiveness of the subject of media rather than public psychology.

What type of public agenda?

While on the one hand individuals try to possess a clear and consistent image of the outside world, they are also faced with trying to solve the dichotomies generated by the constant flow of information and warnings coming from an ever changing outside world (Oskay, 1993: 352). Consequently, as much as individuals feel the need for orientation, they cannot directly accept the objects/situations that they are being oriented towards and approach them with an analytical attitude. "Need for orientation is defined theoretically by two concepts, relevance and uncertainty. Low relevance defines a low need for orientation; high relevance and low uncertainty, a moderate need for orientation; and high relevance and uncertainty, a high need for orientation" (McCombs, 2005: 547). While the need for orientation directs the individual towards the stimulus/media content, the individual's analytical and critical attitude creates a distance between the individual and the content. When this distance is not formed, that is to say, during the comprehension stage, if the fact that the qualities of the stimulus/content have been influenced by the organized social order that the content is a part of goes unnoticed, the perceived characteristics of the content will be determined mostly by the environment/media (Şerif, 1985: 91). Therefore, even though the media shapes its agenda into a form that is appropriate to the public via priming and framing, the capacity for the content to set a public agenda is highly related to the individual's psychographic context.

The analytical and critical attitude of the public gives a clue as to what kind of public agenda the media agenda will transform into. "The agenda of the media can influence society's debate in two ways. First, by the fact that people talk about those issues discussed in the media and about those aspects of them that the media stress" (Waldahl, 1991: 119). If people cannot approach the relationship between the media and its subject, in other words, the state of stimulus formed by the environment/media, analytically and critically, most probably will be transformed into second way media agenda. This observation is not only valid for the public in terms of mass communication, but also for those who form mass communication. Massey and Haas make this comment about journalists who continue to adhere to the traditional role of journalists in their study of traditional and public journalists: "They may still see their role as one of informing news audiences of the views of candidates, instead of one bringing issues of concern to the governed to the attention of those who would govern" (2002: 577). As Waldahl states, if the way people translate the media agenda into their own living practices determines

whether or not the agenda will become the public agenda, similarly depending on the way journalists organize the information in line with how they perceive their own roles determines whether or not they are performing public journalism.

In his publication *The Power Elite* (2000), Wright Mills separates the public and the mass based upon their dominant form of communication. According to him, the mass is made up of people who communicate with the media and as a result transform into the media market itself; and the public is made up of people who widen their arguments with the web of communication amongst themselves. If we take the separation Mills makes based upon the form of communication people have created to search for and share information and take the form of communication they have created within themselves in order to transform the information to knowledge and then create a different psychological dimension, the following can be said: Both how people will transform the media agenda into their daily living practices and how journalists organize information, in other words, how both of them will form a relationship with information, is related to how they perceive themselves and how they begin to communicate with themselves. Consequently, in a mass society, it is very difficult for both people to discuss media subject outside the frame of media and for journalists to disseminate information in a way that awakens public consciousness. However, despite this difficulty, depending on where a person wants to position themselves in a mass society, just as mass communicators can perform public communication, individuals as active subjects can also transform the mass media agenda into the public agenda or a public that exists in conjunction with a media subject can analyze and criticize the subject.

Which form of media agenda?

In order to get a complete picture regarding the relation between human and media, there is an external truth that encompasses them both which should be taken into consideration: A modern life lived in a hurry. In this sort of life, perception will also be hurried. "To the hurried observer a slight connection is enough" (Lippmann, 1967: 71). For this reason, perhaps the most important thing is how well the media structures/frames the agenda topic according to the schemas in the minds of the public. Scheufele and Tewksbury state that "Frames, ... become invaluable tools for presenting relatively complex issues, ... efficiently and in a way that makes them accessible to lay audiences because they play to existing cognitive schemas" (2007: 12). When the media takes complex content and transforms it into a simple and appropriate content by framing it and thus fitting it into the cognitive schema, it is actually making the content ready information. The meaning of this is, a framed content rather than creating/developing public arguments regarding content, creates a consensus effect on a public that is appropriate to the frame. The effort of the media agenda to match the cognitive schema forces the

reinforcement of the already existing traditional values in a society. "Unless the frames' values — social, economic or cultural — are shared by the audience, the frames lose their organizing effectiveness, Reese argued" (Endres, 2004: 8).

On the other hand, the need for the content to be suitable to the schemas is an understandable situation not only with respect to the media but also with respect to the receivers of the content. Graber states as quoted from Rumelhart and Norman, "... Carrying over existing features of existing schemata allows us to make inferences about the new situation. It allows us to learn a good deal very quickly. It also can lead to error" (1984: 148). When the media as an institution makes its agenda suitable to the cognitive schemas, it may sometimes carry a concern to fulfill its public ethic responsibility and sometimes to manipulate it. Another possibility is, even if the media does not have a concern to manipulate the receivers, they may translate the information in a manipulative way depending on their own psychographics. Depending on the many dispositions of the individuals, the media agenda can be transformed in many ways into the public agenda. If the media carries public-ethical concerns regarding its own internal organization, as Graber states, they can either modify existing cognitive schema or allow for the creation of new schema by presenting stories weaved by indirect experiences: "Existing schemas may be expanded and refined ... when direct and indirect experiences challenge their accuracy and completeness. Indirect experiences, which may lead to schema creation or modification, include mass media stories" (Graber, 1984: 147).

Because there are not many ways to divert certain individuals' attention and interest towards the media agenda in the modern world, it is possible to understand the function of the media that frames the subject of the agenda but this situation does not justify the media due to the alternatives it can develop.

A suggestion regarding the relationship between the individuals and the media agenda on the basis of perceptive grouping

Individuals are in a state of relation with both their exterior and their interior environments and while they are trying to control these environments, they are also affected by them. When an individual is faced with any stimulus/media/media agenda, they associate with their interior environments and dependent on their own perceptive grouping; control any change that may be caused by both the stimulus and the environment the stimulus comes from.

A person perceives a stimulus by making many mental and physical connections. When a person creates such a connection, they group/pattern the stimulus, thus taking it from an unknown to a known status. Consequently, the stimulus becomes a specific stimulus for that person. This process is called perceptive group-

ing or patterning. Thus a reaction regarding the stimulus begins with the personal process for determining the stimulus. In that case, explaining the reaction given to the media agenda, in other words, explaining the agenda transfer on a perceptive grouping basis begins the direction of transfer not from the media but from the individual and the individual assumes a central and active role in this transfer process.

The perception process is realized in connection with the person's perception references. These references are made up of many internal and external factors. All of the external (objects, people, groups, cultural products and similar external stimulus) and internal (attitudes, feelings, various psychological states, linguistic concepts, results of past experiences, etc.) factors that are interconnected with each other make up the frame of the perception basis (Şerif, 1985: 14).

Three different variable wholes can be effective on the perception of the media agenda on a perceptive grouping basis. The media and the media agenda, on the one hand, will be perceived as one based upon the relationship between them (the first whole) and on the other hand, will be perceived individually independent of the relationship between them (the second and the third wholes). In that case, two separate variable wholes can be mentioned as follows: one is the perception references related to the subject as framed by the media and the other is the perception references directed towards the media as an (the second whole) institution (the third whole). On the other hand, how the relationship between the media and the media agenda is perceived is of some importance (the first whole). This perception will be realized through analytical and critical attitude related to how the media frames the subject.

It should not be forgotten that all perception processes are related to how people perceive themselves. How an individual perceives themselves, that is to say, the position/reaction that person accords themselves in their own environments, also determines the position/reaction they will give to objects, situations or the media subject in that environment. Valuation is not only a problem of knowledge in a person's life but also a human problem with respect to the person who is assigning value; because with every valuation, a person exists as a whole and each time the many values of people, as a result, the value of the person making the valuation is talked about (Kuçuradi, 2003: 15).

Within this suggestion, the relationship between the individual and the media agenda can be explained in connection to three different variable wholes. 1. The analytical and critical attitude regarding the relationship between the media and the media agenda. 2. Perception references related to the subject as framed by the media. 3. Perception references directed towards the media as an institution.

While the basic principle of the perceptive grouping tries to explain the agenda transfer by attaching an active role to the individual, it will depend on the concept of framing that incorporates the basic psychological suggestions within agenda setting theory. Media owners and employees, consciously or unconscious-

ly, form the subject both in content and in shape in a manner appropriate for the receivers, in other words, they frame the subject according to the receiver. What is different in this proposition is that there is a search for a meaning formed by the individual/public reproducing the frame of media subject, instead of searching for a meaning communicated from the media to the individual/public via the framed subject. As a result, framing is seen as a peripheral form to be evaluated by the receiver during the meaning production process connected to the media subject and depending on this transforming the subject into public agenda. In this form, it may be much more appropriate to use the term gaining the agenda rather than the transfer of agenda.

Let us further explain the aforementioned three variable wholes

1. The subject matter framed by the media has been equipped not only with its own original content but also with characteristics generated from its area of stimulus/media. If we try to schematize the analytical and critical attitude that allows for the exposing of the correlation between the media and the subject within extreme situations; 1.1. The first extreme situation is the situation where the individual can distinguish at a maximum level the characteristics assigned by the media to the subject, in other words, when a maximum analytical and critical attitude is developed towards the relationship between the media and the subject. 1.2. The other extreme situation is when the individual cannot distinguish the characteristics assigned by the media to the subject, in other words, the zero value situations when an analytical and critical attitude towards the relationship between the media and the subject is not developed. As a result, the fact that the media subject has been framed by the media completely escapes the attention of the individual.

2. The fact that people have equal levels of analytical and critical attitudes does not mean that these people will solve and judge the framing effect of the media in the same way and as a result be similarly open to this effect. The perception references of people regarding the subject as framed by the media and media is quite different. Therefore, no matter how the relationship between the media and the subject is perceived, on the one side lie perception references relating to the subject matter as framed by the media;

3. On the other side is the difference of the perception references towards the media.

These variable wholes (1., 2., 3.) cause the framing effect of the media to be different for each person.

For the second variable whole it can be said that the individual can have perception references for or against the subject as framed by the media. Let us say

"a" for the references to be of equal value and "b" to the antithesis. These positions, namely "a" and "b" can go to a maximum or minimum point.

For the third variable whole, it can be said that the person will have a positive or a negative perception reference to the media where the subject is discussed. Let us say positive position "c" and negative position "d." For this variable whole, it can be said that both possibilities can reach a maximum or a minimum point.

The analytical and critical attitude directed to the relationship between the media and the media subject (the first variable whole) and the unity of different stances (the second and the third variable wholes) can determine the success ratio of the media's framing effect. These probabilities are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1. The framing ability of the media on the basis of perceptive grouping

VARIABLE WHOLES	1.	2.	3.	**4.**	**5.**	6.	7.	8.
Analytical and critical attitude directed to the relationship between the media and media subject	Present 1.1.	Present 1.1.	Present 1.1.	**Present (max.) 1.1.**	**Not present/0 (min.) 1.2.**	Not present/0 (min.) 1.2.	Not present/0 (min.) 1.2.	Not present/0 (min.) 1.2.
Perception references relating to the subject as framed by the media	+ 1.1.a.	+ 1.1.a.	– 1.1.b.	**– (max.) 1.1.b.**	**+ (max.) 1.2.a.**	+ 1.2.a.	– 1.2.b.	– 1.2.b.
Perception references relating to the media as an institution	Positive 1.1.c.	Negative 1.1.d.	Positive 1.1.c.	**Negative (max) 1.1.d.**	**Positive (max.) 1.2.c.**	**Negative** 1.2.d.	Positive 1.2.c.	Negative 1.2.d.
Conclusion the framing effect of the media	Successful (max.–min.)	Successful/ unsuccessful intermediate position	Successful/ unsuccessful intermediate position	**Unsuccessful/0 (max.)**	**Successful (max.)**	Successful/ unsuccessful intermediate position	Successful/ unsuccessful intermediate position	Unsuccessful (max.–min.)

Source: Kurtoğlu (2009). Personnel table from the unpublished thesis.

In this table, the plus and minus signs do not point to positivity or negativity for the second variable whole. The signs mean the equivalent value (+) or opposite value (–) of two positions or two variables. Two negative positions/variables are of equal value just as two positive positions/variables are of equal value. Additionally in Table 1.1.1.a. = 1.2.a., 1.1.b. = 1.2.b., 1.1.c. = 1.2.c. and 1.1.d. = 1.2.d.

According to Table 1, the framing effect of the media will be unsuccessful at a maximum level, in other words of zero value, if a person has an analytical and critical attitude regarding the relationship between the media and the subject at a maximum level and if perception references are at a maximum level against the subject as framed by the media and at the same time if the person has negative perception references at a maximum level to the institutional position of the media. This combination is seen in column 4. The exact opposite of this is seen in column 5, and in this case, the framing effect of the media is successful at a maximum level.

As seen in the first column, a person who has positive perception references toward the media, and to the equivalent perception references to the subject as framed by the same media, does not have a stature that will allow the maximum framing effect of the media since the individual has the ability to analyze and criticize the relationship between the media and the subject of the media, but is open to the framing effect of the media as possible. The framing effect of the media will become clearer during the analytical and critical attitude moves from maximum to minimum level, provided that the perception references equivalent to the subject as framed by the media and perception references that are positive to the media as an institution remain constant. In cases where the second and third variable wholes remain constant and finally when the analytical and critical attitude level is at zero, the framing effect of the media will reach a higher level. On the other hand, in column 1 the framing effect of the media will increase when the positive perception references toward that media as an institution and/or the perception references equivalent to the subject as framed by the media increase, provided that the analytical and critical attitude to the relationship between the media and the subject remains constant.

As seen in column 8, a person who does not have an analytical and critical attitude toward the relationship between the media and the subject and at the same time has perception references opposite to the subject as framed by the media and negative perception references to the media as institution will not come under the framing effect of the media; in other words, this effect is unsuccessful. However, that person, in the absence of an analytical and critical attitude, will not be able to decipher or judge the relationship between the media and the subject, and as a result, even though that framing effect is not successful, the individual will not feel it at a zero level. In the case when the analytical and critical attitude at zero as a constant value remains and when the perception references opposite to the subject as framed by the media and/or the perception references are negative

to that media as an institution move through from minimum level to maximum level, the unsuccessful framing effect of the media will move to a higher point.

In Table 1, columns 4 and 5 show the borderline cases of the lowest probabilities on the framing effect of the media. The reason for this is that the being/non-being (for the first whole) equal value/opposite value (for the second whole) positivity/negativity (for the third whole) in the variable wholes for the person are not usually at a borderline level. They usually involve medium levels and since values are not constant they can be restructured and changed according to the conditions; therefore these borderline cases are temporary.

Conclusion

During the process of making the media subject meaningful by way of perceptive grouping, the three different variable wholes combine as 2*2*2 = 8, as seen in Table 1. In such a formulation the possible situations appear to be limited. However, throughout this proposal, the variable whole has been stressed rather than the variable. The whole contains many variables and the relationship that exists between them. In other words, the variable whole expresses not only one variable, but also many variables and also the conditions which contain possible interactions between themselves. As a result, the 2*2*2 combination is nearly infinite in number. When the individual translates a subject as framed by the media into their own world, they will have infinite possibilities to give it meaning.

During the perceptive grouping process, the subject as framed by the media is reframed by the individual and in essence this becomes the new structure that the individual will consider. In other words, the individual becomes the active expounder of the media subject. If the socio-psychological organization of a society that allows individuals to have a more developed analytical and critical approach, then the aforementioned activeness will increase.

References

Agenda Setting Theory. Retrieved May 20, 2004, from fisherhouse.com.

Bektaş, A. (2000). *Kamuoyu İletişim ve Demokrasi* [Public Opinion, Communication and Democracy]. Ankara: Bağlam Yayınları.

Blumer, H. (1967). The mass, the public and public opinion. In: B. Berolson and M. Janowitz (eds.) *The Structure and Function of Communication in Society.* New York, USA: The Free Press, pp. 43–50.

Chyi, H.I. and McCombs, M. (2004). Media salience and the process of framing: Coverage of the Columbine school shootings. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(1), pp. 22–35.

Endres, K.L. (2004). "Help-wanted female": Editor & publisher frames a civil right issue. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(1), pp. 7–21.

Golan, G. and Wanta, W. (2001). Second-level agenda setting in the New Hampshire primary: A comparison of coverage in three newspapers and public perceptions of candidates. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 78(2), pp. 247–259.

Graber, D.A. (1984). *Processing the News: How People Tame the Information Tide.* Broadway, NY: Longman Inc.

Irvan, S. (2001). *Gündem Belirleme Yaklaşımının Genel Bir Değerlendirmesi. Iletişim* [A General Evaluation of Agenda Setting Approach. Communication], 9, pp. 69–107.

Kim, S.-H., Scheufele, D.A. and Shanahan, J. (2002). Think about it this way: Attribute agenda setting function of the press and the public's evaluation of the local issue. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79(1), pp. 7–25.

Kuçuradi, I. (2003). *İnsan ve Değerleri* [Human and Human Values]. Ankara: Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu.

Kurtoğlu, S. (2009). *A qualitative evaluation of the behavior of Turks living in Europe towards the European Union within the context of its being the subject of public agenda: Austrian example.* Unpublished doctorate thesis, Istanbul University.

Lasswell, H.D. (1967). Reader in public opinion and communication. In: B. Berolson and M. Janowitz (eds.) *The Structure and Function of Communication in Society.* New York, USA: The Free Press, pp. 178–190.

Lippmann, W. (1967). Stereotypes. In: B. Berolson and M. Janowitz (eds.) *The Structure and Function of Communication in Society.* New York, USA: The Free Press, pp. 67–75.

Massey, B.L. and Haas, T. (2002). Does making journalism more public make a difference? A critical review of evaluative research on public journalism. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79(3), pp. 559–586.

McCombs, M. (2004). *Setting the Agenda: The Mass Media and Public Opinion.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

McCombs, M. (2005). A look at agenda setting: Past, present and future. *Journalism Studies*, 6(4), pp. 543–557.

McCombs, M., Lopez-Escobar, E. and Llamas, J.P. (2000). Setting the agenda attributes in the 1996 Spanish general election. *Journal of Communication*, 50(2), pp. 77–92.

Mills, W.C. (2000). *The Power Elite.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oskay, Ü. (1993). *Kitle İletişiminin Kültürel İşlevleri* [The Cultural Functions of Mass Communication]. Istanbul: Der Yayınları.

Sanchez, M. (2002). *Agenda Setting.* Retrieved May 20, 2004, from http://zimmer.csufresno.edu/~johnca/spch100/7-4-agenda.htm.

Scheufele, D.A. and Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), pp. 9–20.

Schramm, W. (1973). Haberleşme Nasıl işler. [The process and effects of mass communication]. In: Ü. Oskay (comp. & trans.) *Kitle Haberleşme Teorilerine Giriş* [Introduction to Mass Communication Theory]. Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, pp. 95–134.

Şerif, M. (1985). *Toplumsal Kuralların Psikolojisi* [The Psychology of Social Norms]. Ismail Sandıkçıoğlu (trans.). Istanbul: Alan Yayıncılık.

Shen, F. (2004). Effects of news frames and schemas on individuals' issue interpretations and attitudes. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(2), pp. 400–416.

Shoemaker, P. and Reese, S.D. (1997). Ideolojinin Medya İçeriği Üzerindeki Etkisi [Mediating the message: Theories of influences on mass media content]. In: S. Irvan (comp. & trans.)

Medya Kültür Siyaset [Media Culture Politics] Ankara: ARK: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları, pp. 99–138.

Waldahl, R. (1991). Political attitudes and public opinion. In: H. Rønning and K. Lundby (eds.) *Media and Communication: Readings in Methodology, History and Culture*. Oslo: Norwegian University Press, pp. 113–132.

Wilcox, D.L., Cameron, G.T., Ault, P.H. and Agee, W.K. (2003). *Public Relations: Strategies and Tactics*. Boston, MS: Pearson Education, Inc.