9th International Symposium

Communication in the Millennium

In Cooperation with
University of Texas at Austin (U.S.A.)
Anadolu University (Turkey), and
İstanbul University (Turkey)

May 22-25, 2011

Hosted by
San Diego State University,
School of Journalism and Media Studies (U.S.A.)

The Association of Turkish and American Scholars (ATACS)

The international symposium Communication in the Millennium has been organized since 2003 by scholars in Turkey and the United States, and each year the symposium organizers have noticed increasing interest in this academic event. Because of this interest, the co-founders and the organization committee of this symposium decided to form an association where both countries' scholars are represented.

The mission of the ATACS is to advance the communication profession in both countries through well-grounded academic research and to foster communication academics' cooperation. The Communication in the Millennium is the established ATACS project, but the association will be working on different projects to serve its mission in the near future.

ISBN 978-975-98560-5-2

Copyright © 2011

No part of this publication may be reproduced, storied in a retrieval system or transmitted in any from or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

The papers contained in this symposium book have been provided by authors. Authors are responsible for the contents of their own papers and they are also responsible for copyrighted materials in their studies in terms of legal issues.

e-Book
http://cim.anadolu.edu.tr

9th International Symposium Communication in the Millennium

ISBN 978-975-98560-5-2

9th International Symposium
Communication in the Millennium

The Association of Turkish and American Scholars (ATACS)

Symposium web page:
http://cim.anadolu.edu.tr

e-mail:
cim@anadolu.edu.tr

Adress:

Anadolu Üniversitesi
İletişim Bilimleri Fakültesi
Yunusemre Kampusu
26470 Eskişehir, Türkiye

Scientific Committee

- A. Haluk Yuksel, Ph.D., Anadolu University, Turkey
- Amy Schmitz Weiss, Ph.D., San Diego State University, U.S.A.
- Ayhan Yilmaz, Ph.D., Anadolu University, Turkey
- Brad J. Hamm, Ph.D., Indiana University, Bloomington. U.S.A.
- Christine L. Ogan, Ph.D., Indiana University, Bloomington . U.S.A.
- Craig Carroll, Ph.D., University of North Carolina, U.S.A.
- David H. Weaver, Ph.D., Indiana University, Bloomington. U.S.A.
- Don Stacks, Ph.D., University of Miami, U.S.A.
- Donald Shaw, Ph.D., University of North Carolina, U.S.A.
- Erkan Yuksel, Ph.D., Anadolu University, Turkey
- H. Ibrahim Gurcan, Ph.D., Anadolu University, Turkey
- Homero Gil de Zuniga, Ph.D., University of Texas Austin, U.S.A.
- Judith K. Litterst, Ph.D., St. Cloud State University, U.S.A.
- Karin G Wilkins, Ph.D., University of Texas Austin, U.S.A.
- Maxwell McCombs, Ph.D., University of Texas Austin, U.S.A.
- Murat Ozgen, Ph.D., Istanbul University, Turkey
- Nazli Bayram, Ph.D., Anadolu University, Turkey
- Nejdet Atabek, Ph.D., Anadolu University, Turkey
- Neşe Kars, Ph.D., Istanbul University, Turkey
- Nilüfer Sarı, Ph.D., Istanbul University, Turkey
- Nurdogan Rigel, Ph.D., Istanbul University, Turkey
- Ozden Cankaya, Ph.D., Galatasaray University, Turkey
- Peyami Celikcan, Ph.D., Maltepe University, Turkey
- Roseanna Ross, Ph.D., St. Cloud State University, U.S.A.
- Ramesh C. Sharma, Ph.D., Indira Gandhi National Open University, India
- Sahar Khamis, Ph.D., University of Maryland, U.S.A.
- Sezen Unlu, Ph.D., Anadolu University, Turkey
- Serra Gorpe, Ph.D., Istanbul University, Turkey
- Sevda Alankus, University of Izmir Ekonomi University, Turkey
- Necip Serdar Sever, Ph.D., Anadolu University, Turkey
- Ugur Demiray, Ph.D., Anadolu University, Turkey
- Yasemin Giritli Inceoglu, Ph.D., Galatasaray University, Turkey
- Wayne Wanta, Ph.D., Oklahoma State University, U.S.A.

Co-Founders & Co-Chairs

Maxwell McCombs, Ph.D.
University of Texas Austin, U.S.A.

Erkan Yüksel, Ph.D.
Anadolu University, Turkey

Serra Görpe, Ph.D., APR.
Istanbul University, Turkey

9th Symposium Organization Committee

- **President:** Amy Schmitz Weiss, Ph.D., San Diego State University, U.S.A.
- Maxwell E. McCombs, Ph.D. , University of Texas at Austin, U.S.A.
- Erkan Yüksel , Ph.D., Anadolu University, Turkey
- Serra Görpe, Ph.D., İstanbul University, Turkey

The Association of Turkish and American Communication Scholars (ATACS) Board Members

- *President: Maxwell E. McCombs, Ph.D., University of Texas at Austin, U.S.A.*
- *Amy Schmitz Weiss, Ph.D., San Diego State University, U.S.A.*
- *Erkan Yuksel, Ph.D., Anadolu University, Turkey*
- *Serra Gorpe, Ph.D., APR, Istanbul University, Turkey*
- *Donald L. Shaw, Ph.D., University of North Carolina, U.S.A.*
- *Brad Hamm, Ph.D., University of Indiana, U.S.A.*
- *David Weaver, Ph.D., University of Indiana, U.S.A.*
- *Christine l. Ogan Ph.D., University of Indiana, U.S.A.*

Advisory Board

- *Judith K. Litterst , Ph.D., St. Cloud State University , U.S.A.*
- *Nazli Bayram, Ph.D., Anadolu University, Turkey*
- *Nejdet Atabek, Ph.D., Anadolu University, Turkey*
- *Sezen Unlu, Ph.D., Anadolu University, Turkey*
- *Suat Gezgin, Ph.D., Istanbul University, Turkey*
- *Ugur Demiray, Ph.D., Anadolu University, Turkey*
- *Werner Severin, Ph.D., Austin, Texas, U.S.A.*

Editor of the book

Erkan Yüksel, Ph.D., Anadolu University, Turkey.

- ***Webmaster:*** Inst. Huseyin Altunlu, Anadolu University, Turkey
- ***Cover design:*** Evren Türkgeldi, Anadolu University, Turkey

CONTENT

Scientific Committee ..... *iv*
Co-Founders & Co-Chairs ..... *iv*
Organization Committee ..... *v*
Advisory Board ..... *v*

ABSTRACTS / PAPERS 1

1. **Information System Design for Media Content Analysis Project (Abstract)**
   Lecturer Kutlu Akçoral, Anadolu University (Turkey)
   (Pages 1-2)

2. **Design Analysis of Newspaper Web Sites Operating in Turkey in Terms of Functionality**
   Dr. Ebru Baranseli, Anadolu University (Turkey)
   (Pages 3-13)

3. **Text Mining Applications in Media Content Analysis**
   Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sinan Aydın, Anadolu University (Turkey);
   Lecturer Kutlu Akçoral, Anadolu University (Turkey)
   (Pages 14-21)

4. **Changing Trends in Conducting Business: Research on Generation N**
   Assoc. Prof. Dr. Barış Baraz, Anadolu University (Turkey)
   (Pages 22-34)

5. **Television as New Media: From the 'Televisor' to the 'Televidyon'**
   Instructor Meltem Cemiloğlu Altunay, Anadolu University (Turkey);
   Asst. Prof. Dr. Alper Altunay, Anadolu University (Turkey)
   (Pages 35-46)

6. KEYNOTE PRESENTATION:
   The Representation of Local Culture on Facebook: The Evaluation of Facebook Pages
   Prof. Dr. Halil İbrahim Gürcan, Anadolu University (Turkey)
   (Pages 47-52)

7. **Sniffing Out Shovelware:**
   Millennial Students Analyze News Apps During the iPad's First Year
   Prof. Jake Batsell, Southern Methodist University (U.S.A.)
   (Pages 53-67)

8. **A Study of the Utilization of Facebook as a Social Network Among University Students in Turkey: The Case of Istanbul University Faculty of Communication**
   Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rengin Ozan, Istanbul University (Turkey)
   (Pages 68-73)

9. TOP-PAPER AWARDED:
Pit Bulls and Pantsuits vs. the Hostile Media: The Relationship between Selective Exposure and Hostile Media Effect Perceptions of Sarah Palin and Hillary Clinton
Dr. Thomas J. Johnson; Weiwu Zhang; Shannon L. Bichard, University of Texas at Austin
(Pages 74-91)

10. **Image of Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan's in the US Press after Davos Walkout**
Assoc. Prof. Mustafa Şeker, Selcuk University at Konya (Turkey);
Research Asst. Abdulkadir Gölcü, Selcuk University at Konya (Turkey)
(Pages 92-101)

11. **A Review of the Divergence of Perceptions in the Media on the Path Towards Accession to EU**
Asst. Prof. Dr. Meltem Bostancı, Istanbul University (Turkey)
(Pages 102-110)

12. KEYNOTE PRESENTATION:
What Do the Health Professionals Think About Health Content of the Media in Turkey?
Prof. Dr. Erkan Yüksel, Anadolu University (Turkey)
(Pages 111-124)

13. TOP-PAPER AWARDED:
Miraculous Cures in Health News
Instructor Asuman Kaya, Anadolu University (Turkey);
Prof. Dr. Erkan Yüksel, Anadolu University (Turkey);
R. Asistant Pelin Öğüt, Anadolu University (Turkey)
(Pages 125-141)

14. **People's Complaints on Health Content of the Media to Radio and Television Supreme Council in Turkey**
Instructor Asuman Kaya, Anadolu University (Turkey);
R. Asistant Pelin Öğüt, Anadolu University (Turkey)
(Pages 142-153)

15. **Agenda Setting Effects on Obesity Issues**
Ming-Ching Liang, University of Texas at Austin (U.S.A.)
(Pages 154-168)

16. **Getting Caught While Having Fun: Young Consumers' Attitudes and Motivations Towards Event Marketing**
Assistant Prof. Dr., Göksel Şimşek, Selcuk University (Turkey);
Assistant Prof. Dr., Aşina Gülerarslan, Selcuk University (Turkey);
Research Assistant Dr. Duygu Aydın, Selcuk University (Turkey)
(Pages 169-182)

17. KEYNOTE PRESENTATION:
Net Gain? Selective Exposure and Selective Avoidance of Social Network Sites
Prof. Dr. Tom Johnson, University of Texas at Austin (U.S.A.);
Prof. Dr. Barbara K. Kaye, University of Tennessee-Knoxville (U.S.A.)
(Pages 183-201)

18. **The Climatological Model of Gatekeeping Theory: Local and Wire News Decisions Among American Newspaper Editors**
Marcus Funk, Student, University of Texas at Austin (U.S.A.)
(Pages 202-212)

19. **An Analysis of News and Comments from the American Press in the Turkish Press**
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Süleyman Karaçor, Selçuk University (Turkey);
Asst. Professor Dr. Halim Esen, Anadolu University (Turkey)
(Pages 213-236)

20. **Media Coverage as Foreign Policy Intervention Factor: The CNN-Effect Concept**
Dr. Ewa Nowak, Maria Curie-Sklodowska University of Lublin (Poland)
(Pages 237-252)

21. **Representation of Turkey's EU Bid on the UK Media**
Alaaddin F. Paksoy, PhD. Candidate, University of Sheffield (UK)
(Pages 253-271)

22. **Hate Speech in Turkish and Israel Press:**
A Comparison Analysis of Mavi Marmara Event
Asst. Professor Şükrü Balcı, Selcuk University at Konya, (Turkey);
Research Asst. Abdulkadir Gölcü, Selcuk University at Konya, (Turkey)
(Pages 272-290)

23. KEYNOTE PRESENTATION:
The Communication Discipline Over the Years in the U.S.
Prof. Dr. Bill Eadie, San Diego State University (U.S.A.)
(Pages 291-304)

24. KEYNOTE PRESENTATION:
Of Journalism And Journalism Education In Context Of Digital Environment
Prof. Dr .Suat Gezgin, Istanbul University, (Turkey);
Adem Ayten, Ph.D. Candidate, Istanbul University, (Turkey)
(Pages 305-311)

25. **The Rhetorical Vision of Tolerance of Muslims in Post-9/11**
TV Dramas Submission Category: Cultural and Critical Studies
Prof. Dr. William B. Hart II, Norfolk State University;
Prof. Dr. Fran Hassencahl, Old Dominion University (U.S.A.)
(Pages 312-322)

26. TOP-PAPER AWARDED:
Arabesque Narrative in New Turkish Cinema: Is it Synthetic?
Assoc. Prof. Senem A. Duruel Erkiliç, Mersin University (Turkey);
Asst. Prof. Hakan Erkiliç, Mersin University (Turkey)
(Pages 323-336)

27. **Impacts of 3-0 Film Technologyon Children's Perception**
Research Asst., Özgür Uğraş Akgün, Ph. D., Istanbul University (Turkey);
Assoc. Dr. Seçkin Özmen, Istanbul University (Turkey)
(Pages 337-342)

28. **Television Experience in the New Millennium: Young Audiences' Interpretations of Reality TV in Malaysia**
Dr. Juliana Abdul Wahab, University Sains (Malaysia)
(Pages 343-363)

29. **Media, Women and Policy in Turkey**
Prof. Dr. Hülya Yengin (Turkey)
(Pages 364-370)

30. The **Influence of Design on the Intercultural Communication: Local Design Figures Used in International Press**
Asst. Prof. Dr. Kerim Karagöz, Kocaeli University (Turkey);
Dr. Melike Akkaraca Köse, Marmara University (Turkey)
(Pages 371-389)

31. **The Big "Derby" Between Sport and Eve; Attract Attention of Adam**
R. Asst. Dr. Aşina Gülerarslan, Selcuk University (Turkey);
Asst. Prof. Dr. Mete Kazaz, Selcuk University (Turkey);
Asst. Prof. Dr. Göksel Şimşek, Selcuk University (Turkey)
(Pages 390-405)

32. **Reception Analysis of Representation of Atatürk in Commercial Media**
Asst. Prof. Dr. N. Tülay Şeker, Selcuk University (Turkey);
Research Asst. Fatma Nisan, Gümüşhane University (Turkey)
(Pages 406-419)

33. An **Empirical Research on the Media Viewing Habits of Elementary Schoolchildren Who Took Media Literacy Courses: The Kayseri Example (Abstract)**
Prof. Dr. Hamza Çakır, Erciyes University (Turkey);
Asst. Prof. Dr. Hakan Aydin, Erciyes University (Turkey);
Asst. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kacur, Erciyes University (Turkey)
(Pages 420-421)

34. The **Social Cognition and the Factor of the Prejudice Against the Liberation in the Process of Interpersonal Communication**
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Özodaşık, Selcuk Universty (Turkey)
(Pages 422-436)

35. **Metamorphic Media in India's Political Milieu - An explorative study**
Assoc. Prof. Dr. B.K. Ravi, Bangalore University (India)
(Pages 437-451)

36. **18 Mouths and a Single Word: is Football a Reflection of Reality?**
Asst. Prof. A. Yalçın Kaya, PhD, Selcuk University, (Turkey);
Asst. Prof. Mete Kazaz, PhD, Selcuk University (Turkey);
Research Asst. M.Barış Yılmaz, Selcuk University (Turkey)
(Pages 452-464)

37. **Social Media Effect on Corporate Communications: A Survey Study of Young Adults' Social Media Habits in Turkey**
Assoc. Prof. Dr. İdil Sayimer, Kocaeli University (Turkey)
(Pages 465-480)

FINAL PROGRAM (Pages 481-493)

PHOTO (Pages 494)

A REVIEW OF THE DIVERGENCE OF PERCEPTIONS IN THE MEDIA ON THE PATH TOWARDS ACCESSION TO EU

(Turkey-EU Relations and the Media Attitudes on the Issue)

Assist. Prof. Dr. Meltem BOSTANCI
Istanbul University, Turkey
meltemb@istanbul.edu.tr

Meltem Bostancı is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Journalism, Faculty of Communications, Istanbul University. She holds his Master's degree and PhD in International Relations. After nearly 10 years of experience in journalism, in 2001 she began to work at Istanbul University and since then has concentrated on academic studies. She specializes on European Union, Political Science, and Turkish Foreign Policy, International communication and works on interdisciplinary studies, harmonizing International Relations with Communication Sciences. She has various papers published in newspapers, journals and websites.

Abstract

Turkey's relationship with the European Union (EU) dates back approximately 40 years. This period saw EU to occupy a place with increasing prominence in the political, economic and social life of Turkey. Turkey, whose orientation towards the Europe on political and economic arena has its roots in the Tanzimat period of the Ottoman Empire, was one of the first countries to apply for membership in the EU. However, while even countries that did not exist back then have become members of the EU in the enlargement wave of 2003, Turkey is still not a member. Initially, the obstacles to the EU membership of Turkey were depicted as economic and legal shortcomings of the country. Recent years, on the other hand, saw the voicing of political issues which are far from objective. These issues relate mostly to internal political dynamics of Turkey, while the Cyprus problem and the problems with Greece are other items on the agenda. The progress reports published annually since year 2000 putting forward criteria concerning legal reforms for structural political and social problems of Turkey rendered the EU accession process a most hotly debated issue. The debates revolving around the EU membership for years have led to a polarization against the membership. The parties and segments aligned against the EU membership slowly began to materialize. At this stage of the EU membership process of Turkey, media attitudes regarding the issue have developed in this axis of against and for membership. In effect, the initial promotion of EU membership as a means to achieve economic welfare has provided a substantial support for the membership process. Yet, as the political and legal criteria regarding the terms and conditions of the membership unfolded, the support began to subside, and the skeptics and opponents of membership began to gather supporters through the media. The media's attitude is becoming more and more prevalent in determining the direction of the more than 40 year long membership process of Turkey. The image presented by the media concerning the reforms to fulfill the EU membership criteria is significant enough to affect the internal political dynamics of Turkey. This study aims to analyze the Turkish-EU relations by focusing on the media attitudes regarding the issue. The media attitudes in the membership process, particularly in the period after year 2000, shall be examined and the approach of national newspapers will be reviewed through the method of comparative analyses. The media perceptions and representations of the relations with the EU shall be examined by reviewing the dailies Hürriyet, Yeni Şafak and Zaman. Considering the influence of Media in forging the public opinion and determining the supporting and opposing camps, the influence and power of media on Turkish-EU relations is an undisputed fact.

A REVIEW OF THE DIVERGENCE OF PERCEPTIONS IN THE MEDIA ON THE PATH TOWARDS ACCESSION TO EU (Turkey-EU Relations and the Media Attitudes on the Issue)

Introduction

On the way of foundation of the EU, aim of sustaining perpetual peace among European countries takes priority. Achievement of economic cooperation among European countries to accomplish this is established as principal purpose.

In more than half of a century from the foundation of the EU, efforts to transform it from an economic union to political one show a marked improvement. The Union, in addition to having a say on the global economy, continues to make arrangements to achieve better integration of candidate states with the Union in social and political field as well.

Turkey's application for association to the European Economic Community was resulted in Ankara Agreement, signed in 12th September 1963, and entered into force on 1 December 1964. It can be understood, in the consideration of Turkey's desire for the EU membership and the process under the circumstances of that time, Turkey did not apply only for economic reasons. Benefiting from the Marshall Aid that many European countries utilized when Cold War was heavily experienced Turkey already chose its side in economic, political and military areas, joining UN and NATO before. It was then seen necessary to be part of West functionally. Within the scope of this necessity, Turkey applied for association to the ECC on 31 July 1959, two years after the foundation of it in 1957.

Turkey had a desire to join the European Community of that time for five reasons: positive impacts of the Custom Union, new market opportunities, utilization of investment funds, maintenance of competitiveness with Greece, integration with prospective 'United States of Europe' (Durna,Atik; 2007: 482). From this point of view, the economic and political competition with Greece on a friendly footing cannot be ignored. Thus, Turkey applied to the ECC only two and half months later than Greece did.

Even though military government of 27th May 1960 retarded the evaluation of membership application of Turkey, the negotiations started with new constitution and civilian government and eventually the membership process began with Ankara Agreement signed on 12th September 1963. However, it required to be adopted by the TBMM (the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, GNAT). Towards the late 1963, the government resigned. New government was able to be formed in January of 1964 and then submitted to the assembly for approval (Çalış, 2008: 129). On 1 December 1964, the Ankara Agreement, adopted constitutionally in the assembly and was formally put into effect.

The Ankara Agreement is an association agreement which has a characteristic aiming full membership of Turkey (Karluk, 2007: 450). It is coup d'état of 12 September 1980 which deteriorated the relationship between Turkey and the Community. After the coup d'état, the Community decided to freeze the relationship with Turkey. When the relations were suspended, membership to the EU, became no longer main agenda of Turkey for a while. This stagnation period came to end when Turkey applied for full membership on 14 April 1987.

The decision of the Community regarding full membership of Turkey was procrastinated due to allegedly incompetency of Turkey to meet criteria stated in the Ankara Agreement and this decision made the process longer. The most important development after the full membership application is the Custom Union agreement put into effect in 1996 in the direction of previous scheduled calendar. The Custom Union is the third phase of the economic integration.

The Union pursued its policies against Turkey after signing the Custom Union agreement in Turkey. In the Luxemburg Summit held in December of 1997, the EU leaders did not recognize Turkey's candidate status and the relations were suspended by Turkey. In 1998, European Commission released the first progress report on Turkey.

Helsinki Summit was a turning point in the relationship between Turkey and the EU. In 1999, Turkey was granted as candidate status. On 8 March 2001, a road map of Turkey's accession to the EU, "EU/Turkey: Accession Partnership Document" was approved. This document forms the basis of post-2002 developments.

Post-2002 Turkey-EU Relations

The post-2002 period is an era when Turkey-EU relations have been intensified and debates invoked. Turkey's political outlook constituted by 3 November 2002 elections formed the basis of debates on the EU. The AKP (Justice and Development Party) government attempted to accelerate the EU process by radical decisions. In fact, there were some concerns regarding future of the Turkey-EU relations in the early years of the AKP administration. Views of founders and senior staff of the AKP regarding the EU in 1990s entailed these concerns. After the general election on 3 November 2002, the government was formed under the prime ministry of Abdullah Gül. After a short time period of prime ministry, Abdullah Gül was replaced by Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, who was elected to the parliament thanks to by-election, and Gül became Minister of Foreign Affairs in the new government. New Prime Minister R. Tayyip Erdoğan and Minister of Foreign Affairs Abdullah Gül have the same political opinion. Therefore, they both considered the Turkey-EU relations within the religion based framework and they did politics on the basis of the thesis that the EU is a Christian Club and won't accept Turkey's accession as a Muslim country before 2002. However, it is salient that after a while the government developed a democracy-based rhetoric. New discourse of the government was 'EU membership for democracy'. The AKP administration concentrated on the EU relations in such a way that had not ever been seen until 2000s and pursued concessive policies. These concessive implementations can be outlined as follows: concessions in solution of the Cyprus dispute, concession in social state principle with privatizations and problems generated by the EU based agricultural policies.

The EU relations intensified in the post-2002 period were shaped by the progress reports. The first of these reports was published in 1998 before the Helsinki summit.

The progress report 1998 of the EU Commission made an evaluation based on the Copenhagen Criteria. Accordingly, Turkey was at the bottom of the ladder in terms of political criteria formed of the basis of achievement of "stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities". The progress reports of 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002 have the same slant towards Turkey.

Signing Negotiation Framework Document in 2005 was the top point reached at relationship with the EU. With this document, Turkey advance to a negotiating candidate from a candidate state. This document functions as a road map on negotiations conducted between Turkey and the EU. Within the scope of negotiations, a new Accession Partnership Document (APD) was published on 9 November 2005. APD 2005 stated items to be dealt with in short, middle and long terms

Turkey-EU relations went through bargaining on economic and political items within the period 2005-2007. During this process, it was seen that due to coming general elections, the AKP government acted based on political concerns.

The AKP, victorious party in the general elections of 2007, attempted to initiate in various subjects regarding the EU. The most salient ones of those are Kurdish initiative, which an agreement could not been reached for a long time and labeled as "Democratic Initiative", and "Armenian Initiative", aiming to pave the way for the good relations with Armenia.

The Progress Report 2009 is significant in the way of revealing to what extent the relations improved. The Report exposes to what extent relations with Turkey developed and what are the shortcomings under three main titles. These are as follows; "Political Criteria", "Economic Criteria" and "Ability to Assume the Obligations of Membership".

Effects of Turkish Media on Turkey-EU Relations

In this section within the context of newspaper publishing in Turkey, the study dwells on Turkish media's slant towards the Turkey-EU relations and how they cover the developments. Journal review was employed as the method and since 12 September 1963 dated Ankara Agreement, news items related the subjects were examined. In this field Cumhuriyet, Hürriyet, Sabah, Yeni Şafak and Zaman newspapers were reviewed respectively. The post-1996 news items of Yeni Şafak and Zaman were analyzed.

Given the fact that media molds public opinion in the way of partialism and opposition, effect produced by the media on the Turkey's relationship with the EU is important. Process of Turkey's membership to the EU is not only reported as news, but also become the area where the domestic politics and media set the agenda. Specifically since 1990s it became a matter of debate in domestic politics; achievement of the full membership to the EU has become an election campaign promise. Turkey's application for full membership to the EU was an act to join the "Common Market" of that time. This initiative, after application for association on 31 July 1959 and then along with the Ankara Agreement (12 September 1963) has changed into a field of struggle until today.

The Ankara Agreement gained such prominence that elite media organizations of that time announced it in their headlines. In the day before the agreement was signed Cumhuriyet reported the agreement on the front page, using heading "Common Market Agreement is being signed tomorrow in Ankara" (Cumhuriyet, 11 September 1963: 1). Cumhuriyet considered the Ankara Agreement important as the first step of the accession to the "Common Market", and on the front page of its issue dated 12 September 1963, where the outlines of the agreement were presented, Cemal Erkin's article named "Spirit and Philosophy of the Common Market" (Cumhuriyet, 12 September 1963: 1) was covered as well. On the third page of the same issue, opinions of various economists were covered, making economically evaluations of the agreement. The issue of Cumhuriyet dated 12 September 1963 and numbered 14048 was predominantly reserved for the Ankara Agreement. News items with headings like "Economic Balance Sheet of the Common Market in 1962", "Common Market Counties and Comparative Productions of the USA and the USSR and "The Letter of Agreement". Along with the heading "The Common Market is a legacy to be bequeathed to (next) generations" being the words of Prime Minister of that time, İsmet İnönü, the subject lost its popularity with days passing.

While another elite newspaper of the period, Hürriyet presented the subject with the statement "We joined the Common Market" in large point size, it informed the readers about the prospective time period which the full membership negotiations could be started, using subheading "We can only be a full member of the Common Market after 22 years" (Hürriyet, 12 September 1963: 1). On the same issue, Hürriyet made the evaluation of "Stand the gaff for 22 years, the Common Market brings welfare and prosperity". Hürriyet kept the subject on the agenda for a shorter time period, compared to Cumhuriyet and brought news item emphasizing on the economic aspect of the market to the agenda. It focused on that the Common Market is a economically competitive field, covering the news

item titled "Turkish tobaccos to be export to the Common Market give American tobacconists worry" (Hürriyet, 1 October 1963: 1).

Turkey's signing the Ankara Agreement was evaluated by the newspapers within economic aspects; social, legal and political aspects were relatively ignored. The Common point emphasized was "to achieve economic welfare".

The negotiation process between Turkey and the EU has been going through for more than 48 years. There are basic responsible factors for still being in an open ended negotiation process at the end of such long period. Precisely governments, which have ruled the country from 1963 to the present, have the biggest responsibility. Parties in power have not been able to make the EU membership a government policy and to meet the required reforms for five decades. The most influential factor in this long-retarded process is to consider the EU economically in general. However, the EU has transformed constantly since the foundation and has become a political-legal union. It is necessary for Turkey, in order to be included in this system, to adopt this system.

Another organization which requires to take responsibility in this process is media. The media has not been able to fulfill its duty to comprehend the process well and to raise awareness of the public regarding the future. One of the most effective ways to make the public have the awareness regarding the public is media. However, the media continue to cover the news in such a way of being out of discussing developments in utter detail and of constituting conscious masses. Periods when the Turkish press chooses to cover the EU are generally those when the Union and Turkey negotiate or when a crisis is experienced.

The first significant crisis which froze the relationship between Turkey and the EU was experienced after the coup d'état of 22 January 1980. The European Parliament required the Council and the Commission to suspend the Fourth Financial Protocol and the agreements between Turkey and the Union until Turkey restored human rights and democratic freedoms. The Council followed the recommendation and the relations were frozen (Karluk: a.g.e. 443).

As a result of Turkey-ECC Association Council convened on 16 September 1986 after the coup d'état, the frozen relations came to life. This development was covered as the front page news. Regarding this development, in consideration of the time of the process went through till then; Hürriyet announced the development with a very meaningful heading. The restart of relations was covered, using heading "We are now on Long Narrow Road for the ECC" (Hürriyet, 18 September 1986: 3).

The period when the relations with the EU were predominantly covered in the media was when Turkey applied for the full membership on 14 April 1987. While Cumhuriyet presented the development with the heading "Enthusiasm for the ECC among Industrialists "(Cumhuriyet, 17 April 1987: 1), speeches made in the Istanbul Chamber of Industry were reserved in the detail in the news coverage.

While Hürriyet announced the development to its readers, using the heading "We made debut in Europe" (Hürriyet, 17 April 1987: 1), in following days, it kept up with adding magazinish dimension to the subject with the news of "Shop in London for Kebab Shopper from Adana" (Hürriyet, 16 April 1987: 1) and simplified the public expectation. Hürriyet continued to cover the problems before the Turkey-EU relations in headline and emphasized on the problems to be faced in following years, using the headline "The important key for the ECC is Cyprus" (Hürriyet, 17 April 1987: 1). While covering the domestic problems in Turkey which should be solved on the way of the EU with the heading "five promises to Europe" (Hürriyet, 27 April 1987: 1) announced to reader that Turkey

promised to the ECC to fulfill inadequacies in Turkey regarding field of torture, regime, Cyprus, secularism and economy.

Negative decision to the application for full membership made on 14 April 1987 was given on 18 December 1989. The EC Commission, in its opinion regarding Turkey's application for full membership, stated that the Community could not accept a new member before completing the process of its own internal market, that is, before 1992 and Turkey required to fulfill economic, social and political provisions before the accession. Hürriyet covered this development on the front page, giving a headline "We knocked the door, but stayed out on the threshold" (Hürriyet, 19 December 1989: 1), using the leader of the opposition Süleyman Demirel's words criticizing the government. One of the authors in the same newspaper, Oktay Ekşi's assessment in his columns that "Right state that despite to this report; it is not over according to us. This is because it is imprinted on the memories that even the UK's application to the Common Market years ago was not welcomed" (Ekşi, Hürriyet, 19 December 1989: 17) also demonstrates that the media actually had baseless optimism. Another issue is that the media became bulletin board which sets new goals in order to lessen the failures of the government got poor results in this period. An example of this case is the article of Ertuğrul Özkök in his column, which he gave the title the words of Minister of Foreign Affairs Mesut Yılmaz, "Our alternative to the European Community is the Eastern Block", (Özkök, Hürriyet, 23 December 1989: 17). In the content of his article, it was noised about a claim that the Eastern Block could be alternative to the EC by developing economic cooperation with those counties, but the failure in relations with the EC was not questioned.

The Turkey-EU relations in 1990s were under the shade of terrorist events in Turkey and Greece-Cyprus based foreign policy issues. This process sometimes brought showdowns and this situation was reflected in the media. The most notable example of this can be seen in what happened following the acceptance of Southern Cyprus's application for full membership.

In the news with heading "Cyprus retaliation against the EU" (Hürriyet, 17 May 1997: 1), Hürriyet actually compares unequal powers. While the EU seems to be the powerful in reality, this news which presented Turkey is even in power so that it can challenge to the EU, published that Turkey and the TRNC (Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus) would enter in the process of integration. A similar slant was displayed by Yeni Şafak newspaper after Turkey declared that it would not negotiate political issues with the EU on 5 December 1997. The newspaper, in the news item with the heading "Turkish-Russian Cooperation against the EU" (Yeni Şafak, 17 December 1997: 2), claimed that Turkey turned the face to Russia because of the negative attitudes of the EU.

News coverage of media, which ignores the domestic politics, is uncritical and covertly shows the EU as an opposing party, did not improve the Turkey's relations with the EU and became a factor creating a public opinion against the EU.

Media's View of the EU in the Post-2002 Period

Throughout the process till 2002, the most salient themes in Turkey-EU relations were notably Cyprus Issue, economic issues and terror problem as the domestic problem of Turkey. The national law system and political structure of Turkey required to be reformed in order to accomplish the process of Turkey's full membership to the EU.

In the late 1990s, the capture and trial of Abdullah Öcalan was considered to create new opportunities in adaptation of national law to EU law on the way of EU vocation and three harmonization packages were adopted in the Grand National Assembly of Turkey within period of 2000-2002. The most contentious one among these packages was the third harmonization package which was adopted on 3

August 2002 and abolished the death penalty in all cases including crimes of terrorism. The media did its bit exceedingly and presented the abolishment of capital punishment as the final obstacle before the EU membership. Hürriyet covered the issue with the headline "Capital punishment should be abolished, and (we) should join the EU" (Hürriyet, 25 June 2002: 1). Of course subjects within the third package were not the only issue of those days. Another issue was discussed by a columnist in Hürriyet, Ege Cansen in a more realistic way in his column titled "Give Cyprus, Join the EU", arguing that "No matter how many concessions are made, no one can guarantee Turkey's accession to the EU. The issue of the EU is something else." (Cansen, Hürriyet, 13 July 2002: 11).

In post-2002 period, in parallel with the content of third package, the relations with the EU predominantly began to be covered in terms of "democratization" perspective. Along with the third harmonization package, developments such as abolishment of capital punishment, minority rights, abolishment of some restrictions on the use of Kurdish language led the media to give an image that the pre-accession EU process came to an end

In the post-2002 period, while in the initial years of the AKP government, reforms accelerated, criticism that the unitary structure of the states is aimed to be dissolved were often brought to agenda in columns of the newspapers.

In fact, 2002 became such a year when the media's slant towards the EU changed. Some media organizations which took a negative stand against the EU before 2002, switched their slants as being a strict EU supporter. The most salient media organizations displaying such broadcasting and publishing policy are television channels and newspapers having Islamist broadcasting and publishing policy. At this point, Yeni Şafak can be given as an example. The newspaper, which evaluated the news regarding the EU negatively, began to embrace the idea of the EU-driven democratization. In 1997, although there were no any official statements regarding the EU, the newspaper announced on the front page that "Door to Europe is closed" (Yeni Şafak, 4 December 1997: 5) and contended that Turkey proceeded on its way not with the EU, but through US-based structuring. In the news item titled "The EU on the same wavelength" (Yeni Şafak, 7 December 1997: 8) the newspapers, continuing to claim that the EU would never admit Turkey's accession, on the following day indicated where Turkey really belongs to, emphasizing on the Islamic Conference with the headline "Historic Summit in Iran" (Yeni Şafak, 8 December 1997: 1).

The same newspaper, on the following day covered news with the heading "Anti-EU" (Yeni Şafak, 9 December 1997: 4). That is, the newspaper utilized every source to cover Euroscepticism. In fact, what was emphasized on within the content of the news was that Turkey has leverage in using the right of veto countries expecting to enter NATO. Just before the Brussels Summit of 12 December 1997, Yeni Şafak continued to offer alternatives to the EU and gave the headline "If not Europe, then Eurasia". (Yeni Şafak, 11 December 1997: 3). The newspaper was insistent in finding new routes for Turkey in those years. On the following day of Brussels Summit, the newspaper captioned "We are drifting away from the West" (Yeni Şafak, 13 December 1997: 1). In the subheading there was phase of "We will never be admitted to the EU". One of the cliché words of the media having such broadcasting/publishing policy was covered, having the heading "The EU showed that it is a Christian Club" as being words of ANAP deputy Mehmet Keçeciler.

The newspaper continued its religious based slant, adding the judgment "We sent roses, they responded in crusade mentality" above the headline "Two Faces of the West" (Yeni Şafak, 20 November 1998: 1). In 1998, the newspaper continued to cover Eurosceptic news. The news item titled "The EU Support for Apo" was covered, addressing to the EU in the time when Öcalan harbored in Italy.

In the post-2002 era, when the AKP came to power, in spite of the fact that the structure and policies of the EU did not change, newspapers practicing journalism by giving religious themes prominence like Yeni Şafak began to change their slants towards the EU. Yeni Şafak, adding socialist figures into the staff, began to cover pro-European news.

Comparison of Slants of Hürriyet and Zaman towards the EU in the post-2002 period

Hürriyet and Zaman are chosen because they are such newspapers having different slants towards various issues and their publishing policies differ. In this comparative analysis, it was aimed to examine post-December 2004 when Turkey was given a starting date for full membership negotiation by the EU.

Before the European Parliament adopted the report on 17 December 2004, which recommended starting the negotiations with Turkey on 3 October 2005, Zaman and Hürriyet covered the messages sent by the politicians.

Zaman, using the headline "Final Message to the EU Capitals" (Zaman, 15 December 2004: 1) made assertive prominent the claims like that Turkey wanted to have a concrete date and news issues should not be put before Turkey, otherwise Turkey would leave the table.

Hürriyet, having the headline "An Open Letter to Our Friends" (Hürriyet, 16 December 2004: 1, covered the predictions of Prime Minister R. Tayyip Erdoğan regarding the EU countries.

In this period, while Zaman was contributing to "proudly standing" image of the AKP in domestic politics, Hürriyet covered more objective components.

On 17 December 2004 when the negotiation date was received, Hürriyet announced the developments with the heading "New Life" (Hürriyet, 17 December 2004: 1). Zaman covered the developments with a more realistic headline; "The Date is October 3, Cyprus is Deadlock" (Zaman, 17 December 2004: 1). In this news item, while announcing that the negotiations would start on October 3, it was pointed out that Cyprus would be the most important problem.

In the following day of the decision made, when Hürriyet noted that "We did" (Hürriyet, 18 December 2004: 1), it tried to create a positive atmosphere as if the full membership was obtained. However, it was ignored that open-ended negotiation process indicates 2020s and might last for half century.

Leaving its cautious discourse aside once, Zaman captioned "New Europe, New Turkey" (Zaman, 2004: 1) and tried to create extremely positive atmosphere.

The biggest concession made for the negotiation date is the promise to open Turkish ports to Southern Cyprus and this unilateral recognition was not found newsworthy to be focused on. Both of the newspapers slide around these promises between lines and within inside pages.

On the following days, Hürriyet continued to give headlines such as "Lord of Lobbies", referring to R. Tayyip Erdoğan and "We are New Stars of Europe" (Hürriyet, 19 December 2004: 24). It seems that in this process Zaman, covering news items with headlines like "Europe will be a super power with Turkey" and "Democracy will strengthen and Liberties will expand" (Zaman, 19 December 2004: 1) analyzed the process better.

In the process of negotiations with the EU, while their slants towards the EU remained same, their expectations differed because of the views they represent. Zaman stands on with the emphases on democracy, keeping the determination, whereas Hürriyet cut into pro-government news with opposite implementations of the AKP.

Conclusion

The EU, having gone through political, economic and legal phases from the foundation, appears as an economic union as well as a political union. In consideration of effectiveness of decision making mechanism, it can be seen that there is a supra-national organization. Having an independent parliament and a currency having functionality alone within whole union, the EU has transformed into a political and economic formation with sanction power.

The most important issues that Turkey cannot understand correctly are criteria produced by assertiveness of democratization. As long as government in Turkey continues to make social, political and legal reforms just because of "the EU requires that", it cannot be expected positive developments in this subject. However, Turkey should take these initiatives since they are for the public interest. But specifically post-2002 reforms have been made under the name of "EU harmonization package" Turkey needs to introduce its own demarcation lines to the EU. While the media would have contributed Turkey to comprehend the EU and to take correct and quick steps, but it could not inform the Turkish people sufficiently with correct information. Within this context, it can be said that the media has not been able to inform the public accurately and precisely.

In conclusion, Turkey needs to comprehend the EU in a new and accurate way along with the government, the media, and all other institutions and organizations with authority. Otherwise, change and transformation that Turkey is expected to experience on the way of the EU vocation will not be a healthy and unique change.

REFERENCES

Atik, Hayriye; Durna, Cihan; **Avrupa Birliği, Gümrük Birliği ve Türkiye**, Nobel Yayınları, Ankara, 2007,

Çalış, Şaban; **Türkiye-Avrupa Birliği İlişkileri**, Nobel Yayınları, Ankara, 2008,

Karluk, Rıdvan; **Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye**, Beta Yayınları, İstanbul, 2007,

Cumhuriyet, 11-12-13 Eylül 1963,

Cumhuriyet, 17 Nisan 1987,

Hürriyet, 12 Eylül 1963,

Hürriyet, 1 Ekim 1963,

Hürriyet, 22 Ocak 1982,

Hürriyet, 18 Eylül 1986,

Hürriyet, 16- 17 ve 27 Nisan 1987,

Hürriyet, 19 ve 23 Aralık 1989,

Hürriyet, 17 Mayıs 1997,

Hürriyet, 25 Haziran 2002,

Hürriyet, 13 Temmuz 2002,

Hürriyet, 3 Ağustos 2002,

Hürriyet, 16-17-18-19 Aralık 2004,

Yeni Şafak, 4 ve 7-8-9 Aralık 1997,

Yeni Şafak, 11-13-15 ve 17 Aralık 1997,

Yeni Şafak, 20 ve 23 Kasım 1998,

Zaman, 15, 17 ve 18, 19 Aralık 2004