

HOW TURKISH COLUMNIST FRAMED GENERAL ELECTION IN TURKEY HELD IN NOVEMBER 2015 VIA TWITTER

Deniz KILIÇ¹

N. Bilge İSPİR²

ABSTRACT

More than 35 million people in Turkey use twitter. A lot of people uses for social media include entertainment, sports, and lifestyle as well as following personalities. Also Twitter is good for news gathering, getting information and arguing with other people in media. Followers use journalist/columnists' tweets primarily as a news source to keep up to date on key issues and politics. However another reason is that followers have a guidance motive, meaning that they depend on tweets from journalist/columnist to guide their decisions on how to vote and what positions to take on an issue. After all media framing theory provide an insight to how the media can influence their audience. Framing refers to the process by which people develop a particular conceptualization of an issue or reorient their thinking about an issue. The main purpose of this study is to examine the columnists' attention that Turkey general election in the 2015 November 1st received and this communication theory plays a significant role within the research. In this study, how journalists/columnists framed their tweet about electoral topics was represented. This study examines 1224 tweets and retweets of the top 18 most followed accounts journalist/columnists on twitter in the 2015 November 1st about Turkey general election. Study covers the time period of 23th October - 8th November 2015 about the key topics dominating the electoral debate. The data gathered through content analysis reveal that the mostly placed tweet topics are terrorism, the erosion of freedoms, civil liberties, and rule of law; constitutional reform; the shift to a presidential system; the economic slowdown; the Kurdish issue; and Turkey's foreign policy. Five trained coders analyzed the tweets studied. Inter-coder reliability was 87%. Findings indicate that most important topics are coalition meetings, civil liberties, media freedom and terrorism according to tweets of columnists.

Key words: Framing, Twitter, Social Media, General Elections, Journalism

¹ Anadolu Üniversitesi, İletişim Bilimleri Fakültesi, dkilic@anadolu.edu.tr

² Anadolu Üniversitesi, İletişim Bilimleri Fakültesi, bispir@anadolu.edu.tr

INTRODUCTION

Two general elections were held in Turkey, the first on June 7, 2015 and the second on November 1, 2015, since the first one produced a hung parliament. As a general fact, large numbers of people in Turkey became particularly interested in Turkish General Elections in 2015. Addressing the first one of 2015, June 7th elections took particular attention of the world media and people kept a close eye on the results of this election. In June election, the Justice and Development Party (AKP), which had governed Turkey since 2002, lost its parliamentary majority and only won 258 seats with 40.9% of the vote. The main opposition Republican People's Party (CHP) also fared worse than their 2011 result, and won 132 seats with 25.0% of the vote. The MHP (Nationalist Movement Party) and the HDP (People's Democratic Party) both won 80 seats, with the HDP managing to surpass the 10% election threshold despite concerns that it could fall below the boundary.

After being asked to form a government by virtue of leading the largest party in Parliament, AKP leader Ahmet Davutoğlu held talks with the leaders of the three opposition parties. With the HDP refusing to join a coalition with the AKP and the MHP preferring to remain in opposition, Davutoğlu entered extended negotiations with the main opposition CHP over a possible grand coalition deal. After 35 hours of negotiations spanning over 10 days, negotiations broke down after CHP leader Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu claimed that Davutoğlu had only offered the CHP a role in a three-month government followed by early elections. The CHP had previously made it a condition that any coalition deal should last for four years, the entire duration of the parliamentary term.

The snap election was called by President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan on 24 August 2015 after the June election resulted in a hung parliament and coalition negotiations broke down. On 1 November 2015 snap elections were held in Turkey, after political parties failed to form a coalition after the June general elections. During the elections 8,426 candidates stood on the lists of 16 political parties. The Justice and Development party (AKP) won 49.37% of the votes, gaining 315 seats in parliament.

The Turkish general election of November 2015 was held on 1 November 2015 throughout the 85 electoral districts of Turkey to elect 550 members to the Grand National Assembly. It was the 25th general election in the History of the Republic of Turkey and elected the country's 26th Parliament. The election resulted in the Justice and Development Party (AKP) regaining a Parliamentary majority following a victory, having lost it five months earlier in the June 2015 general election.

Elections of 2015 will be remembered as a milestone, which was used of social media by journalist, columnist and politicians. Almost all journalist, columnist and politicians have twitter account, which they use to varying degrees of effectiveness. While journalist may have millions of Twitter followers hardly use the micro-blogging service of social media as an interactive communication platform.

Social media have become increasingly relevant in election climate as all politicians, citizen and journalists. Social media is a highly popular spectrum as a source of news for online users in Turkey. Twitter is a micro-blogging service that allows users to post short messages up to 140 characters. Users can sign up to "follow" other users, but can also search messages by keywords. Twitter is a platform where people influence each other's opinions about world issues as well as many other subjects from entertainment to health, sports to current affairs. Turkish Twitter users grew massively for the last 5 years. More than 35 million Turkish Twitter users benefit from Twitter and most of them use it in order to follow personalities such as Turkish singers, television and film celebrities, sports persons,

journalists and politicians. The top 20 most followed accounts on Twitter in Turkey include the comedian Cem Yılmaz (with 11,1 million followers), President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan (8,2 million) and the journalist/ columnists Cüneyt Özdemir (4.5 million), Ahmet Hakan (4.3 million), Fatih Portakal (4.1 million).

Moreover, Twitter is beneficial for news gathering, getting information and arguing with other people in media. Followers use columnists' tweets primarily as a news source to keep up to date on key issues and politics. However another reason is that followers have a guidance motive, meaning that they depend on tweets from columnist would guide their decisions on how to vote and what positions to take on an issue. Followers are not merely one-way receivers of information but rather that they are engaged in two-way communication (which include sharing political tweets with their followers and replying to columnist they follow.) Twitter to be even more influential than columnist and political leaders have hoped it could be. The opposite might be true, if followers primarily have an entertainment motive, which would suggest that followers often use political tweets for fun and do not take them seriously. When compared other social media applications, twitter messages are differentiated in two ways in terms of being both short and public. Twitter places an emphasis on being a public medium by calling itself "twitter is a platform for you to influence what is being talked about around the word". (About Us, 2010). Tweets, which send, by journalist/columnist as newspaper coverage can have a positive or negative impact on message of an individual.

This study examines how Turkish columnists framed November 1st. 2015 election of Turkey on their Twitter accounts. To understand this, content analysis method has been choosed and 1224 tweets were analyzed. The purpose of this study is to determine main ideas these tweets were based on and where these journalists politically stand for, how they perceive political parties in Turkey and their performances. The tweets analyzed in this study include dates 23th October and 7th November of 2015; before and after the first election of 2015.

LITERATURE REVIEW

People seek information about the national elections and evaluate the cause of the event and the responsibility of the state for the public issues based on media coverage of the politic agenda. Therefore, it is important to look at how the media frame the national election, the cause of the public issues, and the actors responsible for it because those frames influence the public's perception and impressions of the organization. Besides frames are powerful mechanisms that can help define and solve problems and shape public opinion (Coombs, 2006). Framing is useful for identifying the strategic messages created by communicators, and frames also useful to understand that to shape public perceptions of political issues or institutions (Semetko and Valkenburg, 2000).

This study is based on the framing theory of mass communication. Various framing researches describe how media portray news stories. Framing analysis focus on the relationship between public issues in news and the public perception of those issues. Media framing is based on paradigm that how an issue is characterized in news stories can have an impact on how the audience interprets the story (Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007, p. 12). There is no single definition about framing and news frame. Researchers offer several different definition of framing. Tuchman (1977) is explicating that media use frames to construct social reality for audiences and thus give meaning to words and images. Entman state that "framing theory that shows exactly how frames become embedded within and make themselves manifest in a text, or how framing influences thinking" (Entman, 1993).

Also Entman (1993) suggest that most framing research develops from inconsistent meanings, which result in of fractured paradigm. Entman explain that conceptualizing of

communication process has taken place at least four locations, which are the communicator, the text, the receiver, and the culture. In this process first location contains the content of frames and their joining together of textual components with the factors influence the structural qualities of news frames. These factors (editorial policies, news values, ideology, government pressures, organizational pressures, journalistic routines, and elite discourse) internal to journalism determine how journalists and news organizations frame issues (d'Angelo, 2002; Vreese, 2005). Communicators purposely or unwittingly make a frame in their message or news article with self-judgments that construct to their belief systems. Second location is text, which is manifested by undisclosed or explicit stock phrases, key words, stereotyped images, sources of information, and sentences that provide thematically reinforced clusters of facts or judgments (Entman, 1993). Gamson and Modigliani (1989, 3) suggest that frames as 'interpretative packages' that give meaning to an issue. At the core of this package is 'a central organizing idea, or frame, for making sense of relevant events, suggesting what is at issue'. The third location is receiver that gets frames as prior knowledge to efficiently meaning of messages (Gamson and Modigliani, 1989). According to Chong and Druckman (2007), an individual's attitude has a major influence on how one interprets media. For example, if people hear a news story about the positives of having a politician or political opinion but have a strong belief against them, the overall attitude will not be influenced by how the story was framed. Cappella and Jamieson (1997, p. 47) suggest to the fourth location is placed that frames activate knowledge, stimulate 'stocks of cultural morals and values, and create contexts' in social discourse and thinking.

The word "frame" can be used interchangeably with schema, script, or strip to refer to audience perception and processing (Yioutas and Segvic, 2003). In addition to defining message interpretation, 'frame' has also been used to definition in two different places. First, message construction is a presentative, such as a news story's layout, tone of voice, and camera frame in media message. Second, ideational construction is related meaning such as referring, experience, and beliefs. Framing is concerned with the presentation of issues. In short, a frame is an emphasis in salience of different aspects of a topic. Entman (1993) suggests that framing involves selection and salience, recognizing "to frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described". Frames are parts of political arguments, journalistic norms, and social movements' discourse. They are alternative ways of defining issues, endogenous to the political and social world (Vreese, 2005).

METHODOLOGY

This work builds on Semetko and Valkenburg's (2000) analysis of frames investigating their common frames in Turkey general election via twitter. Semetko and Valkenburg's suggested five frames about media influence in order of predominance were attribution of responsibility, conflict, economic consequences, human interest and morality. In this paper we determined some topics related with election, which were discussed by Turkish columnist on Twitter during the 1th November Turkey general election.

This study content analyzed columnists' tweets in 23th October- 7th November 2015 about Turkey general election, which held 1th November, looking for common frames, topics and tone. In this research eighteen columnist were selected which they have most followers in Turkey. They are Ahmet Hakan, Can Dündar, Ayşe Özyılmazel, Ayşe Arman, Uğur Dündar, Bekir Coşkun, Fatih Altaylı, Yiğit Bulut, Yekta Kopan, Ezgi Başaran Ekrem Dumanlı, Özgür Mumcu, Hayko Bağdat, Abdurrahman Dilipak, Koray Çalışkan, Abbas Güçlü, Nihan Bengisu

Karaca, Nedim Şener. We analyzed all tweets of columnists in electoral period. To measure the extent to which certain frames appear in tweets about election, we developed a series of 9 questions to which the coder had to answer yes (1) or no (0). Each question was meant to measure one of three frames about media influence in order of predominance were conflict, human interest and morality. These questions are below as *subtle questions*. Also we determined most mentioned topics about general election and tone of columnists' tweets. Tonality is an analysis that uses a subjective assessment to determine if the content of article is either favorable or unfavorable to the person, company, organization or product discussed in the text. There are varieties of different way to assess tone. One of the most common is a simple classification of "positive", "neutral" or "negative". Adjectives used in descriptions (positive and negative), which give strong indications of a speaker's and writer's attitude (e.g. it was 'disgusting'). Tone allows, not only, to understand the polarity of feelings undergoing a comment (positive, neutral or negative), but also to identify the single emotion involved.

The research questions of the study are as follows:

1. What are the most followed columnists and number of their tweets about general election?
2. What are the most mentioned topics regarding columnists' on their tweets on Twitter during the 2105 Turkey general election, which held 1th November?
3. What are the most mentioned individuals, groups, and institutions in columnists' tweets on Twitter during the 2105 Turkey general election, which held 1th November 2015?
4. What are the frames, which are morality, conflict and human interest, regarding columnists' in their tweets on Twitter during the 2105 Turkey general election, which held 1th November 2015? *Subtle questions as a frame*: (Brunken, 2006; Semetko and Valkenburg's 2000)

Morality Frames

- a) Does the tweet make reference to morality, God and other religious tenets?
- b) Does the tweet contain any moral message?
- c) Does the tweet offer specific social prescriptions about how to behave?

Conflict Frames

- d) Does the tweet reflect disagreement between parties/individuals-groups-countries?
- e) Does one party-individual-group-county criticize another?
- f) Does the tweet refer to winners and losers?
- g) Does the tweet suggest that an individual, group or party is responsible for coalition fail in Turkey?

Human Interest Frames

- h) Does the tweet emphasize how individuals and groups are affected by the issue/problem?
- i) Does the tweet go into the personal or private lives of the actors?
- j) Does the tweet contain visual information that might generate feelings of outrage, empathy-caring, sympathy or compassion?

Attribution of Responsibility

- k) Does the tweet mention that any an individual, group or party is responsible for democratic situation in Turkey?
- l) Does the tweet mention that any an individual, group or party is responsible for terrorism in Turkey?
- m) Does the tweet suggest that an individual, group or party is responsible for press censorship?

- n) Does the tweet suggest that an individual, group or party is responsible for the issue/problem about foreign affairs?
- o) Does the tweet suggest that an individual, group or party is responsible for the internal conflicts in Turkey?
Economy
- p) Does the tweet mention that any an individual, group or party is responsible for economic conditions in Turkey?

5. How do the Turkish columnists construct certain message/information in their tweets on Twitter during the 2105 Turkey general election, which held 1st November 2015? (Tone)

Five coders were used for the data collection. Krippendorf Alpha was computed for intercoder reliability. Calculated KALPHA is 0,80. Intercoders coefficients of 0,90 or greater are always acceptable, 0,80 or greater is acceptable, and 0,70 may be appropriate in some exploratory studies (Wimmer and Dominick, 2011, p 175) Calculated KALPHA for this study is acceptable.

FINDINGS

Frequency tables, as well as crosstabs were analysed to test the different research questions. The results include the quantitative data gained from conducting the tests. The frequency data produced a general overview of the information obtained. This information is shown below.

Table 1.: The most followed columnists and their tweets about general election.

Columnist		Type of Tweet		Total
		Tweet	Retweet	
Ahmet Hakan	Freq.	18	32	50
	%	36.0%	64.0%	100.0%
Can Dünder	Freq.	52	7	59
	%	88.1%	11.9%	100.0%
Ayşe Özyılmazel	Freq.	58	8	66
	%	87.9%	12.1%	100.0%
Ayşe Arman	Freq.	10	3	13
	%	76.9%	23.1%	100.0%
Uğur Dünder	Freq.	40	92	132
	%	30.3%	69.7%	100.0%
Bekir Coşkun	Freq.	90	18	108
	%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
Fatih Altaylı	Freq.	2	0	2
	%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Yiğit Bulut	Freq.	46	0	46
	%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Yekta Kopan	Freq.	102	4	106
	%	96.2%	3.8%	100.0%
Ezgi Başaran	Freq.	32	47	79
	%	40.5%	59.5%	100.0%
Ekrem Dumanlı	Freq.	13	8	21

	%	61.9%	38.1%	100.0%
Özgür Mumcu	Freq.	101	77	178
	%	56.7%	43.3%	100.0%
Hayko Bağdat	Freq.	103	0	103
	%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Abdurrahman Dilipak	Freq.	48	0	48
	%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Koray Çalışkan	Freq.	49	3	52
	%	94.2%	5.8%	100.0%
Abbas güçlü	Freq.	48	0	48
	%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Nihal Bengisu Karaca	Freq.	48	20	68
	%	70.6%	29.4%	100.0%
Nedim Şener	Freq.	45	0	45
	%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Total	Freq.	905	319	1224
	%	73.9%	26.1%	100.0%

Five different coder code 1224 tweets in this study. Most tweeting journalists were Hayko Bağdat, Yekta Kopan, Özgür Mumcu, Koray Çalışkan, Abdurrahman Dilipak, and Can Dündar (Table. 1).

Table 2.: The most mentioned tweet topics by columnist in 23st October- 7th November 2015.

Topics		Type of Tweets		Total
		Tweet	Retweet	
Election	Freq.	202	83	285
	%	70.9%	29.1%	100.0%
Politics	Freq.	163	46	209
	%	78.0%	22.0%	100.0%
Economy	Freq.	6	1	7
	%	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
Foreign Policy	Freq.	22	6	28
	%	78.6%	21.4%	100.0%
Terrorism	Freq.	22	6	28
	%	78.6%	21.4%	100.0%
Environment	Freq.	1	1	2
	%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Healthy	Freq.	9	4	13
	%	69.2%	30.8%	100.0%
Justice	Freq.	17	2	19
	%	89.5%	10.5%	100.0%
Education	Freq.	30	5	35
	%	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
Cultural and Art Activities	Freq.	57	17	74
	%	77.0%	23.0%	100.0%
Media	Freq.	142	97	239
	%	59.4%	40.6%	100.0%
Others	Freq.	234	51	285
	%	82.1%	17.9%	100.0%
Total	Freq.	905	319	1224
	%	73.9%	26.1%	100.0%

The most popular tweet topic was Election. 285 of the 1224 coded tweets were about Election. Columnists posted 209 tweets about politicians and their politics. Media is rank number three in this category. Media is the much-mentioned topic in columnists' tweets. Tweets about foreign policy have taken fifth place with Terrorism in Table 2.

Most mentioned individuals, groups, institutions in columnists' tweets are shown on Table 3. Names of individuals, groups, and institutions have been determined in 814 tweets. Columnists called the voters to action in this electoral period. Government and AKP were the second most mentioned names columnists' tweets. Columnists called for The Government and AKP to become fairness of the election process. Also columnists called for The President of the Republic to become more connective action and fairness in this electoral period. The most criticized people and institutions are those in power at electoral period on November 2015.

Table 3.: The most mentioned individuals, groups, and institutions in Columnists' tweets.

Individuals, Groups, Institutions	Frequency	Percentage
President	43	5.3
Government and AKP	129	15.8
CHP / Party Leader	27	3.3
MHP / Party Leader	15	1.8
HDP/ Party Leader	13	1.6
Opponents to Government	70	8,6
Government Supporters	55	6.8
Terrorist Groups	39	4.8
Public/Voters	143	17.6
Media	174	21.4
Politicians	71	8.7
Neighboring Countries	35	4.3
Total	814	100.0

Table 4.: The most common frames.

FRAMES	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Morality Frames</i>		
Does the tweet make reference to morality, God and other religious tenets?	36	2,9
Does the tweet contain any moral message?	132	10,8
Does the tweet offer specific social prescriptions about how to behave?	243	19,9
<i>Conflict Frames</i>		
Does the tweet reflect disagreement between parties/individuals-groups-countries	175	14,3
Does one party-individual-group-county criticize another?	405	33,1
Does the tweet refer to winners and losers?	76	6,2
<i>Human Interest Frames</i>		
Does the tweet emphasize how individuals and groups are affected by the issue/problem?	190	15,5
Does the tweet go into the personal or private lives of the actors?	55	4,5
Does the tweet contain visual information that might generate feelings of outrage, empathy-caring, sympathy or compassion?	263	21,5

The most common frame in columnists' tweets was related that parties, groups and individuals have been criticizing each other. Frames of feelings of outrage, empathy-caring, sympathy or compassion are second common frame which their frequency is 263. The third common frame was related that offering specific social prescriptions about how to behave.

The fourth common frame was related that tweet emphasize how individuals and groups are affected by the issue/problem (Table 4.). Also columnists have posted tweets, which were containing visual information about their feelings.

The tone of columnists' tweets about individuals, groups, institutions, parties are shown on Table 5. The most negative tone of columnist' about Government and Terrorist Groups (Table 5.). The President of the Republic is rank number two on Table 5. Government Supporters third rank on Table 5. The opposition columnists often criticized Republic of President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's activities during 2015 parliamentary election campaign.

Table 5.: The tone of columnists' tweets about individuals, groups, institutions, parties.

Individuals, Groups, Institutions		Tone			Total
		Positive	Negative	Neutral	
President	Freq.	9	30	4	43
	%	20.9%	69.8%	9.3%	100.0%
Government	Freq.	10	61	13	84
	%	11.9%	72.6%	15.5%	100.0%
CHP and Party Leader	Freq.	7	18	2	27
	%	25.9%	66.7%	7.4%	100.0%
MHP and Party Leader	Freq.	0	7	8	15
	%	0.0%	46.7%	53.3%	100.0%
HDP and Party Leader	Freq.	1	5	7	13
	%	7.7%	38.5%	53.8%	100.0%
Opponents	Freq.	14	39	17	70
	%	20%	55,7%	24,3%	100.0%
Government Supporters	Freq.	4	40	11	55
	%	7.3%	72.7%	20.0%	100.0%
AKP and Party Leader	Freq.	5	27	13	45
	%	11.1%	60.0%	28.9%	100.0%
Terrorist Groups	Freq.	0	31	8	39
	%	0.0%	79.5%	20.5%	100.0%
Public/Voters	Freq.	58	27	58	143
	%	40.6%	18.9%	40.6%	100.0%
Media	Freq.	59	47	68	174
	%	33.9%	27.0%	39.1%	100.0%
Politicians	Freq.	16	17	38	71
	%	22.5%	23.9%	53.5%	100.0%
Neighboring Countries	Freq.	8	22	5	35
	%	22.9%	62.9%	14.3%	100.0%
Total	Freq.	191	371	252	814
	%	23.5%	45.6%	31.0%	100.0%

Although the total numbers of tweets, which are related democratic situation in Turkey are low, government, ruling party, all Public/Voters and Government Supporters have been held responsible for democratic situation in Turkey (Table 6.). However economic condition is also debate topic between columnists. They argued that Turkey's growth has slumped in recent years.

Table 6.: Does the tweet mention that any an individual, group or party is responsible for democratic situation in Turkey?

Individuals, Groups, Institutions, Parties	Freq.	Percent.
Government	52	45,1
Public/Voter	28	24,4
Government Supporters	9	7,8
Politicians	6	5,2
Opponents people	6	5,2
President	5	4,3
Terrorist Group	5	4,3
Opposition Parties	4	3,5
Total	115	100,

Some of Columnists have held Government responsible than the Terrorist Groups. (Table 7.). During period of elections, polarization in Turkey intensified, terrorist attacks increased and various other factors that could affect the elections came into play. Although the total numbers of tweets, which are related economic condition in Turkey, are low, the Turkish lira has already fallen by about 17% against the dollar after 7th June General Election in 2015 (Table 8.).

Table 7.: Does the tweet mention that any an individual, group or party is responsible for terrorism in Turkey?

Individuals, Groups, Institutions, Parties	Freq.	%
Government	18	40,9
Terrorist Group	14	31,8
Public/Voters	4	9,1
Neighboring Countries	4	9,1
CHP and Party Leader	2	4,5
President	1	2,3
Government Supporters	1	2,3
Total	44	100,0

Table 8.: Does the tweet mention that any an individual, group or party is responsible for economic conditions in Turkey?

Individuals, Groups, Institutions, Parties	Freq.	Percent.
President	4	44,4
Government Supporters	1	11,1
Government	1	11,1

Politicians	2	22,2
Oppositon Parties	1	7,7
Total	9	100,0

Press freedom has been another problematic issue during the ruling party. The ruling party also became more and more intolerant of its critics. There were a lot of times alleged that some prominent daily newspapers and mainstream TV channels were sold to businessmen who are known to be close to the ruling part and their families. For many within in Turkey, privately owned broadcast media had already lost their credibility during the Taksim protests of 2013. Under ruling party, between 2002 and 2014, Turkey's place on the World Press Freedom Index by Reporters Without Borders slid from 99 out of 134 to 149 out of 180 countries. Social media played a key role in keeping people informed in election period. There were a lot of times in Turkey imposed blocks on Twitter, YouTube and Facebook. The pre –and post- election period in Turkey has seen a mass of blocking to against media worker. A lot of times columnists posted that many people in Turkey view the social media restrictions as a sign of the government's intolerance of opposition voices. Also they claimed that there might be more of those restrictions before the elections. Table 9. shows that government and Republic of President is responsible from press censorship in Turkey on 51 tweet of 58 by posted columnists.

Table 9.: Does the tweet suggest that an individual, group or party is responsible for press censorship?

Individuals, Groups, Institutions, Parties	Freq.	Percent.
Government	45	77,5
President	6	15,5
Terrorist Groups	2	3,4
Neighboring Countries	1	1,7
Opposition Parties	1	1,7
Politicians	1	1,7
Media	1	1,7
Opposition People	1	1,7
Total	58	100,0

Ruling party stated to have determined the formula for foreign policy success. Its newly adopted philosophy “zero problems with neighbours”. This approach was a natural reflection of the “Peace at Home, Peace in the World” policy lay down by Great Leader Ataturk, founder of the Republic of Turkey. The part of columnists criticized that Turkey's foreign affairs policies in electoral period and some of them expressed their comments were there is almost no country of immediate interest for Ankara that Turkey has no problem with. Also in this study we haven't specified marked number of statement by columnist about Turkish foreign affairs (Table 10).

Table 10.: Does the tweet suggest that an individual, group or party is responsible for the issue/problem about foreign affairs?

Individuals, Groups, Institutions, Parties	Freq.	Percent.
Government	5	55,5
Public/Voter	2	22,2
Presidents	1	11,1
Terrorist Groups	1	6,7
Total	9	100

The opposition parties criticized the AKP for its failed security policies after 7th June 2015, after then the 2015 Diyarbakır Rally bombings occurred on 5 June 2015 in Diyarbakır, Turkey during an electoral rally of the Peoples' Democratic Party (HDP). Four people died and more than 100 have been injured after explosions at HDP election rally in Turkey. A lot of people expectations were positive about internal peace in Turkey before 7th June 2015. Public opinion view was that the Kurdish problem would solve in a democratic way. People's Democratic Party, largely representing the Kurdish peoples but also encompassing leftwing liberals, surpassed the steep 10% threshold for entering parliament to take more than 13% of the vote and 80 in the Turkish Parliament. Table 11. shows that the part of columnists expressed that people, institutions and groups which have sovereignty in Turkey has been responsible from internal conflict in Turkey. Also columnists figure that the terrorist groups were account for terrorist actions in Turkey.

Table 11.: Does the tweet suggest that an individual, group or party is responsible for the internal conflicts in Turkey?

Individuals, Groups, Institutions, Parties	Freq.	Percent.
Government	25	43,1
Terrorist Groups	16	27,6
Public/Voters	6	10,2
Government Supporters	5	8,6
HDP (Pro-Kurdish Party)	2	3,4
Politicians	2	3,4
Opposition Parties	2	3,4
Total	58	100,0

In the June election, the AKP won 40.9% of the popular vote, down from 49.8% at the previous election in June 2011, and only 258 seats in parliament. A large proportion of voters switched their allegiance to the HDP, which won 13.1% of the vote and 80 seats. On 10 June, Prime Minister declared that the election results showed that the Turkish people did not want a presidential system, internal conflict, and other problems. Although Prime Minister began negotiations with the CHP and the MHP about forming a coalition government, President made it clear that he favoured another election in the hope that the AKP could regain its parliamentary majority, which – even if it still did not have enough seats to change

the constitution – would enable him to continue to shape government policy. The CHP's insistent on a full investigation into the allegations of corruption involving leading members of the ruling party. Devlet Bahçeli, chair of the MHP, made it clear that his party would not participate in a coalition and was ready for a fresh election. As the coalition negotiations foundered, allowing President to call another election for 1 November 2015, the security situation rapidly deteriorated. On 5 June 2015, four people were killed when an alleged Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS) sympathiser detonated an improvised explosive device at an HDP election rally in the Southeastern city of Diyarbakir. On 20 July 2015, an alleged ISIS suicide bomber killed 33 activists. On 22 July 2015, PKK assassinated two Turkish policemen in the town of Ceylanpınar. Also on 10 October 2015 in Ankara, the capital city of Turkey, two bombs were detonated outside Ankara Central railway station. 103 people killed.

Table 12. shows that responsibility of coalition fail in Turkey. In this research 30 of the tweets related to coalition talks but only 7 tweets were related coalition fail.

Table 12.: Does the tweet suggest that an individual, group or party is responsible for coalition fail in Turkey?

Individuals, Groups, Institutions, Parties	Freq.	Percent.
MHP/Party Leader	3	42,9
Terrorist Groups	1	14,3
Public/Voters	1	14,3
Politicians	1	14,3
Opposition Parties	1	14,3
Total	7	100,0

CONCLUSION AND COMMENTS

Platforms like Twitter, Facebook have created online communities where people can share as much as little personnel information as they desire with other members. People's relationship to news has changed creating a different type of news consumer who has developed a new set of digital behaviors. Because user can be a news producer, this has made its more individualistic, more selective and powerful. Also now, a lot of people argue that the basic transmission of information has become a cheap commodity because they assert that anyone who has a cell phone become a journalist, publisher, broadcaster. All academicians, specialists, journalist recognized that freedom of expression on Internet is a crucial challenge to address in formulating inclusive information society.

The aftermath of the Turkey election (November 2015) provided the latest example of how powerful Internet tools like YouTube, Facebook and Twitter are changing the way media are produced, distributed and consumed. In the face of increasingly restricted conventional media in Turkey, people were turning to social media in electoral period. The most ardent critics of the existing order, columnists and others are heavily using outlets such as Twitter and Facebook.

Past research on election campaign media coverage, particularly television channels and newspapers suggests that the media can play an important role in informing voters. However, much of the research on campaign media coverage has focused on how traditional media were shaped and reported on political news. Unlike previous study, this research was focus on posts/tweets in Twitter as a social media by columnist. One of the most important results of this research is many columnists have non-destructive but also slightly implicit beliefs about ruling party and government in electoral period.

In this 1 November election time there were three main issues. First one was related that HDP would pass again 10 percent election threshold or not. Second was Presidency and failing coalition. Third one was suicide bombings and terrorist attacks. However pro-Kurdish party HDP slightly passed election threshold of %10 with 10,6 percent of all votes, down 13% in the 7 June. The AKP secured 41% at the polls the last time around and had to seek support from a rival party to form a coalition government. But it failed to find agreement with both the CHP and Nationalist Movement Party (MHP). A potential CHP-MHP coalition requires the backing of the People's Democracy Party (HDP) to receive a vote of confidence. MHP Chairman Devlet Bahçeli, however, has said his party will never participate in a political formation that directly or indirectly includes the pro-Kurdish party HDP. In this time MHP Chairman Devlet Bahçeli was widely criticized by columnist and opponents to ruling party. Criticising to Devlet Bahçeli, leader of MHP, has decreased considerably while this researching. Also other critics deal with that all the parties have not equal opportunity. Especially the most criticized topic was state-media and pro-government private media considerably disregarded the oppositions. The election was preceded by the deadliest terrorist attack in Turkey's. Several terror attacks prevented opposition parties from staging any demonstrations or public meetings. However, the ruling party has been widely criticized both nationally and internationally for its attacks on freedom of speech, in particular with regards to protests and journalists. Despite different ideological leanings, there was accumulation across the columnists in terms of some aspects of their tweets. Those tweets are related internal conflict, terrorism, failing coalition and media freedom. Discussions which are related those topics usually focus on the criticize columnists each other. Columnists were constantly in conflict each other and politicians. Offering specific social prescriptions about how to behave among in "Morality" the frames was most emphasized by columnist. Also some of columnists called to voter to be in opposition to existing order in Turkey and posted tweets to provide guidance to vote for democratic system of country. There were serious national and international concerns as to whether Turkey would have a truly free and fair general election in November 2015.

Generally columnists have posted tweets to be a fair election. Turkey's economy was exposed to further risks, not only by increasing corruption at country, but also some authoritarian policies was drew attention by columnists in their posted tweets. After result of November election, some columnist posted few tweets about result of election. Because they didn't expect that AKP increase their votes to %49. Not only columnist, nobody expected the AKP to achieve a landslide victory in the November 1 elections. As almost all opinion polls suggested that the AKP would either form a single-party government with a slight majority, or be forced to be part of a coalition government, having fallen slightly short of obtaining a majority. One of the most important conspicuous was columnist tried to avoid giving name of individuals, groups, politicians and parties in their post. Other important conspicuous was columnists had didn't wrote different messages in their tweets like their papers they were affiliated. We assume that some columnists, who were particularly in mainstream media, didn't want to post their ideas about result of election because they were concerned about their corporate identity and for the future of their profession.

The aftermath of June 7 election, the political parties came together to discuss potential coalitions after no party was able to garner enough of the vote to form a single-party government. Despite the fact that topic of coalition fail a lot of times remain on the media agenda these topics did not on columnist agenda. In this research 30 of the tweets related to coalition talks but only 7 tweets were related coalition fail. Difference between two these number show that columnists couldn't want to give a message about coalition possibilities because there were three options for a coalition. The opposition insisted on CHP-MHP-HDP coalition government to AKP. Although this option was ruled out, based on the MHP's consistent refusal to join a coalition with HDP. Also Coalitions talks were held in waves of terrorists' attacks in Turkey. In this atmosphere columnists may not want to give message about coalition possibilities.

Consequently the columnists literally tweeted their ideas on some topics; sometimes they posted their opinion implicitly, sometimes they tweeted hesitantly. Regarding these attitudes of columnists there could be a lot of matters, which were democratic situation of Turkey, freedom of the press, and acts of terrorism.

REFERENCES

- About US (2010). Twitter. Retrieved from <http://twitter.com/about>
- Brunken, B. L. (2006). Hurricane Katrina: A Content Analysis of Media Framing, Attribute Agenda Setting, and Tone of Government Response. Unpublished B.A, Louisiana State University.
- Cappella, J. N., & Jamieson, K. H. (1997). *Spiral of cynicism. The press and the public good.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chong, D., & Druckman, J.N. (2007). Framing theory. *The Annual Review of Political Science*, 10. 103-126.
- Coombs, W. T. (2006). Crisis management: A communicative approach. In C. H. Botan & V. Hazleton (Eds.), *Public relations theory* (pp. 171–197). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- D'Angelo, P. (2002). News framing as a multiparadigmatic research program: A response to Entman. *Journal of Communication*, 870-888.
- De Vreese Claes H. *News framing: Theory and typology*, 2005.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Towards clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43, 51-58.
- Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95, 1–37
- Scheufele, D.A., & Tewksbury, David. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication*, 57, 9-20.
- Semetko H. A., and Valkenburg P. M., (2000) Framing European politics: A content analysis of press and television news. *Journal of Communication* 50(1): 93–109.
- Tuchman, G. (1977). The Exception Proves the Rule: The study of routine news practices in the United States. In Jane Leftwich Curry and Joan R. Dassin, editors, *Press Control Around the World*. New York, Praeger, 1982 pp 3-21.
- Vreese, C.H. de. (2005). News framing: Theory and typology. *Information Design Journal Document Design*, 13(1), 51-62.
- Wimmer, R. D. and Dominick J. R. (2011). *Mass Media Research*, 9th Ed. Wadsworth, Boston.
- Yiouta, Julie and Ivana Segvic. (2003). Revisiting Clinton/Levinsky Scandal: The Convergence of Agenda Setting and Framing, *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 80, (1).