

MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

News Framing in Turkish Media for Local and Global Terror Attacks:

Comparative Analysis of News and Reader Comments about Paris and Istanbul Attacks

Social Science at University of Vienna

verfasst von / submitted by

Gulberk Arpacay

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Science (MSc)

Wien, 2019 / Vienna 2019

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme code as it appears on
the student record sheet:

A 066 550

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme as it appears on
the student record sheet:

Masterstudium Communication
Science

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Hajo
Boomgaarden

News Framing in Turkish Media for Local and Global Terror Attacks:

Comparative Analysis of News and Reader Comments about Paris and Istanbul Attacks

Gulberk Arpacay

University of Vienna

Introduction

From the end of 2015 and until the beginning of 2017 was the year of most frequent ISIS terror attacks, which terrified the humanity in all over the world. Attacks were terrifying but also, they were simultaneous and traumatizing. Obviously, one of the most known ISIS terror attacks was Paris Attacks on November 13, 2015, which was started in Bataclan concert hall and continued different part of the city simultaneously (CNN.com, 2018). Not only Paris Attacks but also Belgium Airport Attack, London attacks, Charlie Hebdo and other attacks in Europe were terrifying events for the world. Meanwhile, in Turkey, ISIS attacks slowly started to appear at the end of 2015 and it lasted until the beginning of 2017. Eight ISIS attacks held in Turkey in a year. As it is in Europe attacks, approximately 292 people lost their lives and 773 people injured during this traumatizing and sudden attacks. The attacks held not only in Istanbul and capital Ankara but also different cities in Turkey such as Sanliurfa and Gaziantep which are border cities to Syria (mediascope.tv, 2017).

After the most known terrifying terror attack, 9/11, many researches were held regarding the media effect on terrorism. All those researches made the connection between Western media and terrorism together with the bound between the location of terror event and news coverage in a victim country. For example, it has been studied that Western media gives more place on attacks in Paris than in Brno because of the proximity and cultural relevance (Nevalsky. 2015). Moreover, studies of Western academia mostly focus on the relationship between Western media and post-terrorism effect of media on public opinions such as Islamophobia and racism. However, the perspective of Eastern media on the attacks happened in the Western world had been studied quite less. In this study, the main aim is to reveal the perspective of Turkish media on ISIS attacks in Paris

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

and Istanbul by comparing three newspapers with different political standing. Moreover, the study also aims to compare reader comments under the Facebook posts of that news.

Literature Review

The Importance of News Framing

Framing theory is capable to explain the political background of news recipients. (Lecheler & Vreese, 2012). Related to that, several authors explained framing theory and its relevance to political communication studies. For example, McCombs's framing theory suggests that it is the selection of a specific number of thematic elements to add in media agenda as a particular object for discussion (as quoted in Scheufele, 2000). On the other hand, recent studies suggest that framing refers to how a piece of given information is showed to the audience rather than what is being communicated and framing can evoke persuasive messages on the audience (Cacciatore, Scheufele & Iyengar, 2016). Moreover, most of the scholars like Price, Tewksbury and Powers together with Scheufele suggest that framing is a distinctive concept and cannot be the extension of agenda-setting and priming theories (see Cacciatore, Scheufele & Iyengar, 2016). The effect of framing needs to be evaluated and measured by itself.

There is a proved indication about mass media's messages matching audiences' interests. In other words, the framing by the mass media and its societal and psychological level of effect on the individual is statically proved and accepted (McCombs & Shawn, 1972). Framing not only matches audiences' interest but also based on the level of political knowledge, some audiences can be more responsive to framings (Lecheler & Vreese, 2010). Hence, even though other media effect concepts (e.g. priming) has no indirect influence, framing can have an influence on the reader's standards while evaluating countries. For example, it has been proved that when people read stories on the domestic front, they do not shape their thought on an international level (Brewer & Graf & Willnat, 2003).

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

According to Shen (2004), the mass media is the elites who gives shapes and importance to the news. Yet, there are not one but different types of framing like issue-specific and generic (Vreese, 2005). Issue-specific news frames focus on specific crisis and scandals (Vreese, 2005). In this study, the news framing focus will also be on a specific issue which is a terror attack. Since media highlight and select certain issues together with effective tone and language, the frame created by media becomes a "central organizing idea or storyline which providing meaning" and what the frame suggest is the always issue of controversy in that country (Shen, 2004, p. 400).

In addition, Scheulefe (1999) contributes to framing studies with two important concepts: media and individual frames. Those two concepts are very explanatory to understand functions of framing by itself. According to a couple of research theories, media frames are about making a storyline by classifying news and expecting their effect on the audience (Scheulefe, 1999). Meanwhile, according to McLeod et al., the concept of individual framing refers to how an audience makes sense of political news (see Scheulefe, 1999). Yet, Iyengar suggests the relationship between framing and audience can be related to issue (see Scheulefe, 1999) so, in the past studies, Iyengar proved that news story frames can influence the quality of responsibility regarding terrorism (see Cacciatore, Scheulefe & Iyengar, 2016). For this reason, news framing theory will help to understand how media frames the terror attacks happened in Turkey and France and the frame effect on reader comments.

Framing in News Coverages of Terrorism

For a long time, researchers mainly focused on media effect of terrorism in the U.S. after the 9/11 attacks. For this reason, there are many research findings regarding westernized media perspective and valance terror coverages. According to Papacharissi and Oliveira (2008), frames can be located in four places in communication: "the communicator, the text,

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

the receiver and the culture itself" (p.53). When you apply "framing" in crises like terrorism, it identifies reasons, responsible agents, moral judgments and policy responses to the event. This causes several distinctions like "terrorism" or "freedom fighters" (Papacharissi & Oliveira, 2008). For example, while citizens of Country A see the illegally armed organization as "terrorist", citizens of Country B might see as "guerillas for freedom". These existed contradictions are main causes of framed media outcomes shaped by media agents, country culture and political spectrum. Not only political spectrum or culture but also religion, linguistic factors, technological influences, institutional and organizational characteristics are also effective reasons for various foreign media responses on terror attacks (Gerhards & Schafer, 2014). In addition, the proximity of the terror event is also effective in the coverage amount and attributes of the event (Yang & Chen, 2018). However, the conflicts between countries or cultures (e.g. Christians-Muslims; West-East) will be always the main hidden reasons for valance news in terrorism. Gerhards and Schafer (2014) confirm that regional differences and interpretation of terrorist events as "ours" and "theirs" influences terror attacks' media representation.

Moreover, after terror attacks some countries' news agencies use more domestic perspective (e.g. British newspapers) while others use international perspective (e.g. U.S. newspapers); however, whether with domestic or international counter-terrorist perspective, governments always use the position to communicate their message by using news coverages (Brinson & Stohl, 2012). International and domestic perspectives vary regarding the coverage attributes such as focusing on international connections of the terrorist group or domestic networks of the terrorist group and so on. Hence, two different perspectives of newspapers as domestic and international influences the audiences' perspective on the event even though there is a global standardization of terror coverages by illegitimate terror. (Gerhards & Schafer, 2014). For this reason, in the news framing of

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

terrorism, newspapers will use their own perspective and background while reporting the news.

Cacciatore, Scheulefe & Iyengar suggest that when news stories are linked with terrorism events in a political context, there is more possibility to increase responsibility upon terrorism together with the will of advocacy on social reforms (2016). On the other hand, when the government uses all levels of framing process, that may also cause the public support of government, underestimating minorities and justification of racism (Brinson & Stohl, 2012). In other words, news framing of terrorism can easily trigger negative emotions and attitudes with some illusory effect (Shoshani & Slone, 2008). Thus, there are contradictory outcomes in news framing of terrorism, which will be analyzed in this study.

Military vs. Diplomatic Framing

Researchers Papacharissi and Oliveira (2008) made computerized content analysis with the sample of 107 articles from New York Times, London Financial Times and the Guardian together with discourse analysis and concluded that U.S. media focus on military solutions while covering terror attacks; however, British media focuses on more diplomatic presentations and evaluations for the news event. Thus, the study of Papacharissi and Oliveira helped this research process to think about their concepts as military vs. diplomatic framing.

The discussion of military vs. diplomatic framing also exists in other studies. Based on the study of Nevalsky (2015), U.S. news media uses "military" and "governmental" terms for the news about terrorist attacks in Borno, Nigeria, on the other hand, they use "police" and "authorities" terms for the news about terror attacks in Paris, France.

Episodic vs. Thematic Framing

According to researcher Iyengar (1991), the episodic frame is described as "the

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

concept which is event or case-oriented and focuses on hard news and concrete, isolated instances. Episodic frames tend to be more drama-oriented, visually compelling, and compatible with the economics of the news cycle", on the other hand, thematic frames is described as "it emanates from specific instances, but focus on providing context and background for the issue at hand. Thematic frames are less descriptive and more analytical" (see. Papacharissi & Oliveira, 2008, p.65).

Journalists like to use episodic frames because they are able to pull the reader into the story better than a thematic frame. On the other hand, episodic frames may cause underestimation, invisibility, and connection of real problems when they are described as unconnected (Gross, 2008). For this reason, the expected amount of episodic framing among news are always higher than thematic framing.

Moreover, Gross showed that episodic framing drives higher emotional reactions than thematic framing (see Aarøe, 2011). Yet, when there is no emotional reaction from the audience, thematic frames can influence the opinions of them better than episodic frames (Aarøe, 2011). For this reason, frame strength should be also considered while testing the effect of episodic and thematic framing.

Descriptors in Framing for Sensationalism and Dramatization

According to Nevalsky (2015), descriptors have also an important role in terms of assessing severity and tragedy associated with attacks to the reader. He defines descriptors in U.S. media about Paris and Borno terror attack news as: "the attack" was described in very different ways depending on the event. In the coverage of Paris, "attack" almost always had a descriptor attached to it. The Paris attacks were described using terms including "horrific," barbaric," outrageous" or "bloodiest"... On the contrary, the coverage of Borno rarely used descriptors when writing about the attack' (Nevalsky, 2015, p. 472). In other words, when brutal and shocking violent events happen,

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

newspapers are more tending to use extreme tone to draw sensationalism and dramatization in the news coverage (Cain-Arzu, 2016). Correspondingly, Iqbal (2017) states that words and phrases are important while investigating how media in foreign or base country frames terrorism after the attack.

Slant news, Negativity Bias and Negative Framing

To be able to define bias in news framing, primarily, slant news and its contribution to bias in news framing need to be empirically analyzed. Levite states that the way of choosing stories and covering political powers based on reports' and editors' political beliefs (see D'Alessio et al., 2000); however, for some other scholars, it depends on political nature of media business rather than editors and reporters (see D'Alessio et al., 2008). As Hastorf & Cantil stated, bias depends on when people see the same message or even however interpreting it in a different way (see D'Alessio et al., 2008). Basically, slant news may contribute the specific political power in the country by emphasizing preferred side and ignoring another side. According to Entman, the level of slant serves two types of bias: content bias and decision making (2010). In addition, some other scholars (such as Hoffstetter) see the slanted news as a "statement bias" which means "interjecting personal opinions into the text of the coverage" (see D'Alessio et al., 2008, p.136).

By definition, content bias refers to "consistently slanted framing of mediated communication that promotes the success of a specific interest party or ideology in competitions to control government power" (see Entman, 2010, p. 393). On the other hand, decision-making bias refers to "guide information processing by individual journalists and, manifested as tacit norms and routines by news organizations" (see Entman, 2010, p. 394). In this case, it is important to find out which type of bias exists in different terror attack news coverages and how foreign or local governments are framed

in the news coverages of Turkish media after the attacks.

Not only the concept of slant news but also negative and positive framing contributes to study to find out bias in the news coverages. Negative framing is the evidence of negative bias, which is also called “valence framing” (Bizer et al., 2011). Valence or negative framing expects to support only one side and being opposed to the other side and the recent study showed that valence framing causes attitude strength (Bizer et al., 2011). Also, the perception of bias could be related with whether the article showed a positive, negative or neutral frame regarding the country or person (Mairescu-Murphy, 2016). Moreover, studies show that localized stories with positive frame shows more bias rather than negative and neutral frames (Mairescu-Murphy, 2016).

In addition, different studies claim that negatively framed articles cause stronger feelings and will of punishment (von Sikorski, 2016). Also, Baumeister et al. state that negative is always more powerful than positive information (as cited in Bizer et al., 2011). For this reason, about terror attack news coverages, articles which are framed negatively about the victim country may cause harsh and brutal comments from the readers. According to Levin et al., (2001), studies showed that negative framing can be more persuasive and draw strong reactions compared to positive framing based on cultural differences. On the other hand, Morris (2007) states that viewers pursue news, which is tailored to their own political beliefs.

The Framing of Victimization on Geographical and Cultural Level

There is an expected differentiation of victims on local news media due to the geographical location of the attack. According to Powell (2018), victims are always described as good and innocent; while, terrorists are described as an evil who caused harm to civilians. However, the level of victimization in between foreigner and local on news coverages is a research gap, which is expected to be discussed in this paper.

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

Newspapers mostly change their agendas and frames based on the geographic location of the terror attack. For this reason, according to Nevalsky (2015), countries closed to the U.S. are more likely to be newsworthy than other countries culturally and geographically distant. Additionally, when there is coverage of those two countries, the content differs in terms of tone and sentiment of the headline. While the geographically far country has more detached and statistical headlines, geographically and the culturally close country has emotional headlines, which are full of with sympathy (Nevalsky, 2015). Correspondingly, in this paper, double standardization in news, opinion articles and headlines will be examined from the perspective of a Muslim majority country. For this reason, Nevalsky's contributions from Western perspective have an enormous impact on this study, while shaping the research model.

According to Sui et al. (2017), cultural closeness and proximity are also key concepts in terrorism news coverages. However, they also implement the importance of the type terror attack, suicide-bombing attacks are more sensational on the eye of the audience; for this reason, it takes attention no matter what geographical location is. On the other hands, Western media like the U.S. links terror attack with Muslims all the time; however, when it comes to Muslim majority countries like Turkey, covering terror attacks is visibly more different than a Westernized way of coverages. For this reason, this study will use the perspective of Muslim majority country's media on "so-called" Islamic terror groups such as ISIS.

Many studies show that the framing of victimization in terror attacks also changes like nature of media coverages significantly when the event is happening in the base country of the media organization rather than in a foreign country. For this reason, many media scholars describe this situation as 'media terrorism' or 'mass mediated terrorism' (Iqbal, 2017). In other words, how media depicts victims will change in geographical and

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

cultural level such as while Western media have Islamophobia in the news coverages of attacks, Eastern-Muslim avoids emphasizing religion of terrorist groups.

Readers' Reactions on News Coverages and Online Public Space

First of all, the Internet is leading as an extension of the public sphere by allowing a citizen to involve public discussions (Zamith & Lewis, 2014). According to Calhoun (1992), the public sphere depends on not only the quality of topic but also the amount of participation (as cited in Zamith & Lewis, 2014). Regarding the understanding of reader comments and public space for deliberation, Manosevitch, and Walker (2009) state that online journalism provides space to promote citizen participation and engagement with comment sections. Even though the study of Manosevitch and Walker mainly focuses comment sections below news pages which allows anonymity; there is also the possibility of commenting under that news from newspapers' Facebook posts. On the other hand, according to Gastil (2008) public deliberation means "political process through which a group of people carefully examines a problem and arrives at a well-reasoned solution after a period of inclusive, respectful consideration of diverse points of views" (as cited in Manosevitch and Walker, 2009, p. 8). In other words, readers are contributing to public deliberation and creating their own public space to discuss the daily news. Manosevitch & Walker (2009) also think that opinion writers take advantage from those comments and contributes to their work.

Moreover, media is willing to draw terror attacks as dramatic and sensational as possible (Powell, 2018). Even though visual media such as TV broadcasts have more emotional and dramatic elements to show audience, thanks to the online development of Web 2.0., online news sources are also effective to show those dramatic elements. According to Cho et al. (2003), visual imagery causes strong emotional responses against terror attacks together with the tone of the content. Online newspapers are eligible to use

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

visual imagery together with news content. For this reason, it is highly possible to have strong emotional reactions from the audience if there are a strong tone and visual imagery in news content; moreover, past research has shown that negatively framed news leads to negative reader comments and strong judgmental perspective in comments (von Sikorski, 2016). Additionally, Price, Tewksbury, and Powers (1997) concluded, from their study among U.S. students, that news frames can definitely affect perceptions of issues and people in the news. For this reason, frames will have an effect on the audience's responses while they write their reactions to the news.

According to Mageed (2008), commenters belonging to Muslim countries are most likely cover their country or citizens in the comments more than covering foreigners. Additionally, findings show that commenters are mostly interested with talking about politics, military, and political violence, in other words; news related with violence, politics, and military always takes more attention from readers and create inner wish to discuss on Journalism 2.0 platforms (Mageed, 2008).

On the other hand, commenters sometimes only contribute to the topic just to attack another commenter personally, in this case; the story loses the attention. However, the study of Paskin (2013) shows that comment boards started to become quite democratic and the only a couple of people tries to distract attention from the topic and carry the conversation unnecessary levels. In general, the public sphere opportunity of Web 2.0. helps us to observe and analyze immediate responses from readers.

The Political Spectrum of France and Turkey

In this study, not only journalism but also literature regarding international relations will be considered in order to provide the aim of the study clearly. Basically, France and Turkey had been in very deep relationships since the period of the monarchy in both countries. However, the huge discussion of Islamophobia and past relations with

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

France caused several disagreements between these two countries and created big prejudice and hate among Turkish citizens. The reason why the political spectrum of France and Turkey is mentioned in this paper is related to reader's and journalist's perception of France regarding terror attacks in Paris.

According to Geisser (2010), France refuses to see the anti-Islamism on their media while criticizing U.S. anti-Islamism. One of the main starting points of anti-Islamism in France is related to The Ottomans which is the Turkish Empire as a threat to the Western world. After some point, Ottomans were not represented as a religious enemy but one of the reasons why Turkey still cannot enter European Union is "Islamic culture of Turkey". Related to that and other anti-Islamic prejudices coming from France, most of the Muslim majority countries like Turkey started to see France as a big threat against religion. Correspondingly, when the terrorist attack happened to Charlie Hebdo, most of the journalist firstly emphasized the anti-Islamic perspective of the magazine (see the opinion column of Kalin, 2016). Overall, France is not more anti-Islamic than any other European countries, however; the tendencies against Islam, hijab, and traditions of Muslim exists and it shapes one part of the conjuncture (Geisser, 2010).

Moreover, Aslan (2014) states that there are many other reasons regarding tendency between France and Turkey different than anti-Islam like Armenian genocide accusation upon Turkey. Armenian genocide issue had been defined as "In the years 1915-1918, Ottoman Armenians living in the region under the heavy condition of the First World War faced dislocation and many Armenians suffered to a great extent with heavy casualties. This very dislocation issue is considered to be genocide by Armenia and presently twenty states all around the world officially recognize Armenian genocide claims including France. Due to this very fact, the Republic of Turkey experiences a series diplomatic crisis in the international arena where it deteriorates its mutual relations

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

with the states that recognized Armenian claims as genocide. Besides, every 24th of April turns out a diplomatic crisis between Paris and Ankara. Eventually, Turkish-Armenian conflict and claims of Diaspora and Yerevan constitute an official obstacle for Ankara for further EU negotiations and its future European Union membership" (Aslan, 2014, p. 129). In this spectrum, existed the problem of accusations toward Turkey from France had created some prejudices and haters toward French people and government among Turks.

Finally, the existed problem of refugee and migrant crisis in the EU is also one of the political insights that we should mention before we focus on the existed tension between Turkey and France. Turkey is dealing with about borders for refugees because of its geographical location as a bridge between Europe and the Middle East. The result of extremist parties in EU, the radicalization becomes an issue and it creates a big threat against EU integration and refugees (Postelnicescu, 2016). Obviously, right-wing Turkish media sees and uses this negative fact regarding EU and shows to people with headlines as "extreme nationalism against Muslims exists" in EU (milliyet.com.tr, 2017).

Research Question & Hypothesis

Based on the literature review, it has been stated that the Western perspective on terrorism and framing effect had already been studied several times with several cases. However, there is an existing research gap regarding the biased perspective of local journalists and readers on terror attacks in foreign countries. Many studies show that online comments of readers are important contributions to political deliberation; not only news coverages but also reader comments are essential to analyze double standards in news framing. Paris and Istanbul attack were held by the same terror groups and their aims. However, reactions toward Paris and Istanbul from Turkish media and citizens were pretty distinguished. For this reason, this study will contribute to news framing from the

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

perspective of Eastern media toward Western people. With this regard, here are my prospected research questions so far.

RQ1: How does the cultural and political background of the country discretely causes negative or positive biases in news reporting of Turkish media about the ISS attacks in Paris and Istanbul?

RQ2: How does the cultural and political background of the country together with news framing affect online discussions of Turkish readers upon the ISS attacks in Paris and Istanbul?

According to Beckett (2016), the main duty of journalists is to show empathy and discretion by avoiding sensationalism. However, nowadays, especially in online journalism, news reporters started to focus on simplification of terror news reporting by using too much sensationalism in the news.

Using dramatic messages is the main part of sensationalism as a concept. For this reason, while analyzing the articles, it needs to be focused on the language and descriptors to measure the level of dramatization and sensationalism. Furthermore, local media sensationalize and dramatize the local terror attacks more than a foreign country's terror attacks by using different descriptors (Patrick, 2014). Related to previous research regarding sensationalism in terror news, **H1** was created:

H1: Compared to global terror attack news, the local terror attack news is mostly framed in more sensational and dramatic way.

Nevalsky (2015) states the importance of cultural distance and proximity when it comes to the victimization of countries after the attacks. Furthermore, Entman (2010) states that based on the level of slant in the news, news coverages may include different bias concepts such as content bias and decision-making bias. Decision-making bias mostly consists of covert bias and hidden support to specific political power or idea. For

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

this reason, based on previous research and findings, **H2** was built based on the concept of victimization, bias and the effect of political spectrum between two countries.

H2: Terror attack news about the foreign country is mostly framed in negatively “biased” way under the effect of political spectrum in media.

On account of bias and victimization of a foreign country, the political standing of the analyzed newspapers is also crucial in this research. Previous research suggests that Turkey has a really long history of political fights among media powers (Sözeri & Güney, 2011). In this research, three different newspapers will be used (see Method part). All of those newspapers have different power struggles and backgrounds from the past. At the time of 2015 and 2016, some of the media owners of those newspapers were even different from today. One of the newspapers in this research is Cumhuriyet, which has been known for reporting alleged illegal arms shipments to Syria by the Turkish Intelligence Agency (MIT). This was a big issue for the government and president Erdoğan. Likewise, a second newspaper that will analyze, Hürriyet, also shared the news on Cumhuriyet as it is but without a problem (FarmanFarmaian, Sonay, and Akser, 2018). In other words, Hürriyet was more in between liberal and center-right and Cumhuriyet were more in between center left or anti-governmental political side at this time (Yumul and Özkırımlı, 2000). Also, according to Balkir et al., Cumhuriyet had a Kemalist and intellectual background (2008). The essential point is even the government relations were bad for both Cumhuriyet and Hürriyet at those times, these two newspapers have a very different historical and political background. According to Özkır, since Hürriyet has existed, the main slogan of the newspaper stayed as “Turkey belongs to Turks” (2013). Thus, Hürriyet newspaper is always existed with its center-right nationalist background (Balkir et al., 2008), even after Doğan Media Group had bought it. For this reason, at the time of Doğan Holding ownership, Hürriyet was never be radicalized and had radical

opposition to government or country even when there were bad relationships.

Lastly, *Sabah*, the third newspaper that will be analyzed in this research has known as the newspaper of President Erdoğan because the media owner is the son-in-law of President Erdoğan. For this reason, *Sabah* was known as the conservative and the most favorable newspaper of the government (Ercebe, 2015). For this reason, for **H2(a)** and **H2(b)**, the political standing of those three newspapers is the main element to measure the causal relationship between the newspaper and framed bias.

H2(a): Based on political standing of the newspapers, conservative right or government slant newspapers implement more “content biased” news framing.

H2(b): Based on political standing of the newspapers, left or center-right slant newspapers implement more “decision-making biased” news framing.

As Falkheimer and Olsson (2011) stated while investigating news framing of terror attacks in Norway, thematic and episodic framing needs to be conceptualized based on the research belongs to Iyengar (1991) to asses which framing way media uses when it comes to terror attack news about a foreign country. According to Iyengar (1991), in thematic framing, issues are represented in a broader context like general trends or as a matter of public policy; while episodic framing focuses on individuals without social contextual information. For this reason, **H3** needs to assess the usage of episodic and thematic framing in local and global terror news of Turkish media.

H3: Terror attack news about a foreign country are mostly framed in thematic way while local terror attack news is mostly framed in episodic way.

Framing the news as positive and negative has a causal relationship with negativity and positivity in reader comments (von Sikorski, 2016; Murphy, 2012). Moreover, the way of framing the message causes quick identification and classification from recipients and it affects the reception of the issue in public opinions by transferring political reality

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

to citizens (Muniz et al., 2015; Matthes, 2012). For **H4, H4(a) and H4(b)**, the political standing of the newspaper and their reader comments which will be analyzed is crucial to assess causal relationship between negativity in news framing and negativity in reader comments (see the part for H2a and H2b).

H4: Based on the political standing of the newspaper, the news framing and comments of news readers on global and local terror attack news differs.

H4(a): Right/government slant and center-right slant newspapers in Turkey most likely to have more negative news framing in the news coverage on terror attacks in France.

H4(b): Readers of right/government slant and center-right newspapers in Turkey most likely to have the more negative context in their comments on terror attacks in France.

According to Nevalsky (2015), in the case of comparative analysis of Paris and Brno news, the framing of military and government has been changed. Additionally, Papacharissi and Oliveira (2008) heightened the difference between military and diplomatic framing between global and local terror attack news. Based on that **H5** would suggest that:

H5: Turkish media most likely use military framing for attacks in Istanbul (local); while using diplomatic framing for attacks in Paris (global).

Method

Since the studies about terrorism and news framing mostly requires content analysis; in this research, quantitative content analysis was used as a research method. Not only the framing of news but also the negative bias of reader comments was also supposed to be analyzed. For this reason, two master students from different fields but daily newspaper reader worked for the coding process of news and reader comments.

Data

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

In this research, the data collection was a vital process to investigate Turkish media and Turkish readers' comments. Hence, three newspapers with different political standings were used for the coding process, which are *Hürriyet*, *Sabah*, and *Cumhuriyet*. The selection of newspapers is not only related to their circulation or online click-bait amount but also their online popularity/share and history. All those three newspapers are relatively old and historically valuable newspapers to investigate differences.

In addition, reader comments are also collected from those newspapers' online Facebook pages since they also share most of the news simultaneously on their Facebook pages as well. In Facebook, readers are more open to discussing politics in the comment section longer and more respectfully than anonymous platforms (Halpern & Gibbs, 2012). For this reason, the reader comments are selected from the Facebook pages of those three newspapers.

In the analysis, the news collection's time period was the first week after the attack. The frequent time period for Paris Attacks news was between 13th and 16th November 2015; on the other hand, for Istanbul Atatürk Airport Attack, it was between June 28th and July 6th, 2016. The reason why the first week is used only was about political changes in Turkey. Since Turkey has a different agenda to discuss for almost every day, that would make sense to only compare the first week of both attacks. Especially, after 15th of July, coup d'état attempt, the news about Ataturk airport (it was held 2 weeks before the coup d'état attempt) were almost disappeared.

For both of the attacks, there was 62.9% of regular news and 35.7% opinion news in total. Most of the quotations and paraphrases were from Turkish representatives for both the Paris Attack and Istanbul Attack (Table 1). Regarding reader comments, 40% of the reader comments were from *Hürriyet*, 33.8% from *Sabah* and %26.4 from *Cumhuriyet* in the analysis. In total, 962 units out of 120 news articles and 420 reader comments were analyzed.

Table 1

Frequency of Quotations and Paraphrases

<u>Turkish</u>		<u>French</u>		<u>Other Representatives</u>		<u>Victims</u>	
<u>Representative</u>		<u>Representatives</u>					
Quotation	Paraphrase	Quotation	Paraphrase	Quotation	Paraphrase	Quotation	Paraphrase
5.9%	3.5%	1.7%	2.5%	3.5%	3.3%	5.3%	1.6%

Note. Top four quotation and paraphrase sources in the analysis.

Codebook

The codebook is a really vital process of a pre-test. First and foremost, the codebook was needed to be prepared and tested several times with coder before the actual coding starts. To accomplish that, several meetings were conducted with the second coder and worked over the codebook several times. In this process, after the 1st, 2nd and 3rd version of the codebook, 4th version was decided as the final version and used for the actual coding (see Appendix A).

Measurement

Sensationalism and Dramatization. The measurement of sensational and dramatic tone in the news coverages had been measured by two elements: Dramatic and neutral statements. The dramatic statement needs to cover descriptors such as “bloody”, “horrific”, “barbaric”, “outrageous” and so on. On the other hand, a neutral statement supposed to be coded in case of lack of evaluation regarding the incident. If the unit includes any other descriptors which reflect sensitiveness and sadness but not in the level of dramatization and sensation; those units were supposed to be coded as “0” for both neutral and dramatic/sensational part. Overall, the intercoder reliability-based Cronbach’s alpha (α) for dramatic/sensational ranged from 0.60 to 1 and for neutral statements α = from 0,90 to 1. In this case, since acceptable

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

Cronbach's alpha (α) starts with 0.60, it is proper to say that intercoder reliability was satisfied.

Framing the Bias. The framing of bias was compromised of two different elements as slant news and accusations toward victim country. Based on intercoder reliability test, for the accusing the victim country variable, Cronbach's Alpha (α) ranges 0,83 to 1. Moreover, slant news/content bias reached α = from 0,83 to 1 and slant news/decision-making reached α = from 0,7 to 1 for all the newspapers and terror events coverages.

Episodic and Thematic Framing. Episodic and thematic framing were asked for all unit of analysis to be coded as either episodic (1) or thematic (2). Based on intercoder reliability test, for episodic and thematic framing, Cronbach's alpha (α) ranges from 0,96 to 1.

Military and Diplomatic Framing. Military and diplomatic framing were asked to be coded when those elements existed as "1" and non-existed as "0". Military framing was able to satisfy Cronbach's Alpha (α) from 0,8 to 1 and diplomatic framing as 0,84 to 1.

Negative Framing for News. Negative framing included a lot of elements such as negative framing of Turkey, negative framing of France, negative framing of attackers, negative framing of governments, negative framing of oppositions, negative framing of newspapers, negative framing of Christianity, negative framing of Islam, "They have deserved the attack", "They do not care the attacks". In general, negative framing for the news also satisfied Cronbach's Alpha (α) from 0,7 to 1.

Negative and Positive Attitudes in Reader Comments. For the reader comments same questions and elements which are asked for negative framing of the news were asked. In addition to that, it was also wanted to know about positive attitudes from reader comments such as "wishing condolences and stating sadness for the incident" or "The critique on commenters". In other words, "The critiques on commenters" were also including positive aspects since it was expected that there will be some critiques on negative attitudes and hate-

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

speech toward victim countries. In general, negative and positive attitudes in comments also satisfied Cronbach's Alpha (α) from 0,73 to 1.

Topics regarding Negative Bias Frame. The possible topics which are bound to negatively biased articles need to be considered as well. There were criticizing topics like "Islamophobia", "discrimination/racism", "accusing anti-Islam", "Middle east relations", "Criticizing Christianity", "Criticizing Islam", "Blaming MIT", "Blaming Opposition" and "Blaming Opposite Newspapers". The Cronbach's Alpha (α) for topics regarding negative bias frame also satisfied intercoder reliability between 0.71 and 0.99.

Topics regarding Thematic Frame. The possible topics about thematically framed articles was also coded to find out the most frequent topics, which are discussed in thematic way. These thematic topics were like "Wrong Middle East Policies", "Undermining Islam", "attack on democracy but they deserved", "Do not pray for Paris", "Blaming Newspapers", "Blaming Islam" and "Blaming Christianity". The Cronbach's Alpha (α) for topics regarding thematic frame also satisfied intercoder reliability between 0.81 and 1.

Results

H1: Compared to global terror attack news, the local terror attack news is mostly framed in more sensational and dramatic way.

Based on independent samples test, there is a significant difference between Paris Attack ($M=.14$, $SD=.52$) and Istanbul Attack ($M=.25$, $SD=.43$) in dramatization level when Turkish media reports the attacks; $t(949) = -3.67$, $p=.031$.

Table 2

<i>Frequency Scores of Dramatization Level in Newspapers based on Terror Attacks' Location</i>				
<u>Newspapers</u>	<u>Paris Attack</u>		<u>Istanbul Attack</u>	
	Counts	%	Counts	%
Hürriyet	28	15.2	20	12.3
Sabah	13	8.2	50	37

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

Cumhuriyet	18	12.2	48	31.2
Total (N=951)	59	12.1	118	26.5

Note. Dramatization level is measured by detecting descriptors.

According to Table 2, frequency table of dramatization level shows that there is higher dramatization level for Istanbul Attack (26.5%) compared to Paris Attack (12.1%). Based on significance level from t-test and frequency table indices, **H1** can be accepted. Additionally, there is a visible difference for government slant newspaper (*Sabah*) regarding dramatization level of Paris Attack (8.2%) and Istanbul Attack (37%).

H2: Terror attack news about the foreign country is mostly framed in negatively “biased” way under the effect of political spectrum in media.

Based on independent samples test, there is a significant different between Paris Attack ($M=.01$ $SD=.12$) and Istanbul Attack ($M=.15$, $SD=.15$) when Turkish media accuse the victims and create biased conjuncture; $t(947) = -7.90$, $p=.000$.

Table 3

Frequency Score of Negative Bias (Accusing the victim) in Newspapers based on Terror Attacks' Location

<u>Newspapers</u>	<u>Paris Attack</u>		<u>Istanbul Attack</u>	
	Counts	%	Counts	%
Hürriyet	1	.5	16	9.6
Sabah	35	22.2	0	0
Cumhuriyet	0	0	53	34.4
Total (N=950)	36	7.3	69	14.7

Table 3 shows that negative bias from all newspapers is higher for Istanbul Attack (14.7%) than Paris Attack (7.3%). However, it is also visible that *Sabah* has higher negative bias for Paris Attack (22.2%) than Istanbul Attack (0%); while *Hürriyet* (9.6%) and *Cumhuriyet* (34.4%) has relatively higher negative bias toward Istanbul Attack than Paris

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

Attack (*Hürriyet*, .5%; *Cumhuriyet* 0%). In this case, **H2** is only acceptable for *Sabah*, since it is not acceptable for *Hürriyet* and *Cumhuriyet*. In total, **H2** is rejected hence it is not valid for all three newspapers.

Table 4

Frequency Scores for Topics of Accusations

<u>Topics</u>	<u>Paris Attack</u>		<u>Istanbul Attack</u>	
	Counts	%	Counts	%
Islamophobia ^a	10	2.0	0	0
Discrimination ^a	8	1.6	0	0
Accusing with Anti-Islam ^a	3	.6	0	0
Middle East Relations	3	.6	31	6.6
Criticizing Christianity ^a	1	.2	0	0
Immigration Policies	4	.08	6	1.3
Blaming MIT ^b	0	0	3	.6
Blaming Islam ^b	0	0	4	.4
Blaming Opposition ^b	0	0	16	1.7
Blaming Opposite Newspapers ^b	0	0	34	4.0

Note. (a) topics only for France. (b) topics only for Turkey

Additionally, Table 4 shows that the most frequent topics for France, which causes negative bias from the media are Islamophobia (2.0%) and discrimination (1.6%); meanwhile for Turkey, middle east relations (6.6%), newspapers of opposition (4.0%) and political opposition (1.7%).

H2(a): Based on political standing of the newspapers, conservative right or government slant newspapers implement more “content biased” news framing.

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

H2(b): Based on political standing of the newspapers, left or center-right slant newspapers implement more “decision-making biased” news framing.

For the first sub-**H2**, one way ANOVA test showed that there is a significant difference among newspapers, *Hürriyet* ($M=.00$, $SD=.00$), *Sabah* ($M=.39$, $SD=.49$), *Cumhuriyet* ($M=.00$, $SD=.00$) for content bias; $F(2,155)=21.3$, $p=.000$.

For the second sub-**H2**, one-way ANOVA test also showed that there is a significant difference among newspapers, *Hürriyet* ($M=.75$, $SD=.50$), *Sabah* ($M=.60$, $SD=.49$), *Cumhuriyet* ($M=1$, $SD=.00$) for decision-making bias; $F(2,155)=20.7$, $p=.000$.

Table 5

Frequency Scores for Content and Decision-Making Bias Level of Newspapers

<u>Newspapers</u>	<u>Content Bias</u>		<u>D-M Bias</u>	
	Counts	%	Counts	%
Hürriyet	0	0	3	.8
Sabah	35	11.4	54	17.6
Cumhuriyet	0	0	64	21.2

Table 5 shows that *Sabah* has both content bias (11.4%) and decision-making bias (17.6%) in their news articles regarding attacks; while *Cumhuriyet* has only high decision-making bias (21.2%) which is even higher than *Sabah*. Nevertheless, *Hürriyet* has also really low degree of decision-making bias (.8%) compared to *Sabah* and *Cumhuriyet* and no content bias at all. In this regard, it is possible to accept both **H2(a)** and **H2(b)**.

H3: Terror attack news about a foreign country are mostly framed in thematic way while local terror attack news is mostly framed in episodic way.

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

Referring to Independent Samples Test, there is a slightly significant difference between Paris Attack ($M=1.15$ $SD=.36$) and Istanbul Attack ($M=1.11$, $SD=.31$) for episodic and thematic framing when Turkish media reports the attacks; $t(949) = 1.98$, $p=.048$.

Table 6

Frequency Scores of Episodic and Thematic framing based on Terror Event

<u>Event</u>	<u>Episodic Framing</u>		<u>Thematic Framing</u>	
	Counts	%	Counts	%
Paris Attack ($N=489$)	416	84.12	73	14.8
Istanbul Attack ($N= 462$)	411	87.8	50	10.8
Total ($N= 951$)	827	86.0	124	12.8

Referring to frequency scores (Table 6), Paris Attack has more thematic framing than (14.8%) Istanbul Attack (10.8 %) in Turkish media. In this case, **H3** can also accepted by taking account low significant score ($p=.048$) as well.

Table 7

The frequency of the topics for Thematic Units

	<u>Paris Attack</u>		<u>Istanbul Attack</u>	
	Counts	%	Counts	%
Wrong Middle East Policies	19	3.8	30	6.4
Undermining Islam	5	1.0	0	0
Attack on Democracy-But They deserved	4	.8	9	1.9
Do not Pray for Paris	1	.2	0	0

Blaming Newspapers	2	.4	0	0
Blaming Islam	0	0	0	0
Blaming Christianity	0	0	0	0

Additionally (Table 7), for France, the most frequent topics which are discussed in thematic units are “wrong Middle East policies” (3.8%), “undermining Islam” (1.0%). For Turkey, as it is for France, “wrong Middle East policies” (6.4%) and “It is attack on democracy, but Turkey deserved because of past relations and politics” (1.9%).

H4: Based on the political standing of the newspaper, the news framing and comments of news readers on global and local terror attack news differs.

One-way ANOVA shows that there is a significant difference among newspapers, *Hürriyet* ($M=.00$, $SD=.054$), *Sabah* ($M=.02$, $SD=.140$), *Cumhuriyet* ($M=.00$, $SD=.058$), regarding negative framing of France after Paris Attack; $F(2,947) = 3.46$, $p=.032$.

Additionally, regarding Turkey after Istanbul Attack, there is also a significant difference among newspapers, *Hürriyet* ($M=.05$, $SD=.216$), *Sabah* ($M=.0$, $SD=.00$), *Cumhuriyet* ($M=.24$, $SD=.43$); $F(2,949) = 66.3$, $p=.000$.

In addition, there is a significant difference among readers, *Hürriyet* ($M=.22$, $SD=.37$), *Sabah* ($M=.18$, $SD=.29$), *Cumhuriyet* ($M=.07$, $SD=.16$), regarding negative framing of France after Paris Attack; $F(2,412) = 8.21$, $p=.000$. Moreover, regarding Turkey after Istanbul Attack, there is also a significant difference among readers, *Hürriyet* ($M=.19$, $SD=.39$), *Sabah* ($M=.09$, $SD=.29$), *Cumhuriyet* ($M=.27$, $SD=.44$); $F(2,412) = 6.61$, $p=.001$. In this respect, **H4** can also be accepted.

H4(a): Right/government slant and center-right slant newspapers in Turkey most likely to have more negative news framing in the news coverage on terror attacks in France.

Table 8

The Frequency Score of Negative Framings after Paris Attacks

	<u>Hürriyet</u>		<u>Sabah</u>		<u>Cumhuriyet</u>	
	Counts	%	Counts	%	Counts	%
About France	9	.3	4	1.3	1	1.3
About Europe/EU	1	.3	6	2	1	.3
About Terrorists	14	4	14	4.6	9	3.0
“They deserved the terrorism”	8	2.3	3	1	1	.3
About Christianity	1	.3	3	1	1	.3
About Islam	1	.3	0	0	1	.3

Based on Table 8, *Sabah* (1.3%) and *Cumhuriyet* (1.3%) has the highest scores for negative framing of France. However, *Hürriyet* (2.3%) is implying “France deserved the terrorism” more than *Sabah* (1%) and *Cumhuriyet* (.3%). Moreover, *Hürriyet* (.3%), *Sabah* (1%) and *Cumhuriyet* (.3%) has low score of negative framing regarding Christianity. To accept **H4(a)**, “negative framing of France” needs to be considered together with “They deserved terrorism”, for this reason, we can partly accept **H4(a)** since only center-right newspaper (*Hürriyet*) showed high level of intolerance to France.

Table 9

The Frequency Score of Negative Framings after Istanbul Attacks

	<u>Hürriyet</u>		<u>Sabah</u>		<u>Cumhuriyet</u>	
	Counts	%	Counts	%	Counts	%
About Turkish People	6	1.7	3	1	3	1

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

About Turkish Government	17	4.8	3	1	73	24.2
About Terrorists	29	8.2	22	7.2	13	4.3
“World do not care Turkey”	1	.3	15	4.9	1	.3
About Islam	8	2.3	3	1	1	.3
About Supporters of President Erdoğan	8	2.3	3	1	21	7

Additionally (Table 9) , *Cumhuriyet* (24.2%) showed extreme level of negative framing regarding Turkish government compared to *Hürriyet* (4.8%) and *Sabah* (1%). Moreover, *Cumhuriyet* (7%) also has high level of negative framing for the supporters of President Erdoğan compared to *Hürriyet* (2.3%) and *Sabah* (1%).

H4(b): Readers of right/government slant and center-right newspapers in Turkey most likely to have the more negative context in their comments on terror attacks in France.

Table 10

The Frequency Score of Negative and Positive Comments after Paris Attacks among Readers of Newspapers

Framing	<u>Hürriyet</u>		<u>Sabah</u>		<u>Cumhuriyet</u>	
	Counts	%	Counts	%	Counts	%
Negative - French People	48	28.7	34	23.9	6	5.4
Negative - About French Government	40	24.0	33	23.2	17	15.3
Negative - About Terrorists	13	7.8	3	2.1	22	19.8
“They deserved the terrorism”	18	10.8	20	14.1	2	1.8
Negative - About Christianity	4	2.4	3	2.1	2	1.8
Negative - About Islam	1	.6	0	0	0	0

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

Positive - Wishing Condolences	19	11.4	0	0	12	10.8
Negative- Critique on Commenters	12	7.2	1	.7	2	1.8

Based on Table 10, in total, all the readers showed higher negativity than newspapers. However, *Hürriyet* readers showed highest scores regarding negative framing of French people (28.7%) and French government (24%). After *Hürriyet* readers, *Sabah* readers showed the second highest score for negative framing of French people (23.9%) and French government (23.2%). Moreover, both *Sabah* (14.1%) and *Hürriyet* (10.8%) readers has the highest score while implying “France deserved the terrorism”. In this case, **H4(b)** can also be accepted.

Table 11

The Frequency Score of Negative and Positive Comments after Istanbul Attacks among Readers of Newspapers

Framing	<u>Hürriyet</u>		<u>Sabah</u>		<u>Cumhuriyet</u>	
	Counts	%	Counts	%	Counts	%
Negative - Turkish People	4	2.4	3	2.1	2	1.8
Negative - About Turkish Government	31	18.6	13	9.2	29	26.1
Negative - About Terrorists	12	7.2	9	6.3	9	8.1
Negative-Law Enforcement	10	6	2	1.4	8	7.2
“World do not care Turkey”	15	9	12	8.5	1	.9
Negative-Islam	2	1.2	1	.7	2	1.8
Negative-President Erdoğan Supporters	4	2.4	9	6.3	5	4.5
Negative-Opposition Party	1	.6	25	17.6	4	3.6
Positive- Wishing Condolences	13	7.8	3	2.1	7	6.3
Negative-Critique on commentors	6	3.6	13	9.2	2	1.8

Additionally (Table 11), regarding Istanbul Attack, *Hürriyet* (18.6%) and *Cumhuriyet* (26.1%) readers showed highest level of negativity for Turkish government. *Sabah* readers (17.6%) showed the highest level of negativity only on government-opposition parties.

H5: Turkish media most likely use military framing for attacks in Istanbul (local); while using diplomatic framing for attacks in Paris (global).

For H5, that there is no significant difference between Paris Attack ($M=.04$, $SD=.188$) and Istanbul Attack ($M=.04$, $SD=.188$) regarding military framing; $t(949)=.001$, $p=.999$. Nevertheless, there is a significant difference between Paris Attack ($M=.09$, $SD=.29$) and Istanbul Attack ($M=.01$, $SD=.11$) regarding diplomatic framing; $t(949) = 5.39$, $p=.000$

Table 12

Frequency Scores of Military and Diplomatic framing based on Terror Event

<u>Event</u>	<u>Military Framing</u>		<u>Diplomatic Framing</u>	
	Counts	%	Counts	%
Paris Attacks ($N=489$)	18	3.6	44	8.9
Istanbul Attacks ($N=$ 462)	17	3.6	6	1.3
Total ($N= 951$)	35	3.6	50	5.2

Table 12 shows that there is more diplomatic framing for Paris Attack (8.9%) and lower for Istanbul Attack (1.3%); however, there is almost no difference for military framing between Paris Attack (3.6%) and Istanbul Attack (3.6%). In this case, **H5** is partly accepted, which is only for diplomatic framing.

Discussion

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

First of all, the study yielded to highlight the effect of dramatization and sensationalism on terror attack news by using descriptors (Nevalsky, 2015). Based on the location of the event, the attitude and the level of dramatization change together with the effect of the political standing of newspapers. As Sui et al., (2017) stated, cultural closeness and proximity affects the news coverages' dramatization and importance level. Apparently, this research proved that local attacks take higher dramatization and sensationalism than global terror attacks in the media. Moreover, for local terror attacks, right/government slant newspapers are increasing the level of drama and sensation a bit more than anti-governmental newspapers. Shoshani and Slone (2008) also state that there is an important effect coming news coverage of terrorism, which produces emotional illusion for the audience. Related to recent findings and findings of this research, a dramatization of terror news differs based on the location of the terror event.

Also, the bias in media is a very contradictory topic and has a lot of dimensions like; slant news, content bias, decision-making bias (Entman, 2010). The study showed that negative bias like accusing the victim of foreign countries' terror attacks is only acceptable for right/government slant newspapers (e.g. *Sabah*). The study could not yield to confirm that all three newspapers including left/Kemalist, center-right political standing, showed a high level of negative bias toward France and French people after the attack. Nevertheless, there is a visible negativity and victim accusation toward the Turkish government and Turkish people, which comes from leftist or "anti-governmental" newspapers (e.g. *Cumhuriyet*). The reason why *Cumhuriyet* is slanted to accuse Turkey and its people regarding the attack is the main government's actions and its supporters. For example, *Cumhuriyet* was the newspaper which reveals the arrested illegal shipments to Syria by the Turkish Intelligence Agency (MIT) (FarmanFarmian, Sonay, and Akser, 2018). For this reason, the accusation toward victim country is different for government-slant and opposition-slant newspapers. Moreover,

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

one of the criticisms toward Turkey after Istanbul Attack was also related to middle east relations (e.g. government's relations with ISIS) and MIT crisis.

On the other hand, a content bias which is the bias of promoting one political idea (Entman, 2010) openly has higher for the right/government slant newspapers rather than center-right and leftist/anti-governmental newspapers. Nevertheless, government slant newspapers like *Sabah* also has decision-making bias, which promotes political ideas or powers discretely (Entman, 2010) together with content bias. It has already known that *Cumhuriyet* has the background of "Kemalism", while *Hürriyet* holds a nationalistic perspective (Balkir et al., 2008). Both of those newspapers were more critical regarding the government in 2016. On the other hand, *Hürriyet* always tried to protect its neutral position in those attacks to prevent President Erdoğan's courts and try to keep government relations secure. Meanwhile, *Cumhuriyet* was more open to promoting leftist and anti-governmental ideas by using decision-making bias since it is a newspaper of (as conservatives says) "Kemalist bourgeoisie" and "anti-conservative" ideas. For this reason, *Sabah* was promoting the ideas to protect President Erdoğan's reputation after Paris and Istanbul Attack together with both open and discrete headlines (see Çevik, 2016). However, *Cumhuriyet* was tending to accuse President Erdoğan and his close middle east relations discretely.

Moreover, not only content and decision-making effect but also negative framing feeds the negative bias of the readers (Măiorescu-Murphy, 2016; von Sikorski, 2016). Obviously, right/government slant and center-right slant newspapers are supposed to show higher intolerance to foreign countries regarding their attacks since they have nationalist perspective. Also, recent studies have shown that negative information is more effective than positive information in creating strong attitudes (Bizer et al., 2005). For this reason, together with negative framing coming from newspapers, the readers of those newspapers should also show higher levels of intolerance compared to left newspaper readers. In this study, *Hürriyet*

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

and its readers had more intolerance to France than *Sabah* and its readers, which confirms the theory of Maiorescu-Murphy, von Sikorski and Bizer et al. In other words, when the newspapers have negative framing, their readers show that negative framing toward foreign country more than the newspapers. Indeed, there are many reasons for the high percentage of negative framing for France coming from news readers. As Aslan (2014) stated, Turkey and France have very tight relations since there is an issue of Armenian Genocide, immigrant crisis, EU membership, and anti-Islamism. (Potelnicescu, 2016; Gessier, 2010). On the other hand, the same kind of negative framing toward home-country also exists among newspapers and readers, especially for anti-governmental and leftist newspapers. For this reason, based on the political standing of the newspapers and its readers, the negative framing differs for local and global attacks.

The dramatization, bias, and negativity in the news are reflections of episodic and thematic framings. This study also yielded to show the difference between episodic and thematic perspective. According to Pappacharissi and Oliveira (2008), episodic framing is more drama oriented and compatible with the economics of the news cycle; while thematic framing is the focus on providing context and background for the issue. Related to that, the study already showed high dramatization level in local attacks, which brings also an episodic framing-oriented focus. Meanwhile, global attacks had thematic oriented focus since it is easier for newspapers, which have less freedom of the press to discuss countries' issues. Additionally, Balkir et al., (2008) state that Turkish media has less freedom of the press and their perception changes based on the political relationship of newspaper owners. For this reason, after Istanbul Attack, it was harder for most of the newspapers to discuss reasons and background openly. Some anti-governmental newspapers like *Cumhuriyet* were discussing reasons and making accusations only in the level of decision-making. Also, *Cumhuriyet* had already the problem of MIT trucks reporting and the editor-in-chief of the newspaper, Can

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

Dündar, was in jail (Can Dündar jailed, 2016). For this reason, the study showed that Turkish newspapers were tending to use higher usage of episodic framing after Istanbul Attack; on the other hand, they used high thematic framing after Paris Attack.

Military and diplomatic framing was also the outcomes of this study. The study showed that military framing does not differ for local and global terror attacks in any of the newspapers. However, diplomatic framing differs based on countries. Past and recent studies suggest that local attacks cause less diplomatic framing from newspapers; while global attack causes more diplomatic framing from newspapers (Nevalsky, 2015; Papacharissi and Oliveira, 2008). In this study, the theory is also confirmed for diplomatic framing.

Overall, the study yielded to show there are different attitudes on attacks of Paris and Istanbul coming from both newspapers and readers. Turkish news media is highly political and has different dimensions based on government relation with its owners. However, most of the time newspapers like *Hürriyet* are shaping their attitudes based on government relations while they still keep their identity as “nationalist” or “center-right” until it has been owned by another economic power. Attacks are always sensational and dramatic events for all the nations; however, some nations react to those dramatic events in different ways. Readers’ comments of Turkish newspapers showed that Turkish readers are focusing on government issues for the local attacks rather than wishing condolences and stating their sadness. On the other hand, for the global attacks, except negative comments, there are more condolences or neutral comments for foreign attack hence not every reader has the same background information and intelligence to discuss reasons and political spectrum of the foreign country. However, when the reader discusses political spectrum and reasons of foreign country’s effect, they are mostly connected with the current political relationship of the home-country and foreign country.

Limitations and Future Research

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

The study yielded to show many differences, however; Turkey has two-faced politics, which means political dimensions can change in one day. For this reason, newspapers have different focuses for every day even when there is a big terror attack. Thus, it was hard to find long and comprehensive articles regarding attacks. Most of the opinion news was quite weak and superficial.

Moreover, ten days after the Airport Attack, 2016 Turkish coup d'état attempt took place. For this reason, news about the airport attack suddenly stopped and the news focus of newspapers changed. Additionally, if the study would be conducted today by another researcher for any other current attack, there would be different results from *Hürriyet*. The owner of *Hürriyet* newspaper changed on 6th of April 2018. The newspaper belonged to *Doğan Holding* from 1994-2018 and today *Hürriyet* belongs to *Demirören Holding*, which has been known as its close relations with President Erdoğan. For this reason, if we would analyze *Hürriyet* after April 2018, there would be different outcomes regarding the newspaper's content and decision-making bias.

The reader comments analysis had to be gathered from Facebook posts of newspapers. This is one of the biggest limitations of this research since Facebook commenters have different background and they are more diverse compared to newspaper commenters even though they are more open to formal discussions.

On the other hand, this study will contribute future studies to analyze Turkish media and its political dimension together with reader comments. Reader comments were the most progressive part of this research. In this way, new studies can benefit from the outcomes of reader comments together with a full analysis of bias dimensions among newspapers of different political powers.

References:

- Aarøe, L. (2011). Investigating Frame Strength: The Case of Episodic and Thematic Frames. *Political Communication*, 28(2), 207-226. doi: 10.1080/10584609.2011.568041
- Abdul-Mageed, M. M. (2008). Online News Sites and Journalism 2.0: Reader Comments on Al Jazeera Arabic. *TripleC: Communication, Capitalism & Critique. Open Access Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society*, 6(2), 59-76. doi:10.31269/triplec.v6i2.78
- Aslan, D. H. (2014). The Historical Background And The Present State Of Turkish-French Relations. *Knv*, 41(3), 122-135. Retrieved November 15, 2018, from <http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.desklight-3e594f40-a2fe-4976-83da-85e620998080>
- Balkir C., Banducci S., Soyaltin, D., & Toker, H. (2008). Expecting the Unforeseeable: The 2007 Turkish Elections in the Media, *Turkish Studies*, 9(2), 197-212. doi: 10.1080/14683840802023907
- Beckett, Charlie (2016) Fanning the flames: reporting on terror in the networked age. POLIS: journalism and society at the LSE (23 Sep 2016). Blog.
- Brewer, P. R., Graf, J., & Willnat, L. (2003). Priming or Framing: Media Influence on Attitudes Toward Foreign Countries. *International Communication Gazette*, 65(6), 493-508. doi:10.1177/0016549203065006005
- Bizer, G., Larsen, J.T., & Petty E. R. (2011). Exploring the Valence-Framing Effect: Negative Framing Enhances Attitude Strength. *Political Psychology*, 32(1), 59-80. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2010.00795.x
- Bizer, G., & Petty E. R. (2005). How We Conceptualize Our Attitudes Matters: The Effects of Valence Framing on the Resistance of Political Attitudes. *Political Psychology*, 26(4), 553-568.
- Bozkir, Y. (2013). *Iğdır University Journal of Social Science*, 45-70.

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

- Brinson, E. M., & Stohl, M. (2012). Media Framing of Terrorism: Implications for Public Opinion, Civil Liberties, and Counterterrorism Policies. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 5(4) 270-290. Doi: 10.1080/17513057.2012.713973
- Cacciatore, M. A., Scheufele, D.A., & Iyengar, S. (2016). The End of Framing as we Know it ... and the Future of Media Effects. *Mass Communication and Society*, 19(1), 7-23. DOI: 10.1080/15205436.2015.1068811
- Cain-Arzu, Deseree L.P., "Sensationalism in Newspapers: A Look at The Reporter and Amandala in Belize 2010 – 2014" (2016). Thesis. Rochester Institute of Technology.
- Cho, J., Boyle, M. P., Keum, H., Shevy, M. D., Mcleod, D. M., Shah, D. V., & Pan, Z. (2003). Media, Terrorism, and Emotionality: Emotional Differences in Media Content and Public Reactions to the September 11th Terrorist Attacks. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 47(3), 309-327. doi:10.1207/s15506878jobem4703_1
- Çelik, İ. (2016, June 29). Turkey, Erdoğan champion true Islam, become main targets of DAESH. Retrieved April 5, 2019, from <https://www.dailysabah.com/columns/ilnur-cevik/2016/06/30/turkey-erdogan-champion-true-islam-become-main-targets-of-daesh>
- Delung, J., Magee, R., DeLauder, R., & Maioreescu Murphy, R. (n.d.). Proximity and Framing in News Media: Effects on Credibility, Bias, Recall, and Reader Intentions. *Journalism & Mass Communication*, 2(7), 748-757. Retrieved January 27, 2019, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287817555_Proximity_and_Framing_in_News_Media_Effects_on_Credibility_Bias_Recall_and_Reader_Intentions.
- D'Alessio, D., & Allen, M. (2000). Media Bias in Presidential Elections: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Communication*, 133-156.
- Entman, R. M. (2010). Media framing biases and political power: Explaining slant in news of Campaign 2008. *Journalism: Theory, Practice & Criticism*, 11(4), 389-408. doi:10.1177/1464884910367587

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

- Ercebe, Ö. (2015). "The News Media as a Political Instrument: The Turkish Case", Athens: ATINER'S Conference Paper Series, No: MED2015-1580.
- Farmanfarmaian, R., Sonay, A., & Akser, M. (2018). The Turkish Media Structure in Judicial and Political Context: An Illustration of Values and Status Negotiation. *Middle East Critique*, 27(2), 111-125. doi:10.1080/19436149.2018.1447773
- Gerhards, J., & Schafer, M.S. (2013). International terrorism, domestic coverage? How terrorist attacks are presented in the news of CNN, Al Jazeera, the BBC, and ARD. *The International Communication Gazette*, 76(1), 3-26. doi: 10.1177/1748048513504158
- Gessier, V. (2010). Islamophobia: A French Specificity in Europe? *Human Architecture Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge*, 8(2), 6th ser., 39-46. Retrieved November 15, 2018, from https://scholarworks.umb.edu/humanarchitecture/?utm_source=scholarworks.umb.edu/humanarchitecture/vol8/iss2/6&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages.
- Gross, K. (2008). Framing Persuasive Appeals: Episodic and Thematic Framing, Emotional Response, and Policy Opinion. *Political Psychology*, 29(2), 169-192.
- Halpern, D., & Gibbs, J. (2012). Social media as a catalyst for online deliberation? Exploring the affordances of Facebook and YouTube for political expression. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(3), 1159-1168. Retrived April 5, 2019 from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.10.008>
- Iqbal, M. Z. (2017). Terrorism in the Backyard: Coverage of London Attacks, 2005 by the British TV News Channels. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 61(2), 449-466. doi:10.1080/08838151.2017.1309407
- Matthes, J. (2012). Framing in politics: an integrative approach. *American Behavioral Scientist*. 56. 247-259. Doi: 10.1177/0002764211426324

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

- Kalin, I. (2017, April 10). Charlie Hebdo ve Seküler Militanlık. Retrieved November 15, 2018, from https://www.sabah.com.tr/yazarlar/ibrahim_kalin/2016/04/10/charlie-hebdo-ve-sekuler-militanlik
- Küçükcan: "Avrupa'da Irkçılık Ve Ayrımcılık, Türkiye'de Vicdan Hakim". (2017, November 13). Retrieved November 15, 2018, from <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/kucukcan-avrupa-da-irkcilik-ve-ayrimcilik-adana-yerelhaber-2399940/>
- Lecheler, S., & Vreese, C. H. (2012). News Framing and Public Opinion. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 89(2), 185-204. doi:10.1177/1077699011430064
- Lecheler, S., & Vreese, C. H. (2010). Framing Serbia: the effects of news framing on public support for EU enlargement. *European Political Science Review*, 2(1), 73-93. doi:10.1017/S1755773909990233
- Lombard, M., Snyder-Duch, J., & Bracken, C. C.(2002). Content Analysis in Mass Communication: Assessment and Reporting of Intercoder Reliability. *Human Communication Research*, 28(4), 587–604. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2002.tb00826.x>,
- Scheufele, D. A. (1999). Framing as a Theory of Media Effects. *Journal of Communication*, 49(1), 103-122. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1999.tb02784.x>
- Scheufele, D. A. (2000). Agenda-Setting, Priming, and Framing Revisited: Another Look at Cognitive Effects of Political Communication. *Mass Communication and Society*, 3(2-3), 297-316. doi:10.1207/s15327825mcs0323_07
- Shoshani, A., & Slone, M. (2008). The Drama of Media Coverage of Terrorism: Emotional and Attitudinal Impact on the Audience. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, 31(7), 627-640. Doi: 10.1080/10576100802144064
- Manosevitch, E., & Walker, D. (2009). Reader Comments to Online Opinion Journalism: A Space of Public Deliberation. *Kettering Foundation*. Retrieved November 15, 2018, from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228340773_Reader_Comments_to_Online_Opinion_Journalism_A_Space_of_Public_Deliberation

- Mccombs, M., & Shaw, D. (2017). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *The Agenda Setting Journal The Agenda Setting Journal. Theory, Practice, Critique, 1*(2), 105-116.
doi:10.1075/asj.1.2.02mcc
- Morris, J.S. (2007). Slanted Objectivity? Perceived Media Bias, Cable News Exposure, and Political Attitudes. *SouthWestern Social Science Association, 88*(3), 707-728.
- Muniz, C., Alvidrez, S., & Tellez, N. (2014). Shaping the Online Public Debate: The Relationship Between the News Framing of the Expropriation of YPF and Readers' Comments. *Universidad Autónoma De Nuevo León, 9*(2015), 3245-3263. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282877829_Shaping_the_Online_Public_Debate_The_Relationship_Between_the_News_Framing_of_the_Expropriation_of_YPF_and_Readers'_Comments.
- Nevalsky, E. C. (2015). Developing terrorism coverage: Variances in news framing of the January 2015 attacks in Paris and Borno. *Critical Studies on Terrorism, 8*(3), 466-477.
doi:10.1080/17539153.2015.1096656
- Papacharissi, Z., & Oliveira, M. D. (2008). News Frames Terrorism: A Comparative Analysis of Frames Employed in Terrorism Coverage in U.S. and U.K. Newspapers. *The International Journal of Press/Politics, 13*(1), 52-74. doi:10.1177/1940161207312676
- Paskin, D. (2010). Say what? *Journal of International Communication, 16*(2), 67-83.
doi:10.1080/13216597.2010.9674769
- Postelnicescu, C. (2016). Europe's new identity: The refugee crisis and the rise of nationalism. *Europe's Journal of Psychology, 12*(2), 203-209. doi:10.5964/ejop.v12i2.1191
- Powell, K. (2018). Framing Islam/Creating Fear: An Analysis of U.S. Media Coverage of Terrorism from 2011–2016. *Religions, 9*(9), 257. doi:10.3390/rel9090257

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

- Price, V., Tewksbury, D., & Powers, E. (1997). Switching Trains of Thought. *Communication Research*, 24(5), 481-506. doi:10.1177/009365097024005002
- Shen, F. (summer 2004). Effects of News Frames and Schemas on Individuals' Issue Interpretations and Attitudes. *J&MC*, 81(2), 400-416. Retrieved November 15, 2018, from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/107769900408100211>.
- von Sikorski, C. (2016). The effects of Reader Comments on the Perception of Personalized Scandals: Exploring the Roles of Comment Valence and Commenters' Social Status. *International Journal of Communication*, 10(2016), 4480-4501. doi: 1932.8036/20160005
- Sözeri, C., & Güney, Z. (2011). The Political Economy of the Media in Turkey - TESEV. Retrieved January 27, 2019, from http://teseiv.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/The_Political_Economy_Of_The_Media_A_Sectoral_Analysis.pdf
- Vreese, C.H. (2005). News framing: Theory and typology. *Information Design Journal*, 13(1), 52-62.
- Yang, L., & Huailin C. (2018). Framing terrorist attacks: A multi-proximity model. *The International Communication Gazette*, 1-23. doi: 10.1177/1748048518802245
- Zamith, R., & Lewis, S. C. (2014). From Public Spaces to Public Sphere. *Digital Journalism*, 2(4), 558-574. doi:10.1080/21670811.2014.882066

Appendix A:

Codebook

Data Collection

The content analysis will be based on sample of news articles and opinion pieces that were published in mainstream newspapers in Turkey in the aftermath of Paris and Istanbul attacks organized by ISIS terror groups.

Coverage Events

Paris Attacks (13th of November, 2015)

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

Ataturk Airport Attack (28th of June, 2016)

Newspapers (online)

- Hurriyet
- Cumhuriyet
- Sabah

Instructions for CODING

Procedures and Definitions

The aim of this section is to define and describe the elements of the coding process. The analysis will focus on News Articles, Commentaries/Opinions and Reader Comments.

News Article

Any news article that has its main theme as Paris attacks (2015) or Ataturk Airport attacks (2016) and that was published on the websites of the Turkish newspapers listed above will be sampled for the first week of the attacks.

Opinion/Commentary

Any material written by either an editorial board member; a newsroom staff; columnist or a professional (e.g., a lawyer, a doctor) or an academician (university professor), published in the newspapers.

Lead Paragraphs

For the purposes of this content analysis, the first paragraph of the article (except the headline) that is being coded will be considered as lead paragraph.

Head Line

For the purposes of this content analysis, headlines of the article will be coded as head line.

Reader Comments

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

Any reader comments at the bottom of news material which are shared on FB pages of those three newspapers will be coded in separate excel file. For this reason, every unit of analysis will be automatically coded as reader comment in this excel file.

Unit of Analysis

Each **paragraph** of an article **entry** should be analysed as a separate **unit**. For this reason, each paragraph of the entry will be coded in a separate line in the excel file.

Contextual Unit

The unit of analysis (paragraph) relies on information given elsewhere in the article, the coder should use the information from the article while coding the paragraph.

Content Analysis Coding Protocol

1. Administrative Information

- 1.1. Coder ID
- 1.2. Newspaper/ Website Name (In case of Reader Comments, that part will be written as Facebook)
- 1.3. Title of the article
- 1.4. Publication Date dd/mm/yy
- 1.5. Article URL
- 1.6. Name and last name of article author as designated by the by-line of the article
(Enter name last name)_____
99. Author Info Not Provided
- 1.7. Enter the paragraph number
- 1.8. Copy the unit (paragraph) to excel sheet

2. Article Characteristics

Please provide the information below about the whole article.

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA**2.1. Origin information as designated by the by-line of the article**

1. News Wire Service
2. Another newspaper, TV, online news source
99. Not provided

2.2. Article type

1. News
2. Opinion
3. Interview
4. Reader Comments (Coding starts after 4 except 4.3)

3. Unit (Paragraph) Characteristics – Sources Used

3.1. Which of the following sources were quoted (using a quotation mark or a block quotation)?

	Yes	No
3.1.1. Domestic mainstream news source: Newspaper, Television (or its website, social media site)	1	0
3.1.2. International mainstream media sources: Newspaper, Television	1	0
3.1.3. Wire service (or its website) (e.g., Reuters, Anadolu Ajansı, Doğan Haber Ajansı)	1	0
3.1.4. Government representatives and other political figures from Turkey (elected representatives, governors, police, intelligence, politicians from opposition parties)	1	0
3.1.5. Government representatives and other political figures from France (elected representatives, governors, police, intelligence)	1	0
3.1.6. Government representatives and other political figures from other countries (elected representatives, governors, police, intelligence)	1	0
3.1.7. Representatives of a group claimed to be responsible for attack	1	0
3.1.8. Victims	1	0
3.1.9. Religious leaders	1	0
3.1.10 Emergency response organizations (volunteers, AKUT etc.)	1	0
3.1.11 Experts	1	0

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

3.2. Which of the following sources were paraphrase (information attributed to a source without quoting the source)?

	Yes	No
3.2.1. Domestic mainstream news source: Newspaper, Television (or its website, social media site)	1	0
3.2.2. International mainstream media sources: Newspaper, Television	1	0
3.2.3. Wire service (or its website) (e.g., Reuters, Anadolu Ajansı, Doğan Haber Ajansı)	1	0
3.2.4. Government representatives and other political figures from Turkey (elected representatives, governors, police, intelligence, politicians from opposition parties)	1	0
3.2.5. Government representatives and other political figures from France (elected representatives, governors, police, intelligence)	1	0
3.2.6. Government representatives and other political figures from other countries (elected representatives, governors, police, intelligence)	1	0
3.2.7. Representatives of a group claimed to be responsible for attack	1	0
3.2.8. Victims	1	0
3.2.9. Religious leaders	1	0
3.2.10 Experts	1	0

4. Unit Characteristics – FRAMING THE TERROR INCIDENT

SENSATIONALISM AND DRAMATIZATION

4.1. How is the framing tone regarding the victim country in the unit?

	Yes	No
4.1.1 Dramatic/Sensational: terms including "horrific," barbaric," outrageous" or "bloodiest".	1	0
4.1.2 Neutral: A statement without evaluating the incident.	1	0

4.1.3 Accusing the victim: Negative portrayal of the victim country. Ex; Emphasizing anti-Islamism in Western world, "policies regarding Middle East led to Incident" and so on.	1	0
---	---	---

FRAMING THE BIAS

4.2. Does the unit have a slant (egilim) to one political power, idea, representative, leader?

Yes – 1

No – 0

4.3. If yes, which type of slant does the unit have?

	Yes	No
4.3.1 Content Bias: The unit openly promotes a success of specific interest party or ideology in competitions to control government power.	1	0
4.3.2 Decision-making Bias: The unit guides information processing by individual journalists and manifested as tacit (yanli) norms and routines by news organizations. The articles has more hidden norms to promote compared content bias (Entman, 2010). (For example: Promoting France had it coming for terror attacks because of their anti-islamic attitudes even though the journalist/news states the condolences for French people.)	1	0

4.4. Does the unit make a reference to negative opinions on the country (France or Turkey) regarding...

	Yes	No
4.4.1. Islamophobia	1	0
4.4.2. Immigration Policies	1	0
4.4.3. Questioning or Criticizing "Pray for Paris" hashtags	1	0
4.4.4. Discrimination/Racism	1	0
4.4.5. Relations/role in Middle East	1	0
4.4.6. Passing "So-called" Armenian Genocide Law Draft	1	0
4.4.7. Anti-Islam content of Charlie Hebdo	1	0

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

4.4.8.	Negative opinions on MIT (National Intelligence Organization of Turkey)	1	0
4.4.9.	Negative opinions on newspaper, journalist, news agencies, columnists	1	0
4.4.10.	If yes for 4.4.9, please stated the name of the person or agency which was criticized _____		
4.4.11.	Negative opinions on opposition parties	1	0
4.4.12.	Christianity	1	0
4.4.13.	Islam	1	0

EPISODIC/THEMATIC FRAMING

4.5. Does the unit apply a thematic frame that focuses on broader social concepts and implications of the incident or an episodic frame, which is more event-oriented?

1. Episodic Frame

[The concept which is event or case-oriented. Episodic frames tend to be more drama-oriented, visually compelling, and compatible with the economics of the news cycle. It focuses on individuals' more than general context.]

2. Thematic Frame

[It emanates from specific instances, but focus on providing context and background for the issue at hand. Thematic frames are less descriptive and more analytical. It identifies the broader context beyond the incident]

EXTERNAL SOURCE: [A FrameWorks Institute FrameByte](#)

4.6. If yes for 4.5., Does the thematic frame imply any of the following explanations regarding the context/causes/trends?

	Yes	No
4.6.1. "That was expected"- policies in middle east by the France /the west/ EU/Turkey led to the incident	1	0
4.6.2. "That was expected"- Islam and its values were undermined by western actors (France, EU and the West)	1	0
4.6.3. It is an attack on democracy/freedom however; the west should stop Islamophobia	1	0
4.6.4. Pray for Paris Reactions: "Everybody talks about Paris when there is a terror attack; do they talk about our terror attacks?"	1	0

4.6.5. Blaming newspapers, news agencies, columnists about their negative attitudes on political leaders of Turkey or Turkish government	1	0
4.6.6. Blaming Islam fate	1	0
4.6.7. Blaming Christian fate	1	0

MILITARY AND DIPLOMATIC FRAMING

4.7. Is any of the units framed in a way of...

	Ye s	N o
4.7.1 Military: Mentioning the military power of the country or response the attacks. Using the descriptors as: war, military, intervention, operation.	1	0
4.7.2 Diplomatic: Mentioning the diplomatic side of the attack. Using descriptors such as police, government, crisis, state of emergency, arresting, investigation.	1	0

NEGATIVE FRAMING

4.8. Does the unit includes or imply...

	Yes	No
4.8.1 Negative framing against to France and French people (Focusing on negative face of France and French people, reviling them)	1	0
4.8.2 Negative framing against to Europe and European Union (Focusing on negative face of Europe and EU, reviling them)	1	0
4.8.3 Negative framing for terror group or terrorist	1	0
4.8.4 "They have deserved"	1	0
4.8.5 "Do not share that much news about France"	1	0
4.8.6 Negative framing about Christianity	1	0

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

4.8.7 Negative framing about Islam Fate and Muslim communities	1	0
--	---	---

4.9. Does the unit includes or imply ...

	Yes	No
4.9.1. Negative framing against to Turkey and Turkish people (Focusing on negative face of Turkey and Turkish people, reviling them)	1	0
4.9.2 Negative framing against to Turkish government (Focusing on negative face of Turkish Government, reviling them)	1	0
4.9.3 Negative framing for terror group or terrorist	1	0
4.9.4 “They Do not share that much news about Turkey”	1	0
4.9.5 “They do not care attacks in Turkey”	1	0
4.9.6 Negative framing about Islam fate, Muslim communities	1	0
4.9.7 Negative framing about voters of President Erdogan or JDP (AKP)	1	0

5. Unit Characteristics – READER COMMENTS

NEGATIVE FRAMING IN READER COMMENTS

5.1.Does the unit includes or imply...

	Yes	No
5.1.1. Negative framing against to France and French people (using insults)	1	0
5.1.2. Mentioning political problems with Turkey “France supported so called Armenian genocide” “France is anti-Islamic”, “France supported PKK”	1	0
5.1.3. Negative framing against to French government, Europe and European Union (for example: about their policies and attitudes on Muslims and so on)	1	0
5.1.4. Negative framing for terror group or terrorist	1	0

RUNNING HEAD: NEWS FRAMING OF TURKISH MEDIA

5.1.5.	“They have deserved”/ “Why are we crying for Paris?” /”Do they cry for us?”	1	0
5.1.6.	“Do not share that much news about France” / “I do not care about French attacks”	1	0
5.1.7.	Negative framing about Christianity	1	0
5.1.8.	Negative framing about Islam Fate and Muslim communities	1	0
5.1.9.	Wishing condolences/Stating the sadness from the terror incident	1	0
5.1.10.	Negative critique on commenters	1	0

5.2.Does the unit includes or imply...

		Yes	No
5.2.1.	Negative framing against to Turkey and Turkish people (using insults)	1	0
5.2.2.	Negative framing against to Turkish government	1	0
5.2.3.	Negative framing for terror group or terrorist	1	0
5.2.4.	Criticizing Law Enforcement Agencies (Kolluk Kuvvetleri. Polis)	1	0
5.2.5.	“World do not share that much news about Turkey”	1	0
5.2.6.	“The world/west does not care attacks in Turkey”	1	0
5.2.7.	“We had it coming” “That is because of Turkey and its political relations”	1	0
5.2.8.	Negative framing about Islam fate, Muslim communities	1	0
5.2.9.	Negative framing about voters of President Erdogan or JDP (AKP)	1	0
5.2.10.	Criticizing opposition parties and their followers		
5.2.11.	Wishing condolences/Stating the sadness from the terror incident	1	0

5.2.12. Negative critique on commenters	1	0
---	---	---

Abstract

Terror attacks are very traumatic events of the last decades. Many scholars studied terror attacks several times especially from the western perspective or showed newsworthiness of terror attacks of western and eastern countries in their own countries. In this study, the main aim is to show news framing of terror attacks in local and global levels from the perspective of home-countries' media and reader comments. Hence, in this study, Paris Attack held on 13th of November 2015 and Istanbul Airport Attacks held on 28th of July, 2016 were selected as cases to analyze the difference of local and global attacks for Turkish media and its readers. Based on political standing, three newspapers are selected: Hürriyet, Sabah, and Cumhuriyet. In total, 962 news units and 420 reader comments were analyzed by using quantitative content analysis method. Results showed, there is a significant difference among newspapers and terror events regarding sensationalism and dramatization level, negative framing, negative and slant bias, episodic/thematic framing and military/diplomatic framing. Moreover, differences were also found in negative attitude analysis of reader comments. The study yielded to show eastern media perspective on terror attacks and differences for the reporting of local and global attacks together with readers' attitudes.

Keywords: framing the terrorism, reader comments, Paris Attacks, Istanbul Atatürk Airport Attack, Turkish media

Abstrakt

Terroranschläge sind sehr traumatische Ereignisse der letzten Jahrzehnte. Viele Gelehrte haben sich mehrmals mit diesem Thema beschäftigt, besonders aus westlicher Sicht, oder gezeigt Aktualität der Terroranschläge westlicher und östlicher Länder in ihren eigenen Ländern. Das Ziel dieser Studie ist, die Rahmenbedingungen für Terroranschläge auf lokaler und globaler Ebene aus der Perspektive der Medien und Kommentare der Heimatländer aufzuzeigen. Daher wurden in dieser Studie Paris Anschlag am 13. November 2015 und Anschläge am Flughafen Istanbul am 28. Juli 2016 als Fallbeispiel genommen, um den Unterschied zwischen lokalen und globalen Angriffen für türkische Medien und ihre Leser zu analysieren. Aus politischer Sicht wurden drei Zeitungen ausgewählt: *Hürriyet*, *Sabah* und *Cumhuriyet*. Insgesamt wurden 962 Nachrichteneinheiten und 420 Leserkommentare analysiert, unter Verwendung einer quantitativen Inhaltsanalyse-Methode. Die Ergebnisse zeigten, dass es einen signifikanten Unterschied zwischen Zeitungen und Terrorereignissen gibt, hinsichtlich Sensationismus und Dramatisierungsebene, negatives Framing, episodisches/ thematisches Framing und militärisches/diplomatisches Framing. Darüber hinaus wurden auch Unterschiede in der negativen Haltungsanalyse von Leserkommentaren festgestellt. Die Studie ergab östliche Medienperspektive auf Terroranschläge und Unterschiede in Berichterstattung über lokale und globale Angriffe zusammen mit den Einstellungen der Leser.

Schlüsselwörter: Terrorismus einrahmen, Leserkommentare, Paris Attacke, Istanbul Atatürk Flughafen Attacke, türkische Medien