



Turkish media under scope: Peace journalism and reporting the conflicts

PAGE | 42

Ekmel Gecer¹

Abstract:

The approach regarding the possibility of doing news stories which will contribute to human rights, democracy, equality and peace has created a new journalism and news producing style which is different than traditional news coverage. This new manner of news producing has been referencing the power of the media in building the daily agenda, creating the representation of the minorities and ethnicities and in their power in finding solution to the social and political conflicts. Therefore this new process of news production has been named as *reporting of rights, citizen and public journalism* and *peace journalism*. In this regard the new mode of news reporting has focused on the discriminations, impartiality and has endeavoured to cover those who are not represented in the mainstream media well enough such as minorities and those who are ignored by the media although their rights are violated and who are usually are subject of socio-political pressures.

In this regard my paper aims to examine the connection between news discourse of Turkish journalism and the representation of human rights and democratisation in Turkey on the basis of Kurdish Issue and the power of news production in managing the conflicts in Turkey.

Key words: Peace journalism; sociology of news; news, news sources and news production; press freedoms; media ownership and pluralism; news, politics and militarism; human rights; minority media; democracy; ethics.

Introduction

The main task of the media is to inform society about recent events in a fast, objective, accurate and trustworthy manner as much as possible. The journalists, while covering the news stories, must consider the common good and the basic journalism criteria. They should ask questions from different perspectives; should not rely on single-sided news and should go to all locations affecting the news story to find out the reality about the newly occurred event. However, can the media members do this when they cover a sensitive topic? For instance have the media ever questioned their positions while covering an ethnic and democratic problem?

The media disseminate information and opinions about the minority groups and the events regarding them. Furthermore the media also creates an ideological circle which eases and helps to legitimize prejudice and discrimination against the minority groups in society. These discourses of ethnic intolerance and racist dogmas are developed by various mass communication tools and they are affirmed by the elite groups who control the capital and the political atmosphere. This reality applies to Turkey as well since the nationalist and racist discourses, which strengthen and

¹ Freelance Journalist and PhD Candidate. Media and Communication, Loughborough University, e.gecer@lboro.ac.uk



justify the inequity against marginal groups, are also under control of “hegemonic” powers.

The Kurdish Problem in Turkey is nowadays a big issue in the public and social sphere which the media is completely busy with and which Turkish and Kurdish society are expecting a solution to within a democratic context. Last year we saw the government trying to overcome the problem by declaring a package of new policies. However, the interesting point here is that although at first the government named this attempt as a “*Kurdish Initiative*”, it later changed the name to “*Democratic Expansion*” and the name “Kurd” was dropped from the declaration title.

PAGE | 43

These changes may be commented on in two different approaches in terms of the Kurdish Problem. The first one is an optimistic view which states that the Turkish authorities are now aware of the long-ignored Kurdish Issue and accept that the Kurdish people faced democratic problems for decades and struggled to keep their existence despite of the “assimilation policies”. Thus the Turkish state gave the name “*Democratic Expansion*” to allow the Kurds to regain democratic rights. However, the second approach is rather a pessimistic one which indicates that, although the authorities are trying to resolve this conflict, they are still not dealing well with the “Kurd” concept and have thus removed reference to this contentious issue from their democratic agenda.

Turkey has a complicated agenda which the journalists and the media as a whole sometimes have difficulty to follow. Predominantly the debates around the Kurdish Issue have a very fast circulation and subject to change just after a second. Therefore the positive atmosphere and the hopes that the decades-long conflict would have an end, nowadays have given way to a new and pessimistic atmosphere both because the government had a nationalist discourse before the recent general elections and because the PKK (Kurdistan Workers’ Party, described as a terrorist organization by the Turkish officials and the mainstream Turkish media) have restarted their armed protests.

Of course both in ending the conflict and maintaining it, the media has an important role along with the social and political solution methods for the Kurdish Problem. Hence it is very important to research how the Turkish media has tackled the issue: What kind of language has the media used? Has the Turkish media ignored the problem or tried to reveal it? How do the Turkish media cover an issue related to democracy? Where does the Kurdish Problem interact with media and democracy relations? Has the media used a supportive tone to overcome the problem or used a functionless tone that on the contrary increased the difficulty of solving the problem? Has the media just behaved as the “state representative” or really did provide civic journalism? Was the “Kurdish Problem” an arena for state authorities, such as the police and army, to justify or legitimize their illegal implementations? Did the media help these authorities to make people believe in their policies?

These questions are the ones which our project will try to answer at the end. However, since the Kurdish conflict gained visibility in the 1980s, the mainstream Turkish media created important perceptions about the Kurdish conflict, the Kurds, political life of Kurdish people and their representability in the Turkish Parliament. Nevertheless these perceptions did not help the conflict to come an end but served to extend it as the media usually related the Kurdish Issue with terrorism and violence, structured the conflict around terror, separatism and backwardness and fed



nationalism with the hegemonic state discourses which pushed the Kurds out of the public sphere. In this sense, the Turkish media through using the “war journalism” but not “peace journalism” and blaming anyone who talks of Kurdish rights as “separatists” and “terrorists is”, widened the Kurdish Problem to a great conflict and thus deepening its deadlock.

PAGE | 44

Interestingly as soon as the government in 2009 declared that they would begin a new initiative to end the Kurdish conflict, the media also changed its language and for the first time renamed the issue as the “Kurdish Problem”. As matter of fact this stance itself tells us a lot about the media and democracy relation in Turkey. Will the media change its new attitude and go back to the years that they blamed every Kurdish rights defender as a terrorist and a separatist? Will they again ignore the democratic problems related to the Kurdish language, culture and the life of the Kurds?

In fact we already got the answers to these simple questions. The political elections in recent years divided Turkish society through the nationalist discourses presented by the political party leaders to increase their votes. Therefore the mainstream media altered its approach and preferred to cover the Kurdish Issue as a terrorism problem which could be ended via security implementations. The propaganda-based news coverage of recent Kurdish “terrorist” activities has shown that not much has changed in the media-democracy relation.

The Turkish media somehow avoided to describe the Kurdish Problem as the ‘struggle for rights’ but rather as an ‘economic and tribal problem’. Even after the democratic expansion policies the media kept on airing videos or covering news which emphasized the economic backwardness of the Kurdish population in Turkey. While doing that, the media usually quoted from security members, police or soldiers, rather than sociologists, academicians or the regional people.

In this regard, despite recent alteration towards a more tolerant media, it still is possible to say that the Turkish media ignored the Kurdish problem and rejected it. Therefore they said that the Kurdish Problem could only be overcome through security implementations and the people should be directly integrated into the mainstream Turkish nationality. Hence the debate about the Kurdish Problem - whether it is an issue of human rights, social and political problem or it is a security and economic problem - caused Kurdish rights not to be legitimized and Kurdish politicians to face difficulties while trying to get support from the Turkish people. Here it is obvious that the media should use a more careful, reconciliatory and solutions-focused language and cover the news from each party to avoid partiality.

Research Progress

My project aims to examine the relationship between the media and democracy on the basis of the Kurdish Problem in Turkey - to question the ability of the Turkish media for covering the “sensitive” issues and thus their capability to report controversial subjects. The study investigates how the Kurdish Issue has been represented in the mainstream Turkish media over the last 20 years as the Kurdish Problem is an increasingly important political and social issue. The research will also ask broader questions about media and democracy in Turkey, as well as assess the democratic transformation of the country more generally. It will also provide an understanding to the agenda-building dynamics of Turkish news-reporting of the Kurdish issue.



The study will talk about the democratization process in Turkey after the 1980s, combining theories of democracy and communication through analyzing special events regarding the Kurdish Question of Turkey which is nowadays described as the “Kurdish/Turkish Spring” after the democratic transitions in Arab countries. Whilst the study will look at how the media is successful in representing ‘the other’, it will at the same time ask more general questions about: the connection between media, society and politics during democratic change in Turkey; cultural diversity and nationalism in the media, and the efficiency of media as a tool for democratic transformation under alleged political and military pressure.

Overall, this research plans to combine a detailed content analysis of the Turkish media’s coverage of the Kurdish Question between 1990 and 2012 with a comprehensive analysis of the agenda-building processes that shape this coverage. For the textual analysis, the principal method in this project will be quantitative content analysis but this statistical data will also be supported by more detailed qualitative analysis of selected examples and cases; in-depth thematic analysis and critical discourse analysis. During this process, the study will especially try to demonstrate how the media tackles a democratic issue (the Kurdish Problem) when seeking freedom for itself. Furthermore the role of the media in the democratic progress in Turkey will also be handled within a broader context.

While the study will try to find out how media has handled a sensitive subject, it will also examine the link between elite perception (which can also be regarded as public approach) and the media coverage, and the political approaches that shape this reporting. Concordantly, the analysis of the political and professional factors that have combined to structure this coverage will be based on semi-structured informant interviews with politicians, academics, NGOs and media professionals.

These interviews will at the same time allow us to examine the issues related to the sociology of news such as agenda building factors of the mainstream Turkish media; media ownership in Turkey; media and government dealings; public/state broadcasting; governmental/self-censorship; the relation between the news sources and news producers within the process of news production; the nature of news coverage; legal frameworks surrounding the press and speech/expression freedoms and journalism experiences while covering the Kurdish Issue.

One of the central objectives of this study will be to assess the extent to which mainstream coverage of the Kurdish Question has changed as a consequence of broader social and political change. To develop this processual perspective, I have selected five key events which can be assumed as milestones of the Kurdish Problem in Turkey:

- 1. Leyla Zana’s Kurdish Discourse in the Turkish Parliament in 1991:** Leyla Zana, the first female Kurdish politician, created a scandal by speaking Kurdish in the Turkish Parliament (speaking Kurdish in a public building is a criminal offence in Turkey), as soon as she took her parliamentary oath saying “*I take this oath for the brotherhood between the Turkish people and the Kurdish people*”.
- 2. Arrest of PKK (Kurdistan Workers’ Party) Leader Abdullah Ocalan in 1999:** Although the PKK leader was arrested after 20 years of fighting, the Kurdish Question remained unanswered and the debate moved into another phase.
- 3. Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan’s Speech in Diyarbakir acknowledging a "Kurdish Problem" in 2005:** This speech was described as the first “high status” speech which acknowledged a “Kurdish Problem” in Turkey very clearly.



4. **TRT 6's Opening in 2009:** Very recently, in spite of rightwing nationalist opposition, TRT 6, an official state-owned TV channel, as part of the Turkish Radio and Television Corporation, started to broadcast in Kurdish just at the beginning of 2009 as a result of deep and historic debates.
5. **Uludere Airstrike in 2011: The Killing of 34 Kurdish Civilians (Roboski Massacre):** The event took place on the Iraq-Turkey border on 28th December 2011. Turkish aircrafts killed 34 Kurdish-Origin Turkish civilians, assuming they were PKK guerrillas, while they were smuggling oil and tobacco from Iraq to Turkey. One villager survived injured from the aircraft strike. Some Turkish and Kurdish media professionals and NGOs called the killings a "massacre" and claimed that it was the result of decades-long pressure on the Kurdish people. Although it is now almost a year after the event occurred, Turkish officials have not yet found the exact criminals who caused this murder and therefore the liberals and NGOs are forcing the government to find and punish those who were responsible from this violent aircraft attack on the villagers.

In order to analyze this coverage, I have decided to use five Turkish daily newspapers for analysis. While selecting the newspapers I have considered the circulation of the newspaper and ratings to avoid partiality. This selection also involved a combination of considerations regarding: geographical access as they are national newspapers; audience size since they do not all serve minority groups, and format and characteristics of the media for they have different political stances. These Newspapers are:

1. **Cumhuriyet:** This leftist paper is described as a "meeting point of Kemalist people" (a philosophic movement founded by Ataturk).
2. **Hurriyet:** The newspaper is known for its centre-right stance and is usually portrayed as the "flagship" of the Turkish media. Its motto is "Turkey belongs to Turks".
3. **Ortadogu:** A nationalist newspaper whose motto is a famous quote from Ataturk's book *Nutuk* (the Speech) and is widely used in nationalistic contexts: "*How happy is the one who says s/he is Turk*".
4. **Taraf:** The newspaper has a "liberal" stance and handles sensitive issues, such as the Kurdish Problem and military issues clearly.
5. **Zaman:** This newspaper currently has the highest circulation figures in modern-day Turkey from our sample. It is known for having "religious and conservative" attitudes.

The second part of the research will involve semi-structured and informed interviews with the political elite, academicians, NGOs and journalists to provide an understanding of the dynamics, restrictions and the pressures that lead the media to structure the Kurdish Issue and other subjects related to democratic coverage within the context of the Kurdish Problem. These interviews will provide us with political understanding of the conditions that has led to the creation of the Kurdish Problem agenda in the media. It will also inform our understanding of whether the approach has changed and by what degree.

These interviews will at the same time allow us to examine the news production, agenda- building factors of the mainstream Turkish media; media ownership in Turkey; media and government dealings; journalism experiences while covering the Kurdish Issue and media and democracy relations more generally in Turkey.

Through these elite interviews the study will explore the role of media in the Turkish democratization; the preferences for political information consumption; the links



between media, society and governments during democratic transitions of power; and the effectiveness of media as a tool for democratic socialization amidst political pressures. My project will also combine theories of democratization and communication. The research on the other hand is taking our theoretical and/or empirical knowledge forward about the function and role of the media in, and/or contributes to our understanding of the dynamics that helps or slow down Turkish democratization.

In this regard my PhD thesis at the same time aims to answer the following:

- How do the media and democracy interrelate in Turkey?
- Is the government influence on the media increasing, decreasing or staying the same?
- Do the legal frameworks protect or restrict journalists?
- Are national security concerns used as grounds to curb press freedom?
- How well do the mainstream media deal with issues of cultural diversity?
- How may state ideologies and transitions of powers affect the news media coverage of the sensitive issues?
- How do political tendency influence the media's role of handling the opposition approach?
- To what extent is transformation in media pluralism shaped by country's political formation?
- Do alterations in media environments in Turkey favour democratization?
- What are the limitations of improved freedom of speech and democratization on media professionals and policy makers?
- How does the character of journalism and of journalistic experience change in an intermediary situation?
- Are unbiased media really a requirement for successful democratization?
- How can the media interact with other democratizing dynamics in order to sustain democratization?

Methodology

Elite Interviews

Elite interviews allow us to analyze political and democratic developments, the changes in perceptions, the reasons of the cultural, ethnic and media conflicts and the obstacles in front of the solutions at the highest level. The interviews will also allow us to realize original parts of information and debates surrounding the subject we study; to find answers for different questions we had before; to close the gaps of a wide area of conflict; to confirm or deny the attitude we had before and to restructure our main focus of study.

Media members or journalists play a key role in constructing the news and deciding the daily agenda. Especially as the "media view" is somehow shaped by journalists, this study will concern the effect of journalism along with the critical analysis of the symbolic world of media output (Deacon and Golding, 1994). Journalists do not just report the news but also create it. While creating the news they draw on their daily interactions with policy makers (Schudson, 2003), NGOs and pressure groups – what journalists call 'sources'.

"Studies of sociology of news tend to view news-making as a reality constructing activity governed by the elites" (Schudson, 2003). Mass media here plays the role of intermediaries between society and the politicians/news sources. Therefore it is



possible to say that news is produced by a group of organizations and elites who want to shape the social interest (Machin and Niblock, 2006). At this point it is crucial to perform “elite interviews” with journalists/media members, NGOs and politicians so as to understand agenda building about the Kurdish Issue in Turkey.

For elite interviews I have interviewed 51 elites in Turkey. Again in order to reach objectivity, I have selected different political parties. These parties are in parliament now and are especially suitable for the research as they represent different specific ideologies. The party in power AKP (Justice and Development Party) is conservative, the main opposition party CHP (Republic People’s Party) is social democrat/secular, MHP (Nationalist Movement Party) is Turkish Nationalist and BDP (Peace and Democracy Party) is the only Kurdish Party in the National Turkish Assembly and HSP (Voice of People Party) which has a religious background and does not have seats in the national assembly. While deciding NGOs, academics and journalists, I have chosen them for their different ideologies as well.

In this sense the interviewees have been categorized into 4 groups. Each category contained different numbers of interviewees according to impartiality satisfaction approach which are very important in getting their opinions to understand media and democracy relations and the Kurdish Issue. The categories are as below:

- a. **Media Professionals:** Journalists, broadcasters, TV/radio presenters and columnists.
- b. **Political Elites:** Both for Media and Democracy Relation and the Kurdish Issue they are the most important ones who have something to say. Moreover as there are “government controlled media” debates in Turkey it will give us a prominent answer for what we are looking for.
- c. **Academicians:** When the Turkish government planned to start a Kurdish Initiative in Turkey, it first had a meeting with the academics who had a critical approach and who believed in a democratic solution for Kurds. In this regard, the academic approach will help us to understand the intellectual background of the media and democracy relation and will give us a detailed understanding of the Kurdish Issue.
- d. **NGOs:** The existence of NGOs and their activity are themselves signs of democracy. In this context they will also point out important issues. Furthermore during “democratic initiatives” some singers and actors acted with the NGOs. This also caused the government to hold meetings with them in order to gain help from them to persuade people.

I have interviewed these groups asking them open-ended questions. Before I conducted the interviews I envisaged approximately sixty interviews. However, as the examiners in my panel exam last year advised me to reduce the interviewee numbers (since it could be difficult and because the elites I interviewed by no means were already the representatives of a wide range of policies and that these interviews have already resulted in appropriate data), I decided to conduct 52 interviews. Nonetheless 3 of the pre-determined interviewees refused to talk to me although they had given a probable approval before I went to Turkey.

Through my interviews I tried to stick to the interview questions below; but as the interview tradition or form changed according to the prejudices of the interviewees and as it is difficult to go to an interviewee with specific questions about a sensitive issue, I sometimes faced difficulties to ask the same questions to some interviewees as I was aware of their pre-acceptances and the reaction I might face. However, at



the end I used to see that I was successful to get the answers for all my “crucial” questions.

While preparing the questions I endeavoured to:

- have different questions for each category of the interviewees according to their occupation and intellectual background;
- not to ask questions which may offend the interviewee;
- get what the interviewee thinks about the theme of the question;
- avoid the questions that I already have answers for;
- ask questions to know more and have further information which might be used for the writing-up process;
- Organize also the same questions for all the interviewees through which I can compare with the other findings from content analysis and through which I can set up the results as in the surveys.

Furthermore the questions are not the only questions I asked my elite participants. As they were semi-structured interviews, in the light of the interview process, I sometimes refined my questions and had new questions shaped in the course of the interviews. When I felt that the interviewees had a wider background and that they pulled me into a better and deeper intellectual background on the Kurdish Issue and the media-democracy relation in Turkey, I did not hesitate to ask them broader questions in order to have a stronger and clearer understanding of the subject I was studying for.

Preliminary Findings

After carefully researching interviewees to discuss media and democracy relations and the Kurdish problem in Turkey, I made a list of “elites” and experts on these issues and requested to interview them. Before I started the interviews I was aware of the problems I could face. The interviewees could refuse, despite my explanation of the study, on the grounds that my subject was too sensitive for them for a variety of reasons.

The Kurdish Problem and the censorship within the media is still a very controversial issue insomuch that people who try to cover the subject in terms of “human rights” are still accused of being “traitors”. Many are still required to leave the country by far-right groups. In addition, the intense debate about governmental pressure on the media currently taking place in Turkey means that media organizations allegedly close to the government could refuse to talk to me on the topic of media and government relations. However, I can say that I was not refused as much as I had expected.

One of the central objectives of this study will be to assess the extent to which mainstream coverage of the Kurdish question has changed as a consequence of broader social and political change with a detailed analysis of the agenda-building processes that shape this coverage. These interviews will at the same time allow us to examine the news production, agenda-building factors of the mainstream Turkish media, media ownership in Turkey, media and government relations, journalism experiences while covering the Kurdish Issue and media and democracy relations more generally in Turkey.



Therefore to be able to reach a more objective outcome I tried to conduct interviews with all media group representatives in Turkey and I was almost successful in reaching my target. In this regard, I can say that my interviews are one of the best attempts to understand the Turkish media and their surroundings. Furthermore if any kind of objection occurs against my study and statistical data, I am sure it is easy to answer this opposition as the people whom I interviewed are those who are at the top of the Turkish media organizations. It is almost impossible to state a comment without applying to those I interviewed during my fieldwork in Turkey.

It can be claimed that 51 interviews are not enough to interfere objective and scientific results regarding an issue. Here I can say that although 51 is not a high number, the elites who have been interviewed are those who cannot be ignored while studying a subject (media and democracy) about Turkey and for that reason their approaches and the statistical knowledge that have been reached analyzing their interviews are very much important to have a correct view on the Turkish media and democracy.

Among all those I applied to conduct an interview, only two media groups refused to talk to me. The first one was *Yenicag Daily* which is known as a pro-Turkish and a nationalist newspaper and I am quite sure that they did not want to talk on the Kurdish Issue because of their stance and approach on the matter. The second media group representative (*Aksam Group*) and one of the important NGOs (TUSIAD: Turkish Industrialists' and Businessmen's Association) in Turkey could not talk to me, and apologized for being very busy and unavailable despite my long and insistent attempts.

To be able to analyze the extent to which mainstream coverage of the Kurdish question has changed the media and democracy relation in Turkey and the issues related to sociology of news, it was crucial to divide the interviewees as *news producer* and *news source*.

While the news producer group includes only the media professionals, the news source group includes political representatives, academics and NGO representatives. The reason why the number of the news producers is higher than the news sources is because the media and democracy relation is the main focus of this study.

To be able to do an extensive and considerable research, in view of the objectivity criteria, I tried to ensure that all participants were from different intellectual and political backgrounds. If you live in a country like Turkey it will not be difficult for you to predict the political view or the approach of the persons whom you want to talk to beforehand. Especially if you are going to interview an "elite" person you will already have some information and predictions about them as you have seen and listened to them many times on TV programmes and read their views in newspapers. In this regard before I commenced my interviews I knew the possible approaches of the interviewees and thus tried to interview diverse backgrounds in order to have an unbiased outcome of the research.

The same selection method was applied while deciding news sources interviewees as well. The "elites" in academia, politics and the NGOs I interviewed were from different political, intellectual and economic backgrounds as well. The selection conditions of the interviewees were as below:

- to be an elite who is widely known by both the Turkish and Kurdish public



- to have specific studies (activities for NOGs) on the Kurdish Issue and media and democracy both for or against
- to have suffered from any kind of pressure while expressing her/his opinion
- to be from a different political background mentioned above
- to be known and highly debated by her/his approach about the Kurdish Issue, media- democracy and other subjects related to sociology of news.

Through this categorization of the interviewees, at the end of the analysis I will be able to know and establish the outcomes about what kind of opinions a group of elite persons has and their approaches and stances on the Kurdish Issue, governmental pressure on media (if there is so), censorship and media ownership .

During my fieldwork in Turkey, I interviewed seven political representatives from five parties. Four of these parties are currently in the Turkish parliament and are especially suitable for the research as they represent different specific ideologies. I also interviewed a party representative from a party that is not in parliament, as it was a religious party and the religious approach is quite determinant in Turkish perception. In this regard the academic sensitivity might be harmed if I did not get the religious approach to the Kurdish Problem and the media and democracy issues in Turkey.

There are two representatives from the party in power and two from the Kurdish party in the parliament, as I think they are the main contributors to the Kurdish Issue and media debates in this study in terms of political view. Thus the details of the political elites I interviewed are as follows:

1. AKP (Justice and Development Party): The party in power, conservative democrat (2)
2. CHP (Republic People's Party): The main opposition party, social democrat/secular (1)
3. MHP (Nationalist Movement Party): Turkish Nationalist, conservative (1)
4. BDP (Peace and Democracy Party): Kurdish Party in the National Turkish Assembly (2)
5. HSP (The Voice of People Party): Religious, not in parliament (1)

Apart from a few very "famous" and "elite" ones, each media professional I interviewed is from different media groups in Turkey. Almost all presumed approaches - nationalist, secular, religious, conservative, democrat, liberal, pro-Turkish and pro-Kurdish media professionals have been included. Furthermore I have tried to answer all possible questions that may form in the mind of the reader and thus I endeavoured to give all the details about interviewees in *Table 1* such as their occupation, ethnic backgrounds and gender. Therefore the outcomes which will be inferred from the interview analysis will allow us to make reliable and considerable comments on the results of the research.

Future Work

Although I have already finished elite interviews and thematically and statistically analysed them, the content analysis will be concluded in 3 months time. The content analysis in this study aims to answer the following questions:

- How is the Kurdish Issue represented in the Turkish media?
- How do the Turkish media cover an issue related to democracy?



- Where does the Kurdish Problem interact with the media-democracy relationship?
- What are the agenda-building dynamics regarding Turkish news-reporting of the Kurdish Issue?
- How has the evaluative stance of coverage changed over the years? Have newspapers become more or less hostile to the Kurdish cause?
- How has the interpretative stance changed? Do we see, for example, a shift from a news agenda fixated with military themes to one focused on civil/cultural dimensions?
- Do we see any increased evidence of improved news access for Kurdish sources in the news?

References

- Allan, S. (2004), *News Culture*. Open University Press: Berkshire.
- Barkey, H. J. and Graham, E. F. (1998), *Turkey's Kurdish Question*. Rowman & Litterfield: New York.
- Blumler, J. G. and Gurevitch, M. (1995), *The Crisis of Public Communication*. Routledge: London.
- Deacon, D. and Golding, P. (1994), *Taxation and Representation: The Media, political communication and the poll tax*. John Libbey: London.
- Downing, J. and Husband, C. (2005), *Representing Race*. Sage: London.
- Gurbey, G. (eds), *The Kurdish Conflict in Turkey*, pp. 31-56. St. Martin's Press: New York.
- Hansen, A.; Cottle, S.; Negrine, R. and Newbold, C. (1998), *Mass Communication Research Methods*. Pelgrave: New York.
- Koudoura, M. (1998), "Multiculturalism or Multinationalism", in Bennett, D. (eds), *Multicultural States*, pp. 69-87. Routledge: London.
- Machin, D. and Niblock, S. (2006), *News Production*. London: Routledge.
- Schudson, M. (2003), *The Sociology of News*. Norton & Company: New York.
- Street, J. (2001), *Mass Media, Politics and Democracy*. Pelgrave: Hampshire.
- Wilson, C. C. and Gutierrez, F. (1995), *Race Multiculturalism and the Media*. Sage: London.