

AN ANALYSIS ON THE DAYTIME WOMAN TALK SHOWS IN  
TURKEY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
OF  
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ÇAĞAN GÜN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE  
IN  
MEDIA AND CULTURAL STUDIES GRADUATE PROGRAM

DECEMBER 2006

## Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Prof. Dr. A. Raşit Kaya  
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Prof. Dr. A. Raşit Kaya  
Supervisor

## Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. A. Raşit Kaya	(METU, ADM)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan	(METU, ADM)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşe İnal	(ANKARA Ü. İLEF)	_____

**I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.**

Name, Surname: Çağın Gün

Signature:

## **ABSTRACT**

### **AN ANALYSIS ON THE DAYTIME WOMAN TALK SHOWS IN TURKEY**

Gün, Çağın

M.Sc., Media and Cultural Studies Graduate Program

Supervisor : Prof. Dr. A. Raşit Kaya

December 2006, 145 pages

As from 2000, the “daytime woman talk shows” with the contents of family tragedies, personal disasters and discussions increasingly draw audience’s attention, particularly women’s, became a popular TV genre with almost every private TV channel having one of its own in the year 2005 in Turkey. Defining themselves as “reality shows” presenting only “reality” and “spontaneity”, the basic claim of these programs is that the ordinary people are hosted to the programs, the problems in their everyday lives are deal with in an enlightening and educational manner, and solutions are brought to them with thanks of the programme. These daytime woman talk shows that led to various discussions in the country’s agenda with some death events experienced and their controversial functions form the subject of this study.

The principal purpose of the thesis is to understand which production practices and dynamics why and how play a role in the content formation and the production process of the programs and in this manner to explain the place and significance of the programs in the Turkish television industry. In the thesis, three programs are analyzed as the pioneering and confrontational shows of this genre in Turkey. The specific features and the world wide historical developments of the daytime woman talk shows are handled on, along with their fundamental elements, and also the interviews with show producers and participants, and the observations about the production processes are included in the analysis.

Keywords: Television, Daytime Woman Talk Shows, Production

## ÖZ

### TÜRKİYE’DE GÜNDÜZ KUŞAĞI KADIN TALK SHOWLARI ÜZERİNE BİR İNCELEME

Gün, Çağan

M.Sc., Media and Cultural Studies Graduate Program

Supervisor : Prof. Dr. A. Raşit Kaya

December 2006, 145 pages

Türkiye’de 2000 yılından itibaren aile dramları, kişisel felaketler ve tartışma içerikli “gündüz kuşağı kadın talk show” programları özellikle kadın izleyicinin artan bir şekilde ilgisini çekmiş ve 2005 yılında neredeyse her özel televizyon kanalının bir adet sahip olduğu popüler bir televizyon türü haline gelmiştir. Kendilerini yalnızca “gerçeği” ve “kendiliğinden” olanı sunan “reality show” programları olarak tanımlayan bu programlardaki temel iddia, sıradan insanların programlara konuk edileceği, sorunlarının aydınlatıcı ve eğitici bir şekilde ele alınacağı ve programlar sayesinde çözüm bulunacağıdır. Yaşanılan çeşitli ölüm olayları ve ihtilaflı işlevleriyle ülke gündeminde çeşitli tartışmalara yol açan gündüz kuşağı kadın talk show programları bu çalışmanın konusunu oluşturmaktadır.

Çalışmanın temel amacı bu programların içerik oluşumunda ve işleyişinde hangi üretim pratikleri ve dinamiklerinin nasıl ve neden rol oynadığını anlamak ve programların Türk televizyon endüstrisindeki yeri ve önemini açıklamaktır. Tezde üç program, Türkiye’de türün üç öncül ve tartışmalı programı olarak incelenmiştir. Çalışmada programların özgül özellikleri ve dünya çapındaki tarihsel gelişmelerinin yanısıra temel öğeleri ele alınmış ayrıca program yapımcıları ve katılımcılar ile yapılan görüşmeler ve üretim sürecine ilişkin gözlemler de inceleme sürecine dahil edilmiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Televizyon, Gündüz Kuşağı Kadın Talk Show Programları, Üretim

To My Grandfather

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. A. Raşit Kaya for his contributions to and patience in my thesis work. If he had not provided his guidance, advice, criticism and insight throughout the study, it could not be possible that this thesis come into existence.

I would like to acknowledge the help of the interviewees who participated in the depth interviews. If they had not stated their own experiences and shared their personal information so honestly the last part of this study would not have been realized like that.

I wish to thank Defne Akıncı from School of Foreign Languages Departments of Basic English in METU for supporting me in writing when I needed.

My father and my fiancée always encouraged and supported me with their patience and love.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM .....	III
ABSTRACT.....	IV
ÖZ.....	V
DEDICATION .....	VI
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	VII
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	VIII
LIST OF TABLES .....	XI
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
2 THE THEORATICAL FRAME OF THE STUDY .....	4
2.1 Daytime Woman Talk Shows And Their Generic Roots.....	4
2.2 Reality Shows In General .....	16
3 PRODUCTION ANALYSIS OF THE DAYTIME WOMAN TALK SHOWS ..	22
3.1 General Features Of The Daytime Woman Talk Shows.....	22
3.2 The Elements Of The Programs.....	25
3.2.1 Guests .....	25
3.2.2 Experts .....	29
3.2.3 Audience.....	31
3.2.4 Producers .....	33
3.2.5 Hostesses .....	38
3.2.6 Advertisements .....	40
4 THE DAYTIME WOMAN TALK SHOWS IN TURKEY .....	47
4.1 General Context Of Turkish Television Industry .....	47
4.2 The Research On The Turkish Daytime Woman Talk Shows.....	52
4.2.1 Methodology Of The Research.....	52



4.3	The Programs.....	55
4.3.1	Kadinin Sesi.....	55
4.3.1.1	The Topics Of Kadinin Sesi.....	55
4.3.1.2	The Guests In Kadinin Sesi.....	58
4.3.1.3	The Experts In Kadinin Sesi .....	64
4.3.1.4	The Studio Audience In Kadinin Sesi.....	65
4.3.1.5	The Producers Of Kadinin Sesi.....	66
4.3.1.6	The Hostess Of Kadinin Sesi .....	69
4.3.1.7	The Advertisements In Kadinin Sesi .....	73
4.3.1.8	Kadinin Sesi In Flash TV.....	74
4.3.2	Biz Bize .....	77
4.3.2.1	The Topics Of Biz Bize .....	78
4.3.2.2	The Guests In Biz Bize .....	79
4.3.2.3	The Experts In Biz Bize.....	82
4.3.2.4	The Studio Audience In Biz Bize .....	84
4.3.2.5	The Producers Of Biz Bize .....	85
4.3.2.6	The Hostess Of Biz Bize.....	88
4.3.2.7	The Advertisements In Biz Bize .....	89
4.3.3	Yalniz Degilsin.....	92
4.3.3.1	The Topics Of Yalniz Degilsin.....	92
4.3.3.2	The Guests In Yalniz Degilsin.....	93
4.3.3.3	The Experts In Yalniz Degilsin.....	96
4.3.3.4	The Studio Audience In Yalniz Degilsin .....	96
4.3.3.5	The Producers Of Yalniz Degilsin.....	97
4.3.3.6	The Hostess Of Yalniz Degilsin .....	98
4.3.3.7	The Advertisements In Yalniz Degilsin.....	100

4.4	Criticisms And Discussions About The Programs.....	101
4.4.1	The Complaints And RTUK’s Stance .....	105
4.5	The General Characteristics Of Advertisements In The Programs .....	107
4.6	Evaluation Of The Research .....	112
5	CONCLUSION .....	120
	BIBLIOGRAPY .....	125
	APPENDICES .....	132
	APPENDIX A. A Picture About The Kadinin Sesi Show With Guests .....	132
	APPENDIX B. A Picture About The Studio Audience Of Kadinin Sesi .....	133
	APPENDIX C. A Picture About The Production Team Of Kadinin Sesi.....	134
	APPENDIX D. Sample Of The Sponsorship Proposal Of Sales And Advertisement Department In Flash TV For The Kadinin Sesi Show .....	135
	APPENDIX E. A Picture About The Yalniz Degilsin Show With The Guests.....	137
	APPENDIX F. A Picture About The Studio Audience And The Set Design In The Yalniz Degilsin Show .....	138
	APPENDIX G. A Picture About The Production Team Of Yalniz Degilsin.....	139
	APPENDIX H. A Picture About Intimate Relations Between Serap Ezgu And The Studio Audience During The Live Show .....	140
	APPENDIX I. Rating Samples Of The Biz Bize Show .....	141
	APPENDIX J. The Special Sponsorship Proposal Of Zedpas For The Biz Bize Show .....	144
	APPENDIX K. The Companies Airing Most Advertisements In The Daytime Woman Talk Shows In Turkey.....	145

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1. The Economic Value Of The Advertisements In The Shows Analyzed For TV Channels.....	110
---	-----

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

It is widely accepted that television as a means of mass communication, has a significant place in the society. Whether it affects the social life in favorable or unfavorable manner, there is a fact that the activity of watching television covers an important part of lives of individuals. Today the television is considered as a means free of charge, source of entertainment and filling up the leisure times of many people. According to the results of the watching survey of the Higher Council of Radio and Television (RTUK) in 2006<sup>1</sup>, Turkey has taken the first place with the television watching rate of 5.15 hours per day during the weekends and 5.09 hours during the week days in the world among the other countries that have high television watching rates and pushed back the USA which has a rate of 4.35 hours per day to the second place<sup>2</sup>. In this sense, it could be possible to observe that the entertainment function of the television surpasses the information, news or education function being important in the social life. Such that the daytime slot in Turkish television channels appear to be a major broadcasting time which the entertainment factor of the television sticks out.

The programs which are mainly targeted women audience take certain forms in accordance with the broadcasting hours. “Woman programs” with comedy, music, dance and magazine contents in the morning hours; daily life, family tragedies, private lives and personal disasters contents in the afternoon are intensively broadcasted during the daytime slot and follow each other till the news at prime time. It has observed that being a new and special type; the daytime woman talk shows among these have engaged a considerable place in the schedules of the television channels and rapidly proliferated by watching enthusiastically in recent years.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Research of television watching trend* for December 22, 2005 –January 5, 2006 period. (March 16, 2006). <http://www.rtuk.org.tr>.

<sup>2</sup> For TV watching rates in 2005 see the reports of Nielson Media Research, (September 21, 2006). Retrieved October 8, 2006 from <http://www.nielsenmedia.com> and for worldwide TV watching rates see the reports of CSM Media Research Company, Retrieved October 12, 2006 from <http://www.csm.com.cn>

The stated programs define themselves as “reality shows” based on only the “real” and “spontaneous” events and ordinary people. As a wide spread genre in the world the basic claim of the shows is that ordinary people from real life are hosted, their every problem is dealt with and solutions are brought even to their unsolved problems thanks to the shows. Hence, some parts of the society consider that these programs have educational, illuminating and therapeutic effects on the society and claim that they do some social functions. However, addressing the people’s problems about family, private relations, sexuality, gender, money or psychology on the Turkish television channels and opening these to public mediation as never done before have led to some negative events and social reactions in the country. Accordingly, particular debates about the programs have started in some platforms like press, television channels, woman organizations, and the Grand National Assembly of Turkey. In this way, the daytime woman talk shows became a social phenomenon engaging the public agenda for more than a year.

In this account, it is important to understand and display what are these programs in real, which cover a great portion of the daytime slots of television channels, draw primarily woman audience and lead to various debates in Turkish public agenda. These programs stand an interesting intersection point where there are the objectives and controlling of the media institutions on one side and the expectations and interest of the audience on the other side. Hence, it is crucial taking their content formations into consideration and taking their production processes under examination in order to apprehend how these programs should be evaluated.

The subject of this study is the daytime women talk shows in Turkish television channels. The purpose of the study is to examine the production processes of the programs mentioned, to answer the question of which production practices and dynamics why and how play a role in the content formation and to describe the place and importance of these programs in the Turkish television industry.

In order to attain the above stated purpose this study was organized as follows: historical and generical developments of the daytime women talk shows in the world are briefly explained, and their relation with the reality shows is defined in the second chapter. The dynamics that were effective in the emergence and development process of the genre is attempted to be conceived within the theoretical frame of critical political economy related with the television and entertainment industry.

The third chapter of the study focuses on the production process of the programs and describes their general and distinctive features. The functional and structural mechanisms of the production process, the specific conditions experimented, the strategies developed, the effective production dynamics and their roles in the programs are analyzed in this section. The basic elements of production of these programs are scrutinized one by one and an analytical frame is tried to be established for the research on the three pioneering programs of this genre in Turkey.

A general view of the Turkish television industry and the history of woman programs are summarized, and the research conducted on the daytime woman talk shows is described in the third chapter of the study. Along with the analytical frame obtained in the second and third chapters, the data gathered from the participants and the producers of three programs by in-depth interviews and participatory observations are also included into this part. The production processes and elements of the programs are analyzed in detail; the practices between the producers, the executives and the advertisers who affect the content formation are tried to be revealed. Additionally, so as to have a comprehensive insight into the programs researched, discussions in the public agenda, criticisms, and complaints also included in this part, taking into the RTUK's stance as a regulatory institution account. At the end of the chapter an evaluation of the research is offered in a way of answering the basic question of the thesis.

The study results with the conclusion chapter where a general evaluation is submitted. Accordingly, the primary conclusion of the thesis is that the claims in regard to the daytime women talk shows solve the problems, enlighten and educate people, hold a mirror to the pervasive social problems, and so, do a social function are invalid. Instead, it is more realistic to emphasize that these programs contributing to stick out the entertainment function of the television are produced with flexible formats and particular practices offering important opportunities to the television companies and the advertisers, which desire to develop strategies for profit and competition in the marketplace.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **THE THEORATICAL FRAME OF THE STUDY**

#### **2.1 Daytime Woman Talk Shows And Their Generic Roots**

Television is widely considered a growing importance in modern societies. It is accepted as a great source to express images, definitions and values since it is one of the primary means of mass communication having a potential for influence (McQuail, 1994). The reason seems to lie in the fact that symbolic goods which are cultural products believed to play an important role between individuals and social relationships today, are widely produced and circulated by media, which largely operate on an industrial scale (Kaya, 1999).

Media in this sense is assumed as an established social institution with its own norms and practices producing cultural products that have a potential to affect many aspects of social life (McQuail, 1994). Media are thus been evaluated as an essential component of a democratic society particularly in exercising of full citizenship. It is hoped to serve an ideal situation, envisaged that the existing communication system would contribute to the conditions which empower “people to become full member of the society” at every aspects (Golding & Murdock, 1989, pp.182). For this reason, the same expectation is declared in the report of MacBride (1980) entitled “Many Voices, One World” by UNESCO, which implies that mass communication via media should have particular functions in the society such as information, socialization, education and entertainment.

Accordingly, it is thought that media fundamentally can supply accession to information in the broadest possible way in the information function. Socialization function on the other hand can be seen as the transmission of social values namely culture to the receivers by the means of media in order to make individuals live together in contemporary heterogenic societies. Function of education is also related to the socialization function. To bring in new individuals to the society and educate them with the cultural values of the society is within this function. The entertaining function of media can be thought as serving especially a function of evaluating leisure time and a means of recreation socially. It presents various broadcasts to help to make people relieved, rest and please them. To illustrate, these can constitute from sports, magazine or woman programs in television broadcasting.

However, despite these functions that MacBride mentioned, it should be denoted that media in today has an economical dimension and seemed increasingly dependent to the economic structures in the society. This situation in which there are various economical interests implies a risky point in fulfilling such functions, the contribution to the full citizenship and public interest properly. It takes the roots from the fact that the current media organizations have actually a dual structure in which they are both similar and different from other economical industries as playing a key role in production and circulation of cultural products.

This signals the theoretical importance of attending to production of media organizations and its relation with the dynamics of wider structures in the society. This approach is in sympathy with the position of Peter Golding and Graham Murdock (2000) in their emphasis to the nature of the 'cultural industries' referring to media (p.84). Based upon Marxian stream, they draw attention to the institutions, structures, and the formation of power in the society and their both visible and invisible implementations that are effective on specific cultural products produced by media. Highlighting the essentiality of comprehending the general market dynamics in the media products, they specify that financing and organizing cultural production in the media have traceable consequences for the range of discourses and representations in the public domain. To this extent, they offer us a useful analytical tool for the understanding of the emergence and structure of the daytime woman talk shows.

In this account, the daytime woman talk shows have been primarily emerged in the 1950s in U.S television. The early daytime women talk show examples consisted particularly of "celebrity" guests "sitting around a coffee table and sharing recipes and other "secrets" relating to the domestic sphere of activities (Moorti, 1998, p.57). But, the sensational women issues-oriented daytime talk show format analyzed in this study originated in the late 1970s, with Phil Donahue. He formed his hour-long show around certain topics focused on "ordinary" people rather than on celebrities. Besides, Donahue was the first television host to position himself with the predominantly woman audience, whose comments and questions were interactively engaged in his show. As a new and attractive format the show was highly discussed as well. The proponents regarded this reality-based show whose topics were no longer on recipes, dress patterns, or so-called "girl talk", instead, "exercise in sociopolitical discourse," related with a range of issues "dealing with both the profound and the profane" such as presidential elections, war, poverty, AIDS, as well as female impersonators and lesbian mud wrestlers (ibid).



Nevertheless, according to the opponents Donahue's show was "the first talk show to market 'serious' girl-talk and to concede the importance of the female voice" in U.S (Haag, 1993, p.116) According to them, it was obtaining a popularity due to its dealing with private issues that were frequently assumed taboo such as rape and homosexuality rather than its addressing with public topics. Besides, it was the genre that allows Donahue's show to deal with taboo topics with economical interests in a manner rarely seen on national television in those times.

First of all, the genre's capacity to deal with taboo and sensational topics has always dependent to the development of new technologies in the field of mass communication. The daytime woman talk shows were highly required to employ certain advanced technologies that allowed television producers in constructing their contents via video effects and reenactment techniques for dramatic episodes; camera shootings for subjective angles; synchronized sound; pre-production technologies facilitating the organization of ordinary people; interactive applications with audience in their house or in distributing them via live broadcasting; recording and rebroadcasting; and point to multipoint broadcasting via satellites. Therefore, what really facilitated all these practices in the daytime woman talk shows were the technological developments in the field of mass communications.

According to Murdock (1990) it was the "digital revolution" as a technological advance in mass communication which allowed "voice, sound, text, data and images to be stored and transmitted" opening up "a range of possibilities for new kinds of activity, for novel forms of convergence and interplay with media sectors" (p.2). "Convergence", in this sense, is a key term that should be noticed as it refers to technological developments implying the merging of the technologies in communication, primarily telecommunication, computing, and broadcasting. With such developments as of satellites, cable, video recording, publishing, telecommunication and computerized information systems and convergence new companies from different sectors also entered into the market and both the media organizations and the structure of ownership have started to be reorganized. This refers a fact that the leading effects to transformation of conventional and factual contents of TV programs into reality-based shows such as daytime woman talk shows were indeed a result of the increasingly being reorganizing field of mass communication in 1980s.

Murdock (1990) explains the reorganization with two processes that "have been particularly important in restructuring the corporate playing field: technological innovation and "privatization" (ibid). Nicholas Garnham (1990) also supports Murdock's ascertain drawing attention to the technological developments in the mass communication. According to him,

cultural products, which have been developed with the aid of the technological advances, are profoundly dependent to the wider structures in the society. He sees them as a part of a shift in the general economic structure belonging to the competitive and industrial capitalism (ibid. pp. 9-33). Hence, they should be considered in a relation with the changes of wider structures in the society.

Bearing in mind, it would be beneficial to look into the social context where the daytime woman talk shows emerged. The transformation and consolidation of established factual genres into daytime woman talk shows particularly in 1980s came into existence as a result of the previously started neo-liberal politics in which privatization and “commercialization” that have reconstituted the public service broadcasting with more “economic patterns of organisation” (Dovey, 2000, p.4). In this conjuncture, media have been gathering wide proliferation and acceleration with the help of the particular political implications enabled media to position itself in the new accumulation model of capitalism. With the aid of the privatization and “deregulation” policies, media has reached an advanced field of operation. Hence, the appearance of the world communication environment and systems has completely changed and the hegemonic order of the New Right has found an environment to operate in (Kejanlioglu, 2001).

The main reason to provide this environment technologically was not to supply people with the opportunity to communicate more or the necessity to contribute to the full citizenship and democracy; it has in fact derived from the need to possess a communication network to ensure a global supervision in the military field. Moreover, the operation of the global monetary markets is also based on the same kind of communication network. Hence, the problem to secure and maintenance these facilities via advanced and expensive military communication satellite system has been solved by offering them to the public consumption in the way of the privatization policies (Alemdar & Kaya, 1993). They were such motivations that have altered the shape of public service broadcasting abandoning state monopoly in the field of broadcasting.

As a result of the deregulation and privatization policies, many media firms and distribution channels were started to enter and expand into the marketplace via the growth of satellites, cable, local stations, VCRs, and networks in U.S. (Raphael, 2004). With the entry of additional channels of communication and increasing competition for market shares, many media firms have forced to change their management structures and their contents of programs that were already used in their schedules. Following the same line, television audiences were increasingly fragmented because of the “advertising revenues that had to be

shared among a larger pool of firms” and distributors (ibid. p.123). In this sense, it could be possible to mention that the industrial picture of U.S. television has been becoming more crowded and the increased competition in the distribution of television programming affected the sphere of programme production particularly in the late 1980s.

Television distributors had to fight with smaller advertising shares along with bigger debts and producers had to compensate rapidly rising costs. For example, the average cost of a one-hour-long drama had increased “\$1 million per episode” by the end of the 80s, and average costs getting rise by “roughly 8 to 10 percent a year” for prime time producers (Vogel, 1990, p.191). The primary reason for the increasing prices was that the “above the line” costs such as “talent, direction, scriptwriting, music composition, computer animation, location” (Bauer, 1986, p.14). Difficulty of finding talented stars with low fees was another issue. With the effect of the increasing competition, the television industry has also experienced a difficult phase in producing expensive programs, using star actors, scenario writers and TV celebrities. Showing the TV audiences the traditional, familiar stars and celebrities within fictional programs for entertainment has been becoming highly expensive and the profit rate of these productions has been becoming relatively lower than ever before. For this reason, filling the schedules for thousands of hours of broadcast every year with the increasing production costs has not seem economical and profitable to executives of TV channels (Raphael, 2004).

It was such conditions that lead to peak for the daytime woman talk shows and their proliferation in U.S. Employing ordinary people and their private life experiences in TV productions as guests, stars or celebrities in the simple studio shootings has increased the profit rate and cut the costs. Besides, a proven sample, Phil Donahue’s high ratings were very remarkable for other networks. Therefore, this quietly motivated them to encourage Geraldo Rivera, Sally Jessy Raphael and Oprah Winfrey to start their shows included a frame of reality shows mostly subsuming private stories of ordinary women and their sensational problems into the nineties. They were joined by Maury Povich, Montel Williams and Jenny Jones in 1991. Afterwards Jerry Springer begun on the scene in 1992 and Leeza Gibbons, Bertice Berry, and Ricki Lake added to the daytime schedule in 1993. Gordon Elliott and Rolonda Watts both had new shows in 1994, while Tempestt Bledsoe and Gabrielle Carteris launched new shows in 1995. In the mid 90s, daytime woman talk shows have been quietly pervasive in American televisions and households (Halter, 2005).

Correspondingly, many people and critics started to voice their concerns about the quality of American TV programming industry and began some public campaigns about daytime

woman talk shows' harmful effects. After certain withdrawal of commercial providers from the shows, many programs ended suddenly in the mid-nineties in U.S. However, it was not a final end, but a break. In the late 90s more entertainment oriented daytime talk shows with women concerns have returned to be produced in both internal and external markets since the producers and network investors in U.S. have also discovered daytime woman talk shows' potential to sell abroad. In this way, they have integrated with a wider industry move toward international boosting their earnings as well (Raphael, 2004).

This situation was deeply associated with a process in which the structure of media ownership had increasingly started to be reorganized via the inclination of "corporate concentration" in that the operational field of media had begun to change internationally (Mosco, 1996, p.175). Additionally, technological developments and convergence support to "diminish traditional market boundaries" and blur the division between media products and the operating field of media markets (Doyle, 2002a, p.3).

In this process, the effects of the process which refer to national markets that had being opened up via "globalization" are significant. Accordingly, the logic of economies of scale was starting to create an incentive to expand product sales into secondary external and international markets (ibid). As market structures have been freed and have become more competitive in international viewpoint, the opportunities for economies of scale and scope have started to soar.

Thus, the process has encouraged media operators to look beyond the local or domestic market as a way of expanding their consumer base internationally. These had led to many media firms to adapt their business and corporate strategies accordingly such that they have been joining forces at a faster pace than ever before. They have being involved in acquisitions, mergers, and other strategic deals and alliances, not only within the same sector, but also with the other sectors for cultural industries (Schiller, 1989). The facilitating process for media operators in this sense was based upon what Vincent Mosco's (1996) term of "spatialization" (p.173). It refers to the constraints on the movement or flow of information, goods and services, and also to the influence of communication on the processes of differentiation of corporate operations and their wide scale reintegration. Hence, In Mosco's account spatialization processes are highly related to the trends towards corporate concentration and globalism. Therefore, "the institutional extension of corporate power in the communication industry" indicates a process that should be chiefly noticed in the production and consumption of cultural products internationally (ibid. p. 175).

Two paths for corporate concentration can proceed are “horizontal” and “vertical integration”. In terms of horizontal integration it can be considered that when a media company buys a significant part of another company which are generally not a direct competitor but a relevant media corporation in its operational field. For example, News Corporation’s takeover of the Twentieth Century Film Corporation, and the huge merger of America Online (AOL) and Time Warner at the beginning of 2000 are the most remarkable examples of cross-media concentration operating according to their world-wide scale of economies (Herkman, 2004).

Vertical integration, on the other hand, takes place when a media company extends control for a line of business producing different products or services often to satisfy a common need and to provide competitive advantage owing to maintenance of production. Forward integration refers to the purchase of companies to which one sells, as in the case of Sony’s acquisition of MGM Studios are relatively recent examples of cross-sectoral market concentration in media and entertainment (O’Brien, 1998). Regarding the effect of the state on the expansion of the media industry, these processes that Mosco’s outlines have inextricably linked during 1990s while media concentration got explicitly a new kind of global scale.

According to this stance, some powerful media organizations, most of which are American or European based started to dominate particularly in the global areas of content production and distribution of television and TV programs increasingly assumed a global appearance as well. For instance, in late 90s it could be possible to state only several giant media conglomerates have been operating global scales (Alger, 1998). In accordance with the several production and distribution companies of TV programs have been extending into global media markets such as Framantle, Endemol, King World Production and Harpo Production. These corporations also cover many famous daytime woman talk shows and reality-based shows in the world. Garnham (1990) emphasizes the underlying logic of the operation of these kinds of multinational and multi-industrial companies. He emphasizes that as the retraction for productivity in production, basic concern is that enhancing the existing audience to maximum possible level in each phase of production and making a return to flow of money from box-office to the production as rapid as possible. Moreover, to minimize the overhead costs of the distribution system and to maximize the turnover time of capital strengthens an inclination concerning an oligopolistic control over both internal and external markets (ibid.p.185). These kinds of growth of scale economies in the field of communication are also heavily criticized due to their potential to turn into a dynamo of monopolization. In this respect, many researches conducted on this issue supports mentioned

theories<sup>3</sup>.

Convergence, internationalization and spatialization in this direction have created many possibilities and incentives to “repackage or to repurpose media contents” into many different formats insofar as they are technically, costly and profitably feasible (Doyle, 2002b, p.5-12). The exertion for cost-effective and profitable programming is certainly one of the reasons for the proliferation of the daytime woman talk shows, but it is also worth considering how such a genre fits into the logic of “mass customization” (Andrejevic, 2004, p.53). Mark Andrejevic (2004) at this point highlights that those incentives were in close relation with the concepts of “mass customization” and “consumption”. According to him, these are somehow fit with a paradigmatic aspect of convergence. He grasps the concept of convergence as to “product differentiation” for consumption envisioned by mass customization in different cultures (ibid).

According to this, daytime woman talk shows in U.S have been differentiated with the help of the different formats used in the daytime women talk show genre in order to be sold abroad. It should be stated in here that the selling and proliferation of the differentiated daytime woman talk shows in the world have been realized by means of two valid methods. In the first method, some shows have been “licensed” to foreign broadcasters as this has been widely done in most U.S. programs keeping the original content and pictures. To illustrate, Jerry Springer Show on NBC owned by Vivendi Universal and General Motors was licensed and broadcasted as it is and watched with fascination by audiences all over Europe (Hume, 2003). What is more, *Oprah Show* produced by Harpo Production and King World Production, which are the leader daytime woman talk show producer and distributor in U.S, is currently distributed and licensed to “204 market in the United States and 120 other countries” (Moorti, 1998, p.17). In the second method, the famous shows have been “adapted” for mass customization according to the specialties of those countries. In other words, the content of the daytime woman talk shows have been tailored and imitated according to the social and cultural characteristics of different countries. In order to better understand how this genre has gathered a world-wide proliferation, the second method should be examined in detail.

The content of the original shows could sometimes include culturally specific items in terms

---

<sup>3</sup> For the scale economies of local daily newspapers in U.S. see Derouzos J.N., & Trautman, W.B. (1990). *Economic effects of media concentration: Estimates from a model of the newspaper firm*. Rand. Besides, for the scale economies of local cable broadcasters in U.S. see Noam, E.M. (1985). Economics of scale in cable television: A multiproduct analysis. In E.M. Noam (Ed.). *Video media competition: Regulation, economics, and technology*. Columbia: Columbia University Press.

of topical and emotional differences of local natures. Thus, there are some difficulties as to national and cultural differences for international TV distributors who have to surmount. Aksoy and Robins (1992) interpret this as a challenge between creating “standards of global markets” and maintaining sensitivity for both different local markets and consumer segments (p.18). For this reason, the second method helped to overcome these difficulties by means of employing TV shows which had been particularly developed with modular formats. Thus, many daytime woman talk shows have also been adopted and customized according to the local appropriateness. In this way, the national broadcasters could recompose the modular show formats to fit their needs and insert some specialties of local entertainment if desired.

At this point, it is important to understand that why national broadcasters purchase the rights of this kind of daytime woman talk shows and/or customize them, instead of producing new and different ones. The explosion of technological advances and concentration of media in the 1980s was not only a U.S. fact but a global one, the similar tendencies of neo-liberal politics and the same market related pressures to cut down costs and survive profitably in the field of broadcasting were been experiencing in the rest of the world. Employing proven formats as to commercial success has greatly reduced the risks associated with huge costs and guaranteed profitability (Caves, 2000). According to Richard Caves, television programming is a highly risky business. Until a show is aired, it is almost impossible to predict its commercial success. Thus, he refers to this problem as the “nobody knows” principle. To reduce the risks, to increase the chances of profitability and to get risk-free decisions for production investments have always been hard and have created an inclination to prefer already proven formats of famous genres. As the generic advantages of the daytime women talk show genre have been more appropriate to the competition rationale and the needs of the private channels, they have been mostly attempted to replicate with slight modifications by many broadcasters in the world. As good templates, mostly the imitators of *Jerry Springer Show*, *Oprah Show* and *Sally Jessy Raphael Shows* became widespread.

In this way, primarily British, Nordic and Romanian networks have started to customize and employ those flexible formats with their local differences. For example, the famous hostess Trisha Goddard has begun her daytime women talk show in ITV produced by Anglia Television in 1998 with the topics of relationships, families in crisis and reunions. The show was famous in Britain particularly due to its conducting of a lie detector and DNA tests revealing the results on live broadcast. There was also a body language specialist, to help Trisha to comment guests’ lies on the show. However, Trisha was frequently accused of copying American formats, of bringing their harmful effects and of exploiting her guests as well (Halter, 2005). As another sample in England, *The Chrystal Rose Show* broadcasted her

programme on January 26, 2000. The topics were dominantly bisexuality and ordinary people from different experiences about that were fiercely discussing whether there was a bisexuality gene.

On the other hand, in Germany, where the number of daytime woman talk shows increased a dozen in 1999, the comments of German critics have been similar (Rossler & Brosius, 2001). The shows have been regarded as highly personalized and emotional programs that “depict bizarre behavior and social deviance”; include bad language, fighting, and confrontations as a mean of problem solutions; “leave most conflict unsolved” (ibid.p. 144). The programs have also taken social reactions in Germany for the reasons of the shows are mainly oriented toward issues of sexuality; and presented the exception as ordinary. Therefore, they were seemed the shows that distort reality and desensitize audience to the misfortunes of others.

In some countries, the format rights of Springer’s show were purchased and turned into the political programming as well. For example, on the Russian talk show *One on One*, a politician who was a controversial presidential candidate could saying "scumbag" and a "bastard" and during the show men then could threw orange juice in each other's faces. Those scenes were shown on CNN television channel all around the world as well (Hume, 2003).

Original American daytime women talk show formats have also being pervasive via local imitations from Venezuela to Brazil and Peru. In *Laura in America*, which was a Peruvian show hosted by an attorney, Laura Bozzo, specialized in physical battles and insults. In this show two sisters could fighting tearfully for a same man, whilst the studio audience were shouting and insulting at them (ibid.).

In Mexico, daytime woman talk shows on Televisa and TV Azteca have also started to be broadcasted in an adapted way. The topics have been evolving around the themes like “Man by day, woman by night,” “My children care only about their inheritance,” and “My husband got our servant pregnant” (ibid.). The programs have been common with Jerry Springer's original show on many specialties such as sentimental issues, confessions, and lifestyles of the rich expressing them with fighting and hair-pulling. As a result of the increasing watching rate, the daytime woman talk shows in Mexico have begun to take place in schedules more than 40 hours per week by July 2000. This was also criticized. While producers and some representatives of social organization claim that “they gave Mexico's



poorer citizens new access to the media spotlight”, Mexican critics decried that they have potential "to discourage people from getting beyond their problems" (ibid.).

With the aid of these samples, the international circulation and the growth of the daytime woman talk shows can be considered as a result of an economic strategy just as David Landler’s words on Business Week: “Think globally, program locally” (Landler, 1994). At this point, Lipsey and Chrystal (1995) well-define this consideration in that;

The communication revolution has ... caused an internationalization of competition in almost all industries. National markets are no longer protected for local producers by high costs of transportation and communication or by the ignorance of foreign firms...Global competition is fierce competition, and media firms need to be fast on the uptake, if they are to survive (p.258).

This situation refers how and why imperatives of wider structures in the society play key role on the media production. This also demonstrates that why critical political economic approach is beneficial for the examination of the shows in question. Thus, it is important to differ that the world-wide expansion of the daytime woman talk shows is profoundly related with every level of institutional circuit as to both production and consumption. These include a chain of primary producers to distributors, tailors to consumers who give attention supplying new processes of production (Winslow, 1996). In this chain, it is also needed to look into the generic roots of the daytime woman talk shows in order to understand and elaborate its structure which has a flexibility to be customized from one country to another. The concept of the “genre” and the “sub-genres” are useful for analyzing such a specific media product.

The genre can be conceived as a “multi-faced phenomenon” (Briggs, 2002, p.2). Thus, in its general basis, genre simply means a kind or type for “any distinctive category of cultural product” (McQuail, 1994, p.263). From this respect, all mass media genres are in essence defined equally by producers and consumers of the content. This provides media to produce it consistently and efficiently creating some expectations in audience. According to Andrew (1984) genres “construct the proper spectators for their own consumption. They build desires and then, represent the satisfaction of what they have triggered” (p.110). This implies that specific products produced by cultural industry as an industrial commodity are formulated via genre templates so as to create particular patterns of consumption (Briggs, 2002).

In order to realize this genre templates frequently make use of the “formats” that are produced as various forms for the genres. Formats in this sense, refer to the coordination of

fundamental routines related to specific themes in a particular genre. For this reason, formats fit the genre and vice versa (Altheide, 1985). For example, the favorite daytime woman talk shows -like the shows of Jerry Springer, Oprah, and Selly Jessy Raphael – create always specific formats providing detailed production and marketing guidelines that can be adapted to each locale (Moran, 1998). Peter Bazalgette (cited in Collins, 2001), creative director of Endemol and a founding producer of *Big Brother* show, well explains this: “... formats are simply concentrated ideas with rules. The key to most of these things is to have the kind of idea that works for everyone” (p.17).

To this extent, it should be emphasized that this kind of effort for processing and presenting the content via particular genre templates is in accordance with meeting the needs of media organizations and providing them most advantages in the marketplace (Altheide & Snow, 1979). Hence, the notion of the genre is seemed inextricably tied to the idea of mass production and consumption.

This can also be seen as to the interchangeability of some genres with any other. According to Barton (1964), basic generic types of programs broadcasted by television are grouped as follows: (1) drama, including adventure and western films; (2) quiz and audience participation shows; (3) variety, including musicals and comedy; (4) situation comedy; (5) sports; (6) news, including interviews, research and documentary. In his remark, under the industrial conditions whenever sub-genres like the daytime woman talk shows emerge, this is derived from some industrial expectations related to diminishing mass production costs and arising profits in the process of the mass consumption.

In this context, as a sub-genre the daytime women talk show has taken its roots from some basic genres like news, documentary, audience participation shows, drama, and some sub-genres like soap opera, crime shows, and talk shows and so on. It is a specific formula and combination of those genres merged in one pot. For example, it gives some information to the audience and includes story-telling but it is not a news bulletin. It relies on real people and expertise but it is not a documentary. It deals with dramatic issues from every day lives theatrically but it is not a drama show or soap opera. Although it deals with current issues as they affect ordinary life, it is neither a current affair nor a consumer affair program.

In this sense, it is needed to say that this specific formula of the daytime women talk show makes the genre boundaries fuzzy and flexible that is open to be altered resulting in diverse genre overlaps and particular integrations. The genre of the daytime woman talk shows is “intergenre” referring to changing traditional oppositions of generic structures in television

industry such as programme and audience, producer and consumer, expert and ordinary, real and fiction and so on (Lunt, 1994, p.179). This expounds that the structure of the daytime woman talk shows is closely related with the need and conditions of television channels and distributors. In other words, what makes the shows complicated is the context of television industry itself, which constantly looks for and adapts new programs.

At this point, before leaving the subject of genre, it should be emphasized that one genre related to the daytime women talk show formation gains much more gravity than the above stated genres. Namely, the genre of the reality shows provides the fundamental specialties for this specific sub-genre. Hence, in order to better understand the structure of the daytime woman talk shows the genre of the reality show and its reciprocal relation will be into consideration in the further pages.

## **2.2 Reality Shows In General**

Reality shows in general term take their basic formation from the concept of “Reality TV” which was established for the first time in 1981 by an independent and voluntary newspaper organization named “Paper Tiger” (Rigel, 2003). They had an assertion concerning that traditional newspaper and TV creates fictional news and this fictional texture of news damages reality. Thus, the founders of this organization tried to broadcast the social and political events that could happen anywhere in the world in their TV channels or in their own anti-media channels by shooting them in a plain documentary format and without editing them especially to act beside the fictional news. In this direction, the reality show conception in broadcasting, which asserts only “reality” without editing or distortion, emerged; in fact, as a new and different kind of news regardless of various aspects in common with the factual news.

In addition to the concept of the Reality TV, it should be specified that the generic system of reality shows is based on “documentary” tradition coming from the idea of observing and seeing what is a mode of “real” behavior and conversations in real life. Therefore, reality programming covering daytime woman talk shows and many others takes its frame of reference, its interest and its pleasure from the real characteristics of real people just like a documentary and just like its varieties; “observational filming, cinema vérité or direct cinema” (Corner, 2002, p. 255). In this regard, to pay attention to the documentary style is illuminating to understand both the development of reality shows from its documentary roots and the point where the daytime woman talk shows stand.

In the development of the documentary it was regarded as a special means overcoming spatial and temporal boundaries, re-creating either historically or geographically distant lives. Documentary in its generic tradition had various concerns. These concerns refer to the “outer world” in relation to the significant actions in history and social world that subsume an effort to explore cultural and political issues. For this reason, the generic expectations of audience about documentary genre were in the direction of their being particularly “educational or scientifically informative, authentic, ethical, socially engaged”, independently produced, and serving the public interest (ibid, p.264).

However, particularly in the last two decades of programs on televisions an interest concerning running with the “inner world” and “inner stories” have developed via documentary genre (ibid. p. 259). As “inner stories” relied on the extensive use of interviews and dramatization to reflect personal and micro social, they started to be seen on television emotionally rather than scientifically. They took some formations and genres under the documentary style like reality shows and daytime woman talk shows with the themes of road accidents, fires, crimes, illnesses, divorces, abortions, sexual harassment, confessions and so forth. Besides they were formulated by using a different method from documentary style. In this method, living space was also the performance space of shooting where ordinary citizens become celebrities. As it can be seen in the Big Brother show, the availability of the real is both “tightly spatial” and “temporal” and the account of its perception is much more emotional (ibid. p.257).

In this respect, having a claim that reflects pure reality, the daytime woman talk shows form in the same ground with documentary and reality shows. Therefore, as reality shows address ordinary people and their real lives experiences in an attractive manner, daytime woman talk shows are also interested in such inner stories, but different focus points and approaches. To illustrate, while the reality shows tend to cover ordinary people in themes related with detective, police, fire, disaster, adventure, and game with some outdoor shooting and reenactment techniques based on mostly visuality, the daytime woman talk shows tend to focus on personal tragedies, domestic issues, sexual problems, love relations etc. with simple studio shooting and reenactment techniques based on mostly talk.

With this in view, even though they look like documentaries lying on the reality concept, the reality shows with the daytime woman talk shows are not full documentaries in practice because of the fact that their material and temporal conditions for real appearances and conversations are entirely constructed by television industry itself. They are carefully photographed and edited just as movies. In other words, “cinematic lighting, special effects,

moody background, music and narration” are added to the shows to enhance dramatic effects for private lives” of ordinary people for the aim of the entertainment (Day, 1996, p.67).

As a result, the using of “inner stories” in reality-based shows are criticized since it is considered that they have led to an important change in the approach of television to the public and private life, particularly in the last two decades. To put into differently, the activity of watching others’ stories in the reality-based shows collapses all conventional private-public and “interior-exterior distinctions” as it enables the audience to observe both private and public lives utterances of ordinary people (Turner, 1998, p. 94). In this sense, with the advance of the reality programming the line of social knowledge and personal experience has become increasingly emotional in the structure of the television production that has been highly reconfigured. For this reason, contrary to the generic expectations of audience about documentary, the reality shows with the daytime woman talk shows are frequently blamed being “commercial, sensational, popular entertaining, potentially exploitative” and manipulative (Corner, 2002, p.264).

This stems actually from the contemporary conditions of the television industry. For example, the employing of inner stories in the commercial approaches and televisually constructed practices has a potential to take matters sharply away from their broader social context. For the object of revealing the personal in the television environment, i.e. extracting the personal from the social by building in a new factual environment, the production process of presenting the real is completely altered and became no more similar to that of the naked documentary. As a result, inner stories are decomposed from their social roots in a new and specially formulated way in the television industry.

Significantly, the acts of “seeing others” and “seeing things” on screen today in reality shows genres are rather different from those of the defining moments of documentary programs despite both have the same essence. Susan Murray (2004) illuminatingly interprets this emphasizing that reality shows as repackaged documentaries under the market conditions of television industry. Thus, her interpretation invites us to consider the reality shows in John Corner’s (2002) term of “post-documentary culture” of which reality-based shows are key component (p.255). The term in his conceptualization refers that many conventional elements of documentary will continue to develop, but in a continuously changed setting. That is to say, they continue to exist and transform in economic and cultural environment of the television industry which includes some ideological implications leading to a blur for the distinction between the public and the private sphere, between the celebrity and ordinary

people, between the media and social space, and between the real and fictional as it does in many current television genres.

This does not imply that the daytime woman talk shows with the generic essence of reality shows are simply a commercialized or mutant branch of the documentary. However, it signifies that the daytime woman talk shows within the relation of the documentary-based reality shows considerably altered the factual programming particularly in the daytime slot of television broadcasting. They also contributed to changes in television production practices, establishing new priorities for programme makers and evoking different expectations in audience.

Joshua Meyrowitz, (1995) in this account, stress on the issue from a broader social context. He deciphers those remarkable changes in TV programming comprehending them within the era of increasing “economic inequality” in the society (p. 49). In his sight, the increasing economic inequality gave rise to economic stratification required more comprehensive forms of the marketplace. Hence, to rationalize the production and marketing processes in a more segmented market, mass customization with product differentiation was necessary in the television industry as a marketing strategy. For this reason, the product differentiation in television products results in merging genres, forming new sub-genres and flexible formats as a solution to keeping resilient in difficult and competitive market conditions, which is particularly applied to the oligopoly market structure and economic stratification. In this way, specific sub-genres like the daytime woman talk shows are constituted to be appropriate for the changing conditions. Thus, differentiating reality shows from documentaries and differentiating daytime woman talk shows from reality shows as well as diversifying them into external markets imply both a cost-effective strategy and a way of control over the market for the audience profitably.

Meyrowitz, (1995) in this sense, draws our attention to a point where the product differentiation in reality shows includes a fundamental feature at their core. According to him, all kind of reality shows are surveillance-based such as *Big Brother*, *Cops*, *America's Most Wanted*, *The Real World*, *Jerry Springer Show* or *Sally Jessy Raphael Show*. They operate certain surveillance mechanisms for monitoring and obtaining a control over the market and audience. To illustrate, the offering a chance of participation for the reality shows to ordinary people both reduces the uncertainty in an increasing diversified market for producers and leads to an inducement to use interactive practices in production process for monitoring (ibid.p. 50).

Accordingly, the daytime woman talk shows under the effects of the reality shows are not only a differentiated genre to be a means of surveillance, but also to be a popular and preferable woman shows for the perpetual monitoring for advertising. Thus, it is the reality show structure that helps to benefit from the knowledge and power of such surveillance, and then to sell this kind of knowledge and the chance for the audience access to advertisers. In this regard, the monitoring of potential consumers by means of interactive TV programs by advertisers is deeply related with the economical interests of the television industry.

With this in view, as we contextualize daytime woman talk shows and their structural relation with the reality shows, Felicity Brown (2006) makes a contribution to our understanding as well. Following the approach of surveillance disciplinary by Foucault (1977) and emphasizing the importance of critical political economy, Brown expresses that the medium of television encourages the monitoring practices in the TV programs. She sees reality shows as one of the primary fields of surveillance mechanisms in the television industry. Thus, she deciphers certain surveillance practices that are highly embedded and concealed in such shows. One of them is the function of entertainment with the ordinary people's own life experiences, so, the surveillance is presented "as an amusing experiment" to the audience (Brown, 2006, p.8). She, in this sense, recognizes certain ideological implementations embedded in the reality shows and then stresses that all production performance of reality shows are done to naturalize the position of surveillance (ibid. p.9). Hence she implies that the reality-based shows can be regarded as the shows have a capacity presenting ordinary and personal experiments as a pleasurable experience and a spectacle – even if they are painful, urgent and necessitating a comprehensive aid.

This approach is also remarkable on the grounds that why entertainment function in the structure of the daytime woman talk shows is in relation with the "creation of hegemony" including the ordinary people during the shows (Meehan, Mosco and Wasko, 1993, p.109). Hence, it should be summarized that the televisually constructed surveillance mechanism are employed in the reality shows, embedded in the various formats and sub-genres of such shows, -like the daytime woman talk shows- as well as supply some advantages to primarily producers and advertisers and operate particularly under the function of entertainment in the shows.

Consequently, it should be emphasized that the daytime woman talk shows as a televisual product have been dependently formed with and differentiated from the genre of the reality shows as well as diversified to be flexible for the changing conditions of the market. In this way, the daytime woman talk shows took common specialties from the reality shows in their

structural base such as cost-effective and controlling implementations and flexible formats. However, they have also some distinctive and dissimilar features seemed in formats of the genre and in production of the shows. Thus, so as to grasp those, they should be also taken into account in the production analysis of the shows in question.



## **CHAPTER III**

### **PRODUCTION ANALYSIS OF THE DAYTIME WOMAN TALK SHOWS**

#### **3.1 General Features Of The Daytime Woman Talk Shows**

First of all, what differentiates a daytime women talk show from other television programs – even woman programs or reality shows- are their open-ended nature. Episodes run concurrently, intersect, and lead to further developments. A single episode of a show is generally switched between several different concurrent story lines that may run independent of each other in studio. Each episode can feature some of the show's current storylines but not always all of them. There is some rotation of both storylines and guests so that any given storyline or guest can appear.

Secondly, they are based on particular claims namely “reality” and “spontaneity” described with the principle of “right here, right now” (Timberg, 2002). Being different from the reality shows, the daytime women talk show must be always experienced in the present tense so that audience should feel fresh, as if the events in the show were happening in that moment. The shows, for this reason, include the implementation of “interactivity” with both studio audience and home audience providing and proving the feeling of reality and spontaneity.

Thirdly, they bear some “docusoap” specialties which stem from the effects of both the documentary tradition and soap opera on the daytime woman talk shows. The point here is on “the personal and intimate” but to supply entertainment (Stella, 2001). In this account, Bruzzi Stella explains the term ‘docusoap’ as a name used by primarily journalists, who regarded this kind of “factual television programs contaminate the seriousness of documentary with the frivolity of soaps” and supply commercial benefits as they are cheap to produce (ibid. p. 27).

In this way, many episodes in the daytime woman talk shows are constructed of the edited and the planned situations just as the fiction of the soap opera. The shows follow a storyline about the lives of a group of ordinary people in the studio environment. This brings an important aspect to the shows including melodramatic features. They mostly consist of psychological contents provided in a shared discourse, which transmit ideas about emotional

conflict, desire and expression. The show producers in this account highly borrow the main themes of soap opera such as romance, secret relationships, extra-marital affairs, as well as personal feelings and matters in everyday life such as rivalry, marital problems, divorce, group identification, poverty, loss and survival, ugliness and beauty, taboos, anxieties, secret emotions about sexual identity and so on.

Additionally, similar to the “telenovela”, mini-series of soap opera format with an origin in Spanish and Portuguese broadcasting, the daytime woman talk shows includes short stories so that they are finalized generally till the end of a single show. The distinctive features coming from the docusoap and telenovela styles in the daytime woman talk shows can be identified with particularly, “reunion episodes” with separated lovers and long-lost people, “shocking events and news” that guests learnt for the first time about their private lives and “match-making” like dating shows.

In storylines, they are shocking instantaneous when a man learns that his previously-unknown children, or a girl learns that her mother is not her real mother and someone gave her for adoption when she was born and then meets with her real mother in studio again with tears, screams and happiness. Such moments and episodes are carefully designed by producers in a way that they would be shocking, striking and dramatic on the live show and in front of the studio audience. Thus, it could be possible for producers to solicit guests by offering a chance to reunite with people they can not find or know before. In this way, some of the reunion episodes and shocking events could be happy or painful or even insuperable for participants particularly for guests in the production and broadcasting processes of the shows. In those cases, it could be highly possible to lead some undesirable results and violence on the show or after the show for them, for example, when women learn their partners are polygamous men; “men learn their girlfriends are actually boys; wives learn their husbands are sleeping with their sisters or ex-wives or both; women learn that their 13-year-old daughters are strippers” and so on (Plotz, 1998).

Sociologist Nancy Day (1996) who has studied daytime woman talk shows in USA in Pennsylvania State University calls this type of reunion and shocking features of the daytime woman talk shows as an “ambush” by producers (p. 52). She regards that the shows do not give sincere help to participants and some even encourage violence among them. In this account, Day is in harmony with the approaches of social psychology that make an important contribution to our understanding of the programs analyzed.

One of the primary theorists of such approaches is Leonard Berkowitz (1962) who has been the leading investigator of the "disinhibition hypothesis," which posits that television violence under particular circumstances can result in increased interpersonal aggression because it weakens inhibitions against such behaviors. In his sight, "the findings so far suggest that such circumstances include those in which the television violence is rewarded" and the environment in which the television performance conducted "contains a target who has previously provoked" (Comstock & Lindsey, 1975, p.27). Accordingly, television and the environment that the shows produced can allow participants to act violently in the show and make contribution to their performance of aggressive behaviors in their personal lives after the show as well.

Taking these contributions into account, it should be added that there are important features of the shows that mark the structures of formats of the genre. They are the public "confessions" -frequently displayed in companion with theatrical behaviors and exaggerations- and "trauma" declarations –particularly concerning the themes of family relations, domestic matters and love affairs.

The confessions and personal declarations about traumatic events lie on the retelling of personal experiences, using the credibility of the source to validate the message. The display of spontaneity and self disclosure of direct experience are vital for grounding the argument, if a guest is seen as credible. Evidence for confessions counts only if can be produced and showed by guests during the show. For instance, if a mother is to speak about her son's illness, she must reveal her own suffering with tears rather than lowly and simple expression. If a wife discusses her marital problems, it is the best if her husband is also present in studio or call-in so that audience directly witnesses their disagreement simultaneously. If the evidence displayed is inadequate, the arguments they supposedly can be rejected and guests can be punished by host or hostess, experts or studio audience. However, if evidence is displayed and agreed, discussions can be drawn on, guests can be rewarded and solving the real problem is of little consequences.

Thus, the daytime woman talk shows tend to orchestrate the public confessions and trauma declarations, which can be able to expose conflict, aggressive responses and violent behaviours as between former husbands, betrayed children, rival lovers and angry neighbours participated in the shows, to provide the studio audience's response with boos, cheers, laughter and to draw home audience's interest (Grindstaff, 2002 p. 168). Participants, for this reason, are encouraged to tell or confess their problems and even most hidden secrets publicly to desire a solution with the help of the hostess and producers of the shows.

In this sense, it should be noted that solutions and aid are mostly offered in emotional manner, as a kind of “therapy” for traumatic declarations and confessions by host or hostess, sometimes expert and studio audience like a therapist. Being another distinctive feature of the shows, such therapeutic approaches rely on the sense of close interaction with ordinary participants’ emotional worlds, private lives and acquaintances in the shows.

Therefore, the shows are organized to generate a sense of supportive intimacy by host or hostess to each confessor in turn using a therapeutical genre<sup>4</sup> in the daytime slot of television for particularly women audience. At this point, Laura Grindstaff (2002) emphasizes that therapy in “two minutes for every lucky participant” in the course of the broadcasting is maybe one of the most important features of the daytime woman talk shows that can be seen fascinating and desirable by audience who have many personal problems in their lives.

According to her, the chance for therapy and solution of the problems is conducted by producers meticulously and deliberately, so, the things on screen are not what they seem to be. This accounts for the fact that the daytime woman talk shows’ approach to personal trauma, pain, injury, loss and to their modes of declaration through certain techniques like public confession, interview, talk, or reenactment are indeed highly influenced by the economical conditions and expectations of the television industry in which they are produced.

In this regard, the distinctive features of the shows seemed in formats of the genre such as their open ended nature in storylines, the interactive implementations, docusoap episodes like reunion, shocking events and match-making are exerted variously under such conditions in production, practice, and broadcasting of the shows. In order to reach a more comprehensive understanding the basic elements of the programs that are effective in exertion of the features in production process should be under examination as well.

## **3.2 The Elements Of The Programs**

### **3.2.1 Guests**

Ordinary people leading desperate lives filled with bad luck and hard times are the guests in most of the daytime woman talk shows at first appearance. They seem to be leading

---

<sup>4</sup> For a detailed explanation of the therapy genre see Livingstone & Lunt (1994) and especially Shattuc (1997) since she calls therapy-type programs particularly as *daytime talk shows* for women and clarifies the genre around their therapeutic aspects. .

miserable lives filled with unconventional actions and bad happenings, sharing most intimate problems, most painful personal tragedies, or irresponsible activities in the shows. However, is this true? Where do they come from? Why do they do it?

According to Nancy Day (1996), certain incentives can be defined in the way like gathering a chance to be (temporarily) a celebrity and being able to tell their friends that they were on a national television is important to people who have no other way to gain recognition. Some guests in this way may have a hope that “someone will want to make a movie of their story or that they will be discovered in some other way” (ibid. p. 42). Thus, they are motivated by an instant fame and fortune to come to the studios where the daytime woman talk shows shot. The message of the shows for guests in this sense is explicit in that ordinary people can become so important that millions will watch them. It is implied with this message that “perhaps the next time the new celebrities might be you”.

In fact, it is hard to write that guests are in the shows find what they hoped and paid something. Each guest only gets a bus ticket, a night in a big-city hotel, and a chance to be (temporarily) a star actor or actress. Yet, the show’s offerings are more than these. It gives guests a chance for a platform from which they can also justify their behaviors and thoughts. Abt (1994) comments this situation that rather than being ashamed, guests eagerly discuss all sorts of immoral and even criminal behaviors in an effort to seek understanding by others. She is thus concerned that the daytime woman talk shows also bear a potential to promote the idea that guests may be rewarded for their bad behaviors by having been given an opportunity to be on national television. The shows in this regard, may feature child-abusers, wife-beaters, serial murderers, and people who have committed other illegal acts as well.

On the other hand, there are also different incentives for guests who have some problems too hard to solve individually. Some guests hope that they would be given a hand for their declarations about their problems by means of television accession as it has a powerful legitimating function in the social sphere, not only for celebrities, experts, or hostess but also for ordinary people. It actually takes the roots from a fact that ordinary people and their everyday life problems exist largely outside the regular primetime news, discussion programs and news programs of television coverage.

Stuart Hall (1978) in this respect brings an illuminating remark about the ordinary people who want to acquire television accession. In his sight, as ordinary people exist largely outside the official channels and established routines of newsmaking, they must do and say

extraordinary things to gain entry. Not being naturally newsworthy –as in the case with celebrities and other elites who are attended to their words- ordinary people obtain access to media more because of what they do, and notions of unusualness, disruptiveness, and deviance which play a crucial role in determining this access. For this reason, the chance of televisual visibility for ordinary people, who could not publicly act out their stories anywhere else in real time and space without being sanctioned, encourages them to tell their even most private stories in the daytime woman talk shows.

As Grindstaff (2002) emphasized, the content producers of the daytime woman talk shows are aware of this and employ such limitation to construct the show for mass consumption. While they give voice to ordinary people normally positioned outside the regular production system of news and other programs in the television environment, they have to speak only in certain ways, only under certain conditions, and according to certain rules that they did not create but set by primarily managers and executives of TV channels and then implementing by show producers.

What do ordinary people in a guest position in this specific television content speak about and where does the source of their authority lie under such conditions? They discuss mostly sensitive personal matters, so their authority stems from their firsthand experience and information rather than formal, educational or professional information. This focus on the backstage of people's lives is often perceived as the transportation of the personal information which is believed to remain private into the public arena. The usage of this kind of information makes often "money shot" in the content of the show (ibid. p.37). It is at that moment when tears fall down from a woman's eyes and her voice rattles in sadness and pain as she describes having lost her child, when a woman tells host or hostess of his husband who has been sleeping with her sister, when members of the studio audience lose their control as they listen to a victim recount the all the details of a ravishing. She describes these moments as the hallmark of the genre, central to claim the genre's authenticity as well as its negative reputation since it employs guests' personal information and experiences (ibid. p.22). Thus, Grindstaff expresses that for producers; the more emotional and volatile are the guests, the more "real" and the more "ordinary" they are.

This implies what Mosco's (1996) stress on the personal information that has become a "commodity" (pp: 143-144). "Commodification" in this sense, as a key concept of our analysis, is defined as "the process of transforming use values into exchange values; of transforming products whose value is determined by their ability to meet individual; and social needs into products whose value is set by what they can bring in the marketplace"

(ibid.). It is most of time regarded as the primary means by which social relations become economic relations. For this reason, in Mosco's point of view one of the entry points of commodification is the collection and sale of personal information. This can be read over the collection and distribution of the information of ordinary people in the daytime woman talk shows as well. Schiller (1996) also clarifies this issue putting stress on the exchange of information by writing:

The spectacularly improved means of producing, organizing, and disseminating information has transformed industrial, political, and cultural practices and processes. ....The production and sale of information have become major sites of profit making. What had been in large measure a social good has been transformed into a commodity for sale (p.46)

However, many guests do not thoroughly aware of the exchange value of their personal information giving an advantage of primarily producers of TV channels. At this point, Modelski (1986) shed valuable insight into the issue saying that the daytime woman talk shows give guests a "warped sense of reality" at first sight, so they tend to easily make "dysfunctional relationship and bizarre problems" during and after the shows (pp: 68-75). This matter may become visible when guests differ that their personal information are employed by the interests of TV producers and channels. Hence, guests can be angered or upset by their experience on a daytime women talk show or by their treatment at the hands of the show producers. The problems may occur while guests confess and reenact their personal problems publicly and are trying to reset their personal and social relations by means of host or hostess and producers in the show. As a result, it could be possible that guests experience some negative events such as harsh discussions, fights and violent behaviours during the show and such events can continue after the show transforming bigger quarrels between acquaintances, family conflicts, divorcement, and even murders and suicides.

Guests and producers together engineer the show performance but their relative contributions are hardly equal. Guests have also limited ways of registering their displeasure. In spite of this, guests are not totally powerless or completely without recourse in the show. Guests have a certain kind of authority in this context: the authority to be watched by millions of audience on a live show. Guests always hold a threat to cancel or drop out the show consciously or unconsciously. As they are core elements of the show, it would not be possible to think about a daytime woman talk show existed without their personal information and participation.

Nevertheless, it should be taken into consideration that producers have a more powerful instrumental position toward guests and their problems in the show making entertainment out of their real lives and employing their personal information. Producers have more power than guests to set the agenda of the show, to drive debates and to decide who deserve therapeutic approaches and/or material help. Therefore, guests are in a situation where they can partly contest and partly challenge with the dominant definitions of who they are and what they should do about their problems in a way of showing how -Gramsci's (1971) term- "hegemony" is working in the shows.

From this point of view, Gamson (1998) makes a contribution to our sight that "exploitation" is the starting point rather than the conclusion of the analysis. According to him, the shows have a potential to exploit fame and fortune seekers and ordinary people who have certain problems too hard to solve individually. Hence, the question should not be whether the daytime women talk show is a simple entertainment or a woman programme, and not whether it "gives voice" to women and men, or reproduces their existing social being, but how and why the two sides come together in the production process of such a specific TV product. Consequently, for what their voice and personal information are organized under which dynamics and practices of the production is more considerable. For this reason, it will be beneficial to examine the other effective elements of the programs in the production process of the shows.

### **3.2.2 Experts**

As a particular point of interest, experts, who can be a lawyer, a psychologist, a sociologist, a marital therapist, a cosmetician and a plastic surgery in the daytime woman talk shows, are one of the most important factors of the shows. Thus, producers look for experts having particular qualities to attract audience to the show. It is considered that whether the expert is an energetic, articulate, and lively person. But, maybe the most important criterion to select an expert and work with him/her is the ability to improve the show and make money shot. Hence, producers often look for an expert who will expose interesting and confrontational manner or for two experts who will disagree with one another and/or with the guests.

Controversial topics thus are more likely to be chosen to raise public attention and studio participation with the help of formal and authoritative position of the expert (Livingstone & Lunt, 1992). In the show business there is no interesting point in the case of people would agree on each topic. Therefore, producers and experts often address issues being controversial in a particular degree. In doing so, they generally consider certain agreed



standards about what is right and wrong in the society and participants are motivated to discuss individual issues accordingly.

In this regard, it should be emphasized that experts in television programs are also regarded as one of the important agencies to play a key role in education and socialization function of media. Though there are no long-term proves about this, it is widely accepted that media have a potential for education and socialization in the society as MacBride (1980) emphasizes. As also pointed out by McQuail (1987) media can function as an important socialization tool “as the teaching of established norms and values by way of symbolic reward and punishment for different kinds of behaviour” (p.280). To put into differently, it is the learning process whereby people in the society can learn how to behave in particular circumstances and learn the particular kind of expectations concerning the roles or positions in the society. According to McQuail, media in this sense are regularly submits “pictures of life and models of behaviour in advance of actual experience” (ibid.).

In this account, the basic claim of the daytime woman talk shows is in parallel with the above mentioned functions of media via television. Experts for this reason are stuck out in the shows as informative parties knowing and presenting different things in different ways from the ordinary knowledge and experience of the participants. It is put forward that the shows are a part of the education and socialization function of television and experts – or hosts or hostess in expert positions - are in the show for behalf of ordinary people to educate, inform and help them. It is relied on the credit attributed to expertise in the show. Thus, they have a special mission to show right ways and values in the society to participants and audience.

In this respect, the shows are also organized in the production process to generate the relation between ordinary people and experts through particular practices which determine whose expression is remarkable, whose argument is good to reward, what evidence is needed to ground claims, and what resolutions are valued and so forth. Hence, professional experts and/or hosts –as the hostess generally takes the status of the expert if there is no expert in the show-- are the dominant agencies for defining what is good, beneficial, and requisite for the participants.

Consequently, they do not simply offer participants what they really need. They, in practice, tend to redefine and pose those needs and requests as a part of the entertainment business in commercial television. For this reason, the professional experts in the daytime woman talk

shows employ the familiar elements of popular cultures, prevalent social inclinations and embedded dominant definitions and values in the society.

In the organization of the content of the daytime woman talk shows the experts are placed in a position where they will hold the side of 'common sense' and act together with the hostess. The hostesses, on the other hand, generally prioritize their status and reserve the last word in the course of the discussions whether they are ordinary or scientific account. In this sense, a successful daytime woman talk shows as to producers and executives of the TV channels depend upon "an amicable partnership between the hostess and the experts" (Tunstall, 1993, p.151). It is with this regard that the experts, hostess and producers have an important degree of authority in addressing and processing of the guests' stories, personal information, emotions and experiences (ibid). This situation reinforces their status that they produce indeed not a simple TV programme dealing with ordinary people and their problematic issues, but a specific product belonged to the entertainment industry of television.

As a concluding remark, it should be stated that even though voice and personal information of participants are highly tried to organize and shape by the experts and hostess under industrial conditions, the daytime woman talk shows are still open for improvisation and signification. Thus, they stay at an intersection point where there are some strategical priorities of control on producers' side, and signification process and hopes on the audience side. Therefore, it would be beneficial to deal with the element of audience from this point of view.

### **3.2.3 Audience**

Both studio audience and home audience of the daytime woman talk shows are mostly composed of women. In the studio audience side, they are the ordinary people –mostly women- who share the similar incentives and tendencies of guests to obtain a chance to be famous or to solve her/his problems by means of the interest of the hostess and producers. Additionally, the close witnessing, the involvement, and the authority of judging others' private lives and problems in front of millions are attractive for being studio audience and give certain pleasure in close watching distress, happiness, and failure as well as success of others on the live show (Day, 1996).

The studio audience are collected by professional audience agencies for television channels and brought to studios of the shows. They are placed directly in the show as joint author of the text having a duty to debate, involve, contribute and valorize social, moral and personal issues of guests (Grindstaff, 2002). With this duty, they are active participants in the

production of the show and they are directed to work on themselves by exploring their own reactions to particularly conflictual matters in the interaction with the guests of the show. Broadly speaking, the ordinary people are invited to identify the hostess and guests in an interactive audience position for these shows. In fact, many formats of the daytime woman talk shows are designed to evoke the studio audience to give credit to hostesses' and experts' roles, authorizations, and powers in production and broadcasting process of the shows. In doing so, many formats of the daytime woman talk shows dispose the studio audience as a figure to monitor, to evaluate, to judge, to reward or to punish the guests and call-in participants, as well as participating the programme content in an interactive role (Livingstone, Lunt and Wober, 1994).

However, to organize studio audience and motivate them as an active figure of the shows are not an easy work. Thus, producers regularly conduct some surveys on their studio audience as they need particular demographic, social and psychological data about them. To evoke particular perception, attitude and behaviors of audience groups they put such data into practice in production process of the shows (Incelioglu, 2004). Accordingly, the established social bonds, group alliances, marital problems, income and education levels of studio audience are quietly important for their adjusting the contents and formats of the shows. For this reason, the use of reenactment techniques, camera monologues, shocking events, reunion episodes and dramatizations are also arranged according to reveal the studio audience' response and to orchestrate them (Adakli, 1999).

In the home audience side, they are mostly women and housewives being 18-49 year-old, who are also the target audience of the daytime woman talk shows. Accordingly, women spare a significant portion of their leisure time by watching TV and housewives constitute the largest percentage of habitual audience of television during the day. One of the most watched TV programs by them is the daytime woman talk shows broadcasted along the day.

As far as their reasons to watch the shows are concerned, Balkin (2004) specifies that the shows are quite attractive and popular for the home audience in several aspects. Firstly, audience easily identify with the ordinary people who are chosen as participants and then become an instant celebrity. The shows present some extraordinary and interesting problems of ordinary people and their manner and thoughts about the matters they tackle arouse the home audience curiosity. They want information about the problem or issue being discussed; because the problems of others make them feel better about their own lives like "My marriage is not perfect, but at least it is not as bad as that". According to Nancy Day (1996), maybe the shows provide an escape from the boring lives many audience lead or they may

serve as a diversion from the urgent issues of the day. Thus, such shows may help to provide a sense of well-being among the audience.

Secondly, audiences derive some gratification from the voyeuristic thrill in that the part of the pleasure of the shows is derived from the way the shows allow the audience to apply their own expertise about so called ordinary people as guests (Grindstaff, 2002 p.89). Thirdly, they enjoy the controversial nature of the show for the changing bodies to win or lose the arguments. Accordingly, people are drawn to watch guests say and do things that they themselves would never say or do on a national television publicly.

At this point, it should be expressed that women audience with such age/gender features is the most important category of audience for producers and advertisers of the daytime woman talk shows. They are regarded as the best consumer category purchasing house-hold goods, which is still perceived to be primarily a woman's responsibility in family.

In this sense, patterns of interests gain an importance for advertisers as they are related to patterns of family and house-hold consumption of this group. Hence, women at home become increasingly visible as consumers as they emerge socially and economically from their family origins. Housewives also form a considerable consumer group whose problems arise and evolve from house and family. Television is widely considered as an easy available medium, programs in there are free of charge and this medium is an important kind of information, socialization, and entertainment agency by housewives. In this context, for many women sitting across the TV set the daytime woman talk shows are regarded as a primary source of information like advice on personal relationship and family problems (Abt, 1994).

However, the primary expectation of producers for home audience by the show is their activity of watching advertisements during the show. In doing so, they indeed perform an activity by watching advertisements in exchange for the "payment" in the production of the shows' contents. In this way, producers as vital element of the shows come into our analytical sight.

### **3.2.4 Producers**

As a useful analytical approach in the examination of the daytime woman talk shows Golding and Murdock (2000) suggest that the production and organization of cultural products can be a starting point concerning the text because the economic dynamics play a key role defining the features of communicative activity, but not as a complete explanation

of the nature of that activity (Golding & Murdock, 2000). Their stress on the production is also couched in Garnham's (1990) point of view as well. According to him, production is an important sphere of media in which various forces meet. In this sphere the production process and the mode of production are vital mechanisms which occur between production and exchange in the circuit of capital (ibid. p. 61). As a remarkable point, this also implies why the political economy approach regards any product of commercial television production as a "commodity" of television industry, as a good which is produced to be exchanged in the marketplace. From this respect, main subjects who are responsible for the production processes and the mode of production are the producers, namely the production teams of this specific television product.

According to Tunstall (1993) a production team of the daytime woman talk shows consists of fifteen and thirty people for a year of broadcasting. They are allocated to particular fields of the production work. To illustrate, they are the "commissioning editor" who is employed by a broadcaster and is responsible for commissioning programs, either for an entire channel or, more likely, a particular range of programs and the "executive producer" who is responsible for ensuring that the programme is delivered on budget and on time and that the department or production company's good name is preserved. Besides, there is a "producer" who is in overall charge of the programme and content, but is also responsible whether the show is delivered in a way satisfying the commissioning editor and there is a "director" who has a responsibility for the sound and look of the show directing the camera team on location and the editor and the assistants in "post-production" (ESRC, 2004).

What should also be mentioned in here as other members of the production team are the hostess, the associate producer, scriptwriters, researchers, producer assistants, consultants and sometimes experts being behind or in front of the camera. All they have to work in both "pre-production" process -involving the phases of research, structuring, draft script, production planning, shooting, editing and storyboarding- and post-production -including the phases logging, restructuring, re-scripting, off-line editing after the show (ibid.).

In these fields of operation mostly researches, assistants and scriptwriters work hard and have to work long hours every weekday (Tunstall, 1993, p.144). The researchers' duties contain establishing of the contact with members of the public as guests, studio audience and call-ins as well as to conduct and organize them in accordance to the regularly updated guest, audience and participant lists.

Having recyclable formats, the daytime woman talk shows typically broadcast every day for at least two hours, which means that producers have to handle roughly four hundred shows (at least four hundred hours of television) each season. In this sense, producers work under particular conditions and set of principles which they did not determine and may not change easily. They are aware of the strategic powers exercised over them by the executives, managers and the workers of sales and advertisement departments of television. From this respect, they “have pragmatic concerns about the role of the producers” because there are many financial and other relevant variables involved in some concerns related with the annual budget, planning, and estimates of a commercial television channel (Lindheim & Blum, 1991, p.194). From the management perspective, a producer of show business is expected to be responsible of “whether the show is delivered on time, on budget, and draws a significant number of the audiences as desired” (ibid).

Grindstaff (2002) in this regard also stresses that the producers of the shows have to work under certain business and budget conditions. She claims that almost all TV channels using the cost-effective daytime woman talk shows in their schedules seek to maximize profits, and most of the producers believe that dramatic, personal narratives will highly draw the attention of audiences. For this reason, this could be thought as the main reason of why high rated shows are built around moments of dramatic revelation like the daytime woman talk shows do.

As a result, producers under such conditions many times can receive punishment or reward according to the degree of their success acquired with the show. This situation indicates a prevailing system under which decisions are taken by commissioning editors and/or executive producers rather than by producers (Tunstall, 1993). Thus, the producers frequently confronts with the decisions as taken almost entirely on the basis of ratings and popularity for their shows. Consequently, the producers of the daytime woman talk shows often find themselves implementing rating-oriented practices and wills of the sponsors in the production process.

This is especially fundamental while producers of the shows conduct, control, orchestrate and reformulate the show content accordingly. From this respect, Hoschschild (1983) makes another important contribution to our understanding of the producers of the show. He takes our attention that especially in the daytime woman talk shows, producers work in a job requiring an “emotional labour” in which they have to add things from their talents and emotional worlds and that this is not demanded as intensely as in any other fields of the television programming as well (ibid. p. 126).

Therefore, many producers feel an institutional demand to attract as wide range of audience as possible. In this sense, popular entertainment with the daytime woman talk shows is one of the few places where ordinary people, rather than TV celebrities, are on the screen. Therefore, producers regard them as their role to ensure that the wideness of show audience as expected to acquire high ratings and attract more advertisers. With this objection, there are particular responsibilities that producers bear. One of them is to establish a studio set that have to be live, colored and conditional to involve sponsors' materials, promotions and gifts in the shows.

Another responsibility of producers is to put the show into proper time band that will be effective on the target audience. This is actually a kind of decision made by both producers and executives. They are both responsible for the right time of scheduling so that the show fills their specific needs. Scheduling, in this sense, is the means by which a day's broadcasting is arranged so that particular programs coincide with particular supposed time of people in their everyday life. Scheduling also provides a regular, week by week slot in which the repetition of particular shows can take place. In addition, the show formats play an important role in acting with the other programs, so a successful show affects the following programme in the schedule. Since they are also devised to deliver the audience to the next programs, to maintain the attention of audience is a necessity. For this reason, once a show obtains success on the audience side, similar features of the formats are tailored using the same formula in order that the first show in the schedule delivers them to the second, and the second delivers them to the third and so on.

Another responsibility that the producers bear is the topic selections. The topics which can be changed day to day or minute by minute are highly floating according to the degree of attractiveness of the show or the matters that already engage the people. One of them is the topic of family which almost all kind of daytime woman talk shows formats involve providing a useful and productive field to process easily.

In such shows it is generally observable that the producers and the hostess cover the concept of the family as a place where domestic problems are experienced everyday. John Ellis' remark in his work of *Visible Fictions* (1982) is illuminating at this point. He clarifies that because of television's tendency to orient the programs towards its presumed audience, it would like to subsume the familiar and pervasive concepts of society into the texture of the shows. Thus, the shows producers are particularly given a central role for employing cultural preoccupations in relation with the nuclear family such as "heterosexual romance", "the

stability of marriage”, “the notions of masculine careers and feminine domesticity”, “the conception of innocence of childhood” (ibid. p.115).

In this account, the matter of the selection of guest is another remarkable responsibility of the producers in the production process. Commonly, guests in the daytime woman talk shows are expected to add attractiveness, humor and entertainment via talking since the producers are highly aware that the only ability they do is talking about their personal issues. According to them, amusing talk of ordinary people on television for one hour is not an easy task because they do not know the show business as professional actors do (Tunstall 1993).

For this reason, the demand for dealing with interesting and attractive guests in the shows sometimes requires to employ fake guests. This is especially a more visible matter which industry insiders are modifying the stories of the guests as well. According to Grindstaff (2002), the reason for this is that producers sometimes have not an attractive guests and story that will make ‘money shot’ at that time, so, they apply to use fake guest and embellished stories, with people who appear eager to get on TV, but whose lives seemed not to fit handled topic sensationally (p.251).

Grindstaff also designates that the producers who encourage guests to exaggerate their emotions or prioritize the more sensational aspects of their stories not for deception but of producing good television requiring certain level of “manipulation (ibid. p.247). At this point, to understand the stress on the producers leading to manipulative practices on guests the statement of a producer of *Sally Jessy Raphael Show*, the show being one of the most watched daytime woman talk shows in U.S. and most sold show format to other countries, is explanatory:

You were constantly living in fear of “We have got to have these guests first, if it is breaking news we have got to get them, and if we don’t get them we have got to explain to our boss why we could not talk them into it”. Also, with ordinary people, they have to deliver goods in act. I mean right off the top of the show, if they are not crying or screaming or emoting in some incredible way, you felt tremendously inadequate, like, ‘Uhh, I am a failure, my show is a failure’ (cited in Grindstaff, 2002, p.282).

At this point, it should also be stated that one of the most executive members of the production team for such practices is the hostess. Hence, it will be quite beneficial to examine the function and practices of the hostess.



### 3.2.5 Hostesses

Maybe the most distinguishing and visible element of the daytime woman talk shows is the “hostesses” that wanders through the guests and studio audience getting opinions from people seated to watch the show. They are generally famous TV personalities being female and take the role of the presenter of the shows. However, the function of them in the shows is more than this.

The hostess can have a high degree of control over the show, from sharp matter to comedic tone. She is also the brand of the show and must be a mediator of different problems and stories of guests in the show. In this regard, she is actually a supposed social commentator and entertainer. The hostess in this regard has to be good to look at and listen to participants<sup>5</sup> eagerly. Additionally, the hostess should attract, repel and negotiate guests in the shows, in many cases; she should be a personality who will be regarded as “everything” for a successful daytime women talk show (Timberg, 2002). Thus, the producers generally want to work with the hostess who is extraordinary, energetic, opinionated, and capable of speaking in loud sound as there is no other way of demonstrating the intimacy and the emotional self-disclosure which form the attractiveness of the genre (Verwey, 1990, p. 239).

For this reason, based on the voices of ordinary experience the show is constructed around the hostess and her performance with participants. She is responsible to orchestrate them around particular topics of the show and then, to improve the interactivity and the sense of reality for home audience. The hostesses in this sense, can be vary in their approaches and seriousness, depending on different topics, expectations, interests and the demographics specialties of the target audience of the show. Therefore, rather than mediating between producers and audiences, the hostess “mediate between audience members themselves” (ibid).

Additionally, it should be mentioned that the genre of the daytime woman talk shows also place host or hostess in the centre on the show. As to Verwey, the hostess’ role, in this sense, is particularly to reveal the conflicts between conversations in the shows. In this way, the hostess has to maximize the attention of the target audience and then to raise a potential for instant solutions.

The genre locates the hostesses in a framework established to show warm and sympathetic behaviors and relations for participants of the show. Thus, they frequently take the roles of

---

<sup>5</sup> In employing the word of “participants” for the daytime woman talk shows in the study, it refers the ordinary people in the shows as guests, studio audience and call-in people.

caring parents, understanding friend, knowing therapist (Abt, 1994). Although they may not have professional credentials to give advice, they do it freely. As a consequence, it could be possible to watch a hostess and members of the studio audience of a daytime woman talk show as they tell guests to “leave or reunion spouses”, “kick out misbehaving lovers” and “quit jobs” without bearing “responsibility for the results of their advice” (Day, 1996, p.48). Moreover, the hostess in such shows can go further by “asking guests questions most people would never ask even to their closest friends” (ibid.). In the meantime, studio audience encourages the guests to open up and reveal all their private issues. In this way, sometimes guests come in a position that no chance to change their minds or to prevent friends, relatives, employers, and complete strangers from gaining access to his/her private fields.

On account of such practices of hostess, some critics regard them as TV personalities who perform a valuable service for participants. Accordingly, appearing on a daytime women talk show can be a life-changing experience for ordinary people. The hostess can give many opportunities to people, who have not any chance to be on television and to tell their problems publicly. For example, people can burden of carrying painful secrets, and the hostess of such shows can help them to solve their problems allowing them to confess and tell their story in the live shows publicly. Proponents also consider that frank discussions about difficult topics and the hostesses’ approaches to them can educate them about important problems and encourage tolerance for different lifestyles. The matters such as child abuse, alcoholism, homosexuality, and domestic violence can be openly discussed with their help and can be healed by their close attention. The practice of therapy in the shows is the most beneficial application for these.

However, above mentioned considerations about positive effects on the participants via hostess are criticized by opponents of the shows. According to them, the hostess in the role of a therapist, lawyer, or confidant is highly attractive for the participants. They give to her credit and value as they think that she has a considerable power to solve all problems, to heal most severe pains and to help people about even their financial matters. This credit and hope for the hostess of the show make her more charming, charismatic and a moral heroine who are supposed to be impartial, neutral, and benevolent. However, this supposition can blur the perception of participants and responses to their real life problems. Challenging with the illusion of a prestigious hostess and developing a critical awareness about the constructed nature of the show could be difficult for participants. Many critics for this reason see the hostess to have been lost somewhere along the conventional storyline. They concern that the hostesses of the daytime woman talk shows contribute to create a blurred relation between “normal” and “abnormal” and between “real” and “fictional” (Abt, 1997). With this in view,

Vicki Abt specifies that making entertainment on the personal problems and transgressions of real and ordinary people with the help of the hostess in the daytime woman talk shows blur the line separating the fact from the fiction, normalize deviant behavior, and encourage the violent behaviours among participants.

On the concern of the therapeutic practices of the hostesses, she adds that psychological terminology and scientific mental health care are thrown away in a way leading often certain problems –like harsh discussion, violent behaviour, fight, family quarrel during the show and divorce, murder and suicide after the show- on the participants who have relied on and participated in the daytime woman talk shows. Hence, Abt draw our attention to an important point emphasizing that the therapy “in 5 minutes” in the show indeed ignores the real need of participants and can only deal with surface issues of participants, which are easy to work on.

Abt, in this sense, emphasizes that the attention paid to therapy as entertainment in the daytime woman talk shows is perceived “the appeal of these shows” and a social good (Abt & Seesholtz, 1994, p. 177). Nevertheless, it does not fulfill a social function but an “ideology” of this new television programs (ibid). As a feature of the reality shows the changes and problems of ordinary people’s lives in the daytime woman talk shows are also dealt with reducing them and not aiming at making an interpretation about the social conditions which those problems have formed (Inal, 1999, p.282). Avoiding making a unified explanation to understand and to help solution, the host or hostess in such shows generally tends to give delayed advice or individual solutions in the way of concealing the conditions of such problems emanated in the society.

Thus, while this kind of ideology provides a control of the ordinary people in the show, it also indirectly “changes the notion of shame, privacy, appropriateness and guiltiness” in the shows (Abt & Seesholtz, op.cit). As a result, the participants of such shows “remain caricatures, plucked out of the context of their lives” and unimportant except for their ability to provide attractiveness and entertainment for the shows. In this context, the analysis of advertisement element of the daytime woman talk shows might put more light on the issue.

### **3.2.6 Advertisements**

The elements of the daytime woman talk shows as guests, experts, audience, producers and hostess tell only half of the story, however. To understand the programme structures of the shows thoroughly, it should be looked at another dimension of the shows. Though not everything, advertisements reveal a lot about the profit side which is a highly effective

incentive regarding the production and content formation of the daytime woman talk shows. For this reason, it is crucial to examine the process of how advertisement element of such shows operates in detail.

According to Leo Bogart (1995), particularly TV corporations in media are driven by the logic of the market and survived with the advertisers. Affecting the classical firm theory of political economy, he specifies that particularly commercial television institutions want always to expand their advertising shares in the marketplace which has already been allocated to particular type of media forms such as radio, press and outdoor advertising. TV companies therefore seek to make and transmit particular TV programs that advertisers will want to reach. Advertisers, on the other hand, primarily prefer the medium of television in the marketplace as they have an important potential to access large and categorized audiences rather than other means of mass communication.

Because not every audience is valued equally advertisers seek to be efficient in their choices of TV programs whose audience's characteristics resemble those of the customers they want to reach. From this respect, there are various ways in which advertisers have classified TV audiences in an attempt to discover whether TV delivers the audience that they want to affect. One of them "is to describe audiences of different TV programs and time bands in terms of attitudinal and psychological characteristics in order to discover whether particular programs in particular times delivered particular types of consumer" since 1950s (Curran, 1986, p.323). This common practice has taken a name: "target audience" referring selectivity via particular programme addressing particular and segmented kind of audience.

Sut Jhally (1987) in this direction offers an elaborating view by giving importance to this practice. He construes that reorganizing the watching audience in regards of their features of demographics actually serve advertisers who have a plan and seek to derive maximum surplus value with the particular unit time. One of the major advantages of television as to advertisers is its offering categorized audience via the particular TV genres broadcasted. This is the point that explains how TV companies make their money, i.e selling a potential to reach particular kind of audience rather than programs (Curran, 1986, pp. 309-35). It is the air time that is the determiner center of all process of valorization. At this point, Jhally (1987) expresses that broadcasters sell air time and organize their production which have already planned to attract specific audiences to particular programs according to the expectations of advertisers. In short, it could be possible say that commercial television is not simply in a business to entertain; rather, it is in a business which is actually to sell audiences to advertisers (Smythe, 1981).

Therefore, advertisers pay for the attention of audiences who have both an inclination and “money (or credit)” to buy their goods or services or who “may develop a long-term brand loyalty” (Magder, 2004, p.142). In this way, advertisers buy time, i.e. determined “audiences’ watching time” and so “media sell potential audience-power although the only thing they can guarantee is the watching activity of audience” (Jhally, 1987, pp. 72-3).

Thus, advertisers buy particular advertisement time according to their target audience in the breaks of the TV programs. They place their advertisement spots, i.e. their “direct sales advertisements”. This is part of a marketing plan of sales and advertisement department of television and also regular and conventional way of funding television.

Jhally, in this sense, lays a significant stress on the function of advertisements. According to him, advertisements pursue an objective using a means of media and creating a canalized effect that might return in the way of capital interest. He specifies that they have an aim of influencing audience making them to think and to behave in particular ways and to create new consumption patterns (ibid. pp. 72-3). Therefore, television is an important means for diffusing the messages of advertisements that involve consumer information and directions.

In this connection, “advertisements cast life in happy glow” (Bogart, 1995, p. 82). They are not part of the world of violence, anger, depression, and offbeat sex that fill the content of the daytime woman talk shows. They represent a world of pure romance and warm fellow-feeling, of strongly knit, happy family environment. The hidden messages of television advertisements are highly subordinate to the primary message of persuading audiences to buy a particular commercial brand, but this purpose does not lessen their impact, they are a continuing affirmation of mainstream values. They contribute to enhance some ideas like “physical beauty, health and well-being”, which are frequently dealt with in the daytime woman talk shows as well (ibid.).

Thus, such advertisements are well fit into the shows giving an importance to appearances, looking healthy, wealthiness and consultants with the slogans like “How to win your husband back?”, “We declare the 13 ways of finding a more satisfying lover”, “10 ways of being more attractive”, “We recreate your body to be more beauty ” and so forth. In this context, there is no better place than the daytime woman talk shows in commercial television that offer many advantages to advertisers.

This, in fact, implies the fundamental transformation of what Mosco’s specified as the commodification of media content (Mosco, 1996, pp. 143-144). This operation includes the transformation of TV contents into marketable products. Items generated as a result of

complex production processes -like the production of a daytime women talk show- are packaged up and distributed to particularly real consumers of television outputs, that is, advertisers.

However, this is not enough for advertisers. They also demand to know the effectiveness of their advertisement activities with the particular television contents to control where their advertising budget has been spent and what kind of effect has been derived. Thus, they purchase services known as “rating” by commercial research firms and act accordingly. This means that they can continue or stop their advertisements for a specific TV programs. For this reason, to gain the minute-by-minute audience reports, include the data about the watching activity of the audience, are also vital for commercial TV channels since the attention of the audience fluctuates one day to another and even during the course of a programme (Barton, 1964, p. 236). As far as the daytime woman talk shows are concerned, the rating reports are essentially obtained for generally five or ten minutes as they are broadcasted live. The results of the reports give rise to particular demands in the side of advertisers.

One of them is advertisers’ strong will to shift the place of their advertisements in the predetermined advertisement breaks in the show. They may demand to be placed their advertisements in other breaks where the attention of the target audience is higher. Hence, the producers of the daytime woman talk shows well know that the programme will be interrupted every twenty or thirty minutes for the regularly updated advertisement breaks. They have to act according to advertisers’ commercial demands and to organize their content according to the advertisement breaks that many audiences annoy. In relation with such annoyance, Raymond Williams (1975) underlines that programs in television should not be conceived as unitary programs which are interrupted by advertisements or such like materials. Because it is more important to see that “programs exist” via “attract advertisers too, and make profit by them just one way of their interrupting the programs” (ibid. p.92).

However, there are some limitations on the concern of advertisers’ accessing and affecting the audience through their spots of direct sales advertisement in the breaks of the programs. Sut Jhally and Bill Livant (1986) express this limitations as a point which advertisers are no longer efficient accessing the audiences –a limit in relation with the number of audiences are willing to watch during the broadcasting of the show. The demand of advertisers, who would exploit the audience activity of watching, is to find a way around this limit. As Jhally and Livant put, advertisers need specific assurances that will allow them to ensure about the work of watching is not being wasted or that the messages is sent to audience who are most

likely to participate in the consumption of the goods advertised (ibid). Additionally, they also demand from commercial TV companies to make the target audience keep stable and reliable in their watching activity.

To overcome such limitations and to meet such demands broadcasters apply two valid paths: developing some techniques to make audience “watch harder” and merging content with compact sponsorship for more effective publicity. With this in objective, the former involves developing the scheduling technique designed to maintain audience stable and predictable. This generally includes transmitting the daytime woman talk shows early in the evening, followed by a sequence of programs that expand and consolidate the mass audience throughout the evening –particularly for evening news bulletin called prime time (ibid).

The latter involves operating the method of “sponsorship” that advertisers are able to promote their goods and services more effectively. Sponsorship, in this sense, is a special kind of program introduction which is formulated to attract the detracted attention of the audiences’ and direct it. It is not convenient and useful method for every TV programme genre, but the daytime woman talk shows. It requires a flexible texture for a TV programme and perhaps the most appropriate programs in which the sponsorship activities can be easily operated in the daytime schedule of television is the daytime woman talk shows.

There are three types of sponsorship which are mostly employed in the daytime woman talk shows. According to Arthur Bellaire (1959), one of them is ‘full programme sponsorship’ that only one advertiser company holds the total publicity rights of the show broadcasted in every weekday. This is the most effective type of sponsorship for advertisers in the daytime woman talk shows which results an access to larger coverage of the desired audience. For this reason, the price for such audience accession is the highest among other types of sponsorship. ‘Participation sponsorship’ is the second used way. It is a method in which as many as six or more unrelated advertiser companies share the show time period. Their budgets are relatively lower, thus, their rights are limited as to their participation to the content.

The third type of sponsorship is “barter deals” (ibid, p.230). It is exerted when an advertiser company has no an advertisement budget for this publicity activity but has some goods or services -like technical equipments, holiday checks and so on- that TV channel can demand. Accordingly, the company submits them in exchange of obtaining particular time or place where the attention of audience continues. There can be many barter sponsors -from also the

field of transportation, food, and clothing and so on- in a daytime woman talk show to cover the production costs of the show.

As a result of the above mentioned sponsorship types, all sponsors want to take part in the show by increasing the visibility of their products or services in television. With this will and the right of interfering to the content, when a sponsor owns a TV programme, actually the context is totally under its control (Bogart, 1995). For this reason, as broadcast historian Erik Barnouw says, “in the sponsor-controlled hours, the sponsor is the king, he decides on programming and is assumed to hold a franchise on his time period” (cited in Bogart, op.cit. p.82).

They can demand to raise awareness and to promote the image about the brands of such products or services in the show. The daytime woman talk shows in this sense demonstrate a high potential to meet such demands to the advantage of sponsors. One of the most visible practices to meet them is product placement i.e. “hidden advertisement”. This accounts for nearly all material reward, gift, promotion or aid to participants in the shows. It should be particularly mentioned in here that while this practice is beneficial on the sponsors’ side, it also would create some advantages on the broadcasters’ side to attract more audience.

For this reason, the broadcasters may not be able to take control over their content and the production thoroughly. In essence, who administer the show is far complex issue. In this sense, it could be possible to reach a point that the content formation of the daytime woman talk shows stand in an interesting point where advertisers are eager to reach the audience of the shows and highly involve the content via advertisements; full, participation or barter sponsorship; and product placements and producers work under the ownership conditions of advertisers holding the rights of broadcasting of the shows. Thus, the content and texture of the daytime woman talk shows actually are not determined by producers who seemed to be highly interested in ordinary people, women concerns or public interest but by advertisers who are only interested in their advertisements activities via the shows.

With this in mind, it should be crucially emphasized that this kind of advertisers’ involvement and special permission given to them by broadcasters are much more thing than maximizing profit for the both sides -TV channels and advertisers. This situation via the daytime woman talk shows has led to leads to a new circulation and reorganization of the capital via television industry. It has also created new production practices and format reorganization to the benefit of the capital that has not been seen before in the television



industry. Jhally (1987) hence calls our attention to the movement of capital reorganization and changing production strategies of broadcasters in the shows.

Accordingly, they create a significant pressure on the producers of the shows. The primary concern is presented about profit maximization via ratings which give rise to financial rewards for producers. Generally, benefits of participants are not a concern. This basic motivation for ratings “minimizes elements of creativity, innovation, and programming quality” (Lindheim & Blum, 1991, p.194). Thus, other incentives which are related to the pursuit of public interests and services become alternative motivations to be implemented in rare times.

However, this does not mean that the daytime woman talk shows under these conditions simply reproduce and express capitalist implementations. Indeed, there is a reciprocal and dependent relation between the producers, the participants, the home audience and the advertisers. They highly influence each other in the production and consumption of this specific output of the television entertainment industry.

So far we have examined the general features of the daytime woman talk shows and the elements of the programs one by one. In further pages, we will take a close view on the production processes of the shows by examining the research of the thesis elaborately.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE DAYTIME WOMAN TALK SHOWS IN TURKEY

#### 4.1 General Context Of Turkish Television Industry

It should be emphasized that the daytime woman talk shows in Turkey are in close relation with the general context of the television industry in which they emerged. Thus, the overview of the television environment in Turkey related to the woman programs is quite beneficial to deeply understand the contemporary daytime woman talk shows.

Woman programs initially started at the term of TRT (Turkish Radio and Television) which was the single television channel in the country in 1972. First woman programme was *Kadin ve Evi* including practical info about preparing meal, home decoration, fashion, and beauty hints for women dealing with them only in house (Korkut, B.,<sup>6</sup> personal communication, June 3, 2005). Afterwards, some woman programs, namely *Kadinin Dunyasi* on TRT1 and *Kadin ve Aile* on TRT 2 began to be broadcasted between the years 1974 and 1980. Likewise, some programs, namely *Gunaydin*, *Gunun Icinden*, *Oglen Uzeri*, and *Ogleden Sonra* which targeted housewives were broadcasted in 1980s. According to Hatice Akdogan (2004) those programs in the way of TRT's conservative politics only addressed particular subjects like housework, women and child care and being a nuclear family in those periods.

However, it was 1980s that the structural transformation of the realm of broadcasting occurred in Turkey. The structure of TV programming was inevitably affected by the transformations at various levels, especially after Turkey entered a new period with through the 1980 military coup. With the process of deregulation and privatization policies initiated by Turgut Ozal as of the 1980s, the ideas of public service broadcasting and public monopolies began increasingly confronting market logic (Kaya, 1999).

Accordingly, the approach of TRT towards woman programs has immediately started to change and the programs initiated to reflect the affects of such structural transformations. One of them was *Hanimlar Sizin Icin* evaluated as a pioneering and commercialized format

---

<sup>6</sup> Bulbun Korkut, the producer of old woman programs of TRT, was interviewed in TRT in Ankara.

on women matters, started to be broadcasted on TRT1 in 1984 (Ozturk, 1987). The programme topics were about women and their daily lives, broadened particularly to display certain parallelism with the “magazine supplements of newspapers” such as make-up, leading fashion, trends of house decoration, recipes, hints for housework, information about gynecology and so forth (Saktanber, 1990, pp.195-215).

Meanwhile, the struggle to break the state monopoly in TV broadcasting, which started in 1990 with the appearance of a non-legal private channel, Magic Box, was rising. A multitude of private radio stations and TV channels were following suit. In this way, public monopoly was removed by the scope of broadcasting, telecommunication infrastructure was considerably developed and satellite links became part of the daily life (Ugur, 1996). As a result of this, private enterprises were entitled to set up in their business in the broadcasting arena. A wide range of different firms, which did not come from broadcasting traditions, but from mostly the banking and contracting sectors, have started to invest in broadcasting business creating a pressure on the market (Tilic, 2000). Consequently, the overall property structure and the posture of the capital in the field of television broadcasting have significantly changed. Besides, mass communication and cultural production by means of television started to be shaped according to the dominant market conditions (Kaya, 1999).

Television, in this direction, implied two significant aspects. The beginning of usage of high technology widely in mass communication gave television many opportunities of reaching to wider people. Thus, the strong link between the power of television and its capability of political and social influence started to be visible. On the other hand, with its high capacity to reach many people, television started to be the most expensive medium for advertising sector among the other means of mass communication like radio, magazine or newspaper. Thus, the field of television communication in Turkey has turned into a profitable and industrial field regarded as an important power, a way of wealthiness and a source of prestige in the society.

Television thus has become one of the most preferred sectors of the great capital and the number of the TV channels has increasingly proliferated. To illustrate, according to the results of the research named “MediaScape Türkiye '98” conducted by Media Information Unit of ILEF in Ankara University, there were totally 280 television channels established in 230 provinces, 15 regional, 35 national and international in 1998.

Private television broadcasting, in this sense, has become an important element of the cultural environment in Turkish society (Aziz, 1999). However, the events occurring in the

field of television communication in the last years indicated that a serious change has been experienced due to the pervasiveness of private televisions. Their ownership structure play an important role in this change, so it should be underlined that a big part of the field of television communication is especially in the hands of few major media groups.

In this sense, it could be possible to mention a couple of great groups making activity in various related and unrelated sectors with media. They generally tend to operate in a structure of “corporate concentration” referring “the institutional extension” in communication industry (Mosco, 1996, p. 175). Merging their power in some strategic alliances and trade association, they display activity in sectors such as press, broadcasting, content production, advertising and distribution in a horizontal integration as well as sectors such as constructing, banking, insurance, and energy in a vertical integration. This actually presents the contemporary field of Turkish communication environment and indicates that they have reached an advanced field of operation leading to a monopolistic structure in the media as well (Kejanlioglu, 2001).

With this in mind, it is necessary especially to stress the names of some big media groups: Dogan Group, Bilgin Group, Erol Aksoy Group, Cukurova Group and Ihlas Group. These few biggest media groups of Turkey hold the ownership and control of the most famous and biggest private television channels of the country namely Channel D, Show TV, ATV and TGRT. These TV channels have to continue their activities and make profit with such broadcasting activities. Advertisement revenues in this regard are vital sources for private television channels.

To increase their market share for advertisement such big television companies make certain strategic movements as partnerships and alliances. One of the main reasons leading to such movements is the common strategy for competition. Dominant firms control a significant part of the total output of the television industry and directly conduct the sales and prices of TV programs as to advertisements. Thus, there is interdependence between them and they are aware of the fact that the competition occurring in this way would be disadvantageous. For this reason, rival media firms tend to collaborate to determine common advertisement prices, to increase their advertisement shares and to minimize the potential dangers in competition maximizing their profits. However, this situation economically gives rise to formation, development and expansion of monopolistic structure in the field of television communication. Examples can better illustrate this point.

Between 1992 and 1994 the advertisement ratios of television channels were decreasing, advertisement prices were determined with special agreements, so, a great instability in advertisement revenues were being experienced (Soylemez, 1998). Based on this situation, in 1993 Show TV, ATV and Channel D started to merge their advertising power under a common firm called Mepas (Media Marketing Company). However, in 1996 with the separation of Show TV, Channel D and ATV a new marketing firm for called Bimas (United Media Marketing Company) established advertisements. In 1998 and 1999 Star TV and Show TV were integrated into Bimas which has turned into a monopoly power with the existence of four big TV channels. As a result of this, advertisement prices were boosted and many advertisers started to react (Dagli, E.,<sup>7</sup> personal communication, December 9, 2005).

Accordingly, many big advertiser companies started to draw their commercials from those channels and oriented towards outdoor and radio advertisements. With this boycott, such television channels embarked a new strategy including binary partnership with more interaction. In this way, while Ciner Group was establishing Zedpas for ATV, Mepas started to collaborate with Zedpas to market the programs and advertisement breaks of Show TV, Digiturk and Skyturk (Akgul, O.,<sup>8</sup> personal communication, December 9, 2005). Meanwhile, Bimas has turned into Birmas for Channel D, and Ihlas Group established Repas (Media Advertisement Production Service Marketing Company) and then Promas<sup>9</sup>.

At this point, it is important to note the shrinkage in advertising sector profoundly affecting the television industry in 1999. According to the reports of Turkish Association of Advertising Agencies, which analyses the investments in the advertising sector, indicate that in 1999 total pie in the advertisements was about 1,200 billion dollars. Television industry had a 32% share of this pie and this number was marking a significant decline when compared with previous years (RD, 2006). Hence, strategic partnerships for television advertisements and inclination of monopolization on the concern of media power increased during this period in the name of both keeping advertisement revenues stable and nourishing from one pool that they were able to control over the market.

---

<sup>7</sup> Ebru Dagli, the advertisement director of Zedpas, was interviewed in the head office of Zedpas in Levent in Istanbul.

<sup>8</sup> Onur Akgul, the advertisement officer in Mepas, was interviewed in the head office of Zedpas in Levent in Istanbul.

<sup>9</sup>Promas (Professional Media Marketing and Advertisement Services) was established in March, 2005 to focus on TGRT news channel and to market the advertisements for this channel so that the broadcasting structure of Ihlas Group can be strengthened due to the sale of TGRT channel to News Corporation in July, 2005 (Baysal, A., personal communication, December 12, 2005).

By the way, it is also beneficial to draw attention to another dimension of the matter briefly. Without any doubt, two remarkable changes in programming structures were occurring in the television industry. Woman programme differentiation and new format adaptations in such programs particularly since 2000.

In this regard, it could be possible to observe that many differentiated woman programs started to take place in the daytime slots of many private TV channels. Some of them usually performed by a singer host or hostess and his or her singer guests, talking about popular issues like singers' albums, models' private lives, recent discussions of famous TV personalities featuring call-ins such as *Sabah Sekerleri*, *Sabah Sabah Seda Saya*, or *Gumbur Gumbur Gulbence* in the morning slots. They are the programs which target housewives in an attractive and entertaining way. Others were mostly thematized form of programs concerning cookery, house decoration, fashion, or art such as *Damak Tadı*, *Sana Mutfagi*, *Knorr Lezzet Klubü*, *Pisir Pisirebilirsen*, *Dekor Aktif*, *Evdeki Mimar*, *Derya Gibi* and *Moda ve Sana* in the afternoon slots. They are the programs which deal with usually maternal and child health, arts and crafts, housekeeping chores, recipes and fashion in a commercialized way.

On the other hand, the daytime woman talk shows emerged with particular features like gossip, confession, begging, voyeurism, obscenity and entertainment. As can be observable, they have actually been adopted from original American formats and became especially popular in 2005. The genre's international popularity, having flexible formats and easy applicability were keys for broadcasters of Turkish television industry. Moreover, their cost effective structures, high ratings and profitability have played an important role to prefer them. Hence, many private channels have started to adapt one and the number of daytime woman talk shows has increased rapidly.

As a result, Turkish society has fascinated by the contents and proliferation of the daytime woman talk shows in TV channels. In this way, the ratings of such shows have started to increase and this has also encouraged broadcasters to maintain and to diversify such shows. For this reason, in approaching the daytime woman talk shows in Turkey the close relations between the ownership patterns in the television industry and economic dependency over the production should be taken into account.

In this context, to have a close evaluation on the daytime woman talk shows and to answer fundamental question of the thesis we will deal with the programs focusing their production processes with a research study in the further pages.

## **4.2 The Research On The Turkish Daytime Woman Talk Shows**

### **4.2.1 Methodology Of The Research**

Under the light of all these elaborations and considerations in previous chapters, the following section tries to build a descriptive framework for the study of the daytime woman talk shows utilizing the elements of the programs mentioned in the second chapter for the production analysis of these shows. The purpose of this section is to approach the production processes of the shows with the aim of clarifying the main question of the thesis.

With this purpose, three daytime woman talk shows in Turkish television channels were selected and a research was conducted on them. In the selection of the programs, three properties were taken into account: to be the three pioneering programs of this genre in Turkey; to be the most watched programs among others; and to draw more social reactions and discussions. In this regard, the programs, *Kadinin Sesi*, *Biz Bize* and *Yalniz Degilsin* were under examination in the research.

The research was realized in two main periods. First one was the April and May 2005 period where in-depth interviews and participatory observations were conducted enclosing each of the three programs in detail. The second was June 2005 and February 2006 period which was used to follow the development period as a result of the discontinuations of the two shows at the end of May, 2005 and to access people and sources that were regarded as necessary but not obtained at first period. In the following period two shows continued to be broadcasted, so, the examination was carried on in the same time. Moreover, some important written sources of the production of these programs were reached and some in-depth interviews were conducted with the producers of the shows, with the managers of TV channels and with the workers in sales and advertisement departments.

As to the research one matter that has to be mentioned in here is that equal amount of data and interviews could not be obtained in the first research period where each of the three programs' production processes were scrutinized. However, this was tried to be compensated by the research data obtained in the second period which contributed to deepen the study.

The research in these periods was conducted by three key methods. The first method was the participatory observation and examination conducted in the Channel D, Show TV and ATV studios where the selected programs were prepared and broadcasted during the first period. In this part certain phases were observed such as pre-production including preparations,

production involving live broadcasting and post-production containing the arrangements right after the broadcasted show for the next show.

The phases were including how topics and guests were chosen; how the relation between them was constructed; what were the reasons of ordinary people for participation to the shows as guests or studio audience; why they actually went there and behave with such unusual manners on national televisions; what they thought after their participation in live shows; what happened to them right after the shows; how organizational control of work and practices were exerted by producers; why and how the production team intervened the live broadcast and motivated the participants; how advertisers were involved into the shows; and how the promotional activities put into practice during the shows.

The participatory observation in this account allowed direct information about people in the course of their routine work practices and to throw a light on how the shows were constructed, as well as how format differences leading to product differentiation between the channels were occurred and how participants were transformed into the mass entertainment industry in the production of this specific media product.

The second method of the research was the in-depth interviews with more than fifty interviewees. The aim of the interviews was to find out the structured practices and complex relations in the production. In the framework of the research, the core elements of the shows were studied within three main categories as producers, participants and advertisers of the shows. Thus, interviews were carried out with the members of the production teams, hostess, technical staff, channel executives and managers in producers' side; the guests and the studio audience in the participants' side. Addition to this, to make connection between the workers having a charge of selling the shows to advertisers and the production of the text the workers were interviewed in advertisers' side as well.

In doing this, to investigate the complex production practices and production relations of the three daytime woman talk shows the questions used in-depth interviews were divided into two major groups. First group involves the daily practices of the interviewees including the content determination, allocation of the work for production process, operation for their production activities, processing of inputs, the time they had to arrange, the control for ratings and the relations with peers, participants and the workers in sales and advertisement departments of TV channels.

The second group of questions focus on the personal values and beliefs about the inputs they have to organize, personal views on the content formations, personal thoughts about



their participation to the shows, their role in the production processes, the incentives and pressures on them, their effects on participants' lives and social functions of their television channel where they work.

In this account, in-depth interviews let us to link the elements of the programs –producers, participants and advertisers- in the production process over the production practices. Besides, they help us to see how the shows were constructed in a factual way in which particular economic and industrial relations occurred.

In addition, deciphering the captured videos, tapes and written recordings during the observations and interviews were employed one by one in a way of making a profound evaluation on the production processes of the shows. Moreover, proposal sheets of the shows in marketing, scripts, production notes and rating reports of the TV channels were also employed.

Besides, in order to evaluate the shows in a more detailed context the social reactions, discussions, critics of both supporters and opponents of the shows were also reviewed via press, TV news, discussion programs, and RTUK's data.

The last method of the research was the literature survey utilizing the published and unpublished thesis, articles, books, annotations, and reports at the official archives in the examination process. In this way, the collected information let us to consider the primary context of content processing of the daytime woman talk shows in Turkish private TV channels. Besides, they help us to make a connection between the constructed daytime woman talk shows as a product and the larger context of the television as a social and industrial institution. In sum, the study is circumscribed as a qualitative analysis in approaching to production processes of the daytime woman talk shows which are popular outputs of the present television industry.

For this reason, this study does not cover all aspects of the production organization of television and it is not an economical analysis of television production. The study does not present an examination of use of sources in television industry, of funding, of budget, and of labor and value relations. Rather, it deals with scrutiny the definitional matters of production, industrial conditions, and contextual features that make the relationship between television output and society so important.

Hence, it should be evaluated as a study describing how and why producers and ordinary people participate in such complicated production processes for the daytime woman talk

shows and how and why such specific television content is formed, processed and put into circulation.

### **4.3 The Programs**

#### **4.3.1 Kadinin Sesi**

After certain preparation process and research by Yasemin Bozkurt, who was the hostess and producer of the show *Yasemin'in Penceresi* in 2000, the first daytime women talk show in Turkey called Kadinin Sesi started to be broadcasted in January 2002 under the management of TGRT group with Enver Oren on TGRT channel. Then, owing to the show's high ratings it was transferred to Channel D with Bozkurt's production company and was broadcasted until May 2005 on Channel D. Kadinin Sesi at that time was discontinued by the manager of Channel D because of various death events and negative criticisms on that occurred during the broadcasting of the programme. However, it was not an end. After 7 months, the show again started to be broadcasted on another television channel viz. Flash TV<sup>10</sup>.

##### **4.3.1.1 The Topics Of Kadinin Sesi**

The main claim in Kadinin Sesi is to be the “voice of women” who are suppressed in the Turkish society, to be a programme in which ordinary women could voice their miseries and problems, and find solutions to their problems ranged from financial aid, family issues, sexual problems, aesthetical anxieties to finding a new spouse. With this claim, the show is designed with the basic frame of women matters and the topics are formed in this frame.

According to this, the topic selection of Kadinin Sesi is completed one day before the show broadcasted by a group including the hostess Yasemin Bozkurt, producer Tulin Ulver<sup>11</sup>, their research assistants, the executive producer and workers and executives of Birmas, which is the sales and advertisement department of Channel D. For the selection of topics the group

---

<sup>10</sup>As Yasemin Bozkurt did not want to renew the annual agreement with Flash TV due to her new projects, Kadinin Sesi was ended on October 18, 2006 at Flash TV (Ulver, T., personal communication, October 19, 2006). Afterwards Flash TV has started to broadcast two new daytime women talk show under reality show genre, namely *Acı Umut* and *Buna da Sukur*, because of the success of the Kadinin Sesi format in ratings.

<sup>11</sup> Tulin Ulver is also sister of Yasemin Bozkurt and shareholders of the production company owned by Yasemin Bozkurt, produces and holds the broadcast right of Kadinin Sesi. The show is rented by Channel D with their production company just as an out-production. But being different form of traditional out-production, the show is provided all the necessary equipment, location and technical team by Channel D like an in-production according to a special contract between the company and the channel (Ulver, T., personal communication, May 12, 2005).

members have to meet after every show and every day in a week which lasts minimum two hours. The topics are determined, grouped and allocated to the days in a week so as to make each show different from the other. The number of the topics in a day, the content specialities that are put forward and the time that will be spent for them are determined. However, this plan and list of the topics are almost never put into practice according to the course of the live broadcast and the results of the five minutes' rating reports, so, the plan and the list of the topics are frequently changed by Tulin Ulver.

If a guest's story that has gained popularity and curiosity in the earlier days without coming out solutions, that guest's story and her/his relevant topic once again put in to the day's agenda. Besides, relatives and friends of the guest are reached as soon as possible and invited to the show in order to keep ongoing curiosity in audience and pursuit the ratings gained by that guest's story and the topics such as personal relations, sexual problems, family issues, lost spouse or children and so on. Accordingly it seems that finding solutions to the problems is not important and that the solutions are delayed as long as possible.

In the light of to the conducted observations, the object of changing topic list of *Kadinin Sesi* every day is highly related with the rating reports. If the minute by minute reports are low, it is the time to make an immediate alteration on the topics during the broadcast time. Those alterations are not seemed to be important for chief or workers in sales and advertising insofar as the show is highly watched.

Notwithstanding, what is not changed in the show topics is the basic show segments allocated to days in a week. Those are as follows: "We make you beautiful" (*Guzellestiriyoruz*); "Confession" (*Itiraf*); "Letters from jail" (*Cezaevinden mektup var*); "I want to get married" (*Evlenmek istiyorum*); "Missing persons" (*Kayıplar*), and "Forgiveness" (*Baristirma*).

It should be specified that these segments also constitute the format specialities of *Kadinin Sesi*. Being different from other daytime woman talk shows *Kadinin Sesi* has an inclination to make novelties and deal not much with the topics concerning violence towards women like others. In this account, the most striking point in the format is the humorous and entertaining approach of the hostess even when addressing to serious events.

When these segments are taken into consideration, it is possible to note that some of the declared segments in the shows have actually been adopted from the shows of Oprah, Sally Jessy Raphael and Ricki Lake. For example, "We make you beautiful" segment is key part of the *Oprah* show that supplies liposuction for "weight-loss" and "plastic surgeries". Although

the show is frequently blamed as its hostess viz. Oprah Winfrey does not publicize all the risks of such surgeries prior to the procedures, so, she makes huge amounts of money from the show and becomes a business woman, one of the most earned woman in U.S., rather than being a hostess of the show (Sellers & Watson, 2002).

In the “We make you beautiful” segment in *Kadinin Sesi*, men or women come to a live show for the reasons that they find themselves ugly, they want to look more beautiful or they want to change their gender and to receive a range of surgeries from plastic surgeons which are among the sponsors of the show as well. In this way, Yasemin Bozkurt and her expert of plastic surgeon are affective to make decisions with the willing guests. Another segment of the show topics is “Confessions” including disclosing private issues and secrets publicly. In this part, if the guest does not want to show him/herself publicly or the decision by production team is in the direction of concealing the guest insofar as he/she raises curiosity, the guest is covered behind a curtain in the studio and motivated to confess his/her private issue. This is also the segment often merged with the “We make you beautiful” segment.

To illustrate, A.C. on the show May 16, 2005 confessed that he had been interested in woman clothing since he was 5. He had noted himself some feminine interests and behaviors, so he was asked whether he would be happier if he took a plastic surgery to change his gender. Then a decision was made for him to change his gender by Bozkurt, the expert of plastic surgery and studio audience and he was guaranteed that he would be turned into a very beautiful woman and be gained his desired sexual identity eventually (A.C., personal observation, May 2, 2005). However, after his surgery, A.C. participated in the *Kadinin Sesi* and unexpectedly, started to state his regret and to explain that he had not made his final decision yet (A.C., personal observation, May 17, 2005). He blamed the producers for causing chaos in his life and said that he could not pursue his relations as old times. He was taken out of the studio in the first advertisement break at once.

Another segment of the show is called “Letters from jail”, which is distinct from the other daytime women talk shows in Turkey. The segment was not included in the show from the beginning 2001 and added later into the format in 2005 so as to make the show different from the daytime woman talk shows in other TV channels which were increasingly proliferated using the *Kadinin Sesi* format (Ulver, T., personal communication, May 12, 2005).

According to producer Ulver, in the initial phases of this segment, the production team considered only reading the letters sent to *Kadinin Sesi* from jails by inmates, spending a few

minutes in the show. Nevertheless, after a while, as this segment drew high ratings Bozkurt and her team wanted to employ “re-enactment” technique of the reality shows and process the letters visually. In this way, the letters are edited and prepared for outdoor shootings addressing the questions like, what kind of events happened to them, why they were penalized and for how long they had to be in jail. In this way, the segment is prepared and aired once a week by means of acquaintances of such inmates from real life in those re-enactment shootings. In this way, the production team started to reach a new audience from jails and inmates’ relatives, as well as, “to discover a new and inexhaustible field for topics” for “creating dramatic effects and attractiveness” to *Kadinin Sesi* (ibid).

Meanwhile, there are also many criticizing and complaining letters for this segment to RTUK and RTUK warned the Channel D several times for this segment (ibid). The point is that giving the convicts the microphone to claim their innocence might be unfavorable and hurting for the ones that suffered because of their crimes and the program got many reprehensions. Hence, Ulver frequently argued with Bozkurt to stop this segment. However, though she made it clear that they risk too much and that she fears from being blacked out by RTUK, she failed to convince Bozkurt due to the segment’s contribution to the ratings (Ulver, T., personal observation, May 13, 2005).

#### **4.3.1.2 The Guests In *Kadinin Sesi***

According to the information held by the research assistant, there are approximately 1.500 applicants who call Channel D to be a guest in *Kadinin Sesi* every day (Cankaya, O., personal communication, May 11, 2005). They are ordinary people such as men who had affairs with their wives’ relatives, mothers who confront the men who have broken their daughters’ hearts, divorced or separated poor women with children, women who were torn between two lovers or whose girls escaped from house and so on. Besides, there are people who would like to be on a national television to obtain only a chance for an instant fame or fortune. It is such that, according to the interviews with guests, some of them would only like to go onto other branches like music, video clip or TV serials, television entertainment industry with the help of the show. They seem to have a tendency to use any personal event and relation for such aims and to exaggerate, dramatize and defend themselves in this account. They also seem to be self-motivating guests that require not many directions, and act as if they were professional and cry whenever it is wanted<sup>12</sup>. For this reason, the

---

<sup>12</sup> It must be noted that ‘tears’ are thought to be the core elements to draw audience interest. The guests and participants, for this reason, often motivated for crying and some of them are ready for that in any time they are wanted. Mr Toyhan, who looks for her mother on the show dated May 10, 2005 for three days, is a good example for such a practice in guest position. He chatted with the studio

producers of the show often specify that it is quite easy to work with such people, who “do not create problems and yield good rating” keeping the producers comfort (Cankaya, O., Personal Communication, May 24, 2005).

In every show, guests are also determined one day before for Kadinin Sesi by the same group of broadcasters selecting the topics every day. In the guest selection process, it can be possible to specify that one of the most important factors that plays role in the selection of the guests in the production process, is the degree to which guests and stories are interesting and extraordinary. Thus, guests can be applicants, like child-abuses, wife beaters, murderers, drug addicts, or people who have committed other illegal acts, but also can be people who have already had popularity with their personel stories taking place in newspapers, TV news or programs. However, if the group makes a decision on an ordinary person who has taken place in recent public agenda and become very famous, it is hard to bring that person in the show due to the “guest-war”<sup>13</sup> with the other daytime woman talk shows (Caltılı, A., personal communication, May 17, 2005).

In the preparation process of the guests all the information about their stories, their reasons for participation, and their acquaintances are collected by 7 research assistants of production team, who work for around 18 hours a day. These pieces of information are then transferred to mainly Tulin Ulver and Yasemin Bozkurt. In this way, around 20 different guests and stories are determined and kept ready in the show for that day.

In the preparation process, the guests are taken to the make-up and hair-do rooms. Yasemin Bozkurt usually checks their clothes and if their heads are covered, she compelled them to take off their headscarves<sup>14</sup>. The ones who get ready start to wait in the cafeteria to have a

---

audience and guests cheerfully at the each advertisement break, but when the show started and phone callers were connected, he again started to cry. This can be considered as how some ordinary people like Mr Toyhan, who was congratulated for his acting by production team, can act even more skillfully than professional actors (Toyhan, T., personal observation, May 13, 2005).

<sup>13</sup> Adile and Rende’s case is illustrative for the “guest-war” among the daytime woman talk shows. The topic of the program called *Telekritik* on February 21, 2004 in TGRT was “the second bride” (*kumalik*) and the stories of two women from Urfa, Adile and Rende, who were the wives of Mehmet Tutbak, were shown as painful stories. Afterwards Kadinin Sesi team decided to bring Adile and Rende as guests to the show. Thus, the production team paid for the trip to Urfa Seyahat and arranged for their accommodation in Istanbul. However, the women did not reach Channel D with the bus, because the production team of *Serap Ezgu ile Sizin Sesiniz* in TGRT was informed about this and they took the women from the bus in Izmit, taking them to TGRT studios. (Caltılı, A., personal communication, May 17, 2005).

<sup>14</sup> The most striking example for getting guests to take off their headscarves was the incidence of Birgül Isık, who was killed in Elazığ by her son. In the interviews, the program directors confessed that they were forced to implement this procedure as required by the policy of the Channel D (Cankaya, O., personal communication, May 18, 2005).

drink. Yasemin Bozkurt, meanwhile, goes through the make-up and hair-do processes with the sponsor hairdressers. At the same time, the set assistants workers complete the last arrangements for the cameras, set decorations, and studio audiences. All the preparations generally last in two hours before the show and the programme is broadcasted live at 13: 10 in the noon in every week day. Before the show starts, guests are also prepared to the show psychologically. The assistants of production team take the guests and motivate them for their expressions.

...Just relax, you'll do fine. This is your life, you've lived it, and so there are no wrong answers. Just tell like it is, straight from the heart. Don't hold back on those emotions because this is your big chance to show millions of people you really care about this issue. And don't be shy –this is *your show*, so if you have something to say, jump right in there. Now, when Yasemin Bozkurt asks you to describe the first time your husband beat you, what are you going to say? (Develi, S., personal observation, May 10, 2005).

As far as the guest's conditions are concerned, it should be stressed that there are particular points in the production of *Kadinin Sesi*. The care for the guests who have been invited and brought to the show is frequently ignored. They are sometimes left hungry, broke, and uncared for their transportation or accommodation during the show or right after the show. The case of 45 years old Cemile Turkoz, who was brought from Sinop, in May 12, 2005 well illustrates those conditions.

Turkoz's daughter was a substance addict who ran away from home regularly for 3 years and who had been lost for 5 months. The mother notified the attorney generalship but had no results. Turkoz wanted to find her 16-year-old daughter. Yasemin Bozkurt promised during the live broadcast that the daughter would definitely be found through the program, and that she would have help from them. The story of the lost girl is decided to deal with for a few more days. Meanwhile, no one cared for the problem of the Turkoz's accommodation during those couple of days. Since the hotel that Cannel D works with in Laleli was full, she was not allowed to stay there to spend the night. Then, the producers told her to take care of her own. A woman that Cemile Turkoz met among the studio audience in the show offered to her stay in her home and helped with all of her expenses (Turkoz, C., personal communication, May 16, 2005).

However, in some cases it is possible for some guests to receive special treatment (Unverdi F., personal communication, May 24, 2005). These guests may be given high amounts of money and gifts by the producers and/or sponsors while others are not even taken place in the programme although they are on the guest lists. Most of such aggrieved people are those

who have called from places like Artvin or Elazig and wanted to tell their problems of poverty, violence, family feud and brought to Istanbul for the show by the Channel D. However, the show lasts for 3 hours, in which 90 minutes is the net broadcast time for the programme. Thus, among the 20 different guests that have been determined for that show one day before, only 10 or 13 of them may actually take place in the show devoting about 9 minutes or less to a person in the program. This means that 7 or 8 persons can not be guest in the show per day<sup>15</sup>. All are promised that they will be on the show that day and that Yasemin Bozkurt will deal with their problems and find solutions. Most of them cannot appear on the program the day they are promised. They may be approved a few days later if an appropriate episode is found.

Burcu. Gulay, (Gulay, B., personal communication, May 11, 2005) in this concern, stated that she and her friend were rejected in the show without any explanation because producers thought they would not attract attention among others in spite of their presence in the show. These people were very angry and disappointed as they did not have any money and none of the promises were kept. They were forced to leave the building with the 20-30 YTL given by the producers and after their cries and protests the security staff of the channel used force to make them go.<sup>16</sup>

It is usual to see women like Ms. Gulay in front of the Channel D building protesting and saying that they are going to sue the producers because of being cheated and to go to other daytime woman talk shows to denounce. Nevertheless, the chances for such people to go on a similar show to tell how they were not given the chance in *Kadinin Sesi* are quite low. For instance, Neriman Hanim, who came from Urfa to tell her husband's cheating on her and beating in the show in May 11, 2005, is illustrative. After she was waiting long time in studio of *Kadinin Sesi* and waiting few days in Istanbul, Ms Hanim came to the show again to try to obtain an allowance, but the members of the production team did not let her to participate in the show. The woman was pushed around and taken out to front of Channel D building by a security personnel, was given 20 YTL and told to take care of herself in

---

<sup>15</sup> Among the three shows researched, it can be stated that, the only program, where the number of guests to go on the program, and who will be the guests are never finalized until the program is ended is *Kadinin Sesi*. The guests lists in the show can be instantaneously changed and some guests who are in the show can be cancelled in the advertisement breaks meticulously and diligently to keep the high audience attention.

<sup>16</sup> It could be possible to specify that no other channel with the daytime woman talk shows researched have a special security staff that intervenes with guests or audience except for Channel D. As working for studio audience to keep discipline in studio, security staff of Channel D also works for the people who did not take place in the show but waited till the end of the show. Sometimes they show harsh behaviours on them and sometimes use force (Security staff of Channel D, personal observation, May 10-17, 2005).



Istanbul, where she had come to first time in her life with no relative or acquaintance (Hanim, N., personal communication, May 16, 2005). For this reason, she decided to go another daytime woman talk show to tell these and to find a help for her problem. However, she was also rejected while she wanted to participate in Biz Bize programme in Show TV (Hanim, N., personal communication, May 17, 2005). According to the producers, the reason for this practice is an important common concern, i.e. one day they can reject a guest in last minute and s/he can go another show to complain about them (Caltılı, A., personal communication, May 18, 2005).

Another remarkable point related to the guests is the fake ones. They are participants that do not have an attractive and tragic story but have a sufficient talent to play the ‘reality’ according to the predetermined fiction by producers of the show. When the story of the guests is not regarded to attract audience attention, it is usual to furnish their stories with some lies and acting. In terms of producers, it is easier to employ the stories of people who seek a chance for a fame and fortune as well. The case of Cemile Guc in Kadinin Sesi is a remarkable example for the fake guest practice.

22-years-old Cemile Guc (Guc, C., personal communication, May 12, 2005) from Ordu was living with her husband whom got married through Islamic procedures. She told Bozkurt that she ran away from her husband with her three children owing to the continuous violence at home, and police did not help them. Then, she started to cry telling that her children were kidnapped while she was slept in Halkali Park. Her story was dealt with three days but at the third day she suddenly started to shout and blame Bozkurt and her production team because of her children during the live show. In this situation, Bozkurt claimed on the show that Cemile was a liar who tried to deceive the program team and who kept the program busy with her false information. She added that such lying guests were very good performers acting theatrically who seek fame and that they were skilled to be able to sometimes deceive even them. However, the real story of this fake guest is far from the one declared. She summarizes best behind the scenes:

My story was totally different from the story declared. After I ran away from my husband with my children, I started to live with my boss. But he did not want my children, so I left them in the doorsteps of a mosque. Then, I regretted and started to look for my children calling both police and Kadinin Sesi. When I came to the show in preparations, the program staff did not like my story and asked me to tell a modified story and to act accordingly on the show. I accepted this on condition that my children will be found and they will take the responsibility of them. They guaranteed for this and my acting pursued 3 days. However, when I learnt that my

children had already been found and put into an orphanage by police and that Yasemin Bozkurt and her team had known this for two days, but told nothing about it, I went crazy and started to shout on air. I made easy way for them to attract audience interest for 3 days but they wanted to continue this game. When I cut my role short suddenly, Yasemin put into action another scenario and I got accused of lying and cheating them on air (ibid).

The events that are out of control with guests like Cemile Guc are also seen during the show. However, the results are not always similar with that case. For example the guests in the show on April 14, 2005, namely Kenan, Tijen Alp and Mehtap, Yusuf Ozbek couples that were married through exchange of children to be married between families (*berdel*). There was already a murder between those families just 6 days before the show and their fierce discussion was moved to the show. After the show Kemal Alp, who is Kenan's father who had killed his wife, killed Yusuf Ozbek and a police officer and wounded many others claiming, "I pulled the trigger as I remembered the words said in Kadinin Sesi" and that an argument was ignited with Bozkurt's "provoking words" in the live show (Eyce, 2005, p.A3). Kemal Alp in his statement told that Yasemin Bozkurt was like a judge, the audiences were prosecutors and the participants were like the family prosecuting party, all coming onto him and that his honor was hurt in front of public, and for this reason he lost his mind after the show and committed the murder.

However, murders and wounding incidents followed one after another related to the guests. After two weeks later Ahmet Yaman stabbed his wife Ferdane Yaman, who did not accept his offer to get together in the Kadinin Sesi show in March 2005, stabbed her wife in May 26, 2005 (Saat, 2005). In addition, after two months later Birgul Isik was murdered, who was the guest leading to the discontinuation of the show in Channel D.

During the programme dated May 17, 2005, Birgul Isik, who was subjected to violence by her husband, had difficulty looking after her children, and living with his second bride ("*kuma*") and step children, was sitting among the studio audience. Then, because she gave "bad picture" she was pressured by the assistants and she could only take place in front of the camera after taking off her headscarf (Isik, B., personal observation, May 17, 2005). In the show Isik was presented as "the best sample of eastern women who has endured all pain, deception, and new brides" and gained respect from the studio audience so Bozkurt promised that they will help her for all the pain she suffer. However, after the program, she was advised to go back home by the production team, so she returned to Elazig with her children. Then, she was shot to death by her son in the bus station with the reason of showing her hair, of

talking about their private lives, of asking for safe place from Bozkurt, and of shaming her family (Gezici, 2005).

With the raising discussions and social reactions about Kadinin Sesi, after the shot of Birgul Isik the Channel D directors discontinued the program. In this concern, the General Director Murat Saygi states that although the show was highly effective on the budget and revenue sides of the channel, they had to stop it. According to him, the reason behind the sudden decision for discontinuation of the program was that the program had turned into a social problem being out of control with the guests and started to take much social reaction (Saygi, M., personal communication, May 17, 2005).

#### **4.3.1.3 The Experts In Kadinin Sesi**

It should be expressed that there are no experts or consultants in Kadinin Sesi show except for the plastic surgeons and the cosmetic specialists. They take place in the show only if a guest is employed in “We make You Beautiful” segment. Every week it is planned that how much time will be spent to that kind of surgeons and their special clinics through publicity activities embedded in the show in advance and that how many guests will be directed towards the clinics as promised to these experts. They seem to be advertisers rather than experts while they are endorsing Bozkurt’s comments on the guests to take plastic surgeries and giving partial information about the operation without touching upon side affects or physiological changes after the operations.

On the other hand, though Tulin Ulver and others want to work with experts from law, psychology or medicine it is Yasemin Bozkurt who sees employing experts very unnecessary and boring. According to her, she is rather qualified in many topics as gender problems and changing gender is “a simple procedure” to suggest and manipulate the guests.

She adds that she had read many books on psychology and she is much more educated and experienced than any other psychologist (Bozkurt, Y., personal communication, May 12, 2005). With this in view, Bozkurt explains that she does not feel the need for an expert in her show, that she cannot stand the dull conversations filled with terminology and that she can not risk the ratings of the program just for this (ibid).

It is clear that the attitude of Bozkurt’s on the concern of the experts constitutes one of the ranges of factors that led to the discontinuation of the show with some murder incidents. The guest and participants’ social and individual being and behavior patterns are vital and conducive to fights, murders, and arguments that occur during and after the show. Therefore,

to understand human psychology thoroughly, create empathy in a beneficial way, direct people in getting married, changing their genders, returning to their homes, making up or breaking up with friends and relatives are fragile matters especially while occurring on television publicly. From this respect, it can be thought that Bozkurt's callous and "knowing all" attitude contributed to some negative events during and after the show.

#### **4.3.1.4 The Studio Audience In Kadinin Sesi**

The studio audience is formed from about 65 people and most of them are women. They are collected from three groups of people. The first group is brought to the Channel D studio by 2 private audience organizers. They are picked up from their homes, who may come from other cities as well, and brought to the studio after paying the price of 10-20 YTL daily. The organizers get 3 YTL "per head" and they have to pay the rest to the television channel. The reasons that people come to the studio by paying for it and sit in a crowded TV studio during a day are diverse. Some are bored at home and some are admirers who want to see Yasemin Bozkurt in real, while some want to find a favorable spouse for their sons in the studio, some come with the hope of finding a job for their daughter, and some want to join in to amusing quarrels, or some think that they may have a chance to talk on the microphone and tell their stories so maybe a famous personality (Studio audience, personel observation, May 6-16, 2005).

The second group consists of the audiences, who take place on television shows regularly as studio audience, are also arranged by organization companies and trained on how to be guests in such programs by the producers (Ozsoy, T., personal communication, May 22, 2005). This group of studio audience in Kadinin Sesi first attends to the program called *Sabah Sabah Seda Sayan* and then come to Kadinin Sesi set, which is the next set to the first one, for the show day. The last group of studio audience, which is smaller in size, are those who "come for their curiosity", constituting the channel staff, set worker acquaintances or relatives.

The security personnel of Channel D direct them every day to be quiet, be seated and do what they are told in a curt and harsh way. Under the control of the security personnel, the studio audience cannot stand up or even go to the toilets without the permission of them. A special control and attention is provided to the studio audience as to their behaviors, appearances, utterances and demographic specialties. For producers it is important to know what kind of people the studio audience constitutes from and what their information and interest levels are. As to the producers this data is beneficial to provide content modifications

at the necessary time besides as to the workers in sales and advertising department this data is also valuable to predict which firm can be a sponsor in Kadinin Sesi and be integrated into the show (Picard, 1993). Thus, some regular surveys are conducted on them by the research assistants of the production team, so, the changing studio audience has to fill the survey sheet every day as well.

According to the results of these regular surveys<sup>17</sup>, 90% are married through formal registration and 94% are still in their first marriages. The age of marriage of the studio audience of the Kadinin Sesi ranges from 14 to 55. 99% never had a pre-marital sexual intercourse and 10% had been sexually harassed by their close relatives. 98% never cheated on their spouses. 17% stated that they would get divorced in the case of being cheated, but 76% stated they would not have the courage to do this and would only get into a serious depression. Moreover, it could be possible to regard them as rather ignorant. 46% of the audience indicated that they do not use protection during sexual intercourse and 18% stated that they believe that Kadinin Sesi show can protect them. 68% of them said that the two most important things in domestic consumption are food and cleaning items. Besides, 72% of the studio audience specified that if they have a chance to make a preference about the show gifts they would prefer cosmetics products and a special permission to come to the show again.

#### **4.3.1.5 The Producers Of Kadinin Sesi**

The production team consists of about 30 people, mainly of the hostess, the producer, the director, the assistant producers, the scriptwriter, the researchers, the screen technicians and the set assistants in Kadinin Sesi show in Channel D. Some of them are the workers of the production company of Yasemin Bozkurt, mostly in creative part, and some are the regular workers of the Channel D, mostly screen technicians. They are in charge of all production level and broadcast of the show. They are responsible for ensuring that the show is produced and delivered on budget, and on time with “a striking content” and with high rating reports for making credit on the sight of the executive producer, who has to give report to commissioning editor, responsible of the daytime programs in the board of administration in Channel D (Server, Y., personal communication, May 11, 2005).

This implies a fact that the producers have to be careful in their relation with guests, with call-ins, with executives, and with workers of sales and advertising department to produce

---

<sup>17</sup> The notes of Channel D studio audience surveys, March 20 - May 10, 2005.

and deliver the content. This requires a full control over the production process even it is live broadcast. Thus, they are quite equipped technologically to control and edit the content as much as possible. They use four studio cameras, one jimmy jeep camera, camcorders, video and audio mixers, editing and recording equipments, microphones, computers, pre-production editing equipments, special effects, lighting instruments, set construction equipments, intercommunication system, studio and control room monitors, VTR control mixer, image control etc. in the course of the production.

These facilitate the pre-production and production processes for the show, providing a direct control both on the hostess and on the call-ins for being ready to sudden changes and flow of the show. For example, while Bozkurt is conversing with a relative of a guest during the show, the information about what will come next and what she needs to say next can be given to her from the production control room and the next episode is prepared immediately through such technological instruments. It is possible to hear such orders for Bozkurt during the show like that “delve into her more”, “prepare her to cry because her mother will be on the phone shortly”, “ finish her story softly, the reports came low”, “ Stall Yasemin another five minutes, fill in with words”, or “we prepared her relatives on the phone to confess her relation with that man and she will be on the phone next, prepare the guests to shock and anger” (Ulver, T., personal observation, May 16, 2005).

All these are for implementing particular organizations to supply the progress of the content and of the conversations in an expected way. In this sense, it should be stated that live call-ins with acquaintances of guests in the studio is the core point of the show. This practice provides two important mechanisms for the show as a promise of the daytime women talk show. The live call-ins are the first useful mechanisms to show the “instantaneity”, “actuality”, and “interactivity” to audience. Hence, all the efforts with live call-ins exerted by the producers are for the audience to feel and think as if all those were real and spontaneous.

The second mechanism with the live call-ins is to increase the arguments’ heat and provoke conflicts. It seems to be significant for producers to create conflicting situations via call-ins. According to them there must be converse parties in processing guests’ stories to be more neutral and to provide curiosity for audience (Cankaya, O., personal communication, May 24, 2005). For this reason, they meticulously control and manipulate participants within the production process. The producer Ulver also engages with the call-ins deciding who is needed to be found and called in, what they should say and how to say it. She is the last person that one has to talk with her on phone line to participate the show on air. Besides, her

assistants are constantly connecting call-ins as related to the guests and their issues by the continuously ringing phones in production control room, either preparing the callers for the show or searching for the phone numbers of the people that they think might make the story more dramatic, exciting and emotional.

It is necessary to point out at this point that the dialogues and statements of call-in participants are also manipulated throughout the live show and that they are prepared beforehand at the last minute and then put on air<sup>18</sup>. While some of these distortions on call-ins are exercised by the producers, they are sometimes the performance of the persons who are connected themselves. Hence, it is usual to meet some guests and participants in call-ins who suddenly start to cry, shout, or swear in the middle of his/her story. The producer Ulver well explains this situation “Many times it does not seem necessary to motivate them. Many of them accept willingly and readily to participate in the show through call-ins. This is a ‘show’ in essence and they know that they have to act accordingly here. Therefore, the rest for us is about orchestrating them and checking the ratings” (Ulver, T., personal communication, May, 16, 2005).

The function of the ratings at this moment seems to be vital. The executive producer and commissioning editor of Channel D do not much interfere with the topic or guest selection except for the rating reports. Minute by minute rating results<sup>19</sup> in a report come to producer Ulver during the show in every five minutes and all members of the production team know that they have to take into account those reports. Thus, they put some strategies into practice to increase their watching rates.

One of them is to take risk in processing the guests’ stories and organizing the relevant connections during the show. The case of Inci Hanim is helpful to understand such

---

<sup>18</sup> In the program where Mr. Toyhan’s missing mother was dealt with, someone in the audience started to cry. Ulver noticed this audience from among the scenes of cameras and immediately ordered the director “zoom in”. Then, she also ordered her assistants to find any one in relation with the crying woman and contact her relatives in back call-ins. After her relative found, Ulver started to motivate her on line by saying “.. look if you swear I will cut you off at that moment, if you talk commonplaces, I will do this again, but if you say like this I will let you be on the program. You are going to say that ‘she never came to me since her mother and father divorced’. You will say that ‘she suffered much from depression’, OK? I will be listening to your every second, I can cut you off whenever I want, be careful” (Ulver, T., personal observation, May 13, 2005).

<sup>19</sup> In this concern, Tulin Ulver, also states that there is another beneficial point to increase the show ratings. According to her, this is the insufficient police force in Turkey. She specifies that there are even those among the police officers who apply to them to find their relative and adds, “Our programme reaches broad masses. The police are aware of this as well; sometimes their own facilities are not enough to find their lost relative, so they increase our ratings as well (Ulver, T., personal communication, May 7, 2005).

strategies. Mrs. Hanim, was a guest on the show in May 12, 2005 and looked for her lover, called Mr. Aziz whom she had not seen for 43 years. Meanwhile, the watching rates indicated that the episode is low. Production team directed Yasemin and she said “Inci Hanim, oh dear, you have raised the attention of all our audiences, everyone is very curious about your lover, we have just found him and in a while you will meet with him on this show, how do you feel?” and the rating reports started to rise again (Kıvanc, F., personal observation, May 12, 2005).

However, the assistant director Fatih Kıvanc realized that they had not found him and any of the effort for the connection with him had no result. They started to get nervous and tense as he could not be alive today, and all exerted was based on an “empty speculation”. After a few advertisement breaks, they understood that it was not possible to find Mr. Aziz during that show and Yasemin Bozkurt attempted to postpone the meeting with made up excuses. The assistant director directed Bozkurt to say that “Mr Aziz told us that although he much wants to meet her old lovers, he cannot come today because his sugar level increased for excitement when he saw his lover on screen, so we continue tomorrow” (ibid.)

As regards the risky strategies put by the producers, another practice is to change air time according to the rival shows broadcasted at the same time. Such a practice is also expected by sales and advertising department to arrange their advertisement breaks and air time efficiently. Hence, the production team has to monitor other shows (especially Biz Bize and Yalnız Degilsin) and has to not overlap their breaks and broadcast at the same time. If any time broadcast or breaks start on those shows, then the advertisement breaks in Kadinin Sesi can be extended or narrowed despite of RTÜK’s monitoring for advertisement time extended. As a technical strategy on air time, it is also expressed that this can also supply to catch audience who start zapping channels.

#### **4.3.1.6 The Hostess Of Kadinin Sesi**

The hostess of Kadinin Sesi is Yasemin Bozkurt who has already been a famous TV personality with the help of her previous TV show called *Yasemin’in Penceresi* in TGRT. In company with her hostess position she is also the main producer, the renter of the show and the associate producer of the Kadinin Sesi format. Thus, it is noteworthy to examine that how the format has been constituted and adopted by her as it is the first format of the daytime women talk show genre in Turkish television channels.

According to Bozkurt, the format of Kadinin Sesi was formed through a demand and letters coming from her audience who want to be in studio with their own stories rather than



watching famous people's life stories as in *Yasemin'in Penceresi* in 2000. She emphasizes that she wanted to make a "revolutionized woman programme" in Turkey because previous woman programs were "nothing more than that of belly dancing and cookery" (Bozkurt, Y., personal communication, May 12, 2005). She adds also that "although TV producers know that the real problems and the needs of Turkish women were not those, it was believed that audience avoided their problems, did not want to listen to troubles, and only wanted entertainment in Turkey. I proved the opposite of this" (ibid.). Therefore, according to her interests she decided to produce a daytime woman talk show under the reality show genre as she thinks this sub-genre deal with ordinary people –particularly women- and their serious problems. In her sight, the reality show frame is important since it provides to improve her format whatever is needed to add for "flexibility". Thus, she started to look for a format (ibid).

Bozkurt knew that the genre have existed with various formats for 60-70 years in America and for 10 years in all over the world. But the problem was to find a convenient format for Turkish audience. In this regard, she confirms that she has been influenced by particularly the show of Sally Jessy Raphael, and Oprah Winfrey but insists that *Kadinin Sesi* is by no means the same. According to her, Oprah in her show dances, her clothing is discussed there, and the topics forming her format include incest, lesbian relationships or pedophilia as well as gender reassignment surgeries, beauty cosmetics, plastic surgeries, marital and sexual problems and so on. Therefore, she states that she decided to adopt a format through taking only their convenient features to Turkish society and putting into practice with her production team in TGRT (Bozkurt, Y., personal communication, May 10, 2005).

Here, it should be noted that cultural differences have played a key role in adopting the format of *Kadinin Sesi* as other producers do in their countries. It is explicit that while *Kadinin Sesi* is still keeping some fundamental elements of the original formats in U.S such as living room decor, inquisitorial behaviors of hostess, subjective camera usage, sensational topics like sexual harassment, marital problems, gender reassignment surgeries, finding a partner and cosmetic surgeries, it does not comprise incest, lesbian relationships or pedophilia that are in the original American formats due to their potential of causing social reactions in Turkey. Hence, instead of buying the whole frame of formats she preferred to make a new and adopted one for Turkish audience like many other countries do widespread methods. As we see before, this is also a more easy way for the genre proliferation both in the world and in the Turkish televisions. However, when *Kadinin Sesi* show was transferred to Channel D from TGRT, the format war and the name discussions for the show started. Unlike its precedents in the world, such war for a second hand format was unique in the

world. The underlying fact is the success of the show's frame as to high watching rates and becoming a commercial brand (Cankaya, O., personal communication, May 18, 2005).

For this reason, it was not a coincidence that, after her transfer to Channel D, TGRT management with the desire to continue the same success and to keep the growing ratings, decided to continue the same format with a famous news presenter during morning hours named Serap Ezgu on February 16, 2004. The name of the programme was the same, that is, Kadinin Sesi at first. Yasemin Bozkurt claimed that she actually had the original format although hers is a well adopted version of American formats and rights of the broadcasting for Kadinin Sesi show and its name, relying on her contract signed on September 1, 2003 with TGRT as proof (Vatan, April 19, 2005). Thus, according to her, TGRT and Ezgu have stolen the format and not paid anything for the right of broadcasting to her. However, it was not true as no one had the original format rights and their licence permission to any adoption. In this concern what was written in that contract was the only name right of the show was owned by the production firm of Bozkurt. For this reason, after Bozkurt's strong reactions and protests in the discussion with Serap Ezgu TGRT changed the name as *Serap Ezgu ile Sizin Sesiniz* (Your Voice) modifying the content, and reconfigured the format. Bozkurt at that moment differed that the format would be proliferated by many other channels and she tried to block that. At this point, looking at Bozkurt's statements concerning the situation can be illustrative to draw the frame of her approach and the format-war between them which mostly appeared in the press as well.

...Now, bogus Kadinin Sesi shows started. I regard those in my shadow with a smile. Serap Ezgu said "The format of Kadinin Sesi is actually owned by TGRT and that is why I hosted it", if she is so naive what can I do? Of course, Ms Serap is a newscaster who has read news from the prompter up to now. Being a good newscaster does not necessarily mean being a good programmer or television program maker...Once Gulgun Feyman tried this before. Now Aysenur Yazici is coming back. But they copied my format and I was humble enough not to file a complaint about them. What should I do instead, file a complaint and strip them off their billions of dollars they made? And what if they sue me, hah, a person should have 2 million dollars minimum in her pocket to sue me....Does Serap have it, I will strip her off down to her knickers, what will she do then, does she even consider that? I am not afraid of anyone... If they step on my toes, then I can beat like Muhammed Ali<sup>20</sup>. (Bozkurt, Y., personal communication, May 13, 2005).

---

<sup>20</sup> As can be seen in her words, Bozkurt is a TV personality who uses aggressive phrases about beating and violence in studio as well. Bozkurt frequently shouts and curses at the production team, assistants and even the guests and studio audience, creating an atmosphere of fear around her. It is possible to

As in the matter of format war, Bozkurt is a hostess who tries to keep her authority in the studio and content production as well. The couches of the studio are designed to be reminiscent of the living room of a home. The guests and studio audience are positioned across Bozkurt so that she can monitor and approach them directly. Before starting the show the set assistants and all the technicians complete the last arrangements for the cameras, set decorations, and the necessary organizations for studio audience as Bozkurt wants.

The hostess Bozkurt comes latest and checks all the preparations in studio. Almost every day she shouts as “look at this, we have very few audience, I want crowds here every day. Change these; I do not want the same people every day.” (Bozkurt, Y., personal communication, May 11, 2005). She changes those who do not wear clothes appealing to her, places the young and beautiful ones on the front, and old ones at the back. In general, she does not admit women with their heads covered to the studio or make them take off their headscarves. The show starts with the credit<sup>21</sup> and the director’s confirmation like “We read”. Then, the hostess goes backstage and enters the studio as if she has been there and seen the audiences for the first time. She salutes the audience in studio and shakes their hands and kiss with an air of enjoyment and with cheerful mood as practiced with the studio audience 20 minutes before. She always first mentions about the huge interests, congratulations and gifts from audience and then starts to explain that day’s topics and guests briefly. Suddenly, she changes all her mimics and moods in telling the story of a miserable guest in parallel with the dramatic effects –with the beginning of sound, lights and visual scenes prepared before. The hostess has to start with the worse story of that day according to the plan and progress line of the applications. Since she confuses the names of the guests and half knows their stories -although she holds script texts in her hands- she frequently takes her cues from the set assistants in the backstage. Thus, the show is usually arranged according to her statements, approaches and manners towards the participants.

As a typical daytime woman talk show format, the most effective aspect of the show is the manner of the hostess towards guests and audience. She locates herself at a close position with participants like a confidant, lawyer, marriage register, match-maker, and therapist. The hostess has an authority and prestige to affect and to motivate the participants and their thoughts, so it is the reason why the show is conceived as educative, alighting and even

---

meet Bozkurt’s statements in advertisement breaks like that “I will beat you with a stick till you die, you will prefer your husbands’ beatings” to studio audience who made noise and “gave her a headache” in the show, although she plays role of their sisters, of lawyers or of therapists only after the break. (Bozkurt, Y., personal communication, May 13, 2005).

<sup>21</sup> The short visual presentation item taking place in a show or a programme at both the beginning and the end of it.

defending women's rights. However, all of them stem from the genre which is only an entertainment show promising to help and educate audience in an easy way. At this point, Bozkurt's effort to justify herself is worthwhile:

We are a mirror of society; we reflect the existing moral deterioration. The solution is education, girls should go to school, know their rights. I keep telling these virtually every day. I tell them not to marry through Islamic wedding vows, if you are marrying a divorced man then go and check with the records... I show audience right ways and set right examples for their marriages and domestic problems. Despite of this, I do not expect everyone to understand the social benefits of the show (Bozkurt, Y., personal communication, May 17, 2005).

#### **4.3.1.7 The Advertisements In Kadinin Sesi**

As far as the the show's revenues is concerned, the advertisements and the promotional activities in the programs become important. The show lasts for 3 hours, in which 120-130 minutes is the net show duration. Every 30 minutes, advertisement break starts, each of which lasts for about 10 or 13 minutes, exceeding the restrictions of RTUK on commercial length. There are nearly 8 advertisement breaks and totally 75-88 minutes of advertisement duration in the show. Each advertisement break covers 13-14 advertisement spots. Moreover, there are many in-frame and band advertisements in the show. In total, together with the in-frame and band advertisements, there are about 90 different companies' advertisements taking place through a day's programme of Kadinin Sesi. Besides, it should be mentioned that there are no official declared full sponsor in the show, except for the embedded promotional activities of beauty and cosmetic clinics and their plastic surgeons creating a segment of the show, called "We make you beautiful". In addition to this, there are approximately 30 barter sponsors in the shows including companies mainly from transportation, hair-making, food and clothing, in return for logo and barter taking place at the end of the show's credit (Cankaya, O., personal communication, May 18, 2005).

To put it a different way, the show is designed so that advertisers and target audience of the show would meet in the same ground. For this reason, all advertisements are highly related to women, their interests and needs. To illustrate, they are small household appliance as "the best gift for the tired mother" by Bosch, practical vacuum cleaner for busy mothers by Phillips, and "Mr. Proper, bleacher, for sensitive hands of women" by Ariel and so on.

According to Birmas figures, Channel D's advertisement agency, in the May 2005 period, the most expensive price of advertisement is the prime time (PT) slot in which per unit second was \$750 and VAT. In the same period prices for Kadinin Sesi advertisement slots,

unit second prices were \$300-350 and VAT. However, when a special technique for marketing of those advertisements, i.e. “packaging” is applied by Birmas for regular advertisers, then, monthly advertisement is used and advertisements are proportionally spread through the other programs as well. Accordingly, the figures of Kadinin Sesi advertisements were discounted to \$200<sup>22</sup> and VAT (monthly advertisement reports of Birmas, May 18, 2005).

As a result of this, according to the research conducted between September 1, 2004 and May 31 2005 by Media Observation Centre -MTM, the general revenue from the advertisement activities in Kadinin Sesi is approximately \$7.5 million per month being a high profitable product (MTM, 2005). Moreover, if we compare these numbers with the general costs of the show, its profitability as a commercial product in its essence can be better understood. According to the monthly cost reports of Birmas, the program costs Channel D about \$80 thousand per month, and the big share is the cost of the hostess and her production team. \$55 thousand solely constitutes monthly price of Bozkurt (Birmas, May 17, 2005). In this regard, the director Oguz Cankaya emphasizes that despite of the high price of the star hostess, Kadinin Sesi is a significant product for the channel and it has a privileged place within the other daytime programs in Channel D owing to its low cost and profitability through the ratings (Cankaya, O., personal communication, May 18, 2005). The rating reports of Channel D<sup>23</sup>, belong to the month of May, 2005, proves this place as the show was at the top among the other daytime programs’ of Channel D and of rival channels having to daytime programs.

#### **4.3.1.8 Kadinin Sesi In Flash TV**

Although it is not expected because of the scandalous discontinuation of Kadinin Sesi in Channel D, after staying off screen for a while Bozkurt on November 7, 2005 has started to do Kadinin Sesi again on Flash TV. According to Behic Yilmaz (Yilmaz, B., personal communication, December 14, 2005), the sales director of the sales and advertisement department of Flash TV, the channel has accepted Bozkurt’s proposal for broadcasting Kadinin Sesi again on condition that she would improve the news on prime time slot contributing to the watching rates of Flash TV. For this reason, the show time was moved to late afternoon and evening slot as a kind of new strategy in scheduling by producers and

---

<sup>22</sup> It is experienced situation that the declared tariff does not always contain real numbers. There is always some discounts related to such declared figures can be to the degree of % 95 and the special advertisement budget of the advertiser firms is prepared according to such discounts (Cankaya, O., personal communication, May, 16, 2005).

<sup>23</sup> The special rating reports of Channel D, May 5-18, 2005.

executives of the channel. Hence, the show was broadcasted both before and after the evening news every day during December, 2005, that means the show is broadcasted live at 17:30 and 20:45 pm. as two episodes and 10 times in a week (ibid.). In this way, it was thought that the show would gain more success on watching rates and draw a larger audience group both for itself and the news of Flash TV.

At the beginning of January 2006, the executives of the channel announced that they were satisfied with the performance and ratings of the show (Egin, E., personal communication, January 18, 2006). Thus, it was moved to 15:50 pm. as it was thought that the right time for *Kadinin Sesi* like other daytime woman talk shows broadcasting in afternoon, so, the show can compete with others. Then, the channel also cut the second live part of the show after the news and launched the reruns on schedule. This rerun part was a compilation of the best segments and episodes of the previous broadcast of *Kadinin Sesi*, entitled *Kadinin Sesi Özel* on 00:45 am. In this way, *Kadinin Sesi* was still on television for two times, once live and once from records in a route way. According to Yılmaz, with this implementation the channel aimed two objectives. One was to increase watching rates and popularity of the show. The other was to increase its advertisers's market shares by providing the audience to meet the same messages of the advertisers more than one time in a day.

It should also be specified in here that there were many modifications and additions in the content and format of *Kadinin Sesi* put into practice in a way of reconfiguring the old format in Channel D. The show in Flash TV's promotion trailers is presented as "love, deceit, lies, slander, confession, lost relatives and surprises" Yasemin Bozkurt is coming with her new content" throughout the show day. Apparently, particular segments have been added and the old ones have been modified. One of the reasons for adding new parts was the search for bringing renewals to the format to increase the attractiveness, and the other reason was to fill the content of the programme that was increased to 5 hours relative to the old one.

With the help of the necessary arrangements for the format, Flash TV presents that Bozkurt still do novelty in Turkey and the new segments of the show will be broadcasted for the first time in Turkish televisions in a way of fascinating the audience (ibid). In this sense the new segments in the content are as follows: "Lies" (Yalan); "Love Stories" (Ask Hikayeleri); "Entrapment" (Tuzak); "Weight loss segment" (Zayıflama Kösesi); "Yasemin's window" (Yasemin'in Penceresi); Besides, some of the old segments continue with slight modifications as follows: "Confession" (İtiraf); "Letters from prison" (Cezaevinden mektup var); "Missing persons"(Kayıplar); "Forgiveness" (Baristirma); "I want to get married" (Evlenmek İstiyorum); "I am having cosmetic surgery" (Estetik oluyorum).

Another point related to this matter that should be stressed here is the advertisements among these segments. Examining advertisements in new Kadınin Sesi in the December and January 2005 period is elucidative in terms of understanding the close relation between advertisement dynamics and the content formation.

According to Egin, the director of sales and advertisement in Flash TV, Bozkurt's monthly salary depends on the advertisements of Kadınin Sesi. Therefore, Bozkurt is not paid a fixed wage per month, but commissions from the advertisements in Kadınin Sesi in accordance with the special agreement paid with Flash TV (Egin, E., personal communication, December 16, 2005). Accordingly, she gets commissions from both advertisements coming through the sales and advertisement department for her show and coming through her own production company which has also been arranged for supplying advertisers to Kadınin Sesi in Flash TV (ibid).

For this reason, finding a full sponsor for the show seems to be quite important for both Bozkurt and the sales and advertisement department of Flash TV. Like the full sponsor Brilliant company that her rival Serap Ezgu has, Bozkurt also prefers a sponsor from the textile sector as she believes it will directly address women target audience. Thus, a bid is prepared and given to Sumerbank Silk Industries as it is thought to be the best and convenient company among other potential sponsors. The bid includes a total price of \$55.000 and VAT monthly.

By the way, it should be noted that owing to the changes in scheduling and thanks to the show's success in the watching rates the show is upgraded in the advertisement price list of the sales and advertisement department. It rises to the 13th rank in Flash TV programme categories and this increase is reflected on the unit second prices of the show's advertisement breaks. Accordingly, 1 second of advertisement on Kadınin Sesi on Flash TV rises from \$75 to \$135 and VAT (Egin, E., personal communication, January 18, 2006). What is more, if an advertiser makes a preference to put its advertisements in-frame, the price of the unit second of in-frame category is \$155,25 and VAT with 15% price difference. Furthermore, if an advertiser requests a special agreement, the department can reduce the prices and provide the optimal cost for accession to target audience i.e. cost per rating point- CPP- can be arranged with a special agreement. Then, the "the prices of unit second of all advertisement breaks in Kadınin Sesi are reduced by % 97 with a big discount on condition that the client pay \$55.000 and VAT to become a regular full sponsor (ibid.).

Consequently, it should be emphasized that, as it is seen, Kadinin Sesi' contents, form the pioneer daytime woman talk show in Turkey, and format can be changed and renewed according to the different TV channel's conditions and economic needs. The flexible structure of the Kadinin sesi format also provided to Kadinin Sesi to be proliferated and viewed under different names. In this sense, it will be continued to the examination of the other programme production process applied by different channels.

#### 4.3.2 Biz Bize

When Kadinin Sesi with Yasemin Bozkurt transferred from TGRT to Channel D in February 2004, the afternoon slot of TGRT became suddenly free and recorded programs of Kadinin Sesi could not fill the gap enough. Thus, Enver Oren offered Serap Ezgu who had been a newscaster on TGRT since September 2003 to produce the same programme with the name of *Serap Ezgu ile Kadinin Sesi*. In this way, the second daytime women talk show in Turkey was reborn in the same channel with the same name. However, after particular discussions with Bozkurt the name was changed as *Serap Ezgu Sizin Seginiz* and broadcasted between December 2003 and January 2004 on TGRT.

Having caught a significant success on ratings side shortly, Ezgu attracted the attention of the other channels, especially ATV and Show TV. Thus, a competition between these channels started lively. The competition also was reflected in the press and the offers for Serap Ezgu called as "astronomical figures" (Super Poligon, January 6, 2005). Finally she and three member of her production team in TGRT<sup>24</sup> were transferred to Show TV with a transfer payment of \$5 billion on March 21 2005, changed the name of the show as *Serap Ezgu ile Biz Bize* (Bayraktar, D., personal communication, November 30, 2005). The show of Serap Ezgu has started to be announced with the promotion trailer in Show TV as follows:

"Serap Ezgu continues to make peace between the separated persons, bring fights to an end, and give hope to those missing loved ones! The program starts every day with interesting stories of women at 17:00" (personal observation, March 15, 2005).

---

<sup>24</sup> After the second transfer of its daytime woman talk shows, TGRT put the same method in to practice and started to use same format, with more conservative specialities, with another hostess called Inci Ertugrul under the director of Ahmet Sarbay who has created a new Kadinin Sesi show under the name of *Sizin Seginiz*. During the time of this thesis was written the *Sizin Seginiz* with Inci Ertugrul was still broadcasted.



#### **4.3.2.1 The Topics Of Biz Bize**

Main claim of the Biz Bize show is defined by Serap Ezgu saying that “We bring Turkey face to face its sorrow realities with a special team effort. We get ratings for this with a true and genuine production. As we do not adulterate the soul and mission of the program for ratings the audience find only their genuineness out in this show” (Vatan, November 1, 2005). With this in view, the primary aim of the show is specified by producers as follows: “Rather than creating an argument or tense atmosphere, our aim is to give the TV audience a message that this can happen to you too by displaying example cases, whereby being educational” (Caltali, A., personal communication, May 17, 2005).

To realize these aims and claims programs’ topics are said to be prepared meticulously and carefully. According to this, the topics of the Biz Bize are determined at least two days before, by production team and Serap Ezgu. It became definite that in this selection work the producers, commissioning editor and executive producers of Show TV do not attend the meetings. The ones who determine the the topic selection and how these are discussed are three assistants of Serap Ezgu whom she brought from her TGRT production team namely Seda Cam, Arzu Caltali and Tugba Ulker and sometimes workers and executives of Mepas and Zedpas, which are the sales and advertising departments of Show TV. But last word is always put by Serap Ezgu. (Cam, S., personal communication, May 27, 2005).

The general director Seda Cam points out that no weekly schedule is followed. But topics are gathered around mainly finding missing persons, getting people married, reunion, domestic problems and violence in a way forming the basic features of the Biz Bize format. Around 9 guests’ topics are dealt with in a one day programme. Daily or by the minute topic changes do not realize as they do in the Kadinin Sesi show. The preparations for the programme are completed 3 days before. Among the daily topics, the field of topic which Serap Ezgu insists on and wants to be present at the show surely at least once is the missing people. In this sense, it is necessary to mention that the programme resembles the “missing people” reality show programs and that this segment constitutes an important characteristic of the format of Biz Bize.

Meanwhile, another point that has to be mentioned here is, the topics of incest, sexual harassment are not discussed as seen in Kadinin Sesi. Besides, it is mentioned that apart from the format of Kadinin Sesi the topics of homosexuality, sexual problem, gender readjustment and rape are not particularly discussed. In this sense, it is determined that, as for the topics of

the programme it is not enterprising for being the first in Turkey and doing the untried one like Kadinin Sesi and it has a tendency to go on with the tried one and that has worked.

#### **4.3.2.2 The Guests In Biz Bize**

In the mean time, for the recording, classification of the applications and in order to make a quick selection, a technological system that does not exist in the other programs is utilized. For this there is a special computer operator for the guest's applications. The audiences who want to be guests or to make comments or to attend the programme with a live call-in, when they call the numbers they see on the screen or send a text message through Turkcell on number "3544", their names, requests, and information about the callers is seen on the computer screen with the aid of the special system called 'IVR'. This system provides that all applications can be recorded and when it is deemed appropriate, the callers can be enabled to put through directly to the participation list for call-ins or to enter the potential guest list without any interaction at first. Then, these lists prepared automatically are checked by the producer of the *Serap Ezgu ile Biz Bize* show, Arzu Caltali, and shared with Serap Ezgu and other production members and sometimes executives of Mepas and Zedpas after Caltali's selection.

According to Caltali, there are about 1.000 applicants per day for Biz Bize in this way. And about 9 guests' stories are addressed in Biz Bize to solve the problems allocating approximately 13 minutes per guest every day. They do not give the guests for their participation, but only their accomadation, transportation, as well as a wage of 30-50 YTL under the title of "participation payment"(Caltali, A., personal communication, May 26, 2005).

There is a fixed guest list before the show so, range of the guests and the list of them are not changed anyway. During the show it is observed that the allocated minutes to the guests can be changed and some of them are reduced by 3-5 minutes, however.

The guests in Biz Bize are people who have low socio-economic status, low level of education and have unsolved problems individually or socially. In the meantime it should be mentioned that, the programme which is although stated as a woman programme in the examined programs, the only programme where utmost men guests are taken and their problems are discussed is Biz Bize. In this sense it is expressed that the problems of such guests are allocated in two major groups. The first group, basically depends on domestic and family problems, has to be relied on personal matters while the second one, has to be unsolved problems with state institutions such as police, hospital, court with the reason of

indifference, lack of information, postponement of applications coming not up with a result yet (Caltali, A., personal communication, May 16, 2005).

To illustrate, Caltali states that they pay special care to selection of the guests among which they do not accept those who have not made legal applications concerning their problems (Caltali, A., personal communication, May 17, 2005). She explains this is a principle of the show preparation terms from their work in collaboration with the police and police increase the ratings of the show by the fact the missing and criminals are found and deciphered before the police and police have to follow the show to take them in many times. Accordingly, they assume that if a lost or criminal is found before the police via the show, the interest of the audience increase and high ratings is acquired. In this regard, she expresses that Police Department has excessive files in their hands especially about missing and criminals, the producers of Biz Bize are thus aware that these will reach them as applicant, and they can solve them through two methods. Special research team of the show is on the one hand and the power of the television to access huge amount of people on the other hand. However, she emphasizes that they know their program would not be powerful as the state organs and couldn't work like them (Caltali, A., personal communication, May 18, 2005).

By the way, on the concern of following the lives and matters of the guests after the show, producers signify that they do not regard it as necessary and emphasize the limited number of personnel in their production team for this. However, the only matters for pursuit after the show are lost people, kidnapping and abduction (ibid.).

In this concern the producer of Biz Bize illustrate that saves of their special research team and effort of Serap Ezgu on screen 7 missing girls who could not be found by police were found and surrendered to police on the show up to that day. They specify that they work frequently with the Police and Ministry of the Internal Affairs for such segments of the show and this creates a special mission for Serap Ezgu as a hostess of the show.

Another important point here is how the guests are prepared for the programme and how the issues are discussed. The guests are taken to the preparation rooms one by one and assistants of the producer do not let them to speak with anyone else about what have been told in the preparation room. Then the assistants of producers motivate them how the stories will be discussed in the broadcast. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that they are given various directives to tell their stories in a striking way. In return for this effort, they are promised that Ezgu will help them and a solution will be offered at the end of the show. This motivation of

the assistants also continues during the live broadcast. In the meantime, studio audience also gives help like the assistants of Ezgu.

For example, the guest in the show in May 17, 2005 was Sinan Keskin (personal observation, May 17, 2005) who frequently beats her wife and uses violence againsts her. In his words, her wife named Ms Halime ran away from his house and was sheltered by another man. However, Keskin did not know where she was and whom she was with. During the broadcast, he confessed that he had had some psychological problems and very aggressive mood, so he was very sorry. He apologized for beating her wife and begged Serap Ezgu to find her and to bring her to the studio. After many call-ins with her relatives and friends talking about where she was and what happened to their marriage speculatively, and then she was found –half and two hours later – and connected to the live show. Meanwhile, it should be specified that the moderator of studio audience behind the jimmy jip camera and next to the studio audience directs and encourages them to show their reactions, emotions, angers and exciting for the matter as all they did in the rehearsals during preparations before the show.

On the other hand, it is observed that particular scandalous events and arranged fictional works lead to negative results in the broadcast. One of the most noticeable examples is an old mother who was the guest in May 5, 2005 looking for her missing son for 10 years. She stated that “I would not be able to recognize him if I see him now” and the production team of the show decided to make a joke to this old woman since the producers believe that this would bring “action” and “humor” to the programme (Cam, S. and Caltılı, A., personal communication, May 11, 2005). The son was found in May 11, 2005 and was brought to live show. However, in the reunion segment of the show someone else was first brought to the studio to sit by her side as if he was the real son of the woman. The mother hugged this man in tears, thinking that he was in fact his son as she could not recognize him. Some time later, Ezgu told that this was a joke made by the production team and that this was not her real son. Hereupon, the woman passed out on hearing this shocking news in the live show and she was taken to the hospital immediately. This drew a lot of criticism both from the audience and critics for Ezgu’s irresponsible and strange manners. It was warned that the programs were “continuing to swim in dangerous waters” and the producers were lucky that the woman did not die from heart attack. (Semercioglu, 2005).

The warnings about the show of Biz Bize stem from the show history that includes two suicide and death events successively. In September 2004, a suicide occurred after the programme and then another one occurred. Furthermore, while some critics and debates

about those arouse, another death event occurred in the period of May and June 2005. This event is important as it led to some modifications in the content and format of Biz Bize show.

In the event there is a family as guests whose underaged girl abducted by a married man with two children, named Hasan Konduoglu. In the show on June 6, 2005 the family members specified that they filed for a warrant for the crime. Parallel with the increasing rating reports<sup>25</sup>, the matter of the family members with other relevant guests were dealt with during eight days in the period of June 6- 13, 2005. Later on, Hasan Konduoglu released the girl, but stated that he was falsely accused of very harsh allegations by the family and Serap Ezgu, that he was accused of “abducting” her girlfriend and “raping” her and so, he was labeled a “pervert” due to the Biz Bize show. After he explains his thought and emotions calling in the show, Konduoglu committed suicide, leaving a note that he is going to commit a suicide due to Ezgu’s approaches as follows: “If I die it is because of Serap Ezgu and Show TV. Without knowing me and before my crime was finalized, she disgraced me and my name in the programme to the 70 million. I couldn’t look anyone’s face... She used me for ratings. If I die look at the records then you will understand that the accusations are not real” (Aksoyer, 2005, p.A4).

Whereupon, the public discussions and complaints rise for Biz Bize show with Serap Ezgu and it is increasingly started to expect to be discontinued by Show TV just as Kadinin Sesi and Yalniz Degilsin that had been discontinued in May 2005. Despite of the fact that there are many social reactions, RTUK warnings and debates on public agenda, Mepas and Zedpas advertisement director Didem Bayraktar explains that the show would not be discontinued (Bayraktar D., personal communication, November 30, 2005). She clarifies that hesitating to cancel and make a pay-off, Show TV administration board makes a decision to continue to the show until the end of the contract till June, 2006. In addition, she expresses that the decision is closely related to both the contract with Serap Ezgu and the transfer fee about \$5 million paid for Ezgu (ibid). As can be seen with this explanation, the channel is on the profitability side in the continuation of Biz Bize show.

#### **4.3.2.3 The Experts In Biz Bize**

According to the conducted observation in the studio, it could be possible to say that there was neither expert in the show nor in the pre-production process in the period between April

---

<sup>25</sup> On June 6, 2005, Biz Bize which was 20 in the first 100 in rating rankings, raised to 19 on June, 8 and 15 on June, 10. *Medya Tava Daily Rating Reports*. (June 13, 2005). Retrieved June 16, 2005 from [www.medyatava.com](http://www.medyatava.com).

and May, 2005, just like the beginning of the show in TGRT. Serap Ezgu, in this sense, sees herself capable of directing people, making them to take new decisions and approaches and developing new behavior patterns for their private lives. She states that she is sufficient enough to solve all kind of problems of individuals in 13 minutes –allocated time to a guest on his/her problem- in the show because she is an intellectual person reading personal development books, law books, and Turkish Criminal Law regularly (Arna, 2004). Ezgu points out that she has an immense responsibility, that she directs people informing and educating them as well as making therapy on them. Ezgu mentions that she has received compliments even from famous psychiatrists in Turkey who see her as already an expert. Her words is exemplifying for this: “Marko Pasha was a famous medical man for solving problems that could not even be solved, with the help of listening just like me. Turkey was awarded with a new Marko Pasha after 100 years with me” (ibid. p. A12).

However, since many discussions and cancellations of two famous daytime woman talk shows arise, she starts to announce that she have already used experts in the preparation process of her show -in spite of no expert during the preparations of the show (Ezgu, personal observation, May 22, 2005). Hence, she launches to host a lawyer, Rahmi Ozkan who has an authoritative, humorous and fatherly attitude, in the format of the show in the new broadcast period in September, 2005. Besides, she decided to give a place to a psychiatrist in the content -as a kind of format change- in the show as the suicide event of Hasan Konduoglu in media agenda in November, 2005 required. Hence, psychiatrist Tanju Surmeli<sup>26</sup> with his arguing, serious and informative personality started to stand in the show giving the last words and points to Ezgu. As regards the experts’ manner in the show, it could be possible to describe that they display an attitude speaking only when Ezgu let them, approving the way the matter is discussed in the programme and dictating the people for what to do urgently instead of giving them information and enlightenment. Generally, they play role with Ezgu in emphasizing of the contrasts and inflaming the arguments. Thus, they tend to act to approve the solutions put by Ezgu. Following case can be illustrative to see the experts’ approach:

The guest in Biz Bize on October 12, 2005 was Ms. Aliye, who had ran away from her house and decided to live separately since she had been exposed to violence by her husband. The husband, Mr. Osman, thus did not let her see the children. She wanted to see her children much and begged Ezgu with tears to solve this problem with her husband at the beginning of

---

13 Psychiatrist Tanju Surmeli is an expert who has already become a famous television personality after he appeared in many news, discussion and slot programs. His fame helped him to be selected by Serap Ezgu to be included in the programme as well (Ozsoy, T., personal communication, January 9, 2006).

the show. Then, her bruises and scars started to be mentioned and shown to audience. Besides, many questions were asked to woman to tell the domestic violence by her husband in detail. In the meantime, the images that have been prepared before the show to display Ms. Aliye's bruises and scars with dramatic visual effects started to be broadcasted again and again during 45 minutes. After victimized Ms. Aliye and decried her husband with loud sound among studio audience, at the end of the show Ezgu gave her a solution as her going back to her house because her children were without their mother's warmth. Addition to Ezgu, Rahmi Ozkan, (personal observation, October 12, 2005) as an expert in that show, spoke in Ezgu's favour by saying "Dear child, look, the children of such separated parents suffer from depression over time, we get to hear from the news in the media all the time and witness these, the result is substance addicted children, they fall into the wrong hands, try to come together with your husband and to give necessary care to your children as mother and forther of them".

#### **4.3.2.4 The Studio Audience In Biz Bize**

According to the personal observation about the studio audience in May, 2005, television companies work with professional contact agencies and inform their "studio audience coordinators" about how many people they want and which features of them are required for which programme regularly. Hence, the studio audience of 70 people for Biz Bize –most of them is women- are provided by Show TV's contact agencies and they are brought to the studio set of the show with great secrecy through the security corridors every day. They are not allowed to talk to anyone by the production team and their coordinators.

One of such "audience coordinator" is Nilgun Enver by Koklu Ajans and supplies audiences to the shows. According to her (Enver, N. personal communication, May 16, 2005), when a TV channel needs some group of talented people especially for their daytime women talk show, then, she is contacted and asked to bring some people to studios having particular features. The people for studio audience in the Biz Bize show are generally from the squatters. They are chosen by these agencies among people whose economic situation and education level is low and has no occupation according to Ezgu's and Caltili's will. Every morning they are gathered and taken to the studio. Some of them get money from the producers and some of them partake by paying money to the coordinators. Young, beautiful and well-groomed women who look interesting and talkative and have a feature to argue and to create a conflict are preferred more in Biz Bize (Enver N., personal communication, May 23, 2005). Besides, it should be denoted that they can appear in other daytime woman talk shows after they become the audience "sought for". In this way, these people can make their

agencies or coordinators rich and sometimes be transferred with great amounts of money from one TV channel to another (ibid).

It is possible to mention a certain kind of hierarchy in these audience groups. It is observed during the production of the shows that every audience refrains from their group leaders who have been participating in these programs for two or three years. In this sense, as looked at the statements of such studio audience in Biz Bize some of them say that being in Biz Bize is an exhilarating experiment in their lives. And others state that being close to Serap Ezgu “gives a chance” to become famous. On the other hand, some of them complain about the price to participate the show. “Even though it is forbidden, group leaders collect money from the audience according to the shows.” Another woman complains about the amount of money she spends to buy outfits and make-up equipment to go to Biz Bize. She says that people on duty warn them saying “dress up in colorful and shining clothes, do your make-up, wear jewelery, be attractive.” The canteens of TV channels are thus turned into a shop selling clothes and jewelery for women audience. A male audience also complains, “After we enter the studio, we are of no value. They use us as an accessory for the show.” (Studio Audience, personal communications, May 11-24, 2005).

At this point, Bekir Hazar (2006), a television critic, construes this new studio audience implementation as a sector formed for television industry saying that “an occupation like this has raised woman programs audience. Like football players, rising women groups in these shows are transferred from one channel to other, together with their groups they bargain” (Hazar, May 20, 2006). Burhan Ayeri (2005), on the other hand, defines this situation indicating that “While men sit at coffee houses, women started to sit at the television programs” today (Ayeri, July 16, 2005).

#### **4.3.2.5 The Producers Of Biz Bize**

A team of 26 people is responsible for the production of Biz Bize every day of a week. They work in the Maslak Ata Studios owned by Show TV. Unlike the other production teams of the daytime woman talk show, 70 % of the personnel of the team, include producer, director, assistants, researchers, set workers and others, constitute women. This predominance of women in the production process is learnt to be Serap Ezgu’s special wish. Three core woman members of the production team have been transferred from TGRT and rest of them are from the regular personnels of Show TV working for different programs production processes as well. Nine people working in the production processes are technicians, researchers, administrative officials and the hostess. On the other hand, eight member of



them work during live broadcast in studio set, six cameraman, one jimmy jeep operator and one studio audience moderator who prepares them before the show and orchestrates them during the show. In the production control room –it is actually a bus that is placed next to the studio- there are seven people working together during the live show composed of the image selector, intercom operator, director, the assistants of director, VTR operator and so on. They are in great effort to follow and select the best pictures and to compile them to broadcast. For example, when the image selector finds anyone shedding tears, she right then notifies her colleagues with cheers, putting that guest’s image or studio audience’ picture on screen (Production Team, personal observation, May 20, 2005). Sometimes, it can be observed that reminders passed on over the intercom for studio team is as follows: “make that women continue crying, she looks very good on screen” (Cam, S., May 22, 2005).

The producers are responsible for obeying the directives of Serap Ezgu about the show, for defining target audience, for determining the content and arranging the décor accordingly, for spending of budget allocated, for checking the ratings, and for fulfilling the demands of the advertisers (Ozsoy, T., personal communication, May 20, 2005). With regard to target audience, director Caltılı underscores that at first they had started with the housewives as the target audience in mind with the daytime women talk show format, but eventually they turned out to be watched even at offices and that they were followed by A, B, C, and D audience categories<sup>27</sup>. Moreover, with high requests from men, they started to reformulate the show as a programme being a “platform where women and men’s problems intersect” (Caltılı, A., personal communication, May 17, 2005).

Another example matter that the producers have to fulfill is the arrangements of the décor. Although the design and the maintenance of the décor are met generally by the department of décor and production of Show TV, Ezgu often demands from her team to arrange the décor according to changing contents or broadcast periods. Hence, the décor are designed mainly in blue and orange to symbolize the colors of Show TV and at the same time to mark Ezgu’s “warmth, honesty, and friendship” (ibid.). Serap Ezgu requires frequently some modifications and asks for novelties in the decorations, for which the performance is towards particularly an “image of having a chat in the living room of a home of the studio” (ibid).

Another mission that Ezgu demands to accomplish is some modifications in the format by the production team. Especially after the discontinuation of two famous programs, she starts

---

<sup>27</sup> According to AGB (2005) measurement techniques for the audience classifications, A refers upper socio-economic layer, B is upper-middle socio-economic layer, C refers middle and middle-low socio-economic layer and D is lower socio-economic layer in potential TV audiences.

to worry about the discontinuation of her programme and urgently asks to shift the Biz Bize show format from drama to more entertainment and magazine in the new broadcasting season of her show (Ozsoy, T., personal communication, November 18, 2005).

For example, the segment named “dreams are coming true” is launched accordingly. In this segment, Ezgu and her team try to dim down the negative arguments by concentrating on life’s pleasures and particularly focusing on making some wedding ceremonies on live show. In this way, guests who could not get married are met in the show and Ezgu marries off them in the studio with glamorous ceremonies and marriage officers by meeting all their expenses and gifts from sponsors.

Another modification in the content that has to be organized by the production team is to host people who have artistic talents and who have not been able to utilize their gift without gaining popularity, just as one would see in other reality shows such as “*Akademi Türkiye*” and “*Benimle Dans Eder Misin*”. Thus, such applicants are accepted to the program to show their talents. The applicants are started to be classified according to their talents that they want to display and the preselection is conducted by the team. It is an extraordinary change both for the format of Biz Bize and for the other daytime woman talk shows. It is declared in the show that from now on people with their special, interesting and humorous talents could apply to *Serap Ezgu ile Biz Bize* and can display their undiscovered talents particularly in the field of music (Production team, personal observation, November 13- December 2, 2006).

In the meantime, there is another modification that the production team of the show has to arrange the content accordingly. It is the broadcasting time of the show that has been changed by the Show TV executives in the new broadcasting season of the show in schedule. In this way, the Biz Bize show time which had been changed from 13:30 in 2005 season to 16:00 has been changed from 16: 00 to 13:30 again in December 2005. The reason for the change of the hours is shown to be the competition for ratings with a similar program made by TGRT called Inci Ertugrul ile “*Sizin Sesiniz*” and the Show TV news might be negatively affected by the latest negative events in the field of the daytime woman talk shows as well (Bayraktar, D., personal communication, December 3, 2005).

As a concluding remark what should be expressed in here is that how the members of the production team think and feel about their own program production. It is seen that many producers including the technical team do not like the show and take their work seriously. It is observed that many of them yearn for going out for a cigarette or coffee in each

advertisement break. Besides, they are in a mood to make fun of the topics, the guests and the preparations of the show. In the interviews they mention that this mood is a result of long and hard working conditions that they get very “tired” during the research and “boring preparations” and they personally annoyed with the “topics discussed and the ways of discussions” (Ozsoy, T., Nedim, B. and Arslan, O., personal communication, May 12- 27, 2005). In addition, as regard social criticism about Biz Bize they specify that to understand how the production of the show is realized is very difficult, so, they actually could not make anyone happy. In their sight, they actually do not try to make the show a social institution that people can apply whenever they meet a problem in their personal or social lives before going to police, judicial court or marriage bureau. Rather, they make an effort to produce “a television show in essence with some dramatic effects and performances that is, in fact, only for entertaining audience and for drawing their attention” (ibid).

#### **4.3.2.6 The Hostess Of Biz Bize**

One of the most important aspects of the hostess in the daytime woman talk shows is her manner. This is also such a manner that gives a main frame to the format and particular expectations to the audience about the show. For this reason, if the manner of the hostess changes, then it directly changes the format too. In this sense, it should be mentioned that Ezgu has quietly different and unusual hostess manner in the field of the daytime woman talk shows. As it can be observed during that period, she presents a personality being aggressive, offensive, inquisitorial, and motivative towards both the members of the production team and participators. For example, when something goes wrong in the preparations for the show to look more dramatic, attractive, and entertaining, Ezgu displays aggressive behaviours and may reprimand the audience and her production team harshly<sup>28</sup> (Ezgu, S., personal observation, May 18, 2005). She is also a dominating personality in every level production. Ezgu coordinates everything with great diligence and nervousness from having guests seated to the decor, and clothing to conversations and camera angles. She calculates every detail in Biz Bize before the show starts. Additionally, Ezgu frequently assumes a rather vulgar manner on the participants as well. To illustrate, one of her harsh statements is towards a man, who does not agree with her point of view and defends his own point, call in is as follows: “This program is a virtuous program, I cannot allow any talk or event to smear this virtue, do you understand me your rascal?” (Ezgu, S., personal observation, May 17, 2005).

---

<sup>28</sup> Some members of the production team of Biz Bize, particularly work for other programs in Show TV often say that they do not like Ezgu and her manner of working or behaving as it is too difficult to work and agree with her (Ozsoy, T., personal communication, May 22, 2005).

However, after particular discontinuation and discussions on the public agenda, she decides to change her manner saying her production team that: “From now on we have to swim in quiet waters. Biz Bize will show people that there are not only unhappiness stories but also happiness stories” (Ozsoy, T., personal communication, December 12, 2004). Hence, she starts to change her manner towards the participants on live show adopting a more pleasant tone of voice. For example, her closure word at the end of the show “I love you very much” is emerged following this period (Ezgu, S., personal observation, November 15, 2005).

According to the close observation, while she changes her manner, she always considers the social values of guests and of participants she addresses. She states that her job is very difficult since she “deals with people from low socio-economical status” (Arna, 2004, p. A12). According to Ezgu, her job as a hostess and the production her show which dealt with the people from the aforesaid group is very dangerous. She, for this reason, underlines that they should according to their participants’ social and personal features and should organize the show accordingly to not draw social reactions. In her sight, the genre of the daytime woman talk show has two faces that they should be aware and bear in mind.

Hence, Ezgu makes a special emphasis on their social responsibility and mission related to working with the public organs rather than ratings. On the concern of displaying guilties and finding of lost people, she comments, “The show is not an alternative to police forces”, but she adds they have a special mission simply to assist the government forces (ibid).

#### **4.3.2.7 The Advertisements In Biz Bize**

The programme is broadcasted 3 hours and there is a total of 70-85 minutes of advertisement composing of 8 breaks. Each break takes 10-13 minutes, thus 18-23 of different company’s advertisements appear in every breaks. Besides, there are total approximately 90 different companies’ advertisements, which include also participant sponsors’ advertisements, take place on screen of Biz Bize employing in-frame, logo, subtitles, and strip advertisements. At the end of the show about 20 barter sponsors’ logos and 15 participation sponsors’ frames also take place in the Biz Bize show’s credit. They are companies from the fields of hairdressing, transportation, hotel, food, drink, jewellery, and household appliance and so on. Some expenses as transportation and accomodation for guests and studio audience are also met in this way (Dagli, E., personal communication, December 14, 2005).

What is more, there is a full sponsor in the show. It can be a new company that Mepas has not worked with before or a usual company that is worked with regularly in other advertisement breaks of Show TV. Hence, if an advertiser think that the effect of

advertisements that his/her company's products or services are promoted in the breaks of the show is not sufficient as expected, the workers in Mepas makes a suggestion that company can be integrated into the content of Biz Bize as full sponsor or participation sponsor to provide more efficiency (Akgul, O., personal communication, November 16, 2005). It is Brilliant Textile Group, which has signed up for the full sponsor of the show and approving the proposal involving the price of \$70.000 per month for one year (ibid.). However, Brilliant experiences troubles regarding the brand prestige particularly after some scandalous murders realized after Kadinin Sesi on Channel D and the discontinuations of Kadinin Sesi and Yalniz Degilsin. Brilliant executives concern that Serap Ezgu and Biz Bize show would be removed from broadcast, so, they seek to look for a more reliable and modest programme for the same target group of audience-housewives. Hence, Brilliant makes a three-month agreement with a sponsorship price of \$35.000 for another daytime women talk show named *Inci Ertugrul Sizin Seginiz Show* in TGRT (Baysal, A., personal communication, December 18, 2005). Hereupon, Mepas and Zedpas begin to seek a new full sponsor subsequent to the favorable sponsorship activities of Brilliant and put in bid of \$70.000 for the Biz Bize show sponsorship (Akgul, O., personal communication, November 16, 2005). The declared advantages that Biz Bize provides for full sponsors in the proposal are as follows:

The special VTR of "XXX Presents" at the start for 12 seconds and "XXX Presented" at the end for 12 seconds are shown. The special VTR with "The Programme 'Serap Ezgu ile Biz Bize' brought to you by XXX will be continued after the break" is shown at each advertisement break for 10 seconds. A total of 12 promotion trailer belonging to 'Serap Ezgu ile Biz Bize' show with XXX" will be shown each week on Show TV as 3 PT<sup>29</sup>, 2 EPT<sup>30</sup> and 7 OPT<sup>31</sup>. In these trailers, a special VTR with "XXX Presents" will be shown for 12 seconds<sup>32</sup> (Special Proposal, Mepas, 2005).

In the program sponsors can also interfere with the selection of guests as they have a right to bring in 2 or 3 guests to the program a day. This is a special right that is specified as a mutual promise and not put on the proposition sheet. It is proposed that while Mepas is entered into an agreement with client company about how they are going to work in conjunction with on the content for advertising activities (Akgul, O., personal communication, December 9, 2006)

---

<sup>29</sup> PT refers the prime time advertisement zone, between 19:00 and 23.00 pm. (Aslan, O., personal communication, May 17, 2005).

<sup>30</sup> EPT refers the early prime time advertisement zones, between 18:00 and 19:00 pm (ibid.).

<sup>31</sup> OPT refers that off prime time advertisement zones, between 16:00 and 18:00 (ibid.).

<sup>32</sup> See Appendix J for the original proposal sheet.

In addition to the selection of guest, full sponsor and participation sponsors can interfere with the content by hidden advertisement implementations. To illustrate, many wedding ceremonies on the show start to be put into practice to advertise and to promote the sponsors' products and services. For this reason, "dreams are coming true" segment is designed and Ezgu starts to marry off the guests, who could not get married, and to give them particular products and services from sponsors as gifts and dowry on live show. According to this, if "a lucky woman and a man" is married in the Biz Bize show, Ezgu can give them bride gowns from Sis, dowry sets from Seral, curtain sets from Brillant, wool carpets from Koyunlu, bedroom furniture from Sultan Mobilya, gold sets from Altin Basak and honeymoon holidays from Afyon Orucoglu for those newly married couples (personal observation, October 12-25, 2005).

On the other hand, due to the rising criticisms and discussions about the daytime woman talk shows, many sponsors also anxious about the discontinuation of Biz Bize or draw negative criticisms. Thus, a protection for brands, under which the companies' products and services are advertised or promoted in the show, is also offered against the possibilities for discontinuation of the program, for harsh warnings by RTUK and for harsh criticisms from consumers. Accordingly, the special VTRs would not be valid and the advantages that the company has bought for full sponsorship would be preserved as they are, transferring them to another suitable Show TV programme in the case of such situations (Akgul, O., personal communication, December 9, 2006)

According to the workers of Zedpas and Mepas, unlike other TV channels, which own the daytime woman talk shows, such possibilities do not affect their price neither for sponsorships nor for advertisements in the breaks. In this regard, looking at the tariffs of Mepas and Zedpas, the price of per unit second of the advertisement break at the begining of the Biz Bize show is \$975 and the price of per unit second of the advertisement breaks during the show is \$1.250. Besides, the price of per unit second of in-frame implementations such as frame, logo, subtitles, and strip advertisements is \$1.500<sup>33</sup> (Dagli, E., personal communication, December 9, 2005). Comparatevely speaking, the tariffs for advertisement breaks of the Biz Bize show have a big difference of two or three in their prices with other daytime woman talk shows. This makes it the most expensive, but, one of the most preffered programs by advertisers as well.

---

<sup>33</sup> It is also emphasized that there is always special dicounts from these declared tariffs that can be to the degree of 94 % (Dagli, E., personal communication, December 12, 2005)

With this in view, the show of Biz Bize which costs is said to be \$100 thousand to Show TV (ibid.) provides an important revenue with advertisements activities between September 1, 2004 and May 31, 2005 is estimated about \$9 million per month (MTM, 2005). These figures also implies the huge size of the profitability of Biz Bize show and indicates how this daytime woman talk show has turned into a considerably valuable programme for Show TV channel.

### **4.3.3 Yalniz Degilsin**

The Yalniz Degilsin show started on January 31, 2005 on ATV in the morning time slot and was hosted by Aysenur Yazici, former newscaster and writer, becoming another daytime women talk show phenomenon after the show's discontinuation in May 18, 2005. The program was broadcast in late morning at 11.00 and its format was formed by purchasing another reality show's format namely *Sen Olsaydin* in Show TV by adopting it into a daytime woman talk show (Yazici, A., personal communication, May 8, 2005) As forming the format many features were added the show under reality shows as third famous and pionerring daytime women talk show format in Turkish television channels.

In this account, during the period of the show's broadcasting in May, 2005 it was defined that the show had been planned to continue for 6 more months if the ratings were favorable. However, just after the discontinuation of Kadinin Sesi program due to certain murders and social reactions, ATV management was also discontinued Yalniz Degilsin in the same day with Kadinin Sesi. According to Yazici, the reason for this was that ATV management were wary of taking social reactions to ATV and that they wanted to take precaution to avoid punishments by RTUK although there are not physically injury and death events occurred up to that day as the other shows analyzed did (Yazici, A., personal communication, May 19, 2005).

#### **4.3.3.1 The Topics Of Yalniz Degilsin**

The fundamental topics in the show are primarily individual violence events, family problems, quarrels, philistinism, unemployment, and financial problems of ordinary people. The topic selection is conducted by an editorial board, which include show producer Selma Demirkol; show director Safak Bakkalbasioglu from BBO<sup>34</sup>; research director Alper Ateş

---

<sup>34</sup> BBO (Bir Baska Olusum) is the hired independent TV production company to conduct the Yalniz Degilsin show for ATV channel, which was established by famous TV director Safak Bakkalbasioglu who was also the former director of the entertainment show viz. Zaga Show with Okan Bayulgen in Channel D.

from BBO, one regular sociologist Gamze Salmanli as an expert; one advertisement director; some research assistants of production team; and one executive producer, but not the hostess.

Thus, the determinations of the topics and of the manners of processing are totally in hands of ATV management and BBO organization. Topic selection and necessary preparations for next three days are finished by production team and the fixed contents are sent to Yazıcı one night before by fax to give her an opportunity to study on the contents till the morning. In this sense, she is emphasized that she generally reads the relevant Human Rights Declarations, Legal Criminal Justice etc. in the evenings to make ready for her performance related with the topics for the next Yalniz Degilsin show. She highlights that the format features of the show are very strict because of ATV management. For this reason, any sort of incest, brothel victims, and singers are not included as topics, but striking events around domestic violence in general (Yazıcı, A., personal communication, May 9, 2005).

Besides, it should be noted that there is a strong will of ATV management to make the show similar to the reality court shows in America which are based on legal cases and jury system. Hence, the studio décor is designed to be like in those programs, built around an oval platform similar to a court. Accordingly, the guests are positioned in center and the studio audiences are located around them like an Ancient jury court (ibid.). Moreover, all camera angles, technological equipments, pre and post production facilities are organized to supply such feeling for the show (Demirkol, S., personal communication, May 11, 2005). Being different from two previous mentioned shows, the guests' stories in Yalniz Degilsin are pursued after the show, to be archived and to be employed again after some developments (Salmanlı, G., personal communication, May 6, 2005).

#### **4.3.3.2 The Guests In Yalniz Degilsin**

The guests are also selected by the same editorial board and some preparations for them are done by the production team daily. Everyday there are nearly 300 applicants for the show. A research is done beforehand about these applicants and their stories in terms of their compatibility with the show topics.

After selecting the guests, the VTRs that will be used in the show and the outdoor shootings that will be employed in presenting the guests' stories visually are determined, as well as the order of the guests in story line and the manner that will be exerted in handling their stories are also determined before the further preparations are completed.



Maximum 4 applicants are selected to be guests and their stories are dealt with a daily show. In selection of this 4 people what is taken into consideration is their being particularly young girls and women, who were exposed to violence, in conformity with the policy of ATV about the show. For this reason, many guests who have been physically violent towards them are masked and called with “nick names” in the show in order to protect them in their lives after the broadcast. On the day of the broadcast, the assistants take the guests to a preparation room and tell them what to say and how. The last person who speaks with guests and tells them what to do is the producer Selma Demirkol. None of the guests can appear in the broadcast without her last check. In this sense, Demirkol see everyday the new guests which she defines as “new goods received” in the preparation room and give them the necessary directives according to the conducted plan and tempo of the show. Meanwhile, the guests are also always reminded that if they do not act accordingly, they can be taken off the broadcast (Demirkol, S., personal observation, May 11, 2005).

Besides, the call-in participants are also arranged and prepared by the same team about what they would talk and how minutes they can partake. Accordingly, there is not sudden modification in the show to change guests, topics, or storyline, except for experts’ contribution to Yazici’s words. The show is conducted in every level of broadcasting according to the predetermined plan. They seem to try to take care of guests and their television experience. The guests are not given any payment in return for participating in the program, but the expenses of accommodation, transformation and food of the guests are met by ATV. Besides, there are professional first-aiders in the studio and an ambulance in front of the building are kept ready as precaution against guests who fell faint or have heart attack during the show.

It is possible to observe that the guests’ stories are addressed within the frame of going personal to general, and then urgent solutions to their problems are offered. Apart from the other shows analyzed, the *Yalniz Değilsin* show seems to have mission on not sending the guests they brought to the studio empty handed and without solutions. The primary aim of the show is defined as to find solutions to topic, particularly financial problems, employment and health in any way possible till the end of the program for the “helpless guests”.

It is such that Yazici (Yazici, A., personal observation, May 12, 2005) in the name of being able to turn into reality mentions some names of many rich and famous businessmen, inviting them to call in. Eventually a few businessmen “who can not stand hearing their names again and again in the show call in and say that they will help to the guests’ matters discussed”, whereby the show turns into a type of donation show where some men’s credit

card loans are paid off, some girls are given some grants to go to school, some unemployment husbands are provided job and so on (Yazici, A., personal communication, May 13, 2005).

One of the best examples is three non-educated and married young girls in the show in May 13, 2005. Sevda, Nurcan and Nurgul Kaplan sisters (personal observation, May 13, 2005) were guests with nick names, wigs and masks in the show. The girls confessed why they had ran away from their father's house in live show. Accordingly, the Kaplans were 11 siblings in total and 10 of them were girls, none of the siblings went to school. The girls were frequently subjected to torment from their father and were not allowed to go to school in spite of their crying. Therefore, they ran away from Tarsus and came to Istanbul to find any opportunity for education, and then they thought that the Yalniz Degilsin show could help them for this. They also said that no other program accepted them due to their stories about the education problems but only Yalniz Degilsin. Hereupon, Yazici (Yazici, A., personal observation, May 13, 2005) tried to find a solution to meet the education expenses of the siblings and started to mention that Sinan Aygun, the head of Ankara Chamber of Commerce, is a very benevolent and generous businessman. After a while Sinan Aygun called in the program and said that he would give jobs to the girls and meet their school expenses.

In this sense, it is noted that unlike the other shows examined, Yalniz Degilsin format seems to focus on more material solutions for the guests. However, this does not always happen as arranged and some negative events occur. The most famous and discussed example of this is the case of "little Samet".

The topic on the program dated May 14, 2005 was violence and the guest was Ms Cigdem (personal observation, May 14, 2005) with the story about her young son viz. Samet, who had been badly beaten by his father and kept under his torture in a house. Ms Cigdem applied to the program "to take her son off her husband's hands". This story was dealt with throughout the show with the slogan "the victim of domestic violence: Samet" and the theme of violence was discussed along with prearranged scenes of violence. The focus was how the child was beaten by Ms. Cigdem's divorced husband and the violence scenes with some reenactments were shown again and again during the show. Yazici (personal observation, May 14, 2005) announced that henceforth Samet would be under her special protection and be her sibling and cousin, as well as, the cute "mascot" of her show. Yazici also declared that when Samet recovered, all his expenses for maintenance, accommodation and education would be met by her and she received big applause from studio audience. The topic and

Ms.Cigdem's story continued for three days with no result. Yazici still started each program with Samet's smiling face in a photo on screen and with slogan about Yalniz Degilsin's success on programming. However, the expected result was not like that. Meanwhile Samet's father did want to give him to his mother and also continued the torture against his son. Consequently, Samet was taken to the hospital by the father's relatives. Following day, news came as a shock when it was learnt that Samet died in the hospital in May 17, 2005. After the scandalous discontinuation of the show in May 18, 2005 Ms. Cigdem was sent to her hometown rapidly and her situation was no more taken interest by neither editorial board of ATV nor BBO (Cigdem, Y., personal observation, May 18, 2005).

#### **4.3.3.3 The Experts In Yalniz Degilsin**

There is no visible expert hosted in the show of Yalniz Degilsin. However, it is observed that during the preparations and research periods experts' opinions are taken from 5 experts including 1 psychologist, 2 lawyers, and 2 sociologists. 2 of them are experts working with the production team regularly in preparation and in broadcasting of the show, as well as in the other fields of the show such as research, editing, script writing or even looking for advertisers and sponsors. These 2 experts are authorized to intervene to the flow of the show behind the cameras particularly in close collaboration with the producer Demirkol, the director Bakkalbasioglu and the producer assistants.

The producer and the director of the show organize the show and direct the experts to make contribution to Yazici's words in live show whenever they see it is necessary. To illustrate, when the show goes the points related to the gaps and insufficiencies of the system, the assistants ask the experts and get the cue to say about the topic at that moment for Yazici. If they think that a reference is needed to be made to a legal article, some portions from Human Rights Articles, EU and UNESCO proclamations are immediately looked in order to give cue to Yazici on time during the programme (Salmanlı, G., personal observation, May 10, 2005).

#### **4.3.3.4 The Studio Audience In Yalniz Degilsin**

The studio audience like the guests is not given any payment in return for participating, but they have to pay a fee to their audience coordinator agencies. They are composed of 65-70 people in each show day and most of them are going to both Kadinin Sesi show in Channel D and Yalniz Degilsin show in turn. For this reason, it is highly possible to meet most of them in the different daytime woman talk shows' studios as they assigned to the shows by their audience coordinators each day as well.

It is distinguished that the studio audience in *Yalniz Degilsin* is much more active position in the show production than the others examined. A special role is given to them to provide their participation in the show to raise particularly conflicts and discussions. Hence, the microphone is given to the audience one by one and they are asked to state their opinions and to make a judgement on the topic dicussed, which is an important feature of the *Yalniz Değılsin* format. The guest is seated around the guests in a higher set décor than the guests sitting in the lower centre of the studio, which is in the shape of a judgement room<sup>35</sup>.

To illustrate, after a guest makes statement her/his story, a poll is carried out to find out what studio audience think in common and then arranged call-ins guests' relatives or acquaintances start. As an important feature of the format of *Yalniz Degilsin*, it is tried to make studio audience judge the guests, their problem and relations with the help of the call-ins leading to raise the esixtent discussions or to fight on the live show.

With the help of the audience coordinator's motivating the studio audience the show is sometimes turned into a live reality court show due to the effort to deal with the topics with more conflicting views. In this sense, the hostess is given a role to collect conflicting views and make the final decision like a judge (Studio audience, personal observation, May 8-17, 2005).

#### **4.3.3.5 The Producers Of Yalniz Degilsin**

There are 30 people working in the production team of the show during the pre-production and production processes involving the producer, the assistants of producers, experts, technicians, directors, and researchers. According to the observation in the studio, the producers of the show work under very hard conditions for production of the show. They do their jobs with long-working hours. Particularly the team of research and scriptwriting has to work nearly 14 hours a day and 7 days a week, and they could not even go home on some days. All of them emphasize that there is big pressure on them as to the ratings. Hence, they express that they have to arrange all their work time and organizations of participants with the strong pressure on them (Production Team, personal communication, May 13, 2005). Hence, they are responsible for all phases of production and broadcasting of the show. Moreoever, they are also responsible to make the guests as possible as "interesting, dramatic and sensational" as BBO and ATV executives want (Ates, A., personal communication, May 13, 2005).

---

<sup>35</sup> See Appendix F for the studio environment of *Yalniz Degilsin*.

However, oftenly changing broadcasting time of the show makes difficult their responsibilities in their account. To illustrate, scheduling, which is specified as one of the most important dynamics in conducting their show, is always related to the other programs and particularly rival shows. Hence, they have to be careful and flexible to take necessary steps in the content immediately to raise the ratings and keep them up. However, according to them, fluctuating scheduling of ATV makes their responsibilities very hard. Aysenur Yazici exemplifies this situation in the name of her production team by saying,

We could never move our right broadcasting time, 13:00 pm. like the other daytime woman talk shows viz. *Kadinin Sesi* or *Biz Bize*. We now run at 11:00 am. When the show first started, we were in the 17:00-19:00 pm. slot [i.e. EPT] and we were expected to sell the prime time news of ATV with Ali Kirca as it was the next program. We did this successfully for two weeks, but the editorial board of ATV was not satisfied and regarded that we could not compete with *Serap Ezgu ile Sizin Seginiz* in TGRT they moved the show at 16:00 pm.. Thus, we were taken to 11.00 a.m. They preferred rebroadcasting the serial of “Dadı” again as a substitute for us. We are very unhappy about the Channel’s indecision about our air time and this makes our responsibilities quite difficult. We have been fed up with our job as we have to consider who broadcast against us and what we should do continuously. May be everyone has a different style; maybe they don’t like us and will watch Serap Ezgu. Why should we cut in on her ratings? And if you ask me, why should she cut ours? (Yazici, A., personal communication, May 13, 2005).

As was noted with her explanation, the concept of the rating is very important for Yalniz Degilsin’s producers and ATV executives as well. Thus, it could be possible frequently meet some rating-oriented practices in the production process. To illustrate, it is frequently possible to hear the director’s voice on the intercom with Yazici at a very critical moment during the live show “ask her, what did her husband hit her with, did it hurt much, make her open up and show her wound” (Bakkalbasioglu, S., personal observation, May 18, 2005).

#### **4.3.3.6 The Hostess Of Yalniz Degilsin**

The hostess of the Yalniz Degilsin show is the famous TV personality, news presenter, and writer Aysenur Yazici. She is also TV programmer and accustomed to producing reality shows as she was the former producers of the reality show called *Adliye Koridorlari* with the producer Mahmut Ovr (Yazici, A., personal communication, May 11, 2005). Yazici states that she had never thought of making a daytime women talk show like her colleagues until it was offered to her. She also express that after the debut of Yalniz Degilsin on January 31, 2005, she sat down and started to think about what she could do different from the others.

Yazici points out that as a woman who suffered from violence from her first husband the woman problems in Turkey are of vital importance and that these problems are needed to be dealt with by television. According to her, the reason why the daytime woman talk shows are proliferated is the moral collapse experienced in Turkey particularly after 1980s regarding the family institution in Turkey. She insists that this fact was revealed only by means of the daytime woman talk shows and they have such a special mission because Guldal Aksit, the current minister of Ministry of Woman and Family in Turkey, does not her duty in such an important position (Yazici, A., personal communication, May 11, 2005). For this reason, she lays accent on her attempts to give a notice of question with the help of Sivas Deputy of Nurettin Sozen to Grand National Assembly of Turkey.

She also emphasized why she is such a sensitive hostess being different from others, by her attempt to call the Ministry of Woman and Family about the problems they deal with in the show. However, Yazici points out that she was aware of the difficulty in trying to change the system with one TV programme and the difficulties in the editorial board of the show that force Yazici to behave with particular manners (ibid.). She stresses the fact of the rating imperatives on her in every level of production. Therefore, she means that some times she does not pay attention to interferences during the live show and sometimes she does not do what she was told even when she was reprimanded.

In that case, Yazici says that she often contradicts with the ATV management and producers of the program, and that she tries as much as possible not to approach the guests with judgemental, accusative and condemning attitudes even though she had been even told to do so, but she can not directly oppose the management. For this reason, she emphasizes that she tries to keep her objective position to listen to both sides of the story to make any comments in dealing with a guest, and that she unintentionally assumed the role of a judge with concerns of keeping objectivity, just as the producers had wanted her to do. Moreover, although she still believes that she can change something via her program's continuation that will be work some sort of a "fourth force" in the society, she is greatly aware that to materialize her individual hope is very difficult and required a long-term struggle with both owners of private TV channels and the existent production system of broadcasts (ibid.).

Another important issue for Yazici is that the name of the genre called. Accordingly, she refrains from evaluating the show as a reality show genre which she regards having much commercial purposes. Yazici (Yazici, A., personal communication, May 16, 2005) thinks that it would be better to be declared the show as a genre of "social problem show".

However, she also point out that although she was much tried to prevent her program from being promoted with this name, the editorial board of ATV rejected her suggestion again.

Yazici also receives a lot of reaction because of her authoritative and almighty role in the program just as the hostesses of the similar programs did. However, she defends herself by saying that she tries to only help people and does not her job as Yasemin Bozkurt. According to her, the Channel D decision about the discontinuation of Kadınin Sesi is right, but ATV's quietly wrong. She explains this by specifying:

Yasemin was doing a very different programme from mine. She was manipulating people by making such interpretations like a judge, police or mother-in-law. However, I was getting requests from nearly 300 women every day who wanted to appear on the show; there are few shelters for battered women with a capacity of 225 women. For God's sake, make their eyes open. If we are doing wrong, then why doesn't the parliament do something, why doesn't it enforce a law . . . There is a strong tendency to hide some issues and keep women in silence. If you do not talk about these problems, there would be no problem. But these shows display helpless people, the government and the reality of Turkey (Yazici, A., personal communication, May, 25, 2005)

Because of the discontinuation of the shows, Yazici wants to start an open air protest campaign together with the women who came to Yalniz Degilsin, forming a sort of a "fan club" against the "media power that judges and kill them" (ibid.). According to Yazici, the removal of her programme made her deeply sorrowful and revengeful because of the unfair treatment she received and the cowerdice of ATV. Yet, the result does not change since ATV makes a decision not to make another daytime women talk show with her again (Yazici, A. personal communication, May 27, 2005). The reason behind this is implied to be not the social sensitivity or responsibility, but recent rating reports being low and unsatisfactory advertisement activities in the show for Zedpas and Mepas, which also market Biz Bize in Show TV (Salmanlı, G., personal communication, May 25, 2005).

#### **4.3.3.7 The Advertisements In Yalniz Degilsin**

The total programme duration is two hours and the net advertisement duration is approximately 50-60 minutes of the show. There are 5 advertisement breaks and each of them lasts 10 or 12 minutes. According to the conducted research on them, the advertisements in breaks are mostly related to the woman and child matters and the fields of interests because the broadcasting time of the show, 11:00 am is also one of the main watching times of children.

The program does not have full, participating or barter sponsors. According to the members of the production team, the reason why Zedpas and Mepas still do nothing about the sponsor sales of the show is the scheduling problem between ATV executives and the production team. Thus, in producers' point of view, Zedpas and Mepas have preferred to stay a while before making sponsor proposals for the show in order to see and have credits about the ratings and the concentration of advertisement breaks of the show (Ates, A., personal communication, May 17, 2005). This implies that the only revenue for the show is obtained from the advertisement breaks. For this reason, the editorial board of ATV suggests that the production team should also look for sponsors and bring them into the program to show Mepas and Zedpas their program how much credible (Salmanli, G., personal communication, 17 May 2005). In this respect, the production team states an urgent necessity to create a good web of advertisers and sponsors for the show to help women they dealt with and to continue their job without any fear and stress about discontinuation.

Until now, we analyzed the findings of participatory observation in studios and of in-depth interviews with producers, participants and workers of sales and advertisement departments of TV channels about the production processes of the shows. However, to reach a better understanding concerning the shows analyzed a short examination about how such complicated production processes have created what kind of social criticisms and discussions in Turkish agenda, as well as complaints made to RTUK is beneficial. Meanwhile, taking into account that under which conditions advertisement implementations in the shows are carried out; that why they are so important for TV channels; and that what the RTUK's stance is as a regulatory institution is also beneficial to illuminate the matter of the subject.

#### **4.4 Criticisms And Discussions About The Programs**

Criticisms about the daytime woman talk shows in question are highly related to producers regarded that they are not doing sufficient investigation about the guests and not be careful about how to handle guests and their real life problems. These criticisms mostly concentrated on the daytime women talk show formats and the producer's approaches. It could be possible to classify these criticisms put by media, various intellectual groups and women organizations in three groups. Those are (i) using elements like entertainment, drama, trauma, therapy and confession on live broadcast in dealing with important social problems of the country, such as violence against women, sexual problems, low income, lack of education, and family feuds plays a significant role in revealing some bad results such as family problems, murders, suicides and so on, (ii) producers acting considerably according to



their commercial interests and (iii) the lack of broadcasting responsibility on the real human lives.

Since January 2004, when especially the number of programs on private TV channels started to increase, the discussions in the press and media about the shows also started to rise particularly after some murders committed in May, 2005. In this way, the show kept the agenda of the country busy for an important period of time. As to examining such discussions, the news on press and media that took place between February 5, 2004 and December 25, 2005 were investigated so that the criticisms and agenda related to the subject could be followed.

At this point, it should be specified that these criticisms led to many discussions towards the shows which separated into various branches but two main wings; on the one hand, proponents focus on cultural and social contexts in which the shows contents emanated, on the other hand, the opponents criticize the producers and their manners of production. The organization of Women for Women's Human Rights' explanation in relation to the proponents' approaches to the shows is illustrative. Pinar Ilkkaracan, co-founder of the Women's Human Rights' organization, supports the aim of the emergence of the shows by saying "The major social problem is that these women get no help in that they have no other place to turn to. I think these programs have emerged because of what's happening in the field. Women wanted to speak out, they wanted help" (cited in Schliefer, 2005).

In addition, I. U. Research and Application Centre for Women Problems also affirm the point. Prof. Dr. Necla Arat, the director of the organization, defends that blaming the programs and producers is wrong. According to her, "we cannot solve problems by ignoring them. There is no other place where these women can apply to. For years studies have not been done sufficiently. These programs are only reflecting the real events. While polygamy [more than one wife] and religious marriage is so widespread, the majority of the public is not aware of it" (cited in Yurtcu, 2005).

Such point of view finds support by some of the sociologists as well. For example, the sociologist Nilufer Narli lays stress on the Turkish society which goes through a period of rapid modernization, and tied this development to European Union concept. According to her, the Turkish women are becoming more open about talking domestic violence, a topic that was once strictly kept within household walls. Pointing out shows like *Kadinin Sesi*, she claims that "Domestic violence used to be a taboo subject, but now people openly discuss it. Things in Turkey are changing with the help of such programs" (cited in Schliefer, 2005).

Moreover, many of the famous newspaper columnists advocate the programs and try to direct attention to the “social realities” and their effects to create public interest. One of them is *Hurriyet* columnist is Fatih Altayli (2005) that participates such point of views by asking “Are only woman programs to blame?” According to him, the reason of the ‘honor’ and tradition-based murders are by no means related to such programs because there were always customs and ‘honor’ murders Turkish society before these programs. Altayli maintains that murders will not end by removing the daytime woman talk shows, while the Ministry of State responsible for women and family affairs continues to do nothing about the women matters, and the total blame should not be attributed to two or three TV programs.

What is more, some interested groups initiate certain activities to draw the Grand National Assembly of Turkey’s attention to this issue and to contribute to systematical solutions in Turkey. Thus, a proposal, which is awaiting in the Turkish Parliament agenda for some time and demands a study to be carried out in honor murders in the society, is resubmitted. Accordingly, the programs actually have been an inducement and have served a positive purpose to initiate officials on the waiting concerns of woman matters in Turkey. In this way, woman programme murders and discussions have been regarded as useful means for the issue to enter the parliament agenda. With the help of the discussions and reactions in public agenda it was thought that the proposal of establishing a ‘Research Commission on Honor Murders’ could be quickly brought to the general board and could be accepted unanimously by the AK Party and CHP deputies (Aksiyon, 2005; Grand National Assembly of Turkey [GNAT], 2005).

On the other hand, opponents criticize the show producers in terms of their rating-oriented practices and irresponsible operations in handling topics and guests. There is an important emphasis on the fact of “rating” and the industrial conditions that producers have to operate in. According to Davut Sahin (2004), *Yeni Asya* Newspaper columnist, “talking *Türkiye*” could not be created by means of such programs. In his sight, they only create an environment of conflict which turns into low level disputes, the most private secrets are revealed and after the interest of the audience are aroused, the commercials continue on and on (He also specifies this by emphasizing “your voice, nor the voice of women, but has turned into being only the voice of rating” (ibid. pA4).

Addition to Sahin, Reha Muhtar (2005), a famous journalist and programme presenter in Turkey, also stresses that Yasemin Bozkurt should not be pressured, that she does not do these on her own, independent of anyone, that it is actually the channel managers that are the ones to blame. According to him, the channel managers are long aware of Bozkurt’s

performance and style in the programme, but have refrained until the last minute from making any serious interventions owing to high ratings, and eventually blaming Bozkurt, they chose to dispense with her.

In this account, Ertugrul Ozkok (2005), the general broadcasting manager of Hurriyet newspaper in Turkey, defends the liberal functions of television and states that the main problem is the competitive and ambitious producers and presenters that are harmful to the field of television rather than the channel management and production conditions. According to him, Bozkurt and some other women presenters have arrived at a dangerous point and thus their channels have been forced to remove their programs from broadcast:

Actually this is not suitable to our liberal approach to television programs because including me, most of us prefer the audience or reader to make decisions in such issues. However, there was a different situation in women discussion programs...The television platform [for such shows] became the arena of women gladiators... a gun was fired. The show on screens turned into a show in real life... That's why the right decision to remove these kinds of programs from the Channel D and ATV broadcasts is highly sound (ibid. p.A 19).

Furthermore, Can Dunder, (2005) Milliyet columnist, writer and documentary producer, makes an important stress on the issue by expressing that the daytime woman talk shows are typically examples of television which has become not a part of solution but a part of problem. In this account, he specifies that the approaches of Channel D and ATV are right as they discontinued their daytime woman talk shows. Thus, he specifies that this common approach should reflect the other programs that are under the so-called reality shows, whereby televizyon channels clean oneself without necessitating RTUK's sanctions. Drawing the attention to the profitability side of the shows, Dunder emphasizes the importance of making an urgent summit agreement between TV managers and advertisers to save current level of broadcasts from the dominance of over simplification (ibid. p.A16).

The Family Preservation Group, in this sense, makes a declaration that these simplistic broadcasts lead to a significant level of degeneration in the family structure and in the society as 'the slightest degeneration in the family would spread to the whole society'. From this respect, Gulsum Kurt, the director of the group, makes an analogy resembling "a television to a chess player, people to pawns, and houses to a chess board", so she maintains that "all kinds of activities in the daytime woman talk shows such as products and promotions of advertisers, and the production and broadcasting of such programs could distort the structure of the family" (cited in Dogan, 2005).

Hereupon, some members of the government decided to take some steps on this issue. With the help of AKP Usak Deputy, Alim Tunc, a proposal regarding that a research commission with the purpose of investigating the daytime woman talk shows and their negative effects, which were thought to have been directly influential in the deaths of six people during the broadcasting of the shows, was prepared and given by 41 AKP members. According to these deputies, such shows were also harmful to the family structure and caused to some uncontrolled events for participants of the shows such as divorcement, family feuds, murders, and suicides. Tunc, in this concern, adds that “lives bound to cotton string, if people can be kept upright without distorting their psychological health, this will be a gain. Let’s not be the cause of other people’s lives” and advocates that such television programs need to be studied in detail, they need to be prepared together with experts and be based on scientific rules” (cited in Dalliag, 2005).

#### **4.4.1 The Complaints And RTUK’s Stance**

In addition to the criticism and discussions towards the programs, having a short look about the complaints made to RTUK is beneficial to note the sensivity of the public towards the shows. Besides, taking into RTUK’s stance on the social discussions account is also illuminating for understanding its regulatory authority against the presence of the powerful media groups in Turkey.

Considering RTUK data<sup>36</sup>, it should be possible state that the number of complaints about television broadcasts is quietly high. 28,717 complaints were made to “Alo RTUK 178” complaint line via telephone and e-mail between January 1, and May 25, 2005 (Guyen, A., personal communication, June 5, 2005). In general complaints about the television programs, the daytime woman talk shows<sup>37</sup> are the fourth most complained programs in Turkish television channels. According to this, the show of Biz Bize with 593 complaints in Show TV is the most complained daytime woman talk shows among the others which are Kadınin Sesi with 506 in Channel D, Yalniz Degilsin with 431 in ATV, *Dertler Derya* with 203 in Star TV and *Inci Ertugrul Sizin Seginiz* with 113 complaints in TGRT.

---

<sup>36</sup> The numerical and statistical data about complaints was obtained by the special documents of RTUK and personal communication with Aynur Guven, who is the officer in the Archive of the Directorship of Pursuit and Evaluation Department of RTUK in Ankara.

<sup>37</sup> Advertisements are in the first place among the most complained broadcast in television channels between January 1 and May 25, 2005. The second is reality quiz shows and the third is TV series. The reality game shows with marriage contest shows and slot programs are the fifth. News at prime time is the last one being sixth most complained television programme (RTUK Documents, 2005).

In this account, the most complaining people for these daytime woman talk shows is men with a 58% share, then women with a 32% share and children with a 10% share. They are from primarily Istanbul with a ratio of 61% and then Ankara, Izmir, Bursa and south and southeastern cities. They express in their complaints that the shows are incompatible with Turkish traditions and social structure and do harmful effects on family relations. Complainers also emphasize that the shows damage psychological health of public, are full of bad samples for children and contain many curses and bad usage of Turkish language.

As for such complaints, the RTUK's head, Fatih Karaca, specifies that although the shows have potential to fulfill some social functions such as informing people about their rights, bringing social problems to public agenda, and suggesting rational and reasonable solutions, they become platforms where judicial events are triggered and lead some murder events. In particular, Karaca draws attention to the high number of complaints, as well as discussions and criticisms in public agenda and emphasizes that the daytime woman talk shows turned into a "social insanity" (Karaca, April 17, 2005). "These programs itch social texture," continues Karaca, in support of the opponents of the shows. "They disclose the matters related to family, children, and spouses -sensitive topics to Turkish society –in an open way without any border line. Public do not like this" (cited in Altuntas & Gulmez, November 28, 2005).

For this reason, he declares that the programs are on the special agenda of RTUK and some measures will be taken like forming a special observation committee for these programs (Karaca, November 28, 2005). However, he points out that as the regulatory institution in the field of mass communication in Turkey they always remain limited and insufficient particularly in sanctions on commercial TV channels which produce and broadcast the shows in question.

Karaca, for example, signifies that before the murders in Kadinin Sesi were committed RTUK had four times asked Channel D to make a defense for the programme, had given four warnings and had three times taken a decision to halt some broadcasts of both Kadinin Sesi and others. Nevertheless, he denotes that such efforts do not create effects on the irresponsible implementations and commercial interests of strong media companies operating in television broadcasting.

Notwithstanding there are many Supreme Board decisions about the enforcement of sanctions for television channels and programs violating the broadcasting principles, RTUK has not power to intervene right time as they can inspect programs only after live broadcasts

and not authority to remove the programs from broadcast totally. Hence, according to RTUK private television channels are also responsible for preventing upsetting outcomes of their programs. For this reason, RTUK invites both producers with their TV Channels to be responsible and the audience to be critical and even boycott such shows by not watching.

Nonetheless, it is hard to say that the popularity of the shows is going to diminish. It should be emphasized that although a lot of criticisms, discussions and complaints, as well as six murder events, RTUK warnings and discontinuation of some shows, the daytime woman talk shows carry on being watched with interest. The results of the study entitled “The Study on Television Viewing Tendencies” conducted between December 22, 2005 and January 5, 2006 by The Broadcasting Research and Evaluation Department of RTUK prove this indicating the daytime women talk shows are still among the five most frequently watched programs by mostly housewives in the mid and lower economic status from Central Anatolian Region and in Eastern Anatolia in Turkey.

Accordingly, it could be possible to write that the genre of the daytime woman talk show under different formats and names still reach their target audience anyway. This implies that the shows also will continue to be progressed to attract audience attention and to be formulated to take more advertisements.

#### **4.5 The General Characteristics Of Advertisements In The Programs**

As it was seen in the three daytime woman talk shows, the element of advertisement in production is quite important for both producers and the channel executives. In this sense, it will be beneficial to look some characteristics of the advertisements which have important effects on the content formation and how they are operated under particular regulations.

The interviews and observations conducted on three daytime woman talk shows indicate that advertisement practices are similar for each of the show. As was seen in the research, while advertisers demand that their products and services are advertised in a more efficient way, the sales and advertisement departments of television channels analyzed tend to extend their legal boundaries and violate the existing regulatory rules. For this reason, it is beneficial to remind what the regulatory rules about the sale of programs to advertisers and support of the TV programme productions financially.

The official regulatory institution concerning the advertisements and commercial financing of TV programs is RTUK in Turkey. Accordingly, there are certain methods, rules, and obligations about advertisements that all private television channels have to obey and

organize their selling time. In the declaration of “Procedures and Rules of the Regulation on Radio Television Broadcasts”<sup>38</sup> by RTUK (2005) a programme on television whether live or recorded broadcast can be commercially financed with the forms of “advertorial spot”<sup>39</sup>, “direct sales spot”<sup>40</sup>, “frame, logo, subtitles, strip advertisements”<sup>41</sup>, “hidden advertisement”<sup>42</sup> and/or “sponsorship.”<sup>43</sup> The mentioned advertisements are subject to certain legal rules and restrictions for these forms. For example, advertorial spots can only be broadcasted between two independent programs and cannot be longer than five minutes. Additionally, the rules and restrictions of sponsorship are worded very clearly as follows:

If financial aid is given to completely or partially broadcasting organizations, the identity of the supporters can be shown at the beginning and/or end of the programme by means of audio and/or visual elements on television for a maximum of 10 seconds in total in written form, and a maximum of 5 seconds in total at the end of the commercial bands and programme promotions. In the promotion of programme that is financially supported, the real or corporate identities cannot be referred (RTUK, article no. 20, February 15, 2005).

In addition, the rules are predetermined explicitly in terms of promotions for sponsor firms as well.

The supporting party cannot make any interventions that will affect the content of the TV programme, the manner of the broadcasting of the programme, the producer’s responsibilities and their independence. In the supported programs, the commodities and services of the supporter or third party cannot be referred to and they cannot be bought, sold or rented in any way (RTUK, article no. 3, February 15, 2005).

---

<sup>38</sup> “Procedures and Rules of the Regulation on Radio Television Broadcasts”, RTUK, February 15, 2005 no. 25728, Official Gazette.

<sup>39</sup> It is a single but relatively long advertisement in which a product, service or organization is promoted, which includes more words, image and music than a single advertisement spot (RTUK, December, 2003, p.19). Put differently, it is what workers in sales and advertisement departments of TV channel call as BBR – This Is A Commercial.

<sup>40</sup> They are single advertisements in which the message including the purchase, sale or hiring of the commercial products and services advertised with this spots in every advertisement breaks (ibid).

<sup>41</sup> They are forms of advertisements promoting a product, a service or a company whereby a subtitle of the advertisement is written, its logo is shown or the image is framed on the screen while the programme is on broadcast (ibid, p.20).

<sup>42</sup> It is the product placement or commercial services integration into the content by advertisement companies that are not always connected with the subject of the content (ibid).

<sup>43</sup> it is the direct or indirect financial or material support for a particular TV program providing to promote real or corporate identities’ names, brands, logos, activities or products that they are not involved in the production of program (ibid).

As regards the restrictions the advertisement durations of televisions are important. According to article no. 12 an advertisement break in a programme or between two programs cannot exceed 8 minutes and the duration of all kind of advertisement forms between programs cannot be more than 5 minutes. Besides, the total advertisement duration of any private or state television channel cannot exceed 15 %, and in some special cases 20 % <sup>44</sup> of a daily broadcasting time (RTUK, April 17, 2005).

Nevertheless, as characteristics of the researched daytime woman talk shows the advertisement implementations are quite different. To illustrate, in the programs of Kadinin Sesi, Biz Bize and Yalniz Degilsin duration of advertisement breaks between two different programs –while the programme is starting after one another- is exceeded 10 to 14 minutes instead of 8. Besides the duration of advertisement breaks in programs are exceeded again 10 to 13 minutes instead of 8. Furthermore, it is not possible to say that there is appropriate implementations of frame, subtitle, logo and strip advertisements in the shows. It is seen that the regulation which says the content and integrity of the programs can not be spoiled and the regulation which says the word of “advertisement” has to put near such applications are violated. Besides, it is often insight that the regulation which says they advertisements can not be broadcasted again in less than 10 minutes and also strip advertisement and subtitle applications can not be implemented following one another without any break are also violated.

It should also be underlined that the most infringed regulation is about the sponsorship. One of the reasons for this is that TV channels inform RTUK about their sponsorship revenues, just like their other commercial revenues since there is a special permission which implies that they are exempted from making a payment as commercial revenue fee subjected to the share of Supreme Board<sup>45</sup>. In this respect, TV channels, who gain advantage from not paying for Supreme Board Share, impose pressure on their sales and advertisement departments to much more focus on programme sponsorship activities rather than direct sales advertisement spots in breaks (Yilmaz, B., personal communication, November 29, 2005). Furthermore, the RTUK rules are not also obeyed in the practice of hidden advertisements, which implies the sponsor firms integrated into the contents with their products and services. By means of the

---

<sup>44</sup>“Radio and Television Foundations and Broadcasts”, article no. 13.4.94, RTUK, April 17, 2005.

<sup>45</sup> The mentioned obligation about advertisement shares for RTUK is explained in article no. 20 of RTUK’s “Procedures and Rules of the Regulation on Radio Television Broadcasts”, published in the 25728 numbered and 15/02/2005 dated Official Gazette.



workers of the sales and advertisement departments of the channels, advertisers and sponsor firms often ask to partake in the programs more and expect some special introductions for their firms. In this sense, “references and open advertisement of the firm or individuals which is the producer or the marketer of the product or the service can not be made” phrase is also infringed and the number of gifts from aesthetic clinics, hotels, home textile and appliances with suggestions and praised presentations rises.

Besides, both in practice and in the propositions of the sponsorships it is seen that the legal duration for special VTRs at the beginning, in the course, and at the end of the shows, i.e. sponsors’ introductions have to be 10 seconds in the breaks and 5 seconds at the end of the program is not also obeyed. This points out that although the fixed rules and legal sanctions about the advertisement misapplied, extending the advertisement seconds for the sake of advertisers and sponsors is quite important for the channels and producers particularly when each second that is sold to hundreds of dollars is into account. In this sense, it could be possible to note that such misapplications are realized consciously as they contribute to create a huge amount of revenue for TV channels. The following table can be helpful to illustrate this situation. It displays the total number of advertisements revenue that the daytime woman talk shows supplied to their Channels. The total duration of these advertisements and the total economic value corresponding to them between September 1, 2004 and May 31, 2005 are covered.

**Table-1:** The Economic Value Of The Advertisements In The Shows Analyzed For TV Channels. The table below only includes declared prices of TV channels, but special agreements, discounts and agent commissions are not contained.

No.	Name of Channel	Number of Spots	Name of Channel	Duration Seconds	Name of Channel	Commercial Value USD
1	TGRT	31.325	TGRT	1.060.764	TGRT	244.930.887
2	KANAL D	20.964	KANAL D	420.619	KANAL D	138.329.158
3	ATV	12.328	ATV	288.805	ATV	140.789.232
4	SHOW TV	3.657	SHOW TV	76.082	SHOW TV	80.294.938
	Total	74.669	Total	1.991.603	Total	604.344.215

**Source:** (Media Observation Centre- MTM, 2005).

As well as, it should be also emphasized that the sponsorship activities in the programs through gifts, promotions and rewards from sponsors are also suit producers' aims to keep audience watching the shows. With this in view, to keep continuously the attention of audiences high producers employ the products and services from sponsors as gifts such as pots, carpets, cutlery sets every day or as rewards such as groomsweat, wedding gowns, golden jewelery sets, packages of trousseau, parlour furniture, holiday packages, and aesthetic surgeons in each week.

With this characteristics, being able to have access to the mentioned commercial gifts by a single call-in or being able to win a reward participating into the shows seem highly attractive to the woman audience at home in this respects. Especially, if those products or services are related directly to a need or meet the audience desire, the interest showed to the programs increases at the same rate. Thus, not only do programme producers keep their promises given to advertisers about advertising and promoting their products and services in the shows, but also succeed in having audience keep at hand providing the attention of audiences in the rating reports high.

In this regard, it should be stated that the daytime woman talk shows which deal with women's problems in a way keeping them in front of the TV, making therapy and improving morale, employing commercial gifts, are highly preferred by advertisers. Besides, since the target audience of the programs is women who generally spend their time at home in front of their TV sets; the advertisers see them as consumers who can be easily accessible through the shows.

When it is considered that a great proportion of the shopping is done by women in the family and that they are the most fundamental target group of especially house consumption, the formats of the daytime woman talk show addressing all kinds of topics related to women, ranging from health, food, cleaning, aesthetics, cosmetics, and fashion best fit the advertisers' need. Thus, it is not a coincidence that the most companies airing their advertisements to the daytime women talk show are formed by related fields of woman interests<sup>46</sup>.

---

<sup>46</sup> See Appendix K for the study carried out by MTM, which displays the 18 brands that gave the most advertisements to woman programs between September 1, 2004 and May 31, 2005.

In this concern, the intense interest shown by commercial providers to the programs are highly explicit. In marketing strategies, various brands of companies in the sectors of cleaning products, small home appliances, home decorations and textile, durable consumption commodities and food frequently use these programs to reach women, which provide suitable and flexible formats to integrate their products and services into the contents and to reach their target groups with more direct and effective way.

As a result of this, it could be highly possible to put forward that the daytime women talk show, which are based on real life stories of ordinary people and which claim to be the real voice of women helping them, have actually become important financial sources of primarily TV channels and advertisers. Hence, the economic correspondence provided via advertisement activities seems to more important incentive and dynamics to motivate TV managers and producers.

#### **4.6 Evaluation Of The Research**

In this study of the daytime woman talk shows, the focus was the production processes of the shows to comprehend the roles and impacts of dynamics and practices in the content production and the operation of the shows. For this reason, the production processes of three woman programs which were pioneers of the daytime woman talk show genre and were broadcasted in three big and famous TV channels in Turkey were examined in detail. In the research, it revealed that the topic, the guests, the hostess, the producers, the audience and the advertisers were the most important production elements. In this account, an evaluation of the research is carried out as follows and the main question of the study is explained with the help of the findings and elaborations in chapters two and three.

According to research data, it was understood that one of the most important dynamics of the content formation process was the topics. In this sense, the topics of each three show were determined around inner world of ordinary people as based on their inner stories with their own utterances. Focusing on the personal experiences and micro social fields, the shows mostly dealt with the themes such as victims of violence, troubled family relations, family feud, adultery, personal disasters, runaways, losts, love matters, sexual deviance, jealousy, heritage rows, homicide, drugs etc. in the topics of the daytime woman talk shows under the reality show genre. It was also seen that blurring the conventional line between private and public life and the distinctions between interior and exterior, the shows gave more place to the issues related to family, to domesticity and to family relations. Hence, it is understood that these are important fields of the topic selection for the producers to keep the attention into inner worlds. This situation seems to support John Ellis's (1992) view that the

television reclines itself to the concept of “nuclear family” and its relations which are often presented as “safe” and “normal”, so, television prefers to discuss family and relations in the domesticity isolated from the society.

In the light of the research results, the other important dynamics of the shows was guests. They were collected in two groups. It was seen that first group consisted of people who applied to police, judiciary or hospitals, but had no result because of indifference, dismission or adjournment. As stated in third chapter of the study, the producers usually collaborated with police and after finding the criminals or losts they delivered them to police in live broadcast. However, it is understood that this situation leads to a perception for the daytime women talk shows as a “social remedy”, as an “ombudsman”, as medium performing social functions that presents alternative solutions for both personal problems in the private lives and insufficiencies in the social system. Owing to the presented promise, many people having serious problems and hope for aid watch the shows with interest and apply to be guest in the shows. Being important dynamics in production, this also shows that the programme producers regarded the insufficient structure and operations of state and bureaucratic system in the social service as useful fields in selecting topics and guests to increase their ratings. On the other hand, the second group of guests constituted from volunteers, who did not have a serious issue, but wanted to attract attention to be famous and to make fortune via television access. Accordingly, such people more open to be manipulated, tend to act dramatically and to disclose all their private lives and relations if desired.

As it can be seen in the research, ordinary people’s real life experiences, personal relations and problems in a guest position in the shows acquire an exchange value when they enter the production system of the television industry. In this way, the producers employ them as material of the production of the daytime woman talk shows to obtain high ratings. Hence, they are distributed to both advertisers and audience ‘consumers’ with commercial purposes. In this regard, it is conceived that applicants’ demographic specialities, group alliances, level of perceptions and attitude structures play role for producers to make them guests and to make their stories contents of the shows. Accordingly, the producers formulate their shows on fundamentally guests for particular purposes, so, they highly want to predict and to arrange their responses and behaviours in the shows. That is why they frequently conduct surveys on them and motivate them before and during the shows.

Considering the social psychological aspects into account, it is understood that all groups of guests behaved in particular norms and behavior patterns of the social groups they belong,

whether they found what they hoped in the shows or not. As a result, when guests were in contradiction with a revealed situation related to their private lives and relations in the programme, they could performed behaviours resulting with violence during and after the shows and blamed the producers for their own actions. In this sense, it should be stated that resultant discussions, murders, suicides and violent manners of guests stem from both the organization of the shows with particular manipulations and guests who have own words or actions which they already want to perform in real life, but prefer to carried out through the shows.

Another element noted in the research, which played an important role in the content formation, was the studio audience groups. It was seen that every weekday these people were taken by the professional agencies from their homes to the studios in return for their money. They were expected to contribute to raise the conflictual matters in the topics and so to increase the ratings for the shows analyzed. If they realized this effectively, it was possible for them to be transferred with large paid from one programme to another and from one channel to another. Besides, it was in line of sight that as desired them to be smart and presentable during the shows they were given the facility to make shopping in some TV channels' canteens. This new practise that daytime woman talk shows created unprecedentedly for the entertainment industry shows how the programs are organized to attract the attention of the audience. In this respect, especially the middle class and unemployed housewives who want to be famous, to be rich and to feel themselves in a new social group, become a volunteered object of this practise and give way to an alternative star sector, which is costless, usable and disposable for the programme producers.

The research also shows that the programme producers with hostesses were another crucial production dynamics playing role in content formation and operation. As was seen, fundamental responsibility of the producers was to determine the topics and the guests. Hence, they were in a careful preparation and selection work in the production process. They selected ordinary people who had suitable stories to be dramatised, to be embellished, to be repeated and to be be exaggerated by highlightining the striking features from thousands of applicants and invited as guests. They motivated them beforehand, asked them to say specific things and prepared some rehearsals for them to practice in preparations of the shows with the production assistants. In a way of increasing the attraction and the ratings of the programs guests stories were edited in advance and sometimes fake guests and stories were even given place. The producers were also responsible for researching on participants, determining and motivating studio audience, arranging of call-ins, organizing contents according to advertisement breaks and developing methods for integrating commercial

products and services of the sponsor firms. It is understood that these are the most important practices that constitute the production process, so, these display that the claims of the programs about “reality” and “spontaneity” as a reality show are not valid.

It is understood that such practices implemented by producers were directly related with obtaining maximum audience attention, i.e. increasing their ratings. For this reason, the producers intended to reach particularly emotional world of their target audience and formulated their shows to create some emotions like “curiosity”, “anxiety”, “fear”, “excitement”, “pleasure” and “identification” highlight the features such as “drama”, “therapy”, “reward”, “financial aid” and “entertainment” rather than scientific accounts. For this reason, most applied practices for such effects on the audience came into scene as “sensationalism”, “victimization”, “sensitivation” and “mystification” as in the reality show genre does (Rose, 1985; Adaklı, 1999). As a result of this, all problems belonging to private or social life are denominated individually. Besides, the issues are addressed without founding a correspondence between cause and effect and in the solution ways it is avoided from an effort to put a complete evaluation and solution as much as possible. Furthermore, the participants’ confessions, narratives, and social beings are discussed by detach them from their social and cultural context. Hence, it could be possible to conclude from these practices that the producers’ manners to address the guests’ problems in the shows analyzed are far from providing a real aid or fulfilling social functions.

Another important finding that has to be noted is that the topic selection, guests and production practices above mentioned are not peculiar to one TV channel and show producers examined, but are in a similar way in each of the three shows. Although they are belonging to competing TV channels and big media groups in Turkey there is an important solidarity among their daytime women talk show producers. This aspect made visible particularly in the situation where some audience, who applied to the shows and were promised to be guest, but could not partaken in the programs. This can be seen as an internal agreement that has to be known and abided by every new producer in the field of the daytime women talk show production. The programme producers without excluding each other’s themes and guests display a common hegemonic stance with common concerns. The daytime woman talk shows examined vary in the surface and are differentiated from one TV channel to another, but they demonstrate a great similarity in the essence. For this reason, it is significant to understand this differentiation and variation only as a variation of supply in order to create a demand which is oriented by the industrial media managed by market strategies to increase consumption and to control over market that brings standardization of media products (Kaya, 1999).

In this sense, it appears that the production conditions under which the producers work are determinant in displaying such similar tendencies in content productions. In the light of the examination, it was seen that the show producers worked under the pressures of their companies in connection with the controls of the executives, the stress for the minute reports of ratings and the continuous demands of advertisers. They conducted their performance in dependence upon financial expectations and directions without any assurances and the rights of initiative. However it was seen that the hostess of the shows, especially Yasemin Bozkurt and Serap Ezgu, were in a different position in the production processes performing more independently than the production teams. At this point, it is understood that they behave as the partners of the show revenues and with the help of the shows they try to provide maximum benefits both for their financial conditions and their popularities in the television industry as famous TV personalities.

It is also comprehended that what is mainly expected from the producers is to make a “money shot” force peculiar to the programs as Laura Grindstaff (2002) stated for the American daytime woman talk shows. In this concern, the research data indicated that while providing this profit making power for the shows, the producers had to add something from their emotional world into the content production of the shows. This confirms the view of the Hochschild (1983) that especially in the daytime woman talk shows producers operate in a special “emotional work” and business that is not demanded so intensively in any programme genre of the television industry.

According to the research, this kind of emotional work leads to a serious “alienation phenomenon” in nearly all of the producers that work in the production of the show areas such as research, editing, direction, continuity, studio set and so on. Most of the producers interviewed stated that they did their jobs compulsorily, without liking and disregard their performances. Under the research findings, it appears that such alienation stems from the topics discussed, the guests selected, the processing techniques employed, the pressures coming from the executives, the broadcasting policies and the rating reports. This alienation reflects in every phase of the production. Thus, it is possible to reach a conclusion that it is effective in leading to some negative events of participants during or after the shows – like violence, murders or suicide- and in producing the total quality of the shows.

Moreover, it was seen that the experts as another important production element of the shows were also a part of such “emotional work”. According to the research data, experts gave emphasis to the emotional aspects of the guests’ stories. Although experts were attributed an informative and an educational role, they played a motivational role with the

hostess in the show. They were in a privileged position in the organization of the shows and supported the dominant position and approaches of the hostesses during the shows. The experts of the shows also played a role in raising the conflictual matters of participants. Accordingly, they were very aware of the guests' features –like their demographic specialities, social group identities and values- and approaches to matters being convenient to the general values, faiths and perceptions of the guests leaning to the “common sense” with the hostesses. It was also found that the experts made use of the shows advertising their health clinics, beauty centers or law offices while they informed the participants about such topics. Therefore, it could be possible to specify that the experts in preparation or in broadcasting processes of the shows take into consideration their personal interests as well.

Taking these results into account, it could be possible to write that the programme producers, ordinary people -in a position of guest, of studio audience or of home audience- and advertisers participate in the production process at the same time and all together. This situation often causes an ambiguity in the traditional boundaries of TV programming and leads to an intersection of conventional categories such as product/producer, audience (consumer)/producer, fictional/actual with each other. It appears that the dynamics which engender a complex production structure and make the familiar boundaries ambiguous in the daytime woman talk shows are formed at the point where the ordinary people and the television industry meet. Thus, while the ordinary people particularly with low income and education levels participate in the shows to obtain a chance of being famous and rich or to find solutions to their problems being a guest or studio audience, the show producers increase their television companies' revenues through advertisements for the advertisers and special publicity activities in the shows for the sponsors. In this account, it is understood that what the enabling to the genre to be watched and to be proliferated is the compromise of the subjects in the production and consumption. This is a point where the industry insiders and the audience meet. For this reason, the view of Ayse Inal (1999) which emphasizes that the continuity of the TV genres can be only exist with the help of the participation of the audience with “consent” to the programs is also supported by the findings of the research as well.

However, the last part of the research related to the criticisms, discussions and complaints about some negative events and six incidents of death indicated a situation where this consent could be fragile and transformed to social reactions. Accordingly, Turkish public seemed to be sensitive about social values and family relations, and the daytime woman talk shows which deal with them. Hence, the programs were started to be seen as highly problematical particularly after some death events because many ordinary people and their



real life problems were discussed in glowing and colourful TV studios where all the details of their private lives were scrutinized and people were made first to quarrel and then reconciled almost everyday. As regards the criticisms, discussions and complaints made to RTUK, it is seen that the underlying stress on the fact that the products produced and marketed in the field of media are quite different from other industrial and commercial activities, so, television is expected to show a special responsibility and sensitiveness about ordinary people's lives to address and to process them. Nevertheless, the research data points out that the fundamental incentive for TV executives and for producers of the shows is based on financial expectations rather than social responsibility. This is why they want to draw the interest of advertisers who have become the real consumers of television products.

In this object, it was conceived that the flexible structure of the daytime woman talk show genre, which was formed by the combination of different formats like news, documentary, soap opera, dramas, talk shows, discussion shows and reality shows, - and their high ratings were remarkable features presenting some opportunities for advertisers to advertise their products and services and to increase their consumption. Moreover, it was revealed that the target audience of the shows, who are mainly housewives and women having average level of income and education belonging to middle and lower socio-economical classes, was another significant feature of the advertisers particularly from food, cleaning and textile sectors, which see the housewives as the basic purchasers of house-hold goods. For this reason, the sales and advertisement departments of TV channels developed some strategies in marketing and production as was often the case with sponsorship activities in the show contents or with extending the break time for advertisements.

As a result, it is understood that the advertisers and the sponsors are very effective to shape the contents of the daytime woman talk shows as particularly they are integrated to the contents and they are provided to advertise their products and services. Thus, the advertisers are actually one of the main production dynamics in the content formation of the programs in a way to reinforce the consumption tendencies among television audiences and to develop new consumption patterns.

In this context, after answering the main question of the research, namely, what are the practices and dynamics that affect the production process, content formation and operation of the daytime woman talk shows and how and why they play a role, explaining the place and the importance of the shows in contemporary television industry become easy.

Taking into consideration of all, contemporary Turkish television environment is increasingly under the effect of global television industry and markets particularly in the entertainment business after the structural transformations experienced in the field of mass communication in 1980s. In this account, it is hard to think the contemporary broadcasts of Turkish television channels separately from international consumption samples of television programs.

Therefore, the cost-effective features without requiring high paid actors or actresses, scriptwriters and outdoor shootings, the flexible format structure which can absorb changes easily and the high ratings made the daytime woman talk shows distinctive for Turkish broadcasters shortly, so, they have increasingly started to be adapted from original American shows as from 2000.

According to the results of the research, such features also made them the most preferable programme genre of the daytime particularly for private television channels and advertisers, whereby, they have become the most profit making genre for the television companies among the other daytime programs through the year of 2005.

While these results explain why the daytime woman talk shows so increasingly proliferated and varied, they also help us to understand how they are in an important place in the contemporary Turkish television industry. This resultant situation proves itself particularly in line with genre's development process in that the same shows with the same hostesses and modified formats again began to be broadcasted, to be proliferated and to be watched with interest particularly in the new broadcasting season of 2006 ignoring the previous negative events and social discussions in the public agenda.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSION**

The subject of this study has been the daytime woman talk shows proliferated increasingly on Turkish television channels and watched with interest as of 2000, which have been the topic of many discussions publicly, as well as taken up country's agenda for a long time.

The aim of this study has been to seek answers to the questions of what, how and why production practices and dynamics of the programs play a role in the content formation, processing and production, and in this manner to explain the place and importance of these programs in the contemporary television industry.

To reach this aim, a summary of the historical development and commonality of the daytime woman talk show genre in the world were presented in the first chapter. Besides, the generic roots of these programs and the genre's connections with the reality shows have also been described and examined within the theoretical framework of the critical political economy related with the television industry.

In the second chapter, the production process of the daytime woman talk shows constituted the main focus. Taking into account their reality show ground, the general features of the programs were dealt with and the basic elements that compose their structures were examined one by one. This also provided a useful analytical framework to the research on the samples of the programs in Turkey.

The third chapter of the study presented a detailed analysis for the elements of the shows focusing on the findings and the results of the research regarding the complex production processes of the daytime woman talk shows. In this chapter, the three pioneering programs in Turkey were scrutinized and structurally described. Moreover, the relation between the production process and the advertisements are examined on the ground of the political economy to reach a better comprehension for the shows. The analysis also included social criticisms, discussions, complaints and the stance of RTUK about the shows analyzed in a way of improving the research matters for a more holistic evaluation.

With this in view, the results of the study showed that the guests, the studio audience, the hostess, the experts, the producers and the advertisers constitute fundamental production dynamics, playing role in the content formation and the production of the shows. The ordinary people from real life are meticulously selected as guests and as studio audience who are then motivated to act like actors and actresses without having to go into any expense.

In addition, the topics of the shows for each weekday are determined purposefully to be striking and mostly related to family problems, violence, sexuality, personal disasters, runaways, losts or love relations. The selected stories are prepared to be conducive to dramatization, sensationalism and exaggeration, and guests are then made ready for the shows with manipulations of production assistants, hostesses and experts. The research revealed that the production practices are coordinated to meet primarily demands of advertisers and to attract audience's attention -particularly women's- which are the primary concerns of commercially constructed television channels. Therefore, the shows are organized in a fictional way, rather than presenting reality.

In this account, the results of the study exposed that as the daytime woman talk shows have been formulated for a flexible format structure composed of different genres, the features of the shows which provide to reach woman audience, to hold their attention with high ratings, and to operate some surveillance practices create important opportunities for both the TV channels and the advertisers from primarily food, cleaning and textile sectors. In this respect, it was found in the study that the sales and advertisement departments of the TV channels developed various methods for the benefit of advertisers integrating them into the show contents through the practices of the sponsorship and of the product placements to raise the television channels' revenues.

The study also revealed that the low cost features and the profit producing specialties of the daytime women talk show genre gave rise to one of the most preferred genres by private TV channels until 2005 and the highest profit providing shows in the daytime for TV channels in 2005 in Turkey. Despite some negative events occurring during and after the shows and the resultant public reactions, the shows were continued to be broadcasted and to be differentiated with some modifications in their formats. This is also evidence to signify that the programs have a significant place in the contemporary television industry and that they bear indispensable economic value for both the television companies and the advertisers. Accordingly, it could be possible to write that as more differentiated daytime women talk show are put into the schedules of TV channels more profit from advertisements and more rating-oriented production practices for the contents will be created. Therefore, its economic

value, or the economic value considered to bear motivate the broadcasters to reproduce, to reconfigure and to proliferate the daytime woman talk shows in the television industry.

The research also pointed out that as a sub-genre of the reality shows such generic features and claims of the daytime woman talk shows like they are the programs striving to find real solutions to ordinary people's problems, and like they present the right ways to the public have led to some criticisms and discussions in the public agenda. For this reason, when examined in its narrow sense, a large proportion of TV audience who have problems in their everyday lives believe that the shows could find solutions to their personal problems. From a broader sense, some public associations, organizations and intellectuals claim that the shows reflect important social issues and present illuminating and therapeutical approaches with regard to the degrading of women in society, the violence towards women, the domestic problems, and the sexual deviations and so on. Therefore, they help raise awareness, educate people and fulfilling some public functions of media. However, great proportion of TV audience and critics decry the shows since they see them as corrosive for family and social values, as exploitative for ordinary people's real life experiences and as samples of broadcast without social responsibility.

Under the light of the study, it is possible to express that contemporary contents of TV programs are the result of a deliberate effort and complex production process put by the television industry. It is inconceivable that the productions of TV programs, which can be described as cultural products, are apart from the underlying incentives or the nexus with political and economic structures in society. The ownership structure of the contemporary Turkish media, the strategic movements of big media groups in competition and the increasing commercialization all affect the field of TV programme production.

In other words, the reorganization of media through the inclinations of commercialization, of corporate concentration and of monopolization in mass communication lead to market-oriented effects in television texts and their production processes. This structure in which the daytime woman talk shows produced also affects their contents creating a demand for more ratings which brings about similar production practices, a common hegemonic stance in rival TV channels and the ignorance of public interest with broadcasting responsibility. In this regard, the results of the research support the view that the economic incentives are the key determiners, as indicated by the critical political economy approach, in shaping the content of the shows and in organizing the complex production processes.

In this context, the production and broadcasting of the daytime woman talk shows in Turkey, which have become a widespread international genre in today, require to be evaluated as a result of particular production decisions, dynamics and practices bound up with the increasing commercialization in contemporary television texts. This points that the claims about the daytime woman talk shows considered as fulfilling social functions, serving to raise awareness and educating the public are invalid. In addition, it could not also be possible to specify that the programs are the forward steps towards increasing access to media, enlightening people and improving the mass communication in the society.

For this reason, the daytime woman talk shows proliferated cannot be appreciated to have been added as a new and different factor into the existent woman programs broadcasted during the daytime, which are targeted specifically at women audience, characterised by talks with famous people about their private lives, tabloid topics or thematic contents with the purpose of entertaining in Turkish television channels.

Taking these into account, it can be also possible to reach that the widespread daytime woman talk shows include some ideological implications through television industry. The analysis of the production processes of the programs figures out that the shows contribute to a process by which the entertainment factor of television overweighs primarily information and news, as well as education and socialization functions of television, which are crucial for a healthier social life and a more democratic society as declared in the report of MacBride in 1990.

To put the matter differently, the daytime woman talk shows with the striking and entertaining features broadcasted during the daytime in many television channels contribute to a diversion which the public attention is kept far from the social and personal issues bearing political dimensions. Hence, while market driven motivations and competition push media institutions harder and harder towards commercialized practices, finding evidence that resultant commercialization would enable this powerful means of mass communication, i.e. television to fulfill its social functions properly, to contribute to the full citizenship or to consider the public interest is increasingly becoming difficult.

In this sense, it is crucial to note that while the commercial media ascends to a stronger position in the complicated social life, people are increasingly becoming distant from a satisfying communication system that will be able to contribute to reach a more democratic and healthier society.

Therefore, the necessity for the audience to be sensitive about what they watch and approve to entertain, to be informed or to interest in television broadcasts arises. In this sense, Denis McQuail's (1992) view emphasizing that people should be informed and educated as much as possible in order for them to establish a critical view about media outputs, is increasingly becoming essential for our contemporary society.

## BIBLIOGRAPY

- Abt, V., & Seesholtz, M. (1994). The shameless world of Phil, Sally and Oprah: Television talk shows and the deconstructing of society. *The Journal Of Popular Culture*, 28 (1).
- Adakli, G. (1999). Televizyon türlerinde dönüşüm. *Yıllık*, Ankara: Communication Faculty of Ankara University Publication.
- Akdogan, H. (2004). *Medyada kadın*. Istanbul: Ceylan Publication.
- Aksoy, A., & Robbins, K. (1992). Hollywood for the 21st century: Global competition for critical mass in image markets. *Cambridge Journal Of Economics*, 16 (1).
- Alemdar, K., & Kaya, R. (1993). Radyo televizyonda yeni düzen. Ankara: Türkiye Odalar Ve Borsalar Birliği Yayini.
- Alger, D. (1998). *Megamedia, how giant corporations dominate mass media, distort competition, and endanger democracy*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Altheide, D. L. (1985). *Media power*. London: Sage Publications.
- Altheide, D. L. & Snow, R. P. (1979). *Media logic*. London: Sage Publications.
- Andrejevic, M. (2004). *Reality TV the work of being watch*. Maryland: Rowmna & Littlefield Publisher.
- Andrew, D. (1984). *Concepts in film theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Aziz, A. (1999). *Türkiye’de radyo televizyon yayıncılığının 30 yılı*. Ankara: General Secretary of TRT Publications.
- Balkin, K. (2004). *Reality TV*. New York: Greenhaven.
- Barton, R. (1964). *Media in advertising: Series in advertising and selling*. New York: McGraw –Hill Book.
- Bauer, P. (1986). Production scene: Hollywood's new low-end market. *Channels*, 6 (8).
- Bellaire, A. (1959). *TV advertising*. New York : Harper & Row Publishers.
- Berkowitz, L. (1962). Violence in the mass media. *Aggression: A social psychological analysis*, (pp.229-255). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bogart, L. (1995). *Commercial culture: The media system and the public interest*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Briggs, R. (2002). *Genre and contemporary Hollywood*. N. Steave (Ed.), London: British Film Institute Publishing.



- Brosius, H. B., Rössler, P. (2001). Do talk shows cultivate adolescents' views of the world? A prolonged-exposure experiment. *The Journal Of Communication*, 51 (1).
- Bruzzi, S. (2001). Observational “fly-on-the-wall” documentary. In G. Creeber (Ed.), *The television genre book*. London: British Film Institute Publishing.
- Caves, R. (2000). *Creative industries: Contracts between art and commerce*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Comstock, G., & Lindsey, G. (1975). *Television and human behavior: The research horizon, future and present*. California: Rand Publication.
- Corner, J. (2002). Performing the real, documentary diversions. *Television & new media*, 3 (3).
- Curran, J. (1986). The impact of advertising on the British media. In R. Collins Et Al. (Eds.). *Media, culture and society*. London: Sage Publications.
- Day, N. (1996). *Sensational TV trash or journalism*. New Jersey: Enslow Publishers.
- Dovey, J. (2000). *First person media & factual television*. London: Pluto Press.
- Doyle, G. (2002a). Media ownership: The economics and politics of convergence and concentration. *The UK and European media*. London: Sage Publications.
- Doyle, G. (2002b). *Understanding media economics*. London: Sage Publications.
- Ellis, J. (1982). *Visible fictions: Cinema, television, video*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. (A. M. Sheridan-Smith, Trans.), Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Garnham, N. (1990). Contribution to a political economy of mass communication. In R. Collins, J. Curran, N. Garnham, P. Scannell, P. Schlesinger, C. Sparks, Et Al. (Eds.). *Media, culture and society*. London: Sage Publication.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). The intellectuals. In *Selections from the prison notebooks*. (Q. Hoare and G. N. Smith Trans. and Eds.), New York: International Publishers.
- Golding, P. (2000). Assessing media content: Why, how and what we learnt in a British media content study. In R. Picard (Ed.), *Measuring media content, quality and diversity: Approaches and issues in content research*. Turku: Turku School Of Economics And Business Administration.
- Grindstaff, L. (2002). *The money shot: Trash, class and the making of TV talk shows*, Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
- Haag, L. (1993). Oprah Winfrey: The construction of intimacy in the talk show setting. *Journal Of Popular Culture*, 26 (4).
- Hall, S. (1978). *Policing the crisis: Mugging, the state and law and order*. London: Holmes & Meier Publishers.

- Hochschild, A.R. (1983). *The Managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*, Berkeley. California: University Of California Press.
- İnal, A. (1999). Televizyon, tür ve temsil. *Yillik*, Ankara: Communication Faculty Of Ankara University Publication.
- İncelioglu, M. (2004). *Tutum algı iletişim*. Ankara: Genel Dağıtım.
- Jhally, S. (1987). *Codes of advertising: Fetishism and the political economy of meaning in the consumer society*. New York: Saint Martin's.
- Jhally, S., & Livant, B. (1986). Watching as working: The valorisation of audience consciousness. *Journal Of Communication*, 36 (3).
- Kaya, R.. (1999). Türkiye’de 1980 sonrası medyanın gelişimi ve ideoloji gereksinimi. *Türk-İş Yıllığı* '99, 2.
- Kejanlıoğlu, D. B., Çelenk, S., & Gülseren, A. (2001). *Medya politikaları*. Ankara: Imge Kitabevi Yayinlari.
- Lindheim, R., & Blum, R. (1991). *Inside television producing*. Boston: Focal Press.
- Lipsey, R., & Chrystal, A. (1995). *Positive economics* (8th Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Livingstone, S. M., & Lunt, P. K. (1992) Expert and lay participation in television debates: An analysis of audience discussion. *European Journal Of Communication*, 7 (1), 9-35.
- Livingstone, S. M., Lunt, P. K., & Wober, J. M. (1994). Studio audience discussion programs. *European Journal Of Communication*, 9 (4), 355-379.
- Magder, T. (2004), The end of TV 101: Reality programs, formats and the new business of television. In S. Murray & L. Oullette (Eds.). *Reality TV remaking television culture*, New York: New York University Press.
- Mcquail, D. (1987). *Mass communication theory: An introduction* (2th. Ed.). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Mcquail, D. (1992). *Media performance*. London: Sage Publications.
- Mcquail, D. (1994). *Mass communication theory: An introduction* (3rd. Ed.). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Meehan, E., Mosco, V., & Wasco, J. (1993). Rethinking political economy: Change and continuity. *Journal of Communication*, 43 (4).
- Meyrowitz, J. (1995). Mediating communication: What happens? In J. Downing (Ed.), *Questioning the media: A critical introduction*, London: Sage Publications.
- Modelski, T. (Ed.). (1986). *Studies in entertainment*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Moorti, S. (1998). Cathartic confessions or emancipatory text? Rape narratives on the Oprah Winfrey show. *Social Text*, 16 ( 4).
- Moran, A. (1998). *Copycat TV: Globalisation, program formats and cultural identity*. Luton: University Of Luton Press.
- Mosco, V. (1996). *The political economy of communication rethinking and renewal*. London: Sage Publications.
- Murdock, G. (1990). Redrawing the map of the communications industries: Concentration and ownership in the era of privatization. In M. Ferguson (Ed.), *Public communication - the new imperatives: Future directions for media research*, London: Sage Publications.
- Murdock, G., & Golding, P. (1989). Information poverty and political inequality: Citizenship in the age of privatized communications. *Journal Of Communication*, 39 (3).
- Murdock, G., & Golding, P. (2000). Culture, communications and political economy. In J. Curran & M. Gurevitch (Eds.). *Mass media and society*, New York: A Hodder Arnold Publication
- Ozturk, S. (1987). *Televizyonda kadınlara yönelik programlar "Hanımlar Sizin İçin" Ve "Çalışan Hanımlar Sizin İçin" programlarının incelenmesi*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Social Sciences, Anadolu University.
- Picard, R. (1993). *Media economics*. California: Sage Publications.
- Raphael, C. (2004). The political economic origins of reali-TV. In. S. Murray & L. Ouellette (Eds.). *Reality TV remaking television culture*. New York: New York University Press.
- Rose, B. (Ed.). (1985). The talk show. *TV genres*, Connecticut: Greenwood Publication.
- Saktanber, A. (1990). Türkiye’de medya kadın serbest müsait kadın veya iyi eş fedakar anne. S. Tekeli (Ed.), *Kadın bakış açısından 1980ler Türkiye’sinde kadın*. Istanbul: İletişim Publication.
- Schiller, D. (1996). *Theorizing communication: A history*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schiller, H. (1989). *Culture, inc.: The corporate takeover of public expression*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shattuc, J. M. (1997). *The talking cure: TV talk shows and women*. New York: Routledge.
- Smythe, D. (1981). *Dependency road: Communications, capitalism, consciousness, and Canada*, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Söylemez, A. (1998). *Medya Ekonomisi ve Türkiye örneği*. Ankara: Haberal Eğitim Vakfı.
- Tılıç, D. (2000). Media ownership structure in Turkey. Ankara: Progressive Journalists Association.
- Timberg, B. M., & Newcomb, H. (2002). *Television talk: A history of the TV talk show*. Texas: University Of Texas Press.

- Tunstall, J. (1993). *Television producers*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Turner, J. S. (1998). Collapsing the interior/exterior distinction: Surveillance, spectacle and suspense in popular cinema. *Wide Angle*, 20 (4), 92-123.
- Uğur, A. (1996). Media, identity and the search for a cultural synthesis. *Private View*, 1 (1).
- Verwey, N. E. (1990). *Radio call-ins and covert politics: A verbal unit and role analysis approach*. Brookfield, Vt., USA: Avebury Publication.
- Vogel, H. L. (1990). *Entertainment industry economics: A guide for financial analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, R. (1975). *Television, technology and cultural form*. New York: Schocken Books.

### Articles From Newspapers

- Aksoyer, Ali. (2005, November 30). İşte Konduoğlu'nun intihar mektubu. *Hürriyet Gazetesi*.
- Altaylı, Fatih. (2005, May 19). Tek suçlu, kadın programları mı?. *Hürriyet Gazetesi*.
- Arna, Sibel. (2004, December 12). Türkiye, 100 yıl sonra benimle yeni bir Marko Paşa'ya kavuştu. *Hürriyet Gazetesi*.
- Ayeri, Burhan. (2006, July 16). İkinci takımlar ilgiyi arttırdı. *Akşam Gazetesi*
- Doğan, Ayşegül. (2005, May 22). Televizyon oyuncu, insanlar piyon, evler satranç tahtası. *Zaman Gazetesi*.
- Dündar, Can. (2005, May 22). Lunapark aynası. *Milliyet Gazetesi*
- Eyce, Ali. (2005, May 25). TV'deki sözleri beni tahrik etti. *Sabah Gazetesi*.
- Gezici, Şahismail. (2005, May 19). Yayın bitti dram kaldı. *Hürriyet Gazetesi*.
- Güney, Nurbanu. (2005, May 20). Kadının tek sesi Serap Ezgü. *Akşam Gazetesi*.
- Hazar, Bekir. (2006, May 20). KPASEKP yolda, geliyor! *Yeni Safak Gazetesi*
- Karaca, Fatih. (2005, April 17). Cezalar trilyona ulaşacak. *Hürriyet Gazetesi*.
- Landler, David. (1994). Think globally, program locally! *Business Week*.
- Collins, M. (2001, April 22). Copyrights and wrongs, in the global TV market: Great ideas are the key. *Observer Newspaper*.
- Muhtar, Reha. (2005, May 27). Kadın programında yaralama.... *Sabah Gazetesi*.
- Özkök, Ertuğrul. (2005, May 19). Dört yaşındaki kızın makyajı. *Hürriyet Gazetesi*.

- Saat, Orhan. (2005, May 26). Kadının Sesi'nde tehdit eden koca 8 kez bıçakladı. *Hürriyet Gazetesi*.
- Şahin, Davut. (2004, December 25). Haysiyet cellatlığı. *Yeni Asya Gazetesi*.
- Semercioglu, Cengiz. (2005, May 13). Serap Ezgü konuğunu bayılttı. *Hürriyet Gazetesi*.
- Yurtcu, Özlem. (2005, May 19). Uzmanlar ne diyor?. *Sabah Gazetesi*.

### Articles From Web Sites And Databases

- Brown, F. (2006, July 27). *Rethinking the role of surveillances studies in the critical political economy of communication*. In IAMCR Cairo 2006 Conference. Retrieved April 27, 2006, from [www.imacr.org/component/option,com\\_docman/task,doc\\_download/gid,32/](http://www.imacr.org/component/option,com_docman/task,doc_download/gid,32/)
- ESRC - The Economic and Social Research Council. (2004, December 22). *Radio and television programme commissions*. Retrieved March 11, 2006, from Society Today Web Site [http://www.esrcsocietytoday.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/what\\_is\\_soc\\_sci/](http://www.esrcsocietytoday.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/what_is_soc_sci/)
- Halter, B. (2005). *Trisha Goddard*. Retrieved June 18, 2005, from Talk Show About Web Site from <http://talkshows.about.com>
- Halter, B. (2005). *Talk show history*. Retrieved June 19, 2005, from Talk Show About Web Site from <http://talkshows.about.com/>
- Herkman, J. (2004). *MediaOwnership and content: Corporatization of the Finnish media in 1990's*. Retrieved May 22, 2006, from [www.uta.fi/viesverk/fmcs/convergence/herkman.html](http://www.uta.fi/viesverk/fmcs/convergence/herkman.html)
- Hume, E. (2003). *Talk show culture*. Retrieved April 8, 2006 from [http://www.ellenhume.com/articles/talkshow\\_printable.htm](http://www.ellenhume.com/articles/talkshow_printable.htm)
- Kadınlar bindiği dalı kesti. (2005, May 23). Retrieved May 28, 2005 from Aksiyon Web Site <http://www.aksiyon.com.tr/detay.php?id=21638>
- Plotz, D. (March 22, 1998). *Jerry Springer once the talk show host was mayor of Cincinnati. Now He's Mayor Of Sodom*, Retrieved May 23, 2006, from Slate Web Site <http://www.slate.com/id/1857/>.
- O'Brien, R. (1998, August 5). *The political economy of communications and the commercialization of the Internet*. Retrieved February 23, 2005, from <http://www.web.ca/~robrien/papers/political%20economy%20of%20communication%20paper.html> [Last Updated November 2, 1999]

Rigel, N. (2003). *Reality show'lardan 'gözetleme show'larına*. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from <http://www.istanbul.edu.tr/iletim/81/haberler/m.htm>

Schliefer, Y. (2005, May 23). *On Turkish TV, women face life and death*, Retrieved May 26, 2005, from <http://www.wworld.org/crisis/crisis.asp?ID=477>

Sellers, P., & Watson, N. (2002, April 1). The business of being Oprah. *Fortune*. 145 (7) 00158259. Retrieved March 2, 2006 from Academic Search Premier Ebscohost.

TGRT'de sunduğu Kadinin Sesi ile reyting sıralarını alt üst eden Serap Ezgü'yü kapmak için iki kanal servet önerdi ! (2005, January 6). Retrieved January 17, 2005 from Super Poligon Web Site <http://www.superpoligon.com/oku.asp?id=11072>

Winslow, M. A. (1996). *Corporations and the media*. Retrieved April 12, 2006, from Ezine Articles <http://ezinearticles.com/?Corporations-and-the-Media&id=323420>

## Reports and Government Documents

ILEF and Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (1998) *MediaScape Türkiye '98*, Ankara: ILEF Faculty of Communication, Ankara University.

Özcan, A. (2005, June 20), *Kadın Programları Hakkında Araştırma Raporu*, Medya Takip Merkezi-MTM, Retrieved July 23, 2005, from <http://www.medyatakip.com/>

The MacBride Report. (1980). *Many voices, one world*. Paris: UNESCO.

Turkish Association of Advertising Agencies. (2006) *Advertising investments in 2006 in Turkey*. Retrieved October 23, 2006, from <http://www.rd.org.tr>

Turkey. GNAT. (2005, May 18). *Genel kurul görüşme tutanakları*. (Töre cinayetleri ile ilgili kadınlara ve çocuklara yönelik şiddetin sebeplerinin araştırılarak alınması gereken önlemlerin belirlenmesi amacıyla kurulan meclis araştırma komisyonu, 10/148,182,187,248,285. 100. Birleşim). Retrieved July 16, 2005, from [http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/komisyon/tore\\_cinayeti/genel\\_kurul\\_tutanaklari.htm](http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/komisyon/tore_cinayeti/genel_kurul_tutanaklari.htm) [Last Updated 2005, October 20]

## TV Programme

Semercioğlu, Cengiz. (Producer). (2005, May 17). [Television broadcast.] [Narr. By Cengiz Semercioğlu]. In *Full Ekran*. Istanbul: Haberturk TV Channel.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A. A Picture About The Kadinin Sesi Show With Guests



In the picture the hostess Yasemin Bozkurt tells audience about the guest Mr.Toyhan's miserable situation due to his lost mother for 20 years.

**Source:** The picture was taken in the studio of Kadinin Sesi by personal observation of author in May 10, 2005 in Channel D in Istanbul.

## APPENDIX B. A Picture About The Studio Audience Of Kadinin Sesi



**Source:** The picture was taken in the studio of Kadinin Sesi by personal observation of author in May 11, 2005 in Channel D in Istanbul.



## APPENDIX C. A Picture About The Production Team Of Kadinin Sesi



In the picture assistants broadcast director control each second of the Kadinin Sesi show and select images that they decide the best from the studio cameras to put on the screen.

**Source:** The picture was taken in the studio of Kadinin Sesi by personal observation of author in May 12, 2005 in Channel D in Istanbul.

**APPENDIX D. Sample Of The Sponsorship Proposal Of Sales And  
Advertisement Department In Flash TV For The Kadinin Sesi Show**



İstanbul 29 KASIM 2005

Sayın Ercan,

Firmanız için 2005-2006 yılı içinde yapacağı reklam harcamalarına yönelik hazırladığımız teklif aşağıdadır.

Teklifte belirtilen fiyata ajans komisyonu ve KDV dahil değildir.

Aylık medya kuru geçerlidir.

Ödemeler yayının başladığı tarihten itibaren 60 gün vadelidir.

Firmanız için Yasemin Bozkurt'un yeni başlayacak olan programında talep ettiğimiz ürünler ve çalışma koşulları ise aşağıda belirtildiği gibidir.

Program başlama tarihi; 07.11.2005

- 1) Ürünler Yasemin Bozkurt'un h.ıçı hergün yayınlanacak olan programında hediye olarak verilecektir.
- 2) Haftada 1 gün olmak koşuluyla aylık asgari 1.700 YTL'yi aşmayacak tutarda, ayda toplam 4 gün çalışmayı talep etmekteyiz.
- 3) Bu fiyat ve koşullarda sizin bize önerdiğiniz ürünler bu çalışma için kullanılabilir.
- 4) Bunun karşılığında program sonunda 10 sn. "SÜMERBANK" logosu görüntülenecek ve program içinde hediye verileceği zaman diliminde "SÜMERBANK"'a özel tanıtım yapılacaktır.

Bilgilerinize sunar, iyi çalışmalar dilerim.

Saygılarımla,

Gökçe ÇALBUR YILMAZ  
Müşteri İlişkileri Yönetmeni  
Tel.:0212 256 82 82 D:170

## APPENDIX D. (continued)

### KADININ SESİ ÖZEL SPONSORLUK TEKLİFİ

**Program İçeriği:** Kadının Sesi'nde Birbirinden Renkli Pencereler Var. Bir Kısım Türkiye'de İlk Kez Yayınlanacak Olan, "Özel Format" Pencerelerde İzleyicide Bağımlılık Yaratacak Konular Bulunacak. İşte O Pencereler;



- İtiraf: (Canlı Yayında Açıklanacak İtiraflar...)
- Yalan: ("Ben Yalan Söylemişim" Bölümü)
- Evlenmek İstiyorum (Evlenemeyen Çiftlerin Umudu Olacak)
- Kayıplar (Kayıpların Bulunma Platformu)
- Cezaevinden Mektup Var (Cezaevlerindeki Dram Ve Gerçek Yaşam Öyküleri)
- Barıştırma (Kavuşamayanlar, Ayrı Düşenler... Barıştırılacak)
- Estetik Oluyorum (Milyarlık Estetik Ameliyatları Yaptırıyoruz)
- Aşk Hikayeleri (Unutulmaz Aşk Hikayeleri Gerçek Kahramanlarıyla Canlı Yayında)
- Zayıflama Köşesi (Zayıflayamayanlara Yardım)
- Tuzak (Yoldan Geçen Kadını Kocasının Tanıyamayacağı Kadar Değiştiriyoruz. Baştan Aşağıya Yenilenen Kadının Öyküsü... Size De Çıkabilir)

**Yayın Periyodu** :Hafta içi her gün

**Yayın Adedi/Saati:** Program iki periyottan oluşmaktadır.

1. Periyot; 18:00-20:00 arası Ana Haber öncesinde yayınlanacaktır.
2. Periyot; 21:00-22:00 arası Ana Haber sonrası yayınlanacaktır.

**Yayın Şekli** : Aşağıda belirtildiği gibidir;

- Programın gerek 1. Bölümü gerekse 2. Bölümü başlarken 13 sn "Sunar VTR si" , bu bölümler sona erdiğinde ise 13 sn. "Sundu VTR si" yayınlanacaktır.
- Reklam kuşaklarına girişten önce 8 sn. "Devam Edecek VTR si" ve reklamdan programa geçişten önce 8 sn. "Devam Ediyor VTR si" yayınlanacaktır.
- Programın 1. Bölümünde 3 kez ve 2 bölümünde 2 kez olmak üzere toplam 5 kez reklam kuşağı yayınlanacaktır.
- Programın gün içerisinde tanıtımları yayınlanacaktır. Bu tanıtımlar öncesi 13 sn. "Sunduğu VTR si" yayınlanacaktır. Hergün en az 3 kez tanıtım yapılacaktır.

**Sponsorluk Süresi:**1 Ay'dır.

**Sponsorluk Ücreti:**55,000\$/ay

Çatma Mescit Mahallesi Elektrik Sok. No:1 Tepebaşı Beyoğlu - İSTANBUL  
Tel: (0212) 256 82 82 Fax: (0212) 256 81 09

## APPENDIX E. A Picture About The Yalniz Degilsin Show With The Guests



In the picture Sevda, Nurcan and Nurgul Kaplan sisters with wigs and masks confess violence from their father against them. They are in the show to look for an education opportunity, but the matter of violence is more pronounced in the show.

**Source:** The picture was taken in the studio of Yalniz Degilsin in May 14, 2005 by personal observation of author in ATV in Istanbul.

## APPENDIX F. A Picture About The Studio Audience and The Set Design in The Yalniz Degilsin Show



In the picture the hostess Aysenur Yazici listen to the studio audience one by one and take their opinions on the guest's story in a special studio décor designed to be resemble with reality court shows in U.S.

**Source:** The picture was taken in the studio of Yalniz Degilsin in May 12, 2005 by personal observation of author in ATV in Istanbul.



## APPENDIX G. A Picture About The Production Team Of Yalniz Degilsin



In the picture the broadcast director Safak Bakkalbasioglu and his assistants in production control room monitor the flow of the show, select the striking images from the cameras and check the studio audiences from cameras whether there is an audience who is crying.

**Source:** The picture was taken in the studio of Yalniz Degilsin in May 16, 2005 by personal observation of author in ATV in Istanbul.

## APPENDIX H. A Picture About Intimate Relations Between Serap Ezgu And The Studio Audience During The Live Show



In the picture Serap Ezgu is seen while she is constructing of intimacy with her studio audience in live show.

**Source:** The picture was taken in the Biz Bize show by personal observation of author in May 27, 2005 in Ata Studios of Show TV in Istanbul.

## APPENDIX I. Rating Samples Of The Biz Bize Show

**SERAP EZGÜ İLE BİZ BİZE**

01-11 Ekim döneminin  
en çok izlenen\* kadın programı  
Serap Ezgü ile Biz Bize  
11 Ekim 2005 Salı günü de ilgiyle izlendi.

11 Ekim 2005 Salı günü İzlenme Oran ve Payları

Ev Kadınları	
Rtg%	Shr%
5.30	23.50
Kadınlar 20+	
Rtg%	Shr%
4.50	24.40
A/B-C1 Yetiş.	
Rtg%	Shr%
3.00	23.10

\* Hedef Kitle : Ev Kadınları  
Kaynak : AGB Nielsen Media Research

**SHOW**

**ZEDPAŞ**

Yeni Söğüt Sk. No:46 34330 1.Levent/İSTANBUL Tel:0212 3176767 Fax:0212 2784743 www.zedpas.com.tr info@zedpas.com.tr

**Source:** Special Documents of Zedpas used only in the sponsorship proposals for the Biz Bize show.



APPENDIX I. (continued)



Source: ibid.

APPENDIX I. (continued)



Source: ibid.

## APPENDIX J. The Special Sponsorship Proposal Of Zedpas For The Biz Bize Show



## SHOW TV Özel Sponsorluk Teklifi

Sn. NERMİN CİHANGİL  
SÜMERBANK

30 Kasım 2005

Sn. Cihangil,

Firmanız için hazırladığımız Serap Ezgü ile Biz Bize programı "Ana Sponsorluk" teklifimiz aşağıda bilgilerinize sunulmuştur.

Bugüne kadar bir çok kaybı yakınlarına kavuşturan, bir çok aileyi barıştıran, kaçan kızların eve dönmesini sağlayan, yıllardır birbirlerini bulamayanları birleştiren Serap Ezgü ile Biz Bize, SHOW TV ekranlarında hayatın içinde halkın sesi olmaya devam ediyor.

### Serap Ezgü ile Biz Bize Ana Sponsorluk Net Bedeli:

**3.500 USD + KDV ( bölüm başı )  
Anlaşmalar 3 ay için geçerlidir.**

**Total: 70bin dolar aylık (20 bölüm üzerinden)**

**SHOW TV'de yayınlan Serap Ezgü ile Biz Bize programı Ana Sponsorluğu'nun getirdiği diğer avantajlar:**

► Serap Ezgü ile Biz Bize programı başında 12 saniye "XXX Sunar" ve dizinin sonunda 12 saniye "XXX Sundu" uygun ibareli jenerik yayınlanacaktır.

► Programın arasındaki her reklam kuşağı çıkışında 10 saniye "XXX'ın sunduğu Serap Ezgü ile Biz Bize Reklamlardan Sonra Devam Ediyor" uygun ibareli jenerik yayınlanacaktır.

► Serap Ezgü ile Biz Bize programına ait tanıtımlar, her hafta SHOW TV'de 3 adet PT, 2 adet EPT, 7 adet OPT olmak üzere toplam 12 adet gösterilecektir. Bu tanıtımlarda 12 saniye "XXX Sunar" uygun ibareli jenerik yayınlanacaktır.

\* Program içine ürün yerleştirilmesi ve içerikte özel tanıtım çalışmaları karşılıklı anlaşmaya bağlı olacaktır.  
\* RTÜK tarafından uyarı gelmesi durumunda, tanıtımlarda yayınlanacak olan jenerik geçerli olmayacaktır.

Değerli işbirliğimizin devamını dilerim.

Saygılarımla,

**Onur Akgül**  
Satış Yetkilisi



Yeni Sülün Sokak No:46 34330 1. Levent İSTANBUL Tel: (212) 317 67 67 Fax: (212) 268 40 57

**APPENDIX K. The Companies Airing Most Advertisements In The Daytime  
Woman Talk Shows In Turkey**

No.	Brand	No. of Spots	Brand	Duration (Sec)	Brand	Commercial Value USD
1	DANONE	2.779	DANONE	75.371	DANONE	23.016.443
2	DARDANEL	2.985	DARDANEL	59700	DARDANEL	20.895.000
3	HOMEDROM SHOP	3451	HOMEDROM SHOP	134.521	HOMEDROM SHOP	16.234.148
4	MIRACLE BLADE	1.443	MIRACLE BLADE	43.276	MIRACLE BLADE	14.281.080
5	KILIM MOBILYA	2.234	KILIM MOBILYA	40.212	KILIM MOBILYA	14.074.200
6	TURKCELL	2.287	TURKCELL	36.883	TURKCELL	13.624.955
7	KOSLA	1.520	KOSLA	41.276	KOSLA	13.290.767
8	CALGON	1.146	CALGON	33.933	CALGON	11.074.209
9	ISTIKBAL	1.045	ISTIKBAL	30.414	ISTIKBAL	9.698.941
10	COCA COLA	2.003	COCA COLA	50.092	COCA COLA	8.766.082
11	NESTLE	1.920	NESTLE	48.010	NESTLE	8.401.715
12	HOMEDROM EASY STITCH	2407	HOMEDROM EASY STITCH	48.146	HOMEDROM EASY STITCH	7.938.872
13	CILIT BANG	1.267	CILIT BANG	21.539	CILIT BANG	9.989.063
14	FITNESS PUMP	1.527	FITNESS PUMP	45.829	FITNESS PUMP	7.332.640
15	IPEK MOBILYA	977	IPEK MOBILYA	19.540	IPEK MOBILYA	6.839.000
16	SUNNY UYDU	1.143	SUNNY UYDU	17.145	SUNNY UYDU	6.000.750
17	ORA	1.474	ORA	36.854	ORA	5.896.640
	TOTAL	35.715	TOTAL	874.142	TOTAL	197.354.505

The table indicates the period between September 1, 2004 and May 31, 2005. It involves the first 17 brands out of 1011 different brands of companies which air most advertisements in the daytime woman talk shows in Turkey. They are mainly from the sectors of food, cleaning products, home textile and decoration. The table only includes declared prices of TV channels, but special agreements, discounts and agent commissions are not included (Ozcan, 2005, June 20).

**Source:** Media Observation Centre-MTM