SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS OF EUROPEAN UNION

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

BY

ELİF SANDAL ÖNAL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

AUGUST 2007

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. Nebi Sümer
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.

_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner-Özkan
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Deniz Şahin   (HU, PSY) ——————————————

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner-Özkan (METU, PSY)——————————————

Assist. Prof. Dr. Dolunay Şenol   (KKU, SOC) ——————————————

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, Last Name : Elif Sandal Önal

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS OF EUROPEAN UNION

Sandal Önal, Elif

M.S., Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Bengi Öner-Özkan

August 2007, 151 pages

The main aim of this study was to reveal the prevailing social representations of European Union. In order to fulfill the aim, first a semi-structured interview was conducted to 13 demographically different individuals and the content analysis of the interviews revealed five categories namely, Turkey's membership to EU, Problems of Turkey, Structure of EU, EU as Disadvantageous and EU as Advantageous. Second, in order to examine the media representation of EU, three newspapers representing different political views were qualitatively analyzed and the dimensions of EU as a must, EU as a threat, and EU as difficult were exposed. Finally, according to the thematic units and categories generated from the qualitative analyses; a "Social Representations of EU" scale was formed and applied to 243 university students. Four sub-scales, namely EU membership is disadvantageous, EU membership is advantageous, religious and cultural threats and EU membership is difficult were extracted from the scale with the reliability coefficients varying from .61 to .88. In

order to investigate whether the different factors of social representations of EU are differing on particular dimensions as political view, exposure to media, newspapers read or SES levels, variance analyses were performed. On the other hand, for answering the question of whether the representations of EU could be predicted from life expectations, perceived political agenda or individual dimensions multiple regression analyses were held.

Significant differences were found in EU membership is disadvantageous representation in terms of university (Gazi University-METU), gender, and political views of newspapers read. EU membership is advantageous representation differed along the levels of gender and newspapers read. Religious and cultural threats were to be differed along the levels of university, gender, political view, newspapers read and exposure to media. Finally significant differences in EU as difficult representation was found in terms of the ideology of the newspapers read.

Feelings toward EU and evaluation of the membership dimensions were found to contribute to the prediction of EU as disadvantageous, EU as advantageous, religious and cultural threats, and EU as difficult representations. Moreover, religious and cultural threats representation is significantly predicted from political view and media exposure.

Keywords: Social Representations, European Union, Media

ÖZ

AVRUPA BİRLİĞİ'NİN SOSYAL TEMSİLLERİ

Sandal Önal, Elif

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Bengi Öner-Özkan

Ağustos 2007, 151 sayfa

Çalışmanın temel amacı Avrupa Birliği ile ilgili baskın sosyal temsillerin ortaya çıkarılmasıdır. Amaca yönelik ilk olarak demografik yönden birbirlerinden farklı 13 kişi ile yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler yapılmış ve yapılan içerik analizi sonucunda Türkiye'nin AB üyeliği, Türkiye'nin problemleri, AB'nin yapısı, AB'nin dezavantajları ve AB'nin avantajları olarak 5 kategori tespit edilmiştir. İkinci olarak AB'nin medya temsilinin ortaya çıkarılması amacıyla 3 değişik politik görüşe mensup gazete nitel olarak analiz edilmiş ve "zorunluluk olarak AB", "tehdit olarak AB" ve "AB'nin zorluğu" boyutları elde edilmiştir. Son olarak nitel analizlerden elde edilen anlamlı birim ve kategoriler kullanılarak "AB'nin Sosyal Temsili" sormacası oluşturulmuş ve 243 üniversite öğrencisine uygulanmıştır.

Anketten içsel tutarlılık katsayıları .61 ile .88 arasında değişen; AB'nin

Dezavantajları, AB'nin Avantajları, Dinsel ve Kültürel Tehdit ve AB'nin Zorluğu olmak üzere 4 alt boyut ortaya çıkarılmıştır. Alt boyutların politik görüş, medyaya maruz kalma, okunan gazete veya sosyo-ekonomik seviye boyutlarında farklılaşıp farklılaşmadığını bulmak için varyans analizleri uygulanmıştır. Diğer taraftan alt boyutların beklenti, algılanan politik gündem ve birey boyutları tarafından yordanıp yordanmadığının ortaya çıkması amacı ile çoklu regresyon analizleri uygulanmıştır.

AB'nin dezavantajları temsili ile ilgili okul, cinsiyet ve okunan gazete değişkenlerinin alt seviyelerinde anlamlı farklar bulunmuştur. AB'nin avantajları temsili, cinsiyet ve okunan gazete seviyelerinde anlamlı olarak farklılaşmaktadır. Dinsel ve kültürel tehdit temsili açısından üniversite, cinsiyet, politik görüş, okunan gazete ve medyaya maruz kalma değişkenlerinin seviyelerinde anlamlı farklar bulunmuştur. Son olarak AB'nin zorluğu temsili, okunan gazete değişkeninin seviyelerinde farklılık göstermiştir.

AB'ye yönelik duygular ve üyeliğin değerlendirilmesi boyutlarının, AB'nin dezavantajları, AB'nin avantajları, dinsel ve kültürel tehdit ve AB'nin zorluğu temsillerini anlamlı olarak yordadığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Ayrıca, politik görüş ve medyaya maruz kalma değişkenlerinin dinsel ve kültüre tehdit temsilini anlamlı şekilde yordadığı ortaya çıkmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sosyal Temsiller, Avrupa Birliği, Medya

To My Sweetie Husband, Saygın "Lord Vader" Önal and

To My Dear Mother Nermin Çilingir

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Definitions of Social Representations

By all means, social reality is not a simple addition of the information that individuals gather from the social environment but rather a constructed phenomenon. People living in a society always try to solve the puzzle embraces them while at the same time socially construct the puzzle itself. While solving it; every single individual acts like a "naïve scientist" (Heider, 1958) by attempting to know and explain the social reality surrounds her / him which is also a postulation of social psychology as "normal individuals react to the facts of the social environment surrounds them as scientists do with an understanding in terms of information processing" (Moscovici, 1984).

Reality is demonstrated as an attribute to the phenomenon by Berger and Luckmann (1967) and this phenomenon forms an independent characteristic from the individuals to be called as reality. On the other hand, social reality is not only a fact investigated and constructed by social scientists but it also engages the society by particularly any medium and daily conversations. However, the investigation of social reality changes in terms of scientists and ordinary people, in the way that, non-

scientists choose to construct something to describe the social reality; in other words, use representation of the reality rather than itself. Taking this point as a premise, one should think of these representations as the theories of ordinary people for the aim of reaching the reality.

Moscovici, as the founder of social representation theory; defines social representations as "universes of opinions" that individuals have about the objects in the social environment. Social representations are the thoughts shared by a social group or whole society to fulfill the individuals' need to understand the world (Moscovici, 1984). According to Moscovici (1973, cited in Sotirakopoulou & Breakwell, 1992), social representations are systems, ideas, and practices which on the one hand prepare the individual to the world by understanding it, and it has a function of facilitating the need for communication by materializing the world on the other. By facilitating the investigation of the world; social representations forms a crucial tool for public's understanding of the unknown. Then, the function of social representations can be achieved as "making something unfamiliar, familiar" (Moscovici, 1984; p.24).

The theory of social representations had emerged from a well-known study of Moscovici in the 50s; in which whether the theory of psychoanalysis; as a scientific concept, impressed in French people's minds. Results indicated that when scientific concepts appropriated by common sense and everyday knowledge; it transforms and begin to circulate within the society; where the theory of psychoanalysis was transformed to a different mode of thinking, namely confession, an important ritual

of Catholicism. Then people choose to understand the unfamiliar, scientific concept in terms of the familiar elements of their own knowledge; and the analytical context transferred into a religious context (Öner, 2002).

According to Moscovici (1981, cited in Hewstone, 1990) social representations take its roots from daily conversations and communication among individuals and provide a set of explanations, propositions and conceptions. Within this frame social representations can be taken as the modern form of common sense and even the provision of beliefs and myths within the context of traditional societies. In the process of production of daily conversations and especially via the mass media communication; social facts are elaborated by individuals (Moscovici, 1984). Created within the process of social interaction; social representations arise in the social context, change, disappear, and reconstructed. Another premise made by Moscovici (1988) for social representations attributes to some different contents of the theory and moves it to another dimension:

> *Social representations concern the contents of everyday thinking and the stock of ideas that give coherence to our religious beliefs, political ideas, and the connections we create as spontaneously as we breathe. They make it possible for us to classify persons and objects, to compare and explain behaviors, and to objectify them as parts of our social setting.* (p.214)

According to Bergmann (1998), social representations emerge as *a product* of values, ideas, or practices in order individuals to understand the world better.

However in a certain process, social representations turn into a system which *produces* particular ideas, values or practices itself. Bergmann states that these postulations cannot be considered to determine which comes before; in other words, whether the social representations are products or producers cannot be detected.

Herzlich (1973, cited in Moliner & Tafani, 1997) suggests similar postulations as Bergmann and puts that composed of a two-fold body as content and process; social representations constitute a frame of information and beliefs about a social object and at the same time they are the "reconstruction of that object". Moliner and Tafani (1997) also state that social representation process has two main dimensions as social and collective and in order social representation process to occur, individuals should be faced with unknown social objects and these social objects should have social implications. Making the complex and unfamiliar world more clear and understandable; social representations are able to adapt the individual to the social environment by the reconstruction of the social information related to the environment.

By defining them as "individual knowledge systems", Wagner and Hayes (2005, p.121) make attributions to some characteristics for social representations: 1) Social representations are structured and multi-dimensional forms where any element of the given set is related to one another as a *theory-like construct* and this characteristic is the one that differentiates social representations from attitudes. 2) By facilitating to make sense of the social world via some sets of social information and constructing a different reality, social representations include cognitive and affective elements. The

social construction of reality in this way requires *linguistically accessible* social facts which are presented in metaphorical manner and the transformation of social facts to the constructed reality includes an affective process for individuals. The affective process brings the evaluation of the given information and as a consequence of the evaluation; the process reflects to bodily and verbal actions which shows the operative characteristic of social representations. 3) Considering the social representations as a link between individual and social world, they include a deeper comprehension of ideas or facts, thus, a proposition of true or false is not applicable in terms of social representation processes. While mediating the social environment and individuals; social representations indicate a symbolic characteristic where they possess a *metaphorical* or *iconic* portrayal. 4) The process of social representations includes *a socially relevant phenomenon* that is anything related to the social environment of the individual can be an object of the representation. These socially related phenomena can be considered as "facts", "events" or "stimuli". While defining the "social" character attributed to the object of social representation; one should think that the social character is not an inherited trait of the object; but the representation of the events or objects is characterized as socially related. 5) Another characteristic of social representations is that individuals should be aware of the event, fact or stimuli of representation. Those having unconscious contents cannot be the object of collective discourse. 6) Commonality of the representation is one of the most important features of social representations; that is, no one can talk about a representation if it is not shared by a social group. The "social" and "awareness" characteristics mentioned above, are the complementary parts of sharedness feature of representation. 7) Although social representations are existent only in terms of a

social group and have a "shared" character; they are also indispensable parts of individual's social identity. Social identity refers to individual's self definition in terms of some social group membership and social representations serve the causality, justification, and differentiation functions of social identity (Breakwell, 1993). Wagner and Hayes (2005) define representations as means to adapting the reality and they add that these representations provide reality with meanings, consistent with the *cognitive and ideological universe of the individual*. Citing from Abric's (1987) notions postulating "the representation system of an individual is an essential factor for maintaining and defending her / his identity"; Wagner and Hayes (2005) make a referral to the critical role of social representations for individuals' identity.

Social representations are about the content of the ideas that give coherence to individuals' religious beliefs, political ideas and the mental connections that they create in the social context. These are the sum of the thoughts and feelings that expressed explicitly and verbally in a given social group (Wagner et al., 1999; cited in Cirhinlioğlu et al., 2006), then one can assume that social representations make individuals possible to classify the people and the things, to explain and compare the behaviors and to reify these as parts of their social environment. Social representations, at the same time, give information of what others think about the experience that a given individual had, by allowing people to name, classify, and discuss their own realities (Cirhinlioğlu et al., 2006) which enables people to give a meaning to the world they live in.

Social representations, on the one hand, are comprehended as the social process of communication and discourse on the course of which meanings and social objects are generated and elaborated. On the other hand, primarily in empirical content oriented research, social representations are seen as individual attributes, as individual structures of knowledge, symbols, and affect, which are shared with other people in a group or society (Wagner, 1995). They make the researchers asking the questions of "when" and "why" the members of society hold similar views of a certain topic about the world (Fraser, 1994a). At this point the study of social representations serve as a framework that the shared views of the individuals living in a given society could be studied.

Spink (1993) presents a two-fold definition of social representations. In the first level; social representations are taken as mental productions which are both the expression within the cultural context having a permanent character (e.g. cultural codes bringing consensus) and diverse features at the same time. The second level of explanation comes as a consequence of the former in which, social representations are at the intersection of two conditions: 1) a "psychic reality" including emotions and images. 2) An "external reality" which comes up in the community and is subjected to group norms. In this sense social representations are socially structured forms of thinking and they reflect the social context in which they are produced and circulate.

Within a macro view; social representations are about how different systems of social regulation interact and constrain the system of cognitive functioning (Doise et

al, 1993; Rutland, 1998). While analyzing the relations between social and cognitive level of functioning; social representations provide an understanding of how social identities operate on the cognitive system (Breakwell, 1993; Wagner, 1995).

1.2. From Collective Representations to Social Representations

The concept of collective representations as emanated from well-known sociologist Emile Durkheim; is referred as the symbols that have a "common-shared" intellectual or emotional meaning (Zeitlin, 1968) found in a social group. Having a historical character; collective representations reflect the shared experiences of a social group over a time period. Although processed in symbolic forms, collective representations can also be referred for the basic concepts that the groups of individuals relate themselves with the world they live in. the function of collective representations can be concluded as expressing collective ideas that provide a social group's solidarity and it is the output of collective representations that produce group cohesion and unity (Zeitlin, 1968). These postulations project some static characteristics of collective representations, that is, these are the facts that are imposed to a given social group or society to provide the social order, which is inevitable for the group's solidarity and, at the same time, these provide the society to become aware of itself and objectify its rules of social interaction (Wagner & Hayes, 2005). The imposition of the collective representations makes them distinct from any process related to the social psychological explanation of human behavior. Durkheim makes a distinction between collective and individual representations and

he proposes that the social reality cannot be explained by individual representations (Wagner and Hayes, 2005) due to the reason that the collective representations are not reducible to individual level because their existence is not bound to the existence of a particular individual (Cirhinlioğlu et. al, 2006). Moreover, the explanation of the phenomena in the collective level and individual level (Farr, 1993) should be distinguished, where each level should be handled by the related discipline. Collective representations define a large-scale of mental forms including religion, science, and myths (Paker, 1999) and according to Durkheim's suggestions; it is the function of sociology and anthropology to investigate these kinds of representations (Öner, 2002).

Wagner and Hayes (2005) state that the collective representations can be taken as the premise of social representations theory and it is the symbolic structure of Durkheim's theory that makes these the antecedent of social representation theory. In terms of adaptation of collective representations to his own theory, Moscovici theorized a more dynamic concept instead. He defined the representations as "social" instead of "collective" in order to clarify that these forms of knowledge is represented throughout the society and shared by the members of a given social group or society. Different from collective representations, that are said to be produced to provide the social order and solidarity; social representations are produced by the members of society who interact with each other, during the daily conversations (Hewstone, 1990). According to Moscovici (1988) Durkheim's collective representations are rather dichotomous (Paker, 1999) in dissociating individual-collective or psychology-sociology concepts. Collective representations

form a uniqueness which constrain individual and this make them static. Therefore, collective representations are related to rather close fractures of society like sects (Paker, 1999); however, social representations are produced in societies where individuals interact and have a spare for communication. Moscovici also criticizes these dual points which creates a disintegration in terms of social reality, he adds that social facts including representations cannot be comprehended by the segments of the whole picture, but a dynamic interaction of the segments might give fruitful explanations of the social reality.

Another difference between collective and social representations takes its roots from the static characteristic of the former and the dynamic feature of the latter. While providing the social order in rather closed societies; collective representations might be far from interrogation and create a society where little arbitrariness is present (Wagner & Hayes, 2005). However, due to their dynamic characteristic, social representations are open to debate because both conflict and cooperation are found in the production of social representations (Cirhinlioğlu et al, 2006). Modern societies enable an environment where critical discourse and discussion of boundaries are allowed, and social representations can easily be produced out of contradictory experiences via everyday discourse. Due its nature that is independent from any individual action; collective representations are not open to critical discourse and contradictory experiences therefore, any form of questioning them is rarely seen. According to Wagner (1995) it is the contradictory experience that makes a collective discourse possible for the production of social representations and at the same time creates an ordinary knowledge and common sense in modern societies.

Considering these determinations; collective representations –with Durkheimian meaning assigned to them- are similar to doxa; a Greek word used for common belief or public opinion which is out of debate in traditional societies. Bourdieu (cited in Wagner & Hayes, 2005) explains these kinds of societies as follows:

These societies align their life and state of being with the world of tradition which is felt to be "natural" and taken for granted. In such a case, the means for recognizing the social world are political means which contribute at reproducing that social world; through an immediate agreement between the world and thoughts about it, which is accepted as convincing and unquestionable. They are means which are products of this world and which continually reproduce and transform its structure (p.221).

To sum up; although social representations inspired a lot from Durkheim's collective representations premise, there are some differences in either the content or the processing of these two conceptions. Especially with the consideration of the societal structures that these two conceptions take place, social representations seems more appropriate for modern societies where many kinds of communication are applicable. Wagner (1995) states that social representations can only be found in societies where social discourse includes the communication of either shared or divergent points of views about topics related to society. The "shared" nature of representations prerequisites an atmosphere where individuals interact with each other, therefore social representations are produced by individuals as a way to gather social knowledge to feel themselves indispensable which enables an unrestricted

discourse about any topic relevant to society and this "shared" characteristic does not change even if the individuals hold different notions of the elements in representation (Augoustinos & Walker, 1995). Moreover social representations are subject to a continuous process of formation and transformation; that is, they necessitate individuals with creative thinking and behaviors (Howarth, 2006) which set them apart from collective representations which are the superstructures, independent from individual thinking and actions.

1.3. Science and Social Representations

Science can be considered as the systematic efforts to seek for the facts related to world and for giving a meaning to the world. However, while fulfilling this function; science makes the familiar unfamiliar, as a contrast with the social representations (Moscovici, 1984; cited in Öner, 2002). Objects, events, or facts are expressed within a distinct terminology in terms of science that lay people can hardly process and even the concepts that people use in their everyday lives turns into a complex formula or logical sequence which creates a *sui generis* construct for scientists. According to Öner (2002); science proceeds from postulations to results, in contrast with the social representations. On the other hand, science and social representations are complementary (Farr, 1993; Öner, 2002; Joffe, 2003) in a way that the scientific information sometimes forms the object of social representation. In addition to that, the scientific knowledge, at the same time, is influenced by social representations (Howarth, 2006) and as the reified universe of the scientific knowledge transforms

into the consensual universe of the common sense; the direct contrary of this postulation is also true. Augoustinos and Walker (1995, cited in Howarth, 2006) puts the opinion as:

This implies that scientists too must rely on social representations to construct reality and to imbue their activities with meaning. They, therefore, must inevitably draw upon social representations when engaged in scientific work (Augoustinos and Walker, 1995, p. 161).

Therefore, one can see the two-fold relationship of influence between science and social representations; both processes do create concepts that might be the subject of each other.

Farr (1993) states that the theory of social representations can be taken as a perfect explanation of public's understanding of science. Due to the reason that scientific explanations of the facts comprise an unfamiliar and complex content for the people and that is why the world of representations contrasts with the world of science. However, during the investigation of the facts and trying to give a meaning to the world; people need to simplify of the scientific information by many processes. Farr (1993) amplifies the issue by inserting the media fact with its role of mediating between the world of science and lay men. As a matter of fact, it is the media representation of science conveying the messages to people's minds and creates awareness about the scientific issue in question which, in a certain period of time, construct the social representations.

Considering the link between science and social representations; Christidou et al. (2004) concludes that, the studies indicating a low number of people who are aware and have a deeper comprehension of the issues related to science and technology; however lay people can be informed about these topics from a large variety of mediated views such as mass media and it is again the media representation which presents some metaphorical explanation of scientific issues for lay people to provide them to simplify and have an understanding accordingly.

Wagner (2005) states that the links between matters of science or scientific knowledge and the practices related to common sense provide lay people to use scientific knowledge in the domain of everyday life. The adaptation process of science to the everyday practices is materialized through social relationships and communication. Hence the role of social representations in this point is to adapt the scientific knowledge to everyday life by objectifying and familiarizing.

1.4. Basic Concepts of Social Representations Theory

The most important premise of social representations theory is to make the unfamiliar, familiar in order to fulfill individual's need to give a meaning to the world. In doing so, the individuals get into various processes and mechanisms and provide the familiarity for the unknown (Cirhinlioğlu, et al, 2006), therefore enable the unfamiliar to be assimilated as a part of the common sense and everyday

14

knowledge. According to Lakoff and Johnson (cited in Christidou et al, 2004); in terms of accommodation of the abstract information; metaphors provide an experiential framework and facilitate the abstract turn to concrete. Metaphoric thinking, within this context, serves to a function of reconstruction of novel meanings in the investigation and transformation of the knowledge. Because the function of social representations is to explain the unfamiliar and ambiguous information by simplifying it; individuals need metaphors for the production of social representations.

1.4.1. Anchoring and Objectification

In the familiarization process; individuals employ two major mechanisms, namely anchoring and objectification (Abric, 1996; Paker, 1999). Anchoring is the process in which the integration of new information to the familiar categories is implemented; that is, the familiarization of the unfamiliar. Within anchoring; unfamiliar ideas are reduced into classes and images and these acquire a familiar context for the individuals and unfamiliar objects and facts achieve some particular meanings, a level of importance is attributed to them and finally these become a part of the social reality (Cirhinlioğlu et. al, 2006). Abric (1996) talks about anchoring as the absorption of novel situation into an old setting and cites from Doise (1992); *"anchoring constantly modules some aspects of representation depending on their insertion in their specific social relations"*. Molinari and Emiliani (1996) clarify the use of anchoring process in three functions as; first anchoring provides the

15

"integration of knowledge" by the processes of classification and naming and facilitates the adaptation of knowledge to well-known categories. Second; anchoring make the allocation of meaning to central and peripheral elements of the representation possible. Lastly, anchoring indicates the "instrumentality of the knowledge" that serves the functionality of the social representations. Doise (1992, cited in Abric, 1996; Molinari & Emiliani, 1996) proposes three types in terms of anchoring process: Operating as a link between notions of actual practices and a more general information of the actual practice; *psychological anchoring* takes place which attaches the specific form with the general. Secondly; when the imposition of the representations by social encounters is constituted, *sociological anchoring* is subjected. Thirdly; when social representations are regulated by social identity dynamics in the condition of multiple roles; one can talk about *psychosocial anchoring*; which operates at the level of socio-cognitive functioning. During anchoring, two sub-mechanisms are also operated; which are naming and classifying. Within the naming mechanism; the facts or the objects named are included in particular words and take a place within the cultural identity (Paker, 1999). On the other hand, the classifying process provides the novel object or fact to place into specific set of behaviors or rules. These processes provide individuals to locate the ambiguous and unfamiliar concept to a known category and label it with a specific name; thus the unfamiliar is attained a meaning in the familiar context and represented (Öner, 2002).

Objectification means the transformation of an abstract entity into a concrete one (Abric, 1996). In this process; the information is sorted out, selected, and dissociated

from the initial context (Abric, 1996, Paker, 1999). Objectification refers to the investigation of a symbolic attribution for the ambiguous phenomena; and requires the reproduction of the objectified entity (Moscovici, 1984; cited in Cirhinlioğlu et al., 2006). For the transformation of the abstract conception; metaphorical and iconic portrayals are used (Wagner & Hayes, 2005). Wagner et al. (1995) investigated about the use of the metaphors in the everyday understanding an abstract conception and they argued that the deeper comprehension of the relationship between source and target domains in a metaphor might be used as an objectification device and this investigation can provide to clarify how social representations are acquired in individual and collective levels. Moreover two levels of the objectification process are discussed in terms of the same study; stating that the occurrence of the objectification requires a cognitive process which serves for the function of selecting specific images and a social process where the popular knowledge is emitted (Wagner et al., 1995).

1.4.2. Structures and Processes of Social Representations

Concerning the structure of the social representations; many studied that have been conducted in this topic, ended up of the result as the internal organization of social representations are based on central elements (Flament, 1994; Guimelli, 1993a; Moliner, 1995; Abric, 1993; Molinari and Emiliani, 1996). Although these central elements are named differently in different studies (see Table 1.5.); most of them agreed upon the idea that the central elements of the social representation give

coherence to the content and provide a consensus in terms of the representation (Guimelli, 1993a). The theories postulating central elements in terms of the internal organization of the social representations are called "core theories" (Abric, 1996) and they assume that the central elements of representation operate as a generating function.

Table 1.1 Some Different Conceptualizations of Central Elements of SR (Guimelli, 1993a)

Author(s)	Name for the Central Element of Social Representations
Doise (1990)	Position Generating Principle
Mugny and Carugati (1985)	Hard Core
Grize, Verges, and Silem (1987)	Organizing Nucleus
Emiliani and Molinari (1992)	Common Core
Jodelet (1989)	Representative Nodal
Abric (1976, 1996)*	Central Core, Structuring Core
Guimelli (1993)*	Central Nucleus

* Added by the researcher

Central core is the element within social representations which signifies the representations and provides the determination of their structure (Abric, 1996). Due to its function that generates coherence within the social representations; central core shows a stable characteristic which is also resistant to change and negotiation. Any representation is thought to be organized around a central core and gains its meaning by this element (Molinari and Emiliani, 1996). Central elements might be an opinion, a belief, an attitude about the representation object (Moliner, 1995). According to Wagner and Hayes (2005); social representations are not unitary structures and various mechanisms (beliefs, evaluations or attitudes) embrace within

their operation and the central core is the starting point in the hierarchical structure of the social representations (p.182). As forming the whole structural organization of the representational field (Guimelli, 1993); central core has the power to transform or to alter the representation in case of an influence directing it to change. Although these elements are not open to debate all the time and show a stable characteristic; the meaning assigned to representation can only change within the change of central core. On the other hand; Moliner (1995) define a "refutation phenomena" about central core; in which, individuals show a distinct reaction for the situations contradicting with the central core of the social representations. According to Moliner (1995); people do not recognize the facts or situations that are inconsistent with the central core and they simply ignore the situation and this reaction is prevalent especially for the group situations where, in case of the questioning of the central elements; the members of social groups refuse to recognize the conflicting fact or object. Another finding indicates the critical role of central core by Abric (1989, cited in Guimelli, 1993) where a group of individuals were subjected to a memorization task and the results presented that individuals were better in remembering the central elements of social representation than the peripheral elements. However, what remarkable for the study was; the subject nevertheless showed some amount of recall in the absence of central elements, probably by assigning some meanings to the task and re-structuring the organization which indicates that people unintentionally try to give a meaning and coherence for the material without central elements, but the novel structuring becomes weak and the memorization becomes difficult.

The central core is the not only element composing the structure of social representations. Different from the central system of representations which is determined through social, historical and ideological situations; *peripheral system* is dependent to dispositional conditions and shows a heterogeneous character rather than homogeneous and stable as central system has (Molinari & Emiliani, 1996). Peripheral elements reflect the dynamic feature of the representation (Guimelli, 1993). Abric (1993) states that the peripheral system work as the complementary part of the central system, and it implies "the reality of the moment" to the representation. Therefore peripheral system is assessed by the immediate context characteristics; different from the historical context related to group functioning of the central system. The characteristics of central and peripheral systems are exhibited below (Table 1.2.)

Table 1.2 Characteristics of the central system and the peripheral system of a representation (Abric, 1993, p.76)

Central System Characteristics	Peripheral System Characteristics
• Linked to collective memory and the history of the group	• Permits the integration of the individual experiences
• Defines the homogeneity of the group	• Supports heterogeneity of the group
• Stable, coherent, and rigid	• Flexible and leads to contradictions
• Not sensitive to immediate context	• Sensitive to immediate context
• Generates the signification of the representation	• Allows adaptation to concrete reality and content differentiation
• Determines the organization of the representation	• Protects the central system

Guimelli (1993) uses the schemas to describe the content and the processing of peripheral elements of social representations. Schemas are the mental structures that organize the knowledge and provide guidelines for the future understanding of the

knowledge and the behavior accordingly. Flament (1993, cited in Guimelli, 1993) proposes two kinds of schemas can be defined as the ones direct individuals to behave in a particular way in a specific situation (prescriptive schema) and the ones that give the description of the situation itself (descriptive schema). He suggests that the peripheral elements are for the most part prescriptive schemas by linking the social practices with the representation object. Then peripheral elements have the feature of guiding the behavior in a specific situation and different from the stable characteristic of central elements; these can dynamically adapt to different situations and orientate the behavior accordingly. In the light of these postulations, the conditions and processes for the transformation of the social representations should be analyzed.

1.4.2.1. Transformation of Social Representations

Any change within the conditions, which comprise the formation process of social representations; directly or indirectly influence the representation itself. Because representations are socially structured elements; major changes in terms of social, political measures or new technologies may lead to transformation of the social representations (Wagner & Hayes, 2005). In order to investigate the transformation process of social representations, the conditions that create the necessity for transformation should be considered.

According to Guimelli (1993), there are some major conditions for the transformation process: first the event which would be the cause for transformation

must a degree of significance subjected for the social group having the representation object. The feature of the significance is adhered to the history of the group; thus, the same event may not have an effect in another group in terms of transformation. Second the situations extrinsic to the representation, but having a strong impact on the object of representation modify by creating a potential threat for the representation and provide the transformation. Thirdly, the challenging situations should be perceived as "irreversible" by the group members (see also Abric, 1993).

If these three conditions are present; then the process of transformation takes place inevitably. Abric (1993) proposes three types of transformation process. The first process is called "resisting transformation" and it includes the efforts of the members of a given group to deal with the novel situation and try to get the older practices; in terms of avoiding contradiction, by the help of peripheral mechanisms. The mission of peripheral elements here is to protect the central core from the contradicting information. The second process is called "progressive transformation" and this occurs when the novel situation does not cause the entire break up of the representation. During the progressive transformation process; the new entries accommodate to the old ones belonging to the central system. Finally the "brutal transformation" process causes the total collapse of the old structure and an entire transformation of the representation is materialized sharply.

The transformation process of a representation is definitely depending on the transformation of the central core (Abric, 1996). As forming the structural element of the representations, the central core is the most resistant part to change and has the

power to alter the whole representation if challenged to change. Accordingly, a direct or brutal transformation process (Abric, 1993) also means a modification in terms of the organization and the generated meaning of social representation as well as the historical significance of it. In order to form such a comprehensive change in a prevailing representation; the challenging entities should also be comprehensive and be included in the social structure surrounding the individuals. Not always; but mostly, the media can have the potential to create such a difference in the central elements of representation, by being impetus in social changes.

1.4.2.2. Functions of Social Representations

The operation of social representations is emanated from the need of familiarizing the unfamiliar entity (Moscovici, 1988). Within all the structures (central and peripheral) and the processes (anchoring, objectifying, naming, classifying), social representations serve the function of explaining the objects, facts, or events that signify for the individuals. Öner (2002) explains this function as the transfer of ambiguous or disturbing information from outside to inside and she proposes that this transfer is resulted in the approval of the unknown then placing it to the familiar categories and forming a novel contextualization of the strange entity.

Concerning the functioning types of the representations; Wagner and Hayes (2005) concludes some functions yielded by social representations. One of these is the instrumental function that provides the required guideline to deal with the

information given. Declarative function gives delineation by ascribing names to the phenomenon prior to justificatory action. Explanatory function provides firstly the "immediate causal explanation" of the information, secondly the "super-explanation for the metaphysical reason" and thirdly the "ideological ground", that is the doctrinal justification of the fact. Epistemic function provides individuals to be responsible to make give a meaning to their world; thus they become less doubtful in terms of the discourse and representation they produce. Evaluative function establishes certain identities for individuals so that they can direct their actions accordingly. The function of guiding action also provides individuals some prescriptions to direct their actions in a given situation.

The above explanations about the functions of social representation also give their role in the process of cognitive functioning. Moreover, functions have their meanings in anchoring and objectification process which serve as the basis for the functioning of the representations. Within a broader consideration, social representations may function at a macro level beside from the individual manner. Moscovici (1988) states that whenever a kind of break is constituted within the social life and the individuals fail to interpret the novel information, social representations function as an agent of social change. This is the consequence of "shared representations" that might create such a great wave that end in a macro modification. Sen and Wagner (2005) conducted a study within the context of Hindu and Muslim relations about the symbols on Hindu Revivalism in India and concluded that the social representations about this topic are based on the history and the representations of historical actions constitute a "narrative network" that

influence the social groups.

1.4.2.3. Methods of Social Representations

By the very definitions of social representations; the methods used in the related research must be useful in terms of the higher cognitive and social processes of individuals and clarify how people think in a systematic way including observation and linguistic analysis (Moscovici, 1988). Social representations cannot exist without the social context inward, including a historical link. Therefore, what should the social representation researcher do is to focus on the knowledge cycling in the society. While doing this; the most feasible way to achieve and evaluate this knowledge is to analyze the daily conversations occurring naturally; due to the fact that what makes representations social is the circulation of a notion and shared feature of it. The social character of the representations necessitates the use of language, which has the role of representing the thoughts (Cirhinlioğlu, et al., 2006).

Prior to the methodology, the levels of explanations related social representations should be considered. According to Wagner (1995), there are two questions to ask in social representations research: 1) is there a causal relationship between social representations and the observed behavior when considering the former as independent variable and the latter as the dependent variable and 2) is social representation a dependent variable itself? In order to provide a comprehensive explanation to the research on representations; Wagner uses a "Modal Explanation"

which establishes an *if-then* relationship between the explaining condition (*explanan*) and the explained event (*explanandum).* While considering the methodological concerns in the light of above model; Wagner (1995) evokes two crucial levels of social representations, which one is the individual processing level and the other is social and collective level.

On the other hand, Moscovici (1984a, cited in Cirhinlioğlu et al., 2006) proposes four postulates in conducting a social representations research: the data collected during the research should include the samples of daily conversations because it is the way of communication in which the individuals get unfamiliar information. Besides, social representations should be considered as a way of reconstruction of the reality. Thirdly; social representations should be investigated in times of large-scale social changes, chaos, and crisis due to the reason that the unexpected and radical events make conversations or debates more clear and overt than normal periods and it is easier to observe social representations occurring naturally. Finally, the target group should be preferred from lay people, interested in science because social representations mostly exist within these groups.

Although the nature of social representations seems to require a consensual approach, social representations should not be thought in terms of a hundred percent of consensus (Rose, et al., 1995; Potter & Litton, 1985; cited in Wagner & Hayes, 2005). As mentioned earlier, individuals of a given group, holding variable understanding of the elements of a representation do not violate the shared characteristic of the representation on the collective level (Augoustinos & Walker,

1995). Therefore, rather than taking the statistical consensus into account which is redundant in terms of a shared representation; one can consider the functional consensus that premise the deviance and ignorance do not influence the interaction of social entity (Wagner & Hayes, 2005).

Because the social representations research aims to find the shared point of views among individuals rather than the differences and variances; the parameter of central tendency is said to be adequate for the statistical consequence of the social representations (Witte, 1994). However, Witte (1994) suggests that the arithmetic mean will not be enough to find out the prevailing representation in a homogeneous group but the median parameter may sometimes give the required descriptive characteristic of the representation. By calculating the weighted arithmetic mean of the most frequent categories; a descriptive parameter can be achieved and the characterizing representation of the group can be described.

As composing a more "social" part of social psychology; social representations include research methods that may be distinct from the other, more individualistic premises of social psychology. Moreover, not only the human participants are investigated but the pieces of art, literature, films, television content, newspapers, and a lot like these which are included in the process of communication might be included in the research.

Ethnography, as one of the methods used is the fundamental research method of cultural anthropology. Within this method, the researcher answers the questions

generally related to the subjects about communities and human behavior; and usually investigates the connection between them. During this study, researchers generally use the sorts of observation method. Another method used within the scope of social representations is focus group; which generally used to examine how people make sense of certain public issues. As one of the most crucial informant for societies; media are also subjected to content analysis including press and other electronic media. However, Wagner and Hayes (2005) states that although television and other electronic media (now the digital technologies and especially the internet can be included) have a great role in the distribution and comprehension of knowledge throughout the society; little research has been conducted on these.

Considering the classical methods of orthodox social psychology; social representations research selectively use these. Farr (1993) proposes that the theory of social representations prefers a multi-method approach rather than limiting the research in a single method – as used in American Social Psychology in terms of experimental methods – and none of these methods seen as the "main" way to investigate the social representations. While social representations examine the anonymous reality, the data collected accordingly are evaluated by multivariate analyses, factor analyses, and so on (Cirhinlioğlu, 2006).

Due to the reason that social representation is a concept having multiple dimensions and showing a versatile character (Allansdottir et al., 1993a); no one method is enough to explain them. The diversity of methodological approaches (Moscovici, 1988) also necessary in proving social representations having micro and macro

levels; i.e. the individual and communal levels. It is their strong bond with the various cultural entities that requires an analysis of the daily conversations and language. In this level; the necessity of studying social representation in a culture-dependent manner with qualitative methods makes sense.

1.5. Social Representations and the Organization of the Behavior

In case of considering the social representations as a result of the cognitive functioning; one should think that whether these representations have an influence on the individual behavior. According to Moscovici (1961, cited in Guimelli, 1993a) social representations have a function of "guiding the action" and they contribute to the processes involved in communication and other social practices. Guimelli (1993a) cites some experimental studies ending with the result that not only the experimentation conditions determine individuals' or groups' behaviors in a given situation but social representations also have an influence on the process.

According to Echebarría (1995), social representations have a determinant role in memory and judgment processes. He concludes that experimented subjects remember more items that are congruent with the central core of the representation and they indicate more agreement with the ideas congruent with the central code (Echebarría & Paez, 1989; cited in Echebarría, 1995).

Moscovici and Perez (1997) conducted a study with respect to Gypsies to find out

whether social representations in a society affect prejudice towards specific groups. The results indicated that prejudices are produced within the societies, whose social representations related determine the categories they created and stereotypes they have.

Horenczyk and Bekerman (1995) indicate that all social practices including behavior should be considered in terms of social representations and add that when behaviors are considered within the elements of social practices as thoughts or language; one can easily see the connection of these elements with the causal understanding of the reality.

1.5.1. Social Identity and Social Representations

Concerning social representations within the scope of social identity theory indicates striking links between the postulations of two theories. As means of re-constructing the social reality, social representations are activated in terms of forming social identities; and social identities also play a great role in the production of social representations. Social identity refers to the premise that individuals determine their self-definitions in terms of the groups they belong and as social entities; they always seek to evaluate themselves positively (Hopkins & Reicher, 1996). The content of social identities is primarily constituted by the content of social representations due to the historical referral of the two processes.

The most remarkable influence of social representations on social identity processes can be observed at the construction of in-group and out-group phenomena; where the representation of out-group determines the homogeneity of in-group perception. Framing the relationship between social representations and social identity; the opposite is also considerable, that is, because social identities are the products of group membership processes; they influence the individual in terms of the exposure and usage of social representations (De Rosa, 1996). Cinirella (1996) emphasizes that since the social representations are taken as the shared beliefs of a given reality, generated in the course of social interaction; social identities – associated with the shared beliefs such as norms and stereotypes – are inevitably integrated to them. He also suggests a linear relationship between two conceptions as the changes in the social identity process can be accounted for the changes in social representations.

Hilton et al. (1996) proposes that social representations of history are important in promoting the "national consciousness" in forming the social and national identity of individuals. These representations are shared which provide the group salience and cohesion (Jaspars & Fraser, 1984; cited in Hilton et al., 1996) they are generally dispersed through the mass communication; like media (Moscovici, 1984). The study conducted by Hilton et al. (1996) results in the finding that social representations of history play a great role in the formation of attitudes towards the unification of Europe and the construction of European identity.

Breakwell (1993) states a three-way relationship between social identity, group membership and social representations of politics and proposes that the

representation of political system is related to the political involvement people have. This representation provides guidance for the group actions in the course of the social identity.

1.5.2. Attitudes and Social Representations

Attitudes have been one of the most popular topics within social psychology since 1920s, the time which the concept had appeared. In a very general definition, attitudes refer to the evaluations of individuals towards specific objects, events, or people. Because the concept is used to determine people's differentiated views on any entity; it is very common to compare these two. Farr (1994) claims that attitude is not "social" anymore because of the individualization of the concept especially by well-known theorist Gordon Allport. Due to this postulate, Farr (1994) prefers to differentiate the term attitude from "social attitude" concept, which he considered more compatible with social representations. He also attributes the "view of the world" approach to social attitudes and social representations while for attitudes he suggests the "consistency of response" approach both because of the methodological concerns and the referral of behaviorism for the latter approach.

Fraser (1994) suggests that the widespread and structural sets of attitudes can be taken as social representations and lists the main differences and similarities between attitudes and social representations as follows:

1. Social representation is a structured system of beliefs however an attitude is a relatively self-contained view of a specific part of reality, without a structured

manner.

2. Social representations are based and defined on their content however attitudes are investigated in terms of their processes.

3. The methods used to evaluate attitudes are generally consisted of experimental ways and quantitative analyses; but social representations are studied within natural settings and social representation studies use descriptive and qualitative methods.

4. Social representations are used to study widely shared within-group similarities in views of the world whereas attitudes focus on the within-group differences.

5. Behavioral, cognitive, and affective components are common to social representations and attitudes.

6. Social representations are not static and always changing however, attitudes are generally stable and attitude change is another major in the literature.

7. Attitudes are shared and widespread as in the surveys of public opinions but there can be alternative social representations.

8. Social representations can not be only studied by interviewing the individuals but they can also be investigated through newspapers, photographs, books, artifacts, etc. However attitude researchers rarely make use of these resources.

De Rosa (1993) stresses that, social representation is both a theory and a heuristic concept; however attitude is a phenomenon defined within different conceptualizations in various theories. She adds that social representations provide

33

an interactive conception based on dynamics of interpersonal and social exchanges but attitudes provide an individualistic perspective which explains social behavior by individual actions.

Considering attitudes as the evaluative components of the representations, Moliner and Tafani (1997) conducted an experimental study to exhibit this postulation and indicate that the attitude change can be referred to the changes in the evaluative dimension of the representation. Moreover they stressed the different characteristic of the two concepts in which representations are collective processes while attitudes are rather individualistic. At the end of the experiment, it was concluded that the changes in the attitudes may influence the peripheral elements of the representation but the central structure of the representation has the power to deal with this change, in case of a conflict.

Jaspers and Fraser (1984) consider attitudes as individual dispositions based on collective representations and they make a difference between public and private change of attitudes that can be related to the difference between individual response changes, which is the fundamental of individual attitudes and cognitive representations.

Bergman (1998) defines attitudes, values, and social representations as "acquired behavioral dispositions" and clarifies this definition as the tendency to evaluate particular objects, facts, or persons. He presumes the difference of social representations from attitudes and values as social representations look for lay

people's knowledge on an unknown entity and in this sense no one can mention about a "hidden" or "latent" social representation. From this perspective, one can assume that attitudes are investigated according to the answers given to a specific question asked however; social representations arise from the daily debates or conversations and seek for the reification of the abstract entity.

1.6. The Foundation of European Union[*]

Notion of a United Europe had a long history date back to the 18th century. Because the lands of Europe attested many wars either between the neighboring nations or with the other countries; a humanistic and peaceful Europe dream grows out of this notion. The World Wars in 20th century took stage in whole Europe; strengthen the notion of a United Europe which resulted in the establishment of Council of Europe in 1949. As a first step of cooperation between European countries, Council of Europe was consisted heavily of West European countries; however six countries, namely Belgium, West Germany, Luxembourg, Italy, France, and the Netherlands desired to go beyond the Council and formed European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in 1950, which provided a strong economical and political bond among Europe. Arising from the Schumann Plan, ECSC had two approaches for the integration of European countries, which were the federalist and the functionalist approaches. The idea of cooperation and complementation among national authorities indicated the federalist notion, while moving the sovereignty from

---

[*] The information about European Union have been compiled from the official portal of European Union (http://europa.eu/) , from Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry, Secretariat General for EU Affairs (www.abgs.gov.tr), and Economical Improvement Foundation (www.ikv.org.tr)

national to community level was raised upon the functionalist approach which also formed the basis of the European Union today.

After the foundation of ECSC, many attempts have been made to establish a union in Europe in terms of defense strategies or political acts but these ended in nothing for a certain time. By the establishment of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as solidarity in terms of defense and by the notion that providing an economical union would be more realistic; the attempts directed to the economical scopes and six countries composing the ECSC signed the treaty to form the European Economic Community (EEC) on March 25th, 1957. Following this agreement, comes the Treaty of Rome operated on January 1st, 1958, to establish the European Atomic Energy Community (EUROATOM). Finally as a result of signing the "Amalgamation Agreement" by the founder members; only one parliament, council and commission had been implemented for ECSC, European Atomic Energy Community (EUROATOM), and European Economic Community (EEC), the budgets of the communities had been combined and the term "European Communities" had begun to be used instead.

On the other hand; Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom had come together to establish European Free Trade Association (EFTA) in 1960. EFTA countries removed the customs and other taxes among member states in terms of industrial products; however they continued to execute their own national legislations against non-member states. Following the completion of Customs Union in 1968, all member states' customs of EEC had been unified.

The first expansion stage of the union was in 1972, implemented by the subscription of the membership agreement by England, Denmark, and Ireland which increase the number of members from 6 to 9. Another country; Norway, also applied for the membership, but the Union disapproved.

The second expansion period took stage in 1981 and the union accepted the membership of Greece; whose application had been turned back in 1975 due to the weakness of national economy. The acceptance of the membership demands of Spain and Portugal in 1986, constituted the third expansion stage of the Union. Although these two countries had applied for the membership in 1962; they were refused due to the non-democratic regimes they had. In the years of 1977 and 1978; two countries provided democratic elections and removed the dictatorship; then the accession negotiations began; which ended in full membership of the countries in nine years.

According to the Schengen Treaty signed in 1985 by Germany, Belgium, France, Luxembourg and the Netherlands; all customs formalities and visa removed for the citizens of committed countries and common customs formality were decided to be used for the third countries. Then comes the fourth expansion stage 1993 and Austria, Finland, and Sweden were accepted as members of the Union, four years after their full membership application. The reason why full membership process of these three countries took shorter time than for the other member states was; these countries had already fulfilled the criteria for the full membership.

Single European Act (SEA) operated in 1987 provided an amendment of the treaties that establish the European Communities. By this act; new common policies were confirmed and the older ones were improved. In this context; new items concerning social policy, economy, social adjustment, and environment were added to the Treaty of Rome and by the way of "European Political Cooperation", member states were provided to collaborate in terms of foreign policies.

In order to form a single unit of currency and a single Central Bank, in terms of procuring "economical and monetary union", and providing a political unity driven on a common foreign and defense policy; Maastricht Treaty was signed on 7th February, 1992 which assembled "European Union" officially replaced the European Community. By Maastricht Treaty, a stronger European Union was tried to be created with harmonized and well-balanced economical policies, sustainable development, and sensitive precautions for the environment. Within the scope of Maastricht Treaty;

- The establishment of a union that provide a system of single unit of currency,
- Creating the "European Citizenship" that enables EU citizens to have the rights to vote for municipality in the country they live,
- Constituting a common foreign and defense policy procuring the values of democracy and human rights.
- Yielding the cooperation in terms of internal affairs and law, in order to ensure the domestic safety issues were handled.

Moreover the issues of education, culture, public health, visa policy, and industrial policy were included to the Treaty. Common policies and related EU legislation in

terms of these issues are binding for the member states.

As a result of Maastricht Treaty, European Communities (ECSC, EUROATOM, and EEC) were included to European Union (EU) and the decision making processes were expanded to new areas, within "co-decisional procedure". Following the formation of European Single Market in January 1st, 1993; free movement of labor, capital, products, and goods was completely provided.

One of the most important landmarks constructing the membership strategy of European Union was conducted in the Summit of Copenhagen; clarified by the items of "Copenhagen Political Criteria". The conditions specified within the Copenhagen Political Criteria express the minimum requirements that candidate states should fulfill. The conditions are grouped in three dimensions as political criteria, economical criteria, and congruency with Acquis Communitaire and can be listed as follows:

- Political Criteria: defines the conditions specifying a consistent corporate structure covering democracy, human rights, and the rule of law
- Economical Criteria: requires the existence of a well-functioning economical market as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within European Union.
- Acceptance of Acquis Communitaire: defines the commitment to the economical, political, and monetary targets of European Union.

In order to specify the process for providing single unit of currency and the expansion strategy of the union; the Summit of Amsterdam was held in 1997 and the

fifth expansion stage was decided in addition to the legal approval of single unit of currency. One of the main aims of Amsterdam Treaty operated on 1999 was to strengthen the corporate structure of EU with the expansion through Eastern European Countries. The Amsterdam Treaty is also important by presenting the declaration of "the EU would be able to legislate on immigration issues, civil law or civil procedure, and it will be necessary for the free movement of persons within the EU. At the same time, intergovernmental cooperation was intensified in the police and criminal justice field so that Member States will be able to coordinate their activities more effectively. The Union aims to establish an area of freedom, security and justice for its citizens (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amsterdam_Treaty). Moreover, a considerable improvement was provided in terms of human rights in the 7th article of the Agreement stating that; a member state which continually violates human rights is prone to the sanctions of other member states. Although this application has never been applied till today; the probability of the sanction directs member states to be more careful about human rights.

Within the scope of Luxembourg Summit, held in December 12-13th, 1997; candidate states were classified for the first time in terms of fulfilling the Copenhagen Criteria. The first class of candidate states that were the ones already fulfilled Copenhagen Criteria were; Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia and Cyprus. On the other hand; Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, and Slovakia did not seem to be prepared for the accession negotiations and not fulfilled the political criteria. The expansion policy of EU directed to the countries from Eastern Europe and the member profile of the Union began to change in terms of

depolarization of East and West (Cem, 2004). Anyway, the states approved for the full membership in the fifth expansion stage in 2004 indicates this policy clearly: The Greek Administration of Southern Cyprus, The Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia. With the approval of full membership of these 10 states; EU implemented the most comprehensive enlarging of historical which increased the population of EU from 378 to 454 million.

Finally, after the negotiations with Bulgaria and Romania completed in 2007; number of member states increased to 27 and the borders reached to Ukraine, Belarus and Russia on the east. Now there are three states, namely, Turkey, Croatia, and Macedonia as candidate states waiting for the approval for full membership.

Concerning the institutional affairs; a convention about the future of Europe was held in February 2002 to develop a draft of EU Constitution. The draft document was admitted in the Summit held in Brussels on June 2004 and the most considerable step was taken in the way to form a political union among EU member states. By this constitution, all constituent treaties and agreements that make intensive changes for the union were combined under a single and new document. In order the constitution to be operative from November 2006; the member states should have affirmed the constitution either by their own parliaments or by holding a referendum in their countries. Although most of the states admitted the constitution, the referendum results were negative in France and the Netherlands due to some articles in the constitution.

1.7. Turkey - European Union Relations

The relations between European Union and the process of membership have been one of the most crucial topics in Turkey's foreign affairs. Within this framework, the national profits and constructed visions through future times are both developed accordingly. Since the Republic of Turkey had always aimed to be a part of the Western Community, the relations with Europe and the organizations related, gain a great importance which have been a significant agenda for the Turkey's political, economical, and social life.

Although the first attempt of Turkey to join the European Community was in 1949, the time which the country had been a part of European Commission, the beginning of the relations between Turkey and EU had been legislated with the Ankara Agreement, signed in 12th September, 1963 and put in to effect in 1st December, 1964 with European Community; which forms the basis of the communality regime between these two.

Turkey applied for the full membership to European Union in 1987, however; according to the decisions that European Commission held, some political, economical, and social requirements were not sufficient, thus the negotiations on full membership could not take a start till 2004.

Ankara Agreement on 1963 anticipated a gradual process for the integration of Turkey with Europe, which provide the free trade as a first step. Then an advanced

economical integration accomplished with the Turkey's participation to Customs Union in 31st December 1995. By this way, the integration level between parties reached to an advanced point; leaving the full membership only to the negotiations. Turkey's attempts to join the EU had slowed down in the second part of 1960s and 1970s due to the military coups, till 1983 which was the time that liberal ideology had dominated within the empowerment of Turgut Özal, and a new process had begun in Turkey-European Union relations. After the Turkey's application for the full membership in 1987, European Union declared that the Union had problems within the internal market which led to the rejection of the membership application. The reasons for the rejection of full membership were not only related to the EU's internal problems but Turkey's economical, political and social situation were also considered insufficient for the EU criteria. Following the Cold War in 1989, EU decided to increase the number of members for the participation of Eastern European countries and the expansion process of European Union had started which on the other hand, slowed down the Turkey's full membership attempts till the mid 1990s, the Customs Union signed, which liberated the trade relations between Turkey and EU countries. The participation to Customs Union in December 31st, 1995 indicates an advanced level of economical integration to EU.

The Summit of Luxemburg, held in 1997, resulted with declaration to Turkey that the developments in human rights, minorities, and the relations with Greece should be accelerated and the negotiations would take start afterwards. Then, comes the 1999 Helsinki Summit, which determines the start date of the negotiations as December, 2004; and a new period begun in terms of Turkey-European Union relations. The

Helsinki Summit summarizes that Turkey will be in an equal position with the other candidate states and predicted to sign an "Accession Partnership Document" (APD) as the other candidate states did. The Accession Partnership Document was signed on March 8th, 2001 and approved by the Council of European Union. In order to implement the priorities related to the participation criteria in APD, Turkish Government approved a "National Program" and consigned it to the Commission.

1.7.1. Towards Full Membership and the Beginning of Accession Negotiations:

The Copenhagen Summit held on December 2002, the decision made to start the accession negotiations on December 2004; if Turkey fulfills the Copenhagen political criteria, based on the report and advice of the Commission. The accession criteria approved on June 1993, by the European Council in Copenhagen states that:

"Membership requires that candidate country has achieved stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and, protection of minorities, the existence of a functioning market economy as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union. Membership presupposes the candidate's ability to take on the obligations of membership including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union.

(http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/atwork/_documents/dgenlargemen
tbrochure/sld005.htm, 04.08.2007)

Beside from the presentation of the criteria, the 2002 Copenhagen Summit declared to strengthen the current Participation Strategy for Turkey and the Commission was invited to deepen the investigation of legislation process. The decision of enlarging the Customs Union between Turkey and EU, and increasing the pre-accession monetary support for Turkey are the other conclusions of the Summit.

Since 1999 Helsinki Summit, Turkey implement many political, administrative and juridical reforms, regarding the fundamental freedoms and human rights. The enlargement of latitude of thought, strengthening of the worship freedoms of individuals with different beliefs and thoughts, and providing the freedom of usage of different languages and dialects used by the citizens of Turkey are some reforms actualized by Turkish Government in this process. On the other hand, many reforms regarding the Turkish system of justice, prevention of torture and bad treatment, and the improvement of equality of men and women were applied to meet the criteria. However, the most crucial development in terms of human rights was the removal of "capital punishment" from the Fundamental Law of Turkey.

In order to operate the reforms indicated above, Turkish Government modified the Fundamental Law on October 2001 and the new Civil Code, as harmonized with the Copenhagen criteria, operated on the 1st January, 2002. Between February 2002 and June 2003, eight adjustment packages operated, including the necessary changes, in order to meet the political criteria postulated by European Union. On the other hand, some regulations were accomplished concerning the gender equality, liberty of the

press, the status of international instruments and the functionality of judicial authority.

The Commission made a comprehensive evaluation of these changes with the determination of political criteria had already been met and commended to start the negotiation process with Turkey and the other candidate states. According to the "Impact Assessment Study", Turkey's full membership to EU was evaluated in terms of influencing European Union's justice and internal affairs, economy, domestic market, agriculture, and fishery. Conclusively, the membership of Turkey was found to make a contribution to the Union.

On 17th December, 2004 the decisions held on Helsinki and Copenhagen Summit were confirmed and the steps taken by Turkish Government in the reform process were met gladly. Thereby the accession negotiations were decided to take a start on 3rd October, 2005; in the frame of the 23rd clause of Summit Conclusion. After the Summit; with the beginning of a new period in the relations with EU; two important documents were prepared by the Commission to determine the main points of the accession negotiations which are the "Negotiation Framework" and Accession Partnership Document" and Turkey is liable to fulfill the requirements of 35 negotiation chapters listed below:

Table 1.3 Negotiation Chapters

• Free movement of goods	• Freedom of movement of workers
• Right of establishment and freedom to provide services	• Free movement of capital
• Public procurement	• Company law

Table 1.3. (continued)

• Intellectual property law	• Competition policy
• Financial services	• Information society and media
• Agriculture and rural development	• Food safety, veterinary and phytosanitary policy
• Fisheries	• Transport policy
• Energy	• Taxation
• Economic and monetary policy	• Statistics
• Social policy and employment (including anti-discrimination and equal opportunities for women and men)	• Enterprise and industrial policy
• Trans-European networks	• Regional policy and coordination of structural elements
• Judiciary and fundamental rights	• Justice, freedom, and security
• Science and research	• Education and culture
• Environment	• Consumer and health protection
• Customs union	• External relations
• Foreign, security, and defense policy	• Financial control
• Financial and budgetary provisions	• Institutions
• Other issues	

Although the decision made on 2004 about the beginning of the accession negotiations, the road to full membership still seems to indicate a difficult and long process for Turkey. The coordination of political actors, media, and non-governmental organizations is certainly required for the aim that may cause a great change for this country in social, economical or political manner. However as the process gets longer, the support given for the full membership to European Union and the image of Europe also, are influenced negatively by Turkish society. According to the Public Opinion Research conducted by Eurobarometer by European Commission in 2004; the level of support for the EU membership of Turkey in spring was 71%, however decreased to 62% in autumn. 75% of the participants

found the membership as advantageous while this decreased to 73% in the autumn. The results of the same research re-conducted on 2006, however, indicate that the level of support for Turkey's full membership to EU has been decreased to 44% with an increase in the number of people who do not see Turkey's EU membership "as a good thing"; however it was 12% of people in 2004 expressed their opinions negatively which then rises to 25% in 2006.

The reasons of decrement in the level of support and concurrently in the positive attitudes towards Turkey's membership may have different sources. These reasons will be evaluated in the discussion chapter of this study with the results gathered in accordance with Eurobarometer surveys. Anyway one should consider that the reasons causes this decrement may have both individual and societal dimensions; from personal beliefs to the matters related to international relations and politics.

Although the political and social agenda of Turkey change rapidly, the concern of being a part of Western Community and "reaching the level of contemporary civilization" target have always been placed in any civil or governmental action since the establishment of the Republic of Turkey. As a step forward to getting closer to the Western world; the most serious acts have been taken for being a part of Europe, which seems to form the shortest way to the aims mentioned. Being a bridge between Europe and Asia, Turkey played a great role in terms of international relations in either political or economical manner, however; the people living in this country seemed to dispose to the eastern world, rather than the western society, especially during the times of Ottoman Empire. Therefore, the actions to take a route to West

sometimes might require a great social change in terms of society particularly with the consideration of the reality that the Republic of Turkey is rather a young establishment. Turkey's attempts to join into the western world have many reflections throughout the society and the most serious act in this way, namely, the attempt to enter the European Union has been one of the most important topics concerned by the society.

Considering the structure of European Union and the political (Copenhagen) or economical criteria that should be fulfilled for the full membership; it is clear that almost all people living in Turkey have a notion and approach through the Union. Because the membership process includes many changes either in macro dimensions or in individual dimensions; people are prone to develop a representation for both the initiation and the results of the process. The concepts and the facts related to European Union are generally holding a political and economical terminology which makes the situation more complex for non-expert people. Then, European Union concept and the evaluation of Turkey's full membership attempts can be taken as unfamiliar due to the terminology they have but at the same time; these are the matters that people are aware of because of their frequent presentation by the media (further explanation for the "Media Representation of European Union" will be discussed in Chapter 3). These postulates highlight the motivation of choosing European Union as an object for social representation for this study, that is, the concerns about how people make the European Union concept familiar, how the social representations of EU constructed and whether these representations constructed influenced by the media presentation of EU, directed the researcher to

study this topic.

1.8. Expectations of the Study

As discussed in the previous sections; European Union has been a central topic to people's agenda living in Turkey due to its historical bonds with this country, a long and detailed membership process and the possible changes it would create for Turkish people in case of an acquired full membership. Within this scope; EU is at the same time has a very complex structure and the relationship between the Union and Turkey has been going on a sophisticated and multi-dimensional aspect.

According to Rutland (1998), EU is a convenient topic for social representations due to two reasons: first the concept of Europe is a concrete and significant issue for the groups of people and second, it is difficult to determine a particular cognitive operation for the process of EU. As mentioned before, for the production of social representations, people should be aware of the represented object (Wagner and Hayes, 2005). Moreover, since the presentation of EU related information within media is clear; the awareness of the topic is intensified and it is quoted before that the social representations of a particular fact or object is dispersed throughout the media (Moscovici, 1984), thus; the influence of media should be investigated accordingly. On the other hand, it is clear that people's views on EU are emanated from a political framework and the content of social representations produced would include a socio-political aspect. Representation of politics is highly related to the

political involvement people have (Breakwell, 1993). Therefore, the investigation of social representations about EU could be operated within the differentiated political views.

The conception of EU is also related to the constructions of social identity within the frame of a possible European identity. Hortaçsu and Cem-Ersoy (2003) investigated the relationship between social identities, values and construction of EU and they resulted in the finding of three constructions as "Europe is different", "impermeable boundaries" and "dissimilar but advantageous" and she concluded that these constructions are highly related to the social identities of the subjects. It is clear that social identity and social representations might have a linear relationship in which the changes in the former may influence the latter and vice versa (Cinirella, 1996). Therefore the European related identity constructions should be revealed within the investigation of social representations of EU.

The main aim of this study was to find out the contents and structures of social representations of European Union. In order to fulfill this aim, two qualitative and one quantitative study had been conducted. The first study was composed of a semi-structured interviews about the EU and it was expected that the central structure of social representations of EU would be Turkey's membership to EU and the structure of EU (detailed information about Study 1 is presented on Chapter II). The second study consisted of a content analysis of three newspapers in terms of the headlines and news about the EU and it was expected that two opinions would arise from the media about EU proposing the advantages and disadvantages of Turkey's

51

membership to EU. Finally the third study three scales had been conducted to measure social representations of EU and to find out the predictors of the representation in question.

Correspondingly, the research questions and the hypotheses of the study are as follows:

Research Question #1: What are the contents and the structures of the social representations of EU produced by Turkish people?

Studies indicating a prevailed social representation of European Union generally focus on the social identity aspect of the phenomenon (Breakwell, 1993, Augoustinos, 1993, Breakwell & Lyons, 1993, De Rosa, 1996, Huici et al., 1997, Chryssochoou, 2000, Licata, 2003). Rutland (1998) conducted a study about social representations of EU among British children of 10-16 years old and concluded that the children's social class groups have an influence on the development of the beliefs and acquisition of the information about EU. On the other hand, Licata (2003) investigated the relationship between social representation and social identity in terms of national and super-national levels of identification of EU and found that identification with EU is facilitated by the representation of Europe. Another study discussing the EU within the context of social representations and social identities conducted by Chryssochoou (2000) suggesting that people give meaning to the social categories via social representations and the status-positions of the nations (subgroups) directs the formation of the representation on which the social category built upon.

Hypothesis #1: It was expected from the study that the central structure of social

52

representations of EU is mainly based on the elements of first; the views of Turkey's membership to EU and the views of Turkey's full membership would be evaluated on "advantageous" and "disadvantageous" dimensions. Second element of the central structure will be the "structure of EU" and the corresponding evaluations will be made on the religious and cultural conflicts and referral of historical representations.

Research Question #2: How does the media representation of EU differentiate along the national newspapers in Turkey and whether these representations are informant for the production of social representations of EU?

Moscovici (1984) states that social representations are produced in daily conversations and mass media presentations of the social information. Especially about the sophisticated and unfamiliar entities; media play a great role in terms of the familiarization and reification of the social facts. Gardikiotis et al. (2004) suggest that the exposure to socially mediated information might cause individuals to establish a corresponding frame of reference, especially in case of high exposure to these sources of information. The production of public discourse on a particular topic is highly relevant to the media representation of that topic; due to the reason that mass communication emanates the proper atmosphere for the production of social representations. Wahl (1992) conducted a study about the media presentation of mental illness and concluded that media portrayals do perpetuate a negative image of mental illness with a connection of violence. In the same vein, Foster (2006) depicts that the continued linking of mental illness and violence, in the context of media presentation, ingrains this connection within society by stigmatizing the mentally ill people as "others". Livingstone et al. (1998) propose that the mass media

presentation of any information is an important source for social understanding and social representation. Moscovici argued that there are three styles in which mass media deals with the new knowledge contents and serve for converting and spreading of that information (Wagner & Hayes, 2005): 1) Diffusion: Transmission of the knowledge in a neutral way, 2) Propagation: The transmission is targeted through a well-structured reader group, 3) Propaganda: Within the regulatory and organizational functions; the transmission of knowledge is emanated with the creation of an external threat.

Hypothesis #2: Media representation of European Union would be differ along a political view continuum where liberal media would produce advantageous dimensions of EU membership diffusively, right-wing media would consider EU as a threat to religion within a propaganda style and finally left-wing newspaper content would produce an advantageous representation of EU with the propagation style.

Research Question #3: On what dimensions social representations differentiate and predicted?

As indicated earlier, social representations of politics are dependent on the political views people hold (Breakwell, 1993). Moreover, social class inclusion is also a predictor of social representations produced towards European Union (Rutland, 1998). It is clear that social representations are also fruited from values, beliefs, or attitudes and due to their shared nature; both individual and culture dependent dimensions may contribute to the formation of representations. As Chryssochoou (2000) indicated; social positioning of the groups is effective in the social representation of Europe. Considering that social representations are not only generated in terms of social conditions, but the contribution of individual dynamics

such as attitudes, values, expectations, or identities is also apparent (Spink, 1993).

Hypothesis #3: It was expected from the study that social representations of EU would differentiate along political affiliation, media exposure, SES levels and the ideological orientation of the newspaper read. On the other hand; the individual dynamics such as feelings and evaluations of EU, individual expectations and perceived agenda of the society lived in are thought to contribute for the prediction of social representations within different dimensions.

CHAPTER II

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVIEWS

2.1. Introduction

Social representations are produced in daily conversations and everyday discourse. The diffusion of the knowledge of lay people is elaborated by the verbal acts or overt behaviors and this process is eventuated in the context of communication. The importance of communication for social representations requires an environment that enables the act of communication in any kind. Then it makes sense that social representations are the products of modern societies where discussion or debate is permitted. Although social representations are shared through traditional communication or mass media; it does not mean that these indicate to a homogeneous structure (Moscovici, 1988). Conversely, it is the heterogeneity of notions and evaluations which create the discourse for debate and enable the production of social representations.

As indicated earlier, language is the most important device that contributes to social representations. In order to negotiate the notions and acquire the necessary

information from the sources; language plays a great role in terms of expressing the thoughts (Cirhinlioğlu et al., 2006). Therefore, the research on social representations requires a detailed analysis of the daily language as a method, to reach the very center of the lay theories produced by the individuals. Due to the reason that social representations are produced within society, they should be investigated in their natural settings (Aktaş et al., 2004, Öner, 2002) without any manipulation or orientation.

Conclusively, qualitative analyses of daily conversations, newspapers, TV programs or books are necessary for the comprehension of the social representations (Moscovici, 1988). In order to find out the most prevailing social representations of EU in Turkey, a semi-structured interview had been conducted and applied to thirteen subjects and the interviews were put through a content analysis.

2.2. Method

2.2.1. Participants

Thirteen subjects (3 women and 10 men), with an age mean of 39.07, were participated the interview study, whose demographic variables are presented in Table 2.1. The subjects were randomly selected in terms of their ages, education or SES levels. The professions of the participants were as follows: 1 porter, 1 civil servant, 2 retainers, 1 hairdresser, 1 craftsman, 1 web designer, 1 computer programmer, 1

middle manager, 1 retired worker, 1 housewife, 1 secretary, and 1 photographer. As can be seen from the professions of the participants; the group heterogeneity was provided so that the prevailed representations could be attributed to different segments of the society.

Table 2.1 Demographic Variables of Interviewees

Variable	#	Percentage
Education		
Primary School	5	38.46%
Secondary/Elementary School	0	0%
High School	4	30.76%
University	4	30.76%
Income		
0-1000 YTL	8	61.58%
1001-5000 YTL	5	38.46%
5001 YTL and above	0	0%
Birth Place		
Village	1	10%
Town	5	38.46%
City	0	0%
Metropolitan	7	53.84%
Political View		
Left Wing	4	30.76%
Right Wing	0	0%
None	7	53.84%

2.2.2. Procedure

Prior to the interviews, the participants were informed about the aim of the study, approximate length of the interviews (10 to 30 minutes), voice recording device, and privacy; i.e. they were told that their names or surnames would not be acquired and the interviewer would not call them by their names in any part of the interview. Finally they were informed about the evaluation of the interview and reminded that

the participation to the study is based on volunteering. Emphasized topics asked to

the participants are as follows:

Table 2.2 Emphasized Topics of the Interview

- Considering the next 50 years, how do you evaluate the international-political position of Turkey?
  - Within this process, what would be the most striking agenda of Turkey in terms of international relations and why?
- What do you think about European Union?
  - What do you think about Turkey's membership to EU?
  - In case of Turkey's gathering of the full membership to EU, what advantages and disadvantages
- Does Turkey's EU membership cause any kind of change in your life? If "yes", what kind of changes do you expect?
- Which sources of information do you prefer for getting information about EU?
  - Which daily newspapers do you read?
- What is your political view?

The structure of the topics sometimes changed according to the direction of the

interview, but the main points were tried to be discussed by the interviewees. The

questions addressed to interviewees were sequenced by a logical sequence; from

general to specific ones. What aimed with that sequence was to catch the concept of

EU from the general knowledge and evaluation of Turkey in terms of international

relations and future expectations. The length of the interviews was between 8 to 33

minutes and 12 of them out of 13 were recorded. One participant reported dislike of

the voice recorder, thus, the interview was noted by the interviewer.

2.3. Results

Prior to analyses, the recorded interviews were coded in terms of the thematic units. Thematic units are the elements consist of meaningful sentences or words that make sense in terms of the topic of the study. Based on the emphasized topics questioned during the interview, five categories were found and shown on the Table 2.3.

Table 2.3 Basic Categories and Thematic Units

CATEGORİES AND THEMATIC UNITS	#	Frequency
1. Turkey's Membership to EU		
• EU will not accept Turkey as a member	11/13	17
• Turkey's participation will be a second-level membership in case of the acceptance	8/13	8
• EU will continue to detain Turkey's membership	11/13	13
• Turkey does not need a EU membership	5/13	11
• Instead of EU, Turkey should direct to be participated to an Eastern Union.	3/13	5
• Cultural or religious differences and make Turkey's membership impossible	5/13	7
2. Problems of Turkey		
• Education	4/13	8
• Terror	3/13	5
• Economy	3/13	7
• Low level of self-confidence and lack of self-presentation	2/13	6
3. Views on the Structure of EU		
• EU is a Christian Community	7/13	10
• EU will be disappearing soon.	3/13	4
4. Disadvantages of EU		
• Limited membership	4/13	4
• Economical dependency and indebtedness.	5/13	8
• Cultural hegemony and degeneration	5/13	10
• Ethnic minorities desire to dissociate	2/13	3
• Religious conflicts	7/13	12
5. Advantages of EU		
• Educational, technological and economical yields	3/13	4

Table 2.3. (continued)

• Social justice and improvement of income level	5/13	11
• Well-developed industry	4/13	4
• Norms and standards in terms of social life	3/13	4
• Improvement of human rights and system of justice	4/13	4
Political Views		
• I don't consider myself in any political position	7/13	7
• I am a leftist	2/13	2
• Social democrat	2/13	2
Sources of Information		
• Television	10/13	10
• Newspaper	13/13	13
• Internet	2/13	2

2.3.1. Representations about "Turkey's Membership to EU"

The thematic units indicated that participants expressed "Turkey's membership to EU" category as involving the most prevailing social representations of EU. Most of the participants indicated a lack of faith for the membership of Turkey to EU and they declared that the negotiation processes, acts, and decisional Summits are the tactics to detain Turkey because EU is not intended to accept Turkey's membership. Moreover, about half of the participants emphasized that even if EU accepts Turkey as a member, it would be impossible for this country to gain the same rights as other members of the Union; that is, Turkey would be treated as a "step child" whose benefits would certainly be ignored. When asked the reason for this proposal, participants declared the religious differences or uncompromising cultural contrasts between Turkey and EU countries. On the other hand, nearly 62% of the participants expressed Turkey does not need the EU membership and this country could put up

with her own sources to provide the necessary development in economical manner. In line with this notion, some participants predicated that instead of struggling to be a part of Western community, Turkey should direct to integrate with the Eastern countries or join an already established Eastern union.

2.3.2. Representations about the Problems of Turkey

Although the social and economical problems were not included to the topics of the interviews, some participants tend to express these issues. Especially after asking the first and second topics, questioning the possible position of Turkey in terms of international relations and the agenda provision in foreign affairs manner; participants tend to discuss the problematic issues and their concern for these. Interviewees indicated the education system in general and the education level of people living in Turkey is the most important problem of the country and it is this problem that prevents the necessary developments in many areas. A representation about education also came out as an advantage of EU, in a way that, it would be a yield for Turkey to be a member of EU in terms of the improvement of education system. Another problems related to this category was terror, economical difficulties and the lack of self-presentation of Turkey.

2.3.2. Representations about the Structure of EU

The notions about the structure of EU marked a prevailed representation. 7

interviewees claimed that European Union has a structure based on religion and it is a "Christian Community". They also indicate a link between Turkey's membership issues and the structure of EU in a way that the reason EU does not accept Turkey as a member is the religious differences and it is impossible for a Christian Community to integrate with a Muslim country. One of the participants defined the expansion processes of EU as the heir of the Crusades in the middle age, trying to exploit the sources of wealthy East. Beside, some interviewees stated that the structure of EU seems to be weak and the Union would be disintegrated soon due to the internal conflicts among the member states.

2.3.4. Represented Advantages and Disadvantages of Turkey's Membership to EU

Considering the advantages and disadvantages of EU, the negative sides of the union seem to be more uncompromising and enduring; however the positive sides can also be achieved if Turkey could stand on her own feet. Participants mentioned more about the disadvantages than advantages (37/27) and attributed more emphasis on that. In terms of disadvantages, the most prevailed representations are religious differences, economical dependency, and cultural hegemony. Participants declared that a possible membership acquisition would cause conflicts in terms of different religious convictions and added that it is anyway one of the causes of Turkey's rejection of membership to EU. On the other hand, due to the financial support that EU gives, participants agree on the idea that a possible membership would create an

economical dependency to the Union and it would be Europe to exploit the sources of Turkey. Some participants also give utterance to the situation of Turkey's possible status of "colony" of EU. Other concerns about the disadvantages were emanated from the belief that Turkey would not gain a "full membership" position and would only acquire limited rights within the Union. Beside from the disadvantages; the interviewees considered some advantages in case of the completion of membership process. The most prevailed advantage was the advances in social justice and in income levels; however, additional expectations were expressed concerning the assurance of human rights and improvement of justice system.

2.3.5. Sources of Information and Political Views

The aim of the final part of the interview was to investigate the sources of information that participants use for getting knowledge about EU and their political views. These topics delayed to the end of the interview to prevent any manipulation of interviewees and getting their natural and spontaneous thoughts about EU. It was resulted that all of the interviewees acquire the necessary information mostly from newspapers and sometimes television may be a useful source of information. However, when asked to indicate which newspapers they read; the answers differed from the radical left-wing newspapers to the right-wing ones. The political views they affirmed, on the other hand, were on a two-dimensional manner where most of them reported to have no political views or they insist on there is no political view that they can locate themselves on. 2 interviewees called themselves as leftist and 2

as social democrat.

The thematic units found in this study were used to construct the Social Representations of EU Scale, which applied to compare the people with different political views and SES. Detailed information and analyses of the scale is presented on Chapter 4.

2.4. Discussion

As indicated in the results, the prevailed representation about EU was related to Turkey's membership to the Union and the interviewees had a shared notion of difficulty of Turkey's acceptance. Although the reasons they give for this premise; a lack of faith through EU and Turkey's membership is clear. This finding is supported by the studies on public opinion about EU, conducted in Turkey by Eurobarometer; the public opinion research center of European Commission. Eurobarometer studies indicated that there is a visible decrement to the support of Turkey's membership to EU from 2004 to 2006 (Standard Eurobarometer 67, 2007). Some of the interviewees stated that the intensity of Turkey's population cause a threat for other EU member states; because, the states that are in charge in European Commission are the ones who have the largest number of parliaments in the commission due to their intensity of population (Quote 1 and 2).

Quote 1.

Even if Turkey would fulfill all the requirements, EU will never accept Turkey as a member. The membership will come true whenever EU needs; for example in case of a war, it is not depending on Turkey's desire. Now Germany is a fascinating power; due to the population, France is a fascinating power, England anyhow joined later, Italy is a fascinating power; but France and Germany in terms of the population. Although Germany seems like an engine of EU, beginning from Turkey's entrance to EU, Turkey will have the majority of parliaments, not Germany. Thus, they (EU member states) cannot impose the decisions they want. France will lose ground behind Turkey (…)	*Türkiye tüm isteklerini kabul etse bile AB'ye almayacaklar. AB sıkıştığı anda Türkiye'yi kabul eder, ihtiyacını hissettiğinde mesela bir savaşta veya başa çıkamayacak bir durumda olduğu zaman Türkiye'yi kabul eder. Türkiye istediği zaman değil, onlar istediği zaman. Şimdi Almanya sürükleyici bir güç, nüfusu bakımından sürükleyici bir güç, Fransa sürükleyici bir güç, İngiltere neyse sonradan girdi, İtalya sürükleyici bir güç ama nüfus bakımından Almanya ve Fransa. Şimdi ne kadar da Almanya AB'nin lokomotifi gibi duruyorsa da, Türkiye girdiği andan itibaren bütün çoğunluğu, parlamenterleri Almanya değil, Türkiye elde edecek. Böylece onlar istedikleri kararları bir şekilde empoze edemeyecekler. Fransa Türkiye'nin gölgesinde kalacak (…)*

Quote 2.

As I said before about EU, I don't think that they will accept us, or appropriate us. There are lots of strategic issues, the intensity of population. It is because; we'll have the majority right to speak in parliament. In fact, the problem with France is that we could forestall them (…)	*AB konusunda dediğim gibi AB'ye bizi alabileceklerini, içlerine sindirebileceklerini düşünmüyorum. Nüfusumuzun birçok stratejik konu var, nüfusun fazla olması. Eğer AB'ye girdiğimizde en yüksek parlamentoda söz hakkına sahip olacağımızdan… Esasında Fransa'nın derdi onların önüne geçebilecek olmamız (…)*

On the other hand; in line with the notions presented above, a prevailed representation on Turkey's membership category was the belief that EU would continue to delay Turkey's membership acceptance, as a tactic to detain Turkey. Participants claimed that the full membership would never be come true but the

process will continue just like today (Quote 3). The reason for this might be emanated from the long period and relatively ineffectual attempts of Turkey for the membership for near 40 years. The history of the relations between EU and Turkey seem intense but rarely accelerated. Liu and Hilton (2005) suggest that socially shared representations of history may adopt different political views that provide guidance for interpreting the current events.

Quote 3.

The relations with either EU or USA will be left hanging in the air, I don't think of any improvement or setback. Probably it will be same because the current situation serves for EU and USA. USA will continue creating conflict in South East and illegal arms trafficking. Then EU will go on to expand the process of membership, I mean, I don't know would it last for 50 years or not, would the relations break off but consequently maybe EU will accept Turkey's membership however Turkey would not wait. EU would not wait either but they would express more prerequisites. They would introduce prerequisites or restrictions but I don't think it would be a "full membership".	*Gerek AB gerekse Amerika ile olan ilişkilerde yine böyle devamlı sürüncemede kalacak, hiç gelişme ya da kötüleşme olacağını zannetmiyorum. Herhalde aynı olacaktır çünkü AB ve ABD için mevcut durumun korunması onların işlerine geliyor. Amerika yine güneydoğuyu karıştıracak, silah ticaretine devam etmeye çalışacaktır. Ondan sonra AB aynı şekilde yine üyelik sürecini uzatmaya devam edecektir, yani 50 yıl sürer mi, sürmez mi; ilişkiler o arada kopar mı bilmiyorum ama sonuç olarak bir gün AB'ye sokarlar bir şekilde ama Türkiye'de beklemez AB de beklemez ama AB'ye girer çeşitli ön koşullar olur. Ön koşul öne sürer, belirli kısıtlamaları öne sürer, ondan sonra hiçbir zaman tam üyelik şeklinde olacağını düşünmüyorum.*

Again in terms of the "Turkey's membership to EU" category, another proposal was about Turkey's possible position in case of the accession to full membership. Participants declared that Turkey would never get the same position and same rights as the other member states of EU; the membership would be based on a constrained one. The possible reason for this representation might be the news mentioning a lot

about the possibility of "limited membership" in the times when accession negotiations slow down. The metaphors used for this representation were striking, where all of them agreed on a "second-level" membership in case of the entrance (Quotes 4, 5 and 6)

Quote 4.

In case of joining EU, the social deviance that can be seen in ghettos would dominate Turkey. EU would be the urban, and Turkey would be suburb. Morality, culture, thinking on making easy money, etc. (…)	*AB'ye girilmesi halinde sosyal alanda Türkiye'yi tamamen varoşlardaki sosyal çarpıklık Türkiye'ye hâkim olur. AB kent, Türkiye varoş olur. Ahlak, kültür, kolay para kazanma düşüncesi, vb gibi (…)*

Quote 5.

This place, think about a city, will entirely be the industrial district of the city; bosses will settle their affairs, laborers will work here and live here in the slum houses; if we consider EU as a city. As the working hours end in the evening, those men –bosses- will turn back to their residences or flats and we will be living in the slum houses. Consequently I am thinking this kind of discrimination in terms of the position of Turkey in EU.	*Burası, bir şehir düşünün, şehrin sanayi bölgesi gibi olacak tamamen; patronlar burada işlerini halledecekler, işçiler burada çalışacaklar, bu bölgede gecekondularda yaşayacaklar; şehir gibi düşünürsek AB'yi. Akşam mesai bitince adamlar kendi evlerine, dairelerine dönecekler; onlar rezidanslarda yaşarken biz burada yine gecekonduda yaşayacağız. Sonuç olarak bu tür bir ayrım olacağını düşünüyorum Türkiye'nin AB içerisindeki konumu açısından.*

Quote 6.

Let us say we gather the membership; which I don't believe in, I don't think that we can do it, first of all our culture is different. Our membership will be constrained. Not everything will be free like other member states; a membership that gained with quota applications does not make sense.	*Hadi oldu diyelim, üyeliğe kavuştuk; hiç inanmıyorum da, yapamayız gibime geliyor kültürümüz farklı bir kere her şeyden önce. Ne kadar şey sağlayabilirler; bizim AB'ye girişimiz de kısıtlanacak. Diğer ülkeler gibi her şeyi serbest bir şekilde olmayacak, kota uygulamaları ile gelecek olan AB üyeliğinin hiçbir anlamı yok.*

The attributions made on the cultural and religious differences as the obstacles of Turkey's membership to EU are both emphasized in terms of the Turkey's membership and disadvantages categories. Participants give utterance to the religion again, in terms of the structure of EU. Studies confirm that religious conflicts and differentiation has a major role in defining Turkey-EU relations (Kuran-Burçoğlu, 2003, Soykut, 2003, cited in; Hortaçsu & Cem-Ersoy, 2005). Because this situation has an enduring and historical characteristic, it is important to emphasize the role of history in the production of social representations (Abric, 1993, Hilton et al., 1996, Liu & Hilton, 2005, Sen & Wagner, 2005). The uncompromising conflicts in terms of cultural characteristic and religion between European Community and Turkey date back to times of Ottoman Empire (Hortaçsu & Cem-Ersoy, 2005) and the attributions made to the structure of EU in terms of religion have a history even to the Crusades in middle ages. Concerning the category of Turkey's membership to EU, interviewees consider the religious and cultural differences make the full membership impossible (Quote 7).

Quote 7.

| One of the reasons why EU does not accept us as a member is; there is a cultural difference between us and Europe. Besides, because we are an Islamic country, 98% of our population is Muslim. As I said, it is because of religious and cultural differences. I don't think the big EU countries would have a positive attitude towards us, in order not to lose their strategic things. | *Bir de bizi almamalarının nedeni; açıkçası bayağı bir kültür farkı var aramızda Avrupa ile. Bir de İslam ülkesi olmamız, nüfusun %98'inin Müslüman olması. Dediğim gibi din farkı, kültür farkından dolayı. AB'deki büyük ülkelerin stratejik şeylerini yitirmemeleri adına bize pek olumlu bakacaklarını düşünmüyorum.* |

Coming to the disadvantages, some interviewees consider that the cultural structure and religious values might be damaged (Quote 8 and Quote 9)). Considering EU as an out-group, they indicated possible negative influences on people's identities and feel a threat in especially the religious identity. Hortaçsu and Cem-Ersoy (2005) stated that the negative construction of EU anticipated a threat in terms of historical and religious differences.

Quote 8.

(When asked about the advantages and disadvantages of membership) I think many things can be changed, in that way, we can listen to Ezan (Moslem call to prayers) with the sound of Church bells. There are churches in Ankara and Istanbul; we are respectful to their religious things (…)	*(Olası AB üyeliği ile ilgili avantaj ve dezavantajlar sorulduğunda) Bence çok şey değişebilir, şöyle de olabilir yani. En basitinden dinlediğimiz bu ezanları çan sesi ile duyabiliriz. Kilise var Ankara'da da, İstanbul'da da, çeşitli yerlerde var, biz onların dini şeylerine saygılıyız (…)*

Quote 9.

We already changed a lot, our old traditions and customs will not be present. We will entirely be European.	*Zaten şu anda bile çok değiştik, eski gelenekler, görenekler, ananeler olmayacak diye düşünüyorum. Tamamen Avrupalaşmış olacağız.*

In terms of the structure of EU, the attributions on religion have been made in which the interviewees conceptualized the Union as a "Christian Community". It is clear that, in case of an acceptance of Turkey; EU would have the first Muslim member state and considering the historical conflicts between two structures sometimes interpreted as emanated from religion; the situation might become unexpected. 7 interviewees out of 13 give utterance to religious basis of EU, which compromised a prevailed representation in this case (Quote 10, 11, and 12).

Quote 10.

The position of Turkey is a strategic one; she is neighboring both Europe and Asia. They do know that but, as I declared before, our governments are in a contention as "I'll be in the power, you'll be…" and they have an attitude of protecting their own strategies. Moreover because we are a Muslim country, I consider EU as a Christian community and I don't think that they can appreciate us.	*Türkiye Avrupa ile Asya'ya komşu, ikisini bağdaştıran bir konumda, çok stratejik bir yerde. Bunun da bilincindeler fakat dediğim gibi bizim iktidarlarda sen olayım ben olayım çekişme gibi, onlar içinde bir stratejisini koruma yönünde tavırları oluyor. Bir de Müslüman olmamız, açıkçası ben AB'yi Hıristiyan bir topluluk olarak görüyorum ve bizi içlerine sindirebileceklerini düşünmüyorum.*

Quote 11.

The only problem might be about religious issues, we will keep up eventually. This is not only true for us; this tendency is also present in EU community as "they are Muslim, what do they do in Europe?" Not the majority maybe, but a specific conservative part of Europe, the radical Christians consider us as "they are Muslim".	*Tek sorun olabilecek din meselesi; eninde sonunda bir şekilde ayak uyduracağız din meselesini aşarsak. Bu sadece bizde değil; Avrupa halkında da böyle bir eğilim var, onlar Müslüman ne işi var AB'de. Çoğunluk değil ama belli bir muhafazakâr kesimleri; Türkiye'de bu daha yayılmış durumda ama Avrupa'da daha katı Hıristiyan olanlar "bunlar Müslüman" gözüyle bakıyorlar.*

Quote 12.

EU is a Christian Union, they have a blood relationship. In the times of kingdoms, their children got married with each other, thus there are close relations between them. They also have an agreement in 90%. EU is a Christian Community anymore. When 98% of population is Muslim in our country, here a religion conflict is the matter. Because of this conflict, they always exclude me. They were displeased with my Prophet. Their prophets are also ours, but they do not have such a tolerance.	*Şimdi AB kendine göre bir Hıristiyan Birliği, muhakkak bir kan bağları var. Evvelki yıllarda, krallıklar zamanında bunlar kız almıştır, oğlan vermiştir, bu şekilde birbirlerine bir yakınlıkları mevcuttur. %90 da ağız birlikleri aynı ağız birliğidir. AB artık bir Hıristiyan topluluğudur. E biz de %98 İslam olarak gözüküyor, burada haliyle bir din çatışması oluyor. O din çatışmasından dolayı beni daima da dışlıyor. Tuttular bugün benim en kutsal peygamberimi çekemediler. Biz bugün onların hiçbir peygamberlerine, o peygamberler de bizim ama onların öyle bir genişlikleri yok.*

Beside from these confirmations, interviewees refer to the possible economical dependency and cultural hegemony in case of a membership to EU. They indicated that the reason EU carries on the negotiations is the economical expectations and the desire to exploit the sources of Turkey. The consideration of EU as an out-group and the possible threats perceived from the integration of in-group to out-group is visible again as concluded in Hortaçsu & Cem-Ersoy (2005); one of the predictors of the EU construction as "Europe as Different" was the threat that EU might cause harm to the cultural and religious elements in the country. These implications were also in line with the notion supporting that "Turkey does not need EU membership" and "Turkey should be eager to join an Eastern Union". Therefore, the focus seems to be on the disadvantages of the membership and negative attitudes towards EU with the referrals to probable cultural regeneration and being a "colony" of imperialist Europe.

What also striking in the interviews was, the emphasis made on United States of America, especially during the consideration of foreign affairs of Turkey. In fact, except two of them, no participants made any referrals to EU in the international-political agenda of Turkey. Participants highlighted the matters of Iraq, terror, USA, or economical difficulties but they did not specify European Union as being a part of the political agenda of Turkey within next 50 years. Those who mentioned about EU in terms of international political area state that there would not be any change in the relations with EU and the current process would endure. None of the participants indicated an expectation of an EU membership for the next 50 years. This situation

shows that the central core of the social representation of EU does not involve a positive attitude or a proactive belief in terms of Turkey's membership to EU, and without the representation of "Turkey's membership", EU does not make any sense. If one considers EU as the sophisticated and unfamiliar entity, it can be concluded that Turkey's membership is the way to objectify this entity. This objectification inevitably requires an evaluation of the status in terms of advantages and disadvantages; and can be seen from the results, disadvantages are more prevailed and strong than advantages.

In order to make a detailed evaluation of these results, the time of the interview and the current agenda should be analyzed carefully. Although the analysis of the media is presented in the next chapter of this study; some topics are worth to remember. The time that the interviews were held was in 2007 April, therefore the political agenda in that term was not supporting a positive atmosphere about EU. Most of the news about EU was including the evaluations about the Presidential Elections in France, in which one of the candidates was known as being against Turkey's membership to EU; namely Nicolas Sarkozy (Quote 13). Sarkozy's negative attitude to Turkey and her membership might have given rise to the representations in a negative manner.

Quote 13 (Milliyet, 17th January, 2007)

Sarkozy said "Turkey" again	*Sarkozy, yine 'Türkiye' dedi*
Nicolas Sarkozy, attended the program organized by various media institutions as Le Parisien and Le Monde, repeated that he does not look Turkey's membership to EU positively. He said that "I am not against Turkey, because they are Turkish and Muslim" and he added that Europe is not only an idea but a geographical area and that is why it has to have determined boundaries.	*TV5, Europe - 1, Le Parisien ve Le Monde gibi çeşitli medya kuruluşlarının önceki akşam ortaklaşa düzenlediği programa katılan Fransa İçişleri Bakanı Nicolas Sarkozy, Türkiye'nin AB üyeliğine sıcak bakmadığını bir kez daha tekrarladı. "Türk ve Müslüman oldukları için Türkiye'ye karşı değilim" diyen Sarkozy, Avrupa'nın sadece bir "fikir" değil, bir coğrafi bölge olduğunu ve bu yüzden belirgin sınırlara sahip olması gerektiğini savundu.*

Another important event that might have an influence on social representations of EU is the "cartoon crisis" in which a Denmark newspaper, Jyllands-Posten, issued a cartoon of Mohammed, the prophet of Muslims. According to the Islamic beliefs, it is forbidden to draw pictures or figures of God and the prophet; therefore a conflict in either societal level or in diplomatic level has broken out. The attributions of religious conflicts in terms of the relations between Turkey and EU might have strengthened because of this crisis. Although the publication of the cartoons dates back to 2006, the reactions and evaluations had a long run in public agenda even to the first months of 2007.

Beside from the EU news, there were other issues that occupied the public agenda in the time of interviews. The possibility of early parliament elections in Turkey and the accordingly the election of the new president brought some issues related to secularism, ongoing war in Iraq, and so on might have distracted the public attention to varying topics other than EU. Moreover, lack of a certain timetable for the EU

membership of Turkey and the lack of information about the situation of accession negotiations in media might create hopelessness and direct people to conceptualize EU in a similar manner.

In conclusion, social representations produced toward EU are liable to the relations between EU and Turkey, therefore the central structure of the representations is composed of Turkey's membership. Because the central structure mainly includes a negative belief to the acquisition of full membership, another representation is prevailed in terms of the disadvantages of EU membership and the attribution to possible threats in terms of cultural or religious entities in disadvantages category is consistent with the findings in the "Europe as different" construction suggested by Hortaçsu and Cem-Ersoy (2005). In terms of the representations about the structure of EU, religious conflicts dominate the other dimensions and again the representations are produced with reference to compare the religion of Turkey and Europe. Representations about the structure of EU are convenient to indicate the historical links in the production of the shared representations.

CHAPTER III

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE NEWSPAPERS

3.1. Introduction

The importance of media messages in the process of social representations is overt. The understanding and construction of social reality requires the means of communication and for the diffusion of knowledge to become true in a "shared" manner, mass communication is the most convenient way. Doise et al. (1999) state the importance of communication in generating social representations by providing a frame of reference for individuals and groups, in their study on social representations of human rights. In fact, one of the factors that make political, scientific or ideological concepts a topic of everyday conversation, therefore transform them to social representations (Macek et al., 1997), is the media by representing the concepts explicitly. Staerklé et al. (1998) highlighted the role of massive media diffusion of human rights contributed to this concept in a way to make it a part of the widely shared knowledge and common sense. In the same vein, Stewart and Lacassagne (2005) indicated that exposure to mass media; provide the elaboration of the representations about social objects or facts in a particular way. These ways are generally related to the history of the groups and evaluated in accordance with the experiences of the group. The particular representation of social reality in media may

have enduring effects of public opinions (Foster, 2006) and depending on this, the postulation might be extended to the point that mass media produces, affects and maintain particular social understandings (Farr, 1993, cited in Foster, 2006). For example Moloney et al. (2005) concluded that the negative reporting of organ donation in the media creates discourage for donation and some representations had been produced, stating that the transplantation of organs is generated when the organs are still viable which caused a redefinition of death, different from natural ways.

Sibley et al. (2006) suggested that a social object or fact is more heavily anchored when it is discussed and reproduced in media and everyday discourse, and the framing characteristic of media provide a holistic effect on shared representations. Hodgetts et al. (2004) question the role of media in shaping the understandings of the public about a social fact and they concluded that the media is heavily required in the process of understanding and objectifying the social reality because these are the only sources for "taken-for-granted" frameworks of social issues.

As an example of the analysis of media representation on particular issues; the study conducted by Gardikiotis et al. (2004) investigating the representations of majorities and minorities in British press is a striking sample. When they indicate some rules to be considered in terms of content analyses of newspapers; they suggest that the frequency of the objects, the kinds of attributes made to the objects, and the issues that are related to the objects should be clarified. It is apparent that the frequency of representations is crucial in terms of reflecting the effect of "message repetition"

(Petty & Cacciopo, 1979; cited in Gardikiotis, 2004) and "mere exposure" (Zajonc, 2001) on individuals. Moreover they declared that the salience of social group membership associated to the objects should be obviously determined. Another study on the media representations conducted by Gencel-Bek (2001) who analyzed the press coverage about European Union following the 1999 Helsinki Summit. She analyzed the news coverage in terms of the dimensions of, meaning of Europe, expectations from EU, economic elements, conditions of and obstacles to the membership of EU, and the expressions of political elements. She concluded that the representational dimensions along three newspapers (Hürriyet, Sabah, and Star) indicate that the main agenda of the Helsinki Summit is perceived and represented as Turkey's candidacy; which was not true. The result of this situation, according to her, is to constrain the information about the Summit by reducing its agenda only to Turkey and make readers' attempts to access other information about the Summit difficult. Finally she figured out that the expectancy dimension of the EU is based on economic gains, thought to be receives from EU, while the condition dimension is based on the political obligations that Turkey should fulfill in order to get the full membership.

3.2. Method

In order to investigate the media representation of EU, three newspapers reflecting three political views, namely; liberal (Hürriyet), Islamic-right wing (Yeni Şafak) and radical-left wing (Birgün) were examined. The examination of the newspapers was

conducted in terms of getting the notions about "Turkey's membership to EU", "Structure of EU", and "Advantages and Disadvantages of EU Membership" dimensions. These were the dimensions gathered through the interview study, explained in the Chapter II; and the examined newspapers were limited to date within the first six months of 2007, the duration encloses the applications of both interviews and scale applications. On the other hand, this period contains some striking events in terms of politics in which, an early parliament election would be held on July and a new president would be chosen due to the expiration of term for the former. The political party in government was being discussed because of the tendency to Islamic thoughts and the candidate for Presidency of this political party has also been debated for just the same reason. Another issue on the agenda in this period concerning EU was the election of Nicolas Sarkozy as the president in France, who is known with his negative attitude towards Turkey's membership to EU. As will be specified later, the period was underlying a relatively "slowing down" term, which sometimes turned into a negative atmosphere, for EU process. However; because the EU membership process is a long run and any political events ultimately relate to EU directly or indirectly; the agenda about the Union is always warm. Additionally, the ambiguous atmosphere about EU would exhibit the representations clearly in which the process of unfamiliar entity transforming to familiar notions can be traced within the scope of EU.

3.3. Results

Three different newspapers indicate three different conceptualizations of EU. The first conceptualization underlined the EU membership as inevitable for Turkey, represented as "EU as a Must". The second view conceptualized EU within a slow-down process and considers the difficulties for the membership process, however, seem to be fond of EU. For the second view, "EU as difficult" representation is found to be prevailed. Finally the third point of view conceptualized EU and Turkey's membership process in terms of religious and cultural affiliations and considers EU as a threat.

3.3.1. EU Membership as a Must

The evaluation of EU membership as a compulsory task figures out that the membership would provide advantages in terms of human rights, justice system, and the standards of life. The justification for this postulate emphasizes the democratic characteristic of Europe and EU states that governed by the rules of law. According to this view, if Turkey claims to be a democratic state, where the human rights, respect for the rights of minority are internalized; there is no choice but membership to EU, which guarantee the necessary criteria for these dimensions. The representation of "EU as a must" anchors to the advantages of EU membership within the premises of the characteristics in question.

3.3.2. EU Membership as Difficult

The consideration of the slowing down process of the Turkey-EU relations in terms of the membership might create a "hopeless" situation. The representation of "EU as difficult", anchors to the unsolved problems between Turkey and EU and to the negative attitudes of some authorities within EU, towards Turkey's membership. The prolonged process of the membership enhanced with the perceived detention and negative attitudes causes to the consideration of EU membership as difficult.

3.3.3. EU as Threat

The media representation of EU within the consideration of threat anchors to the religious differences and hegemonic attributions to EU. In this point of view, EU is characterized as a Christian Community or an imperialist force. Representing EU as a threat considers the conflicts of religion as unsolvable due to the reason that EU would present a double-standard to Turkey because of the religious differences.

3.4. Discussion

The analysis of the columns indicated that the newspapers with a political affiliation in the left-wing have a representation of EU as a must. The notions about EU point out Europe as effective in terms of the human rights and democracy (Quote 1), where Turkey is considered as incompetent. Centralized around the human rights and

democracy, the idealization of EU is generated as the central structures of the representation.

Quote 1.

Besim Can Zırh (BİRGÜN, 23.04.2007)	
Her insanın yaşadığı ülkeyi sevmek ya da sevmemek için nedenleri olabilir. Bu nedenler birbiri ile çelişebilir de.(…) Fakat asıl tartışılması gereken mesele sıralanan nedenler arasındaki farkta yatıyor. Şöyle ki, İngiliz gazetesi son 50 yılda AB'nin siyasal, ekonomik, yönetimsel, yasal, toplumsal, kültürel alanlarda ve çevre, güvenlik, azınlık hakları gibi konulardaki kazanımlarına işaret ederken Tempo dergisi Türkiye için aynı zaman zarfında gerçekleşmiş herhangi yeni bir kazanıma işaret etmiyor, edemiyor. Bunun yerine hâlihazırda sahip olduğumuz kimi şeylerin 'kendince' bir dökümünü yapıyor. Sözgelimi, Avrupa'nın son 50 yılda daha güvenli bir yer haline gelmesi İngiliz gazetesinde birinci sırada yer alıyor. Diğer nedenlere baktığımızda şöyle bir tablo betimleniyor: Sınırların olmadığı, ekonomik olarak daha kalkınmış, siyasal ve yönetsel olarak daha etkinleşmiş, demokratik hak ve toplumsal güvencelerin geliştiği, çevre sorunları karşısında daha duyarlı bir ve tek Avrupa (...)	Every person may have some reasons to love or not to love his country. These reasons may eve contradict with themselves. (...) But the main issue to be discussed lays in the differences between the reasons. While an English newspaper pointed the yields in the last 50 years on the issues like political, economics, administrative, legal, social, cultural areas and environment, security, minority rights, Tempo Magazine does not or cannot point any new yield in the same period. Instead, it lists some things that we have already according to it. Namely, Europe becoming more secure in last 50 years comes up at first place in the English newspaper. Looking at the other reasons, a table is depicted: "A single and one Europe with removed borderlines, developed in economy, effective in political and administrative, developed democratic rights and social security, sensitive to environmental problems."

Another dimension within Europe as a must representation is the predicted high standards of life in case of the membership. For example, Nazım Alpman from Birgün newspaper (Quote 2) figures this out within an ironic style. Here the writer emphasized a comparison between the current status of Turkey in terms of the standards and the commitments of EU that would be materialized in case of the membership. In this point, the concept of EU is objectified and the information

82

necessary to comprehend it is received by an ironic style, in which Turkey's incompetence in terms of life standards are presented as desired entities. Ignoring the irony, one can see the premise of representing the EU as a way to reach the required standards of life. By giving the rationale for the inevitable situation for raising life standards as the membership to EU, the representation is structured as a theory and differentiates from attitudes (Wagner & Hayes, 2005).

Quote 2.

Nazım Alpman (BİRGÜN, 19.04.2007)	
Avrupa Birliği "istediği" için yapmamız gereken o kadar çok şey var ki... AB, "Türk halkının yaşam standartlarını yükseltin!" diyor. Sana ne? Biz belki yaşam standardımızı yükseltmek istemiyoruz? Böyle çok mutluyuz. Rögar kapağının bulunmaması yüzünden çocuklarımızın ölmesinden AB'ye ne? Bu kadarla da kalmıyorlar... Bizden aleni olarak "karayolu taşımacılığında yolcu güvenliğinin artırılmasını" istiyorlar! Abi size ne? Biz kendi küçük dünyamızda "trafik canavarı" diye bir masal kahramanı yaratmışız. Her büyük katliamı onun üzerine yıkarak gayet mutlu yaşıyoruz. Bizi bu mutluluktan niçin mahrum etmek istiyorsunuz? Siz esas "karayolu güvenliğinin" altında ne var onu açıklayın! Biz taşmış lağım sularından meydana gelen göllerin üzerinde, sabah sigaramızı tüttürerek, sendikasız gazetecilerin yazdığı, rögar kapağı yüzünden ölen küçük çocukların haberlerini, karayolu katliamlarını, yüzümüze yayılan geniş bir huzur içinde okumanın mutluluğu arzuluyoruz. Tıpkı Kapalıçarşı düzeni gibi dinamik bir devingenlik içinde varlığımızı korumak ve yüceltmek istiyoruz. Kuralsızlığın, kurallarına saygılı toplum olmanın iç huzuruyla, Türk varlığına armağan etmek en büyük amacımızdır! O halde sormak gerekiyor: Avrupa bizden ne istiyor?	There are too many things that we have to do just because EU demands so... EU says "life standards of Turkish people should be increased". What's it to you? May be we don't want to increase our life standards. We are happy with it. Why do you care about our children dying because of the manhole forgotten open.(...)They don't stop. They clearly demand us that "increase the passenger security on highway transportation"! What's it to you bro? We have created a fantastic hero called "traffic monster" in our own little world. We live extremely happy by accusing it of every major massacre. Why do you want to debar us of this satisfaction? You better explain what is under the disguise of "highway security"! We desire the satisfaction of smoking on the ponds made up of flooded drains in the morning, to read the news of the children dying because of the manholes, highway massacres, written in the newspapers by nonunion journalists, in a wide happiness spreading over our faces. We desire to protect and glorify our presence in a dynamic circulation like the order of Grand Bazaar. By the clear conscience of being a society respecting the regularity of irregularity, it is our great purpose of bestowing to Turkish existence. Then it is needed to ask: What does Europe want from us?

EU as a must representation is also anchoring the criteria that should be fulfilled in terms of the full membership. Same notions of human rights, democracy and respect to the rights of the minority are valid here; which form the prerequisites of the membership take place in political criteria of Copenhagen and a chapter in the accession negotiations. Hrant Dink (Quote 3) respects for the process of the membership rather than the membership itself, for the accession of these notions. The criteria that should be fulfilled for the membership makes the candidacy process important and might account for a change in terms of the values that should be reached and that are inadequate in Turkey.

Quote 3.

Hrant Dink (BİRGÜN, 08.07.2004, republished in 03.05.2007)	
Aslolan Süreç	**The Real Thing is the Process**
(…)Şu anda hiçbir şey Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği'ne giriş süreci kadar önemli değil. Hatta Avrupa Birliği'ne girmek bile. Sonuçta yaşanan tartışmalar da gösteriyor ki Avrupa değerleri dediğimiz ilkelerin bir mutlakıyeti yok. İslam'ı içine alacak bir çok-kültürlülükle henüz yeni tanışan ve de gerçek anlamda bocalayan bir Avrupa değerleri söz-konusu. Bu bocalama sürecinin geçici olması ve gerçek bir değerler arayışına yönelmesi bile saygı duymamız gereken bir süreç.(…)	(...) Now, there is nothing important than the process of being a member of Turkey to European Union. Even more than the membership to European Union. At last, the discussions show us that there in no absoluteness of the principles which we called as European Values. It is the European values which meet the multi-culturalism that is going to enclose Islam and really flounders, to be discussed. Even being temporary and orienting to search for real values of this floundering process is a process to be respected.

The representation of EU as a must, is dominating the left-wing newspapers due to the reason that it anchors the values of generally referred to the left political view as the raising of concepts like human rights, democracy, environmental consciousness

or the respect for the rights of minorities. Concerning the beliefs contents it has and the target group (leftists) which is properly structured, the representation is produced by propagation (Wagner & Hayes, 2005). Here the new social phenomenon is represented in order to provide a dominant conception around some elements (i.e. fundamental rights) and the existing situation (i.e. membership process) is kept going. The knowledge of the EU is selectively diffused by presenting as an imperative phenomenon, due to the values of the group.

On the other hand, another representation is acquired as emphasizing the difficult situation of the membership. EU as difficult representation stems from the prolonged and respectively futile characteristic of the relations between EU and Turkey. However, this representation is not as salient as "EU as must" or "EU as a threat" representations due to the reason that the process is anchored rather than the defining notions and situation that cause the production of the representation might be temporary. For example the news about a cited article on Hürriyet presented in Quote 4, the relations between Turkey and EU is defined by using a metaphor of man and his mistress and make referral to the pre-conditions of the membership; in which, when Turkey fulfills a criteria, EU would find another and the process would continue like that.

Quote 4

HÜRRİYET, 11.08.2007	
Türkiye AB'nin Metresi Gibi	**Turkey as the Mistress of EU**
İngiliz Guardian gazetesinde yayınlanan bir köşe yazısında, Fransız bir diplomatın Türkiye'yi, Avrupa Birliği'nin(AB) metresine benzettiği, AB'nin Türkiye'yi ne kaybetmek ne de onunla evlenmek istediğini söylediği aktarıldı. Geoffrey Wheatcroft imzalı makalede, Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği'ne (AB) üyeliğinin, umutlu bir koroya rağmen gerçekleşmeyeceği ifade edilen makalede bunun asla olmayacak anlamına gelmediği ancak üyeliğin yakın zamanda gerçekleşecek gibi görünmediği belirtildi.	According to an article published in English the Guardian, a French diplomat is said to consider Turkey as the mistress of EU; that neither wants to neither loose Turkey nor marry her. The article by Geoffrey Wheatcroft suggested that the membership of Turkey to EU would not come true, despite a hopeful chorus but this does not mean that the membership would "never" be accessed however; it is not seem to become true in near future.

Another point in "EU as difficult" representation is presenting in Quote 5, suggesting that the EU states are against Turkey's membership and the authorities belong to these make the membership difficult for Turkey, by finding alternative membership versions. The slowing down process of the negotiations is also attributed to this reason. The quote is striking in terms of the representation in a way that it does not represent EU in terms of advantageous or disadvantageous dimensions or no idea is introduced determining the support or negative attitude for the membership. The transmission of the knowledge, within EU as difficult representation is tracing the style of diffusion in which the source of information (liberal newspaper in this situation) does not carry any particular intention or a stable orientation (Wagner & Hayes, 2005). Moscovici (1976, cited in Wagner & Hayes, 2005) states that although the articles diffusing the new knowledge do not make any effort to direct the reader to orientate a specific point of view; diffusion might be so effective. In this sense, the liberal newspaper; namely Hürriyet, does not show a tendency to direct the readers as

being pro or con in terms of membership; however a representation of "EU as difficult" is finding a place for itself in people's minds (see Chapter V for the details).

Quote 5

Yalçın Doğan, (HÜRRİYET, 26.06.2007)	
Türkiye için pişirilen ortaklık	**The partnership cooked for Turkey**
*Brüksel'de bugün Türkiye'nin AB tam üyeliği yolunda, yeni bir engel var. 2004'te AB'nin kabul ettiği görüşmelerde, çevre, tarım, sağlık, sanayi, istatistik gibi konu başlıkları tek tek ele alınıyor. Görüşmeler o başlıklar çerçevesinde yürütülüyor. Ele alınan konular hem yavaş gidiyor, hem de konu başlıklarından bazılarının açılması istenmiyor. Örneğin, **para politikasının** açılması istenmiyor. Para politikası, bir anlamda **tam üyeliğe giden yol** olarak görülüyor. **Herkes Fransa'nın bizi istemediğinden söz ediyor, oysa on bir AB ülkesi Türkiye'nin AB üyeliğine karşı.*** *Görüşmeler, o nedenle ağır, aksak gidiyor.* ***TÜRKİYE-RUSYA*** *Çeşitli AB ülkelerindeki araştırma kuruluşları, ortaya şimdi yeni bir proje ile çıkıyor. Arkalarında **siyasal destek** bulunan bu kuruluşlar, Türkiye'ye yeni bir öneri getiriyor: **"Sizin yeriniz AB değil, sizin yeriniz Karadeniz".** Onlar, KEİ'yi ilerde AB gibi bir kuruluş olarak görmek niyetinde. Böylece, özellikle Türkiye'ye **alternatif şemsiye** hazırlığında.*	Today in Brussels, there is a new obstacle against membership of Turkey to EU. The negotiations that EU accepted in 2004, the subjects such as environment, irrigation, health, industry, statistics etc. were handled one by one. The negotiations were being conducted on these titles. Both the subjects handled slowly and some subject titles were not wanted to be opened for debates. For example, money policy was not wanted to be argued on. Money policy seems to be the way to full membership. Everybody says that "France does not want us" however, eleven EU countries are against the membership of Turkey to EU. Because of this, the negotiations are being conducted slowly. (...)Now, the research institutions in some EU countries are turned up with a new project. These politically supported institutions offer a new proposal: "You do not belong to EU, your belonging to Black Sea" They tend to see BSEC as a foundation like EU. By this way, they are preparing an alternative umbrella for Turkey.

Finally a salient notion is encountered as "EU as a threat" especially represented in Islamic-right wing newspapers. The representation of threat seems to be stemming

from the anchor of religious differences and consider a conflict between EU and

Turkey in terms of religious affiliations (Quote 6).

Quote 6.

Akif Emre, (YENİ ŞAFAK, 05.07.2007)	
Türkiye Hıristiyan Olsaydı	**If Turkey was Christian**
(…)Hiçbir Avrupalı siyasetçi, laik olmasına rağmen halkı Hristiyan olduğundan dolayı, Hrisitiyan kültüründen beslenmiş olmasından dolayı Hrisitiyan ülkesi olarak anılmasından gocunmaz. Bu tanımlama laik siyasi yapıya ve siyasilerin dinle kurdukları çok farklı ilişkilere rağmen böyledir. Nitekim özellikle Avrupa'daki Müslüman azınlıklar söz konusu olduğunda asimilasyon politikalarını meşrulaştırmak için en liberal ve seküler siyasetçilerin ağzından "burası Hristiyan kültürü ile yoğrulmuş bir ülkedir, buraya gelenler bu kültüre uymak zorundadır", savunmasını az işitmedik. Ayrıntılandırmaya gerek yok; bu, İngiltere'den Almanya'ya kadar göçmenlere yönelik "uyum" politikalarını savunmada temel argümalardan biridir.. Avrupalılar adına, en azından "Müslümanlıktan uzaklaştırma"yı hedefleyen, kimliğini AB kriterlerine uyum sağlamaya çalışan bir projeyi yok sayamayız.	(…)Because of his people is a Christian despite being a secular and has been fed by Christian culture, none of the European political take offense at being called as a Christian country. This definition is in this way, despite the secular political structure and the relations that political developed many different ways of relations with religion. In fact, in order to legitimate the assimilation policies especially when it is about the Muslim minorities, we have heard many times that "here is a country which is molded by Christian culture and people coming here should be adopted to this culture" from the most liberal and secular politicians. There is no need to go in detail; this is one of the main arguments in order to defend the "adaptation" policies for immigrants from England to Germany...In the name of Europeans, at least in order to "estrange from Islam", we can not ignore the project trying to adapt its identity to EU criteria.

As can be seen from the article; EU is defined in terms of Christianity (Quote 7) and

the criteria for the membership are perceived as targeting to sending Islam away. In

this sense, the membership phenomena enable assimilation in religious and cultural

manners; therefore the EU is a threat for these affiliations. Because the readers of the

newspaper are well-structured (those have a salient religious Muslim identity and

right wing political view) and because the represented notions are classified into a pre-existing context by denying conflicting elements; propagation style of representation' might be suitable for this context. However, the tendency to create an external threat and the expression of in terms of the group identity make propaganda more convenient for EU as a threat representation. One of the characteristics of propaganda is to emphasize the disputing sides of the object or event represented (Moscovici, 1976, cited in Wagner & Hayes, 2005) and this postulate indicate that, due to the level of explanation constrained by the religious conflicts; the threat representation produced by Islamic-right wing press is emanated from propaganda.

Quote 7.

Fehmi Koru, (YENİ ŞAFAK, 25.03.2007)	
AB: Bundan Sonra Ne?	**EU: What is next?**
Türkiye AB üyesi olmak istiyor elbette; ekonomisini güçlendirip vatandaşlarını refaha kavuşturmak, demokrasisini takviye etmek, gerçek anlamda bir hukuk devleti haline dönüşebilmek için… Avrupa Türkiye'nin de yakalamak istediği bu ortak evrensel değerlerle yetinecek ve "Herkesin dini kendine" diyebilecek mi, yoksa farklı bir 'uygarlık' tanımına sarılıp değişik bir yöne doğru gitmeyi mi yeğleyecek? Avrupa Ekonomik Topluluğu olarak başlayıp Ortak Pazar'a dönüşen sonra da Avrupa Birliği adını alan arayış, kendisine 'Hıristiyan Avrupa Birliği' adını da yakıştırır mı?	It is obvious that Turkey wants to be a member of EU; in order to make his people live in prosperity by strengthening its economy, to strengthen its democracy, to be a state governed by the rule of law... Can Europe settle for these common universal values that Turkey wanted to grasp at and say "everybody's religion is to himself" or go to another way by defining a different explanation for the term "civilization"? Can the search beginning with European Economic Community, then changing into the Common Market, later adopted the name of European Union, suit the name "Christian European Union" to itself.

The representation of EU in the press indicates that different styles are used to produce different representations of EU. Right, left, and liberal points approach the

phenomenon of EU is various aspects, which cause to represent the phenomena in different ways. Moreover, the dispersion of the represented knowledge is materializing in different styles; where diffusion is proper for liberal points, propaganda and propagation are convenient for right and left views. The representations of EU as must, difficult or threat is thought to be influential for the social representation of EU; in which these representations are in line with those acquired throughout the interviews. However, one should consider that the quantity and intensity of the media reporting is important for the formation of social representations (Wagner & Hayes, 2005).

CHAPTER IV

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSES OF THE SCALES

4.1. Method

4.1.1. Participants

The sample consisted of 243 university students (93 females and 150 males) from various departments of Middle East Technical University and Gazi University in Ankara. The mean age of the students was 21.78 and the ages were ranged between 17 and 33 with a standard deviation of 2.15. The detailed information of the demographic characteristics of participants can be seen in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Demographic Variables

VARIABLES	UNIVERSITIES	
	METU	GAZI UNIVERSITY
Age		
Mean	21.81	21.75
SD	2.14	2.17
Gender		
Female	60 (52.2%)	33 (25.8%)
Male	55 (47.8%)	95 (74.2%)
Faculties		
Engineering	47 (40.9%)	74 (57.8%)
Arts and Sciences	24 (20.9%)	0
Administrative Sc.	23 (20.0%)	53 (41.4%)
Education	7 (6.1%)	0
Architecture	8 (7%)	0

Table 4.1. (continued)

Place of Birth		
Village	1 (.9%)	2 (1.6%)
Town	12 (10.4%)	4 (3.1%)
City	56 (48.7%)	77 (59.4%)
Metropolitan	46 (40%)	45 (35.2%)
Mother Education		
No literacy	0	2 (1.6%)
Literate	4 (3.5%)	4 (3.1%)
Primary School	20 (17.4%)	20 (15.6%)
Secondary School	6 (5.2%)	18 (14.1%)
High School	39 (33.9%)	43 (33.6%)
University	43 (37.4%)	37 (28.9%)
MS/MA	0	4 (3.1%)
PhD	3 (2.6%)	0
Father Education		
No literacy	0	0
Literate	1 (.9%)	0
Primary School	6 (5.2%)	14 (10.9%)
Secondary School	6 (5.2%)	11 (8.6%)
High School	23 (20%)	35 (27.3%)
University	70 (60.9%)	63 (49.2%)
MS/MA	5 (4.3%)	5 (3.9%)
PhD	4 (3.5%)	0
Income		
0-1000	4 (3.5%)	38 (29.9%)
1001-2000	17 (14.8%)	39 (30.7%)
2001-3000	30 (26.1%)	26 (20.5%)
3001-4000	39 (33.9%)	19 (15%)
4000 and above	25 (21.7%)	5 (3.9)
Source of Information		
Newspaper	20 (17.4%)	27 (21.1%)
Television	34 (29.6%)	57 (44.5%)
Internet	59 (51.3%)	43 (33.6%)
Other	2 (1.7%)	1 (.8%)
Frequency of Reading Newspapers		
None	2 (1.7%)	1 (.8%)
Occasionally	15 (13%)	12 (9.4%)
Once a Week	6 (5.2%)	5 (3.9%)
Several Times a Week	49 (42.6%)	48 (37.5%)
Everyday	43 (37.4%)	62 (48.4%)
Political View		
Radical Left	9 (7.8%)	4 (3.1%)
Left	37 (32.2%)	19 (14.8%)
Close to Left	29 (25.2%)	16 (12.5%)
Neutral	20 (17.4%)	29 (22.7%)
Close to Right	11 (9.6%)	20 (15.6%)
Right	8 (7%)	25 (19.5%)
Radical Right	0	2 (1.6%)

4.1.2. Questionnaires

The first part of the questionnaire was consisted of items about demographic variables of the participants. The demographic information involved; age, gender, level of family income, place that lived in most, name of the university, department, mother's education, father's education, source of information, frequency of newspaper reading, regularly read newspapers, and political view (see Appendix A for the demographic information). The rest of the questionnaire consisted of three parts, namely "Political Agenda and Expectations Scale", "Individual and EU", and "Social Representations of EU Scale".

4.1.2.1. Political Agenda and Expectations Scale

The items of the scale are originally used in public opinion research studies conducted by Standard Eurobarometer; the Public Opinion Analysis Sector of European Commission. The scale is consisting of the measures about life satisfaction, expectations from life and about Turkey, and measures about the current and future agenda of Turkey and the participants were asked to evaluate these dimensions on a 5-point-scale (1 = strongly disagree, 3 = I have no idea, 5 = strongly agree). While the items of life satisfaction and expectations were used as the original scale; items measuring current and future agenda of Turkey were added according to the categories generated from content analysis of the interview on social representations of EU (see Chapter II). The scale consisted of thirteen items and the

measures about the structure and reliability of the scale will be presented in the Results (see Appendix B for the scale used in this study).

4.1.2.2. Individuals and EU Scale

The items of the scale were generated from the Public Opinion Questionnaire used by Eurobarometer. The assessment of feelings evoked by EU and Turkey's membership to EU was placed in this section. Moreover, two items inquiring the identity constructions of individuals also took place, whether the participants consider themselves as European or Turkish solely. The feelings about EU and Turkey's membership were hope, danger, ignorance, trust, and threat. Participants were asked to evaluate eleven items on a 5-point-scale (1 = strongly disagree, 3=I have no idea, 5 = strongly agree). (See Appendix C for the scale)

4.1.2.3. Social Representations of EU Scale

Final scale consisted of the expressions generated from the content analysis of interviews stated in Chapter II. Twenty-five items placed in the scale were to measure the representations of Turkey's membership, structure of EU, advantages and disadvantages of EU dimensions. The items on Turkey's membership were composed of supportive and unsupportive expressions; items on structure of EU reflected some religious attributions, which were prevailed in the interviews and in the media representation of EU and the belief about the dissociation of the Union;

and advantages and disadvantages consisted of items that express educational, economical or social advantages of EU and religious or cultural disadvantages (see Appendix D for the scale). The evaluations were made on a 5-point-scale again.

4.1.3. Procedure

Scales were given to most of the participants during class hours. The students were informed about the scope and the aim of the study both verbally and written (See Appendix E for the informed consent) and they were assured about the confidentiality of the information they gave. Data gathered from Gazi University received in the lessons at faculties of engineering and administrative sciences, while from METU, three courses from the departments of Psychology and Philosophy, that are opened to all departments were selected. The duration for filling the questionnaires ranged between 15 to 30 minutes. Further information about the study was given privately for those who demanded, after the applications.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

5.1. Data Screening

Prior to main analyses, the data gathered were checked in terms of accuracy, missing values, normality, and homogeneity assumptions via various programs of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Because the missing values consisted less than 5% of the entire data; these were replaced with the mean values. Due to the reason that one subject was detected as an outlier both in univariate and multivariate analyses; he has been excluded and the rest of the analyses held with 242 subjects. The assumptions of homogeneity, normality, and linearity were met for the data.

5.2. Factor Analyses and Scale Construction

5.2.1. Measures about Political Agenda and Expectations Scale

A factor analysis with Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation was performed to the responses of 13 items in Political Agenda and Expectations Scale. The evaluation of initial eigenvalues, scree plot and percentages of explained

variance indicated a two factor solution. As indicated in Table 5.1, the first factor included seven items and the second factor included six items. The factors explained 46% of the total variance and the factor loadings ranged from .43 to .82.

Factor 1 consisted of items like "I am satisfied with my life", "I believe my life will be better within the next 10 years", "I am satisfied with Turkey's situation" or "I believe the general situation of Turkey will be worse within next 10 years". Because the expressions indicated a foresight of individuals about their own life and the situation about their country; the factor was named as "Climate of Expectations". The factor had an eigenvalue of 4.26 and it explained 32.38% of the variance. The internal consistency of the factor was above fair ($\underline{\alpha} = .87$).

Some of the items that were loaded under Factor 2 were "I think economy is the most important agenda of Turkey", "I believe EU will be the most important agenda of Turkey in next 10 years" or "I suppose terror is the most significant topic of agenda in Turkey now". What conceived in the items was the predicted agenda that Turkey is now dealing with or will be dealing with in the near future. Therefore the factor was named as "Predicted Agenda". The predicted agenda factor had an eigenvalue of 1.71 and the percentage of explained variance for the factor was 13.64%. The factor was found internally consistent as it indicated a Cronbach Alpha value of .74.

Table 5.1 Results of Factor Analysis Performed on Items of Political Agenda and Expectations Scale

Items	Factor Loadings	
	Factor 1: Climate of Expectations	Factor 2: Predicted Agenda
7. I believe the general situation of Turkey will be better within next 10 years.	.825	.255
2. I believe my life will change positively within next 10 years	.767	-.146
10. I am satisfied with the general situation of Turkey now.	.759	.236
12. I believe my life will change negatively within next 10 years.	.754	-.003
11. I believe the general situation of Turkey will be worse within next 10 years.	.745	.213
6. I am not satisfied with my life recently.	.645	.039
1. I am satisfied with my life.	.633	-.117
8. I think the most important agenda of Turkey has been "economy" recently	-.066	.806
13. I think the most important agenda of Turkey will be "economy" within next 10 years	-.063	.797
4. I think the most important agenda of Turkey will be "European Union" within next 10 years	.289	.489
5. I suppose "terror" is the most significant topic of agenda in Turkey now.	.031	.451
9. I think "terror" will be the most important agenda of Turkey within next 10 years.	.096	.446
3. I suppose the most important agenda of Turkey is "foreign policy" now.	.055	.437
Eigenvalues	**4.26**	**1.71.**
Explained Variances	**32.38%**	**13.64%**
Alpha	**.87**	**.74**
Total Alpha = .71		
Total Explained Variance = 46.03%		

5.2.2. Measures about the Individual and EU Scale

The responses to the 11 items of Individual and EU Scale were subjected to Principle Component Analysis with varimax rotation. The initial analysis extracted three factors based on eigenvalues over 1. However, the items loaded on the third factor; namely the "identity" items were not found internally consistent because of a low alpha value. When the items about identity were excluded; the initial solutions of factors analysis performed to 9 items extracted two factors; with an explained variance of 60.6%. Factor loadings of the scale ranged from .56 to .86. The detailed information about the factors is presented on Table 5.2.

The first factor consisted items like "I believe EU is a threat for Turkey", "I trust in EU" or "EU gives me hope". The items reflected some positive and negative emotions evoked to EU, therefore the factor was named as "Feelings toward EU". The explained variance of the factor was 42.07% with an eigenvalue of 4.21. The reliability of the factor was satisfactory and indicated the existence of internal consistency (α = .86).

The items of "I think Turkey's membership will be positive in terms of EU" and "I think Turkey's membership will be negative in terms of EU" loaded under the second factor. The items correspond to an evaluation of Turkey's membership from the view of European Union and the factor was named as "Evaluation of Membership". The factor yielded an explained variance of 18.58% and eigenvalue of 1.24. However the internal consistency of the factor was under desired value, which

was .68. The reason for this might be the number of items loaded under the factor which was low respectively. But because the individual evaluations membership was crucial for the study, the items were included to further analysis.

Table 5.2 Results of Factor Analysis Performed on Items of Individual and EU Scale

Items	Factor Loadings	
	Factor 1: Feelings toward EU	Factor 2: Evaluation of Membership
2. I think EU is dangerous.	**.788**	.165
1. EU gives me hope	**.788**	.232
5. EU evokes a feeling of despair on me	**.782**	.206
10. I believe EU is a threat for Turkey	**.731**	.270
4. I trust in EU	**.717**	.171
3. I think EU does not take Turkey's opinions into consideration.	**.705**	-.084
6. I think EU attaches importance to Turkey	**.563**	.085
9. I think Turkey's membership will be negative in terms of EU	.053	**.866**
7. I think Turkey's membership will be positive in terms of EU	.262	**.826**
Eigenvalues	**4.21**	**1.24**
Explained Variances	**42.07%**	**18.58%**
Alpha	**.86**	**.68**
Total Alpha = .85		
Total Explained Variance = 60.65%		

5.2.3. Measures about the Social Representations of EU Scale

A principal component analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation was performed to the responses of 25 items placed in Social Representations of EU Scale. The initial analysis extracted five factors; however, the fifth factor was containing only one item

(item#10) which loaded negatively. When investigated in detail; the item was seen to have insignificant correlations with other items that could threat the internal consistency of the scale. Therefore the item was excluded from the analysis. Remaining 24 items extracted four factors with an explained variance of 56.70% and factor loadings ranged from .40 to .82 (see Table 5.3. for factor loadings, explained variances, eigenvalues and alpha values).

The seven items loaded under Factor 1 indicate disadvantageous attributions to Turkey's membership to EU. Items like "EU membership would cause cultural degeneration", "Turkey's EU membership is going to make the country economical dependent to foreigners", "I believe EU membership will be disadvantageous for Turkey" loaded under the factor, therefore the name "EU as disadvantageous" given to the factor. The factor had an eigenvalue of 8.97 and it explained 24.1% of the total variance. "EU as disadvantageous" factor had showed an internal consistency, where the alpha coefficient was equal to .87.

Second factor consisted of eight items like "Turkey's membership to EU is necessary to provide economical growth.", "I support Turkey's membership to EU." or "Turkey's aim of "becoming a modern civilization is going to be materialized by the full membership to EU". As can be seen, the items conclude a positive point of view to Turkey's membership to EU and include advantageous sides of EU, therefore the factor named as "EU as advantageous". The eigenvalue of the factor was 2.01 and the percentage of explained variance was 14.75% (α = .88).

Six items were loaded under Factor 3, which was named as "Religious-Cultural Threats". Some of the items of the factor were "There is no place for the Muslim Turkey in EU", "I think that the main obstacle against the Turkey's membership to Europe is the cultural differences", "EU is a Christian community". The factor of "Religious-Cultural Threats" had an eigenvalue of 1.49 and it explained 10.77% of the variance (α = .64).

Finally Factor 4, named as "EU as Difficult" which included three items expressively "I believe EU is detaining Turkey", "I think Turkey will never get EU membership" and "EU requests impossible demands to make Turkey's membership difficult". This factor explained 7.04% of the variance with an eigenvalue of 1.11 (α = .61).

Table 5.3 Results of Factor Analysis Performed on Items of Social Representations of EU Scale

Items	Factor Loadings			
	Factor 1: EU membership is disadvantageous	Factor 2: EU membership is Advantageous	Factor 3: Religious Cultural Threats	Factor 4: EU member ship is Difficult
21. Turkey's EU membership is going to make the country economically dependent to foreigners.	**.753**	.191	.122	-.024
22. EU is going to cause cultural degeneration.	**.732**	.145	.065	.116
12. I do not support Turkey's membership to EU since the beginning of the negotiations process.	**.637**	.477	.307	.133

Table 5.3 (Continued)

Items	Factor 1: EU membership is disadvantageous	Factor 2: EU membership is Advantageous	Factor 3: Religious Cultural Threats	Factor 4: EU member ship is Difficult
11. I believe that EU membership will be disadvantageous for Turkey.	**.636**	.400	.234	.218
25. Turkey's membership to EU is going to encourage the ethnical groups within the country to separate.	**.599**	.251	.245	.133
7. I do not support Turkey's membership to EU	**.597**	.367	.303	.137
5. Turkey does not need EU membership	**.402**	.301	.210	.293
20. I think that EU membership is going to provide many standards in social life.	.213	**.829**	-.024	.075
24. EU membership is going to provide improvement in education.	.263	**.734**	.117	.183
14. I believe that Turkey's membership is going to provide advantage about the human rights.	.295	**.717**	.114	.152
8. Turkey's aim of "becoming a modern civilization" is going to be materialized by the full membership to EU.	.204	**.544**	.448	-.028

Table 5.3 (Continued)

Items	Factor 1: EU membership is disadvantageous	Factor 2: EU membership is Advantageous	Factor 3: Religious Cultural Threats	Factor 4: EU member ship is Difficult
17. Turkey's membership to EU is necessary to provide economical growth.	.310	**.526**	.360	-.007
2. I consider Turkey's membership as advantageous.	.497	**.508**	.286	.126
1. I support Turkey's membership to EU.	.239	**.477**	.133	.307
3. I believe that Turkey can get full membership to EU.	.115	**.337**	.063	-.061
9. Turkey should direct to a Union in East instead of EU	.024	.295	**.700**	.057
16. I think that EU will be disappearing soon	.166	.037	**.691**	.066
15. EU is a Christian Community.	.215	-.042	**.634**	.015
18. There is no place for the Muslim Turkey in EU.	.427	.197	**.437**	.092
13. I think that the main obstacle against the Turkey's membership to Europe is religion.	-.059	.062	**.303**	.066
19. I think that the main obstacle against the Turkey's membership to Europe is the cultural differences.	.054	-.013	**.300**	.017

Table 5.3 (Continued)

Items	Factor 1: EU membership is disadvantageous	Factor 2: EU membership is Advantageous	Factor 3: Religious Cultural Threats	Factor 4: EU membership is Difficult
6. I think Turkey can never get membership to EU.	.221	.162	.119	**.765**
4. I believe that EU is detaining Turkey.	.221	-.070	-.038	**.572**
23. EU requests impossible demands to make Turkey's membership difficult	.434	-.055	.244	**.453**
Eigenvalues	**8.97**	**2.01**	**1.49**	**1.11**
Explained Variances	**24.11**	**14.75**	**10.77**	**7.07**
Alphas	**.87**	**.88**	**.64**	**.61**

Total Alpha = .92
Total Explained Variance = 56.70%

5.3. Main Analyses

5.3.1. Comparisons in terms of the Dimensions of Social Representations

A university (2) by social representations (disadvantages, advantages, threat, difficult) MANOVA was performed in order to see whether the factors of social representations are differentiated in terms of universities. Multivariate tests indicated that the linear combination of the social representations is significantly changing in terms of the universities, where $F (4, 237) = 5.178$, $p < .01$. The univariate analyses indicated that there is a significant difference between students' responses of METU (M = 3.19, SD = .90) and Gazi University (M = 3.47, SD = 1.0) in terms of EU

membership is disadvantageous, where $F_{(1, 240)} = 4.974$, $p < .01.$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Another significant difference emerged between METU (M = 2.67, SD = .68) and GU (M = 3.09, SD = .80) in terms of the perceived religious and cultural threats, where $F_{(1, 240)} = 19.54$, $p <. 01.$, $\eta^2 = .08$. The dimensions of difficult and advantages indicated no difference between universities.

Another comparison was held in terms of gender (2) and social representations (4) by performing MANOVA and the multivariate tests showed that the combination of dependent variables is significantly changing in terms of sex, where $F_{(4, 237)} = 5.33$, $p<.001$. It was detected that there is a significant difference between males and females for disadvantages ($F_{(1, 241)} = 5.22$, $p<.05$, $\eta^2 = .02$), advantages ($F_{(1, 241)} = 5.41$, $p<.05$, $\eta^2 = .02$) and threat ($F_{(1, 241)} = 5.75$, $p<.05$, $\eta^2 = .02$). Detailed investigation of the means indicate that females produce a shared representation of disadvantages (M = 3.51, SD = .78) more than males do (M = 3.22, SD = 1.05). However, in terms of threat; males have a more tendency to produce threat representations (M = 2.98, SD = .78) than females (M = 2.74, SD = .74). Finally, considering advantages; males are more prone to produce advantageous representations of EU (M = 2.80, SD = .96) than females (M = 2.52, SD = .79).

A political view (7) by social representations (4) MANOVA is conducted to compare participants with different political views by the respect of social representations. Significant change was evident in the factors of social representations in terms of political views, where $F_{(4, 232)} = 2.04$, $p<.05$. A significant difference generated in terms of religious and cultural threats where, $F_{(6, 241)} = 3.56$, $p <.01$, $\eta^2 = .08$. Post

MANOVA analysis of Bonferroni adjustment indicated that those who have a political view of radical left (M = 2.48, SD = .79) are significantly different in terms of threat representation from those who are neutral (M = 3.06, SD = .77), who are close to right wing (M = 3.13, SD = .61), who are in the right wing (M = 3.00, SD = .62) and those who implicate a radical right political view (M = 3.75, SD = 1.76). Those who indicated their political views as leftist (M = 2.79, SD = .83) are significantly different from those who indicate a close-to-right political view (M = 3.00, SD = .62). Finally a significant difference is present between participants who are close to left wing (M = 2.60, SD = .75) and those who have the political views of neutral, close to right, right, and radical right.

When a frequency of reading newspaper (5) by social representations (4) MANOVA is held, the multivariate test indicated a significant difference between the linear combination of social representations and frequency of reading newspapers, $F_{(4, 237)} = 3.924$, p<.05 and in order to examine whether there is a difference amongst individuals exposing newspapers in different frequencies in terms of social representations; a significant value was detected in threat representation, where, $F_{(4, 241)} = 2,76$, p<.05, $\eta^2 = .05$. Post MANOVA results (Bonferroni test) indicated that individuals who are reading newspapers occasionally (M = 2.49, SD = .80) are significantly different in terms of threat representation, from people who are reading newspapers once a week (M = 3.16, SD = .87), several times a week (M = 2.86, SD = .73) and everyday (M = 2.99, SD = .76).

Finally a newspaper (4, liberal, right, left, other) by social representations (4) MANOVA is performed and the linear combination of dependent variables were found to be changing in terms of the political view of the newspapers read, $F_{(12, 622)} = 3.62$, $p<.001$. Significant differences in terms of disadvantages ($F_{(3, 241)} = 5.60$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2 = .07$), advantages ($F_{(3, 241)} = 6.41$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2 = .07$), threat ($F_{(3, 241)} = 3.93$, $p<.01$, $\eta^2 = .05$), and difficulty ($F_{(3, 241)} = 3.69$, $p<.01$, $\eta^2 = .05$) were generated. In terms of disadvantages, those who read liberal newspapers ($M = 3.44$, $SD = .92$) are significantly different from those who read right-wing newspapers ($M = 2.83$, $SD = .91$) and those who are reading left-wing newspapers ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 1.00$) are significantly different from those who are reading right-wing newspapers. Moreover, post MANOVA analyses (Bonferroni tests) showed that individuals reading right-wing newspapers are significantly different from both those who are reading liberal newspapers and right-wing newspapers. In terms of advantages; those who read liberal newspapers ($M = 2.64$, $SD = .86$) are significantly different from those who read right-wing newspapers ($M = 3.22$, $SD = .99$). Individuals who are reading right-wing newspapers are different from both liberal newspaper readers and left-wing newspaper readers ($M = 2.59$, $SD = .83$). Considering the threat representation, participants who are reading liberal newspapers ($M = 2.91$, $SD = .81$) are significantly different from those who are reading left-wing newspapers ($M = 2.59$, $SD = .83$). Another significant difference emerged in terms of threat as, those who are reading right-wing newspapers ($M = 2.97$, $SD = .65$) are significantly different from the left-wing newspaper readers. Finally, left-wing newspaper readers are significantly differing from both right-wing and liberal newspaper readers. In terms of difficulty representation, right-wing newspaper readers ($M = 3.42$, $SD =$

.78) are significantly different from liberal (M = 3.93, SD = .81) and left-wing (M = 3.83, SD = .95).

Although MANOVAs were performed for the variables of income level and source of information in terms of the social representations of EU scale dimensions, no significant difference has emerged considering these variables. A detailed summary of means and standard deviations is presented on Table 5.4.

Table 5.4 Descriptive Information of the Dimensions of Social Representations on University, Political View, Gender, Newspapers, Frequency of Reading Newspapers, Source of Information and Income Level

	Disadvantages			Advantages			Threat			Difficulty		
	Mean	SD	F	Mean	SD	F	Mean	SD	F	Mean	SD	F
Universities												
METU	3.19	.90	4.97**	2.76	.82	1.03	2.67	.67	19.54*	3.77	.84	1.23
GU	3.47	1.00		2.64	.98		3.09	.80		3.89	.84	
Gender												
Female	3.51	.78	5.22***	2.52	.79	5.41***	2.74	.74	5.75***	3.91	.76	1.33
Male	3.22	1.05		2.80	.96		2.98	.78		3.78	.89	
Political View												
Radical Left	3.51	1.15		2.39	1.10		2.48	.79		3.61	.81	
Left	3.36	1.02		2.62	.94		2.79	.83		3.83	.94	
Close to Left	3.33	.83	.145	2.65	.71	.756	2.60	.75	3.56**	4.06	.77	1.48
Neutral	3.35	.86		2.66	.90		3.06	.77		3.92	.81	
Close to Right	3.31	.99		2.86	.81		3.13	.61		3.73	.77	
Right	3.24	1.10		2.88	1.06		3.00	.62		3.56	.82	
Radical Right	3.28	2.42		2.56	2.20		3.75	1.76		3.66	1.88	
Newspapers												
Liberal	3.44	.92	5.60**	2.64	.86	6.42*	2.91	.81	3.93**	3.93	.81	3.69***
Right	2.83	.91		3.22	.99		2.97	.65		3.42	.78	
Left	3.27	1.00		2.59	.83		2.61	.62		3.82	.95	
Frequency												
Never	3.42	.51		2.45	.44		2.66	.44		3.33	.88	
Occasionally	3.07	1.19	1.06	2.71	.80	,654	2.49	.80	2.76***	3.56	1.04	1.62
Once a week	3.66	.66		2.40	.87		3.16	.87		4.09	.61	
Several	3.28	.83		2.79	.73		2.86	.73		3.78	.78	
Everyday	3.42	1.04		2.65	.76		2.99	.76		3.93	.86	

110

	Mean	SD	F	Mean	SD	F	Mean	SD	F	Mean	SD	F
Source of Information												
Newspaper	3.18	1.02		2.95	1.02		2.84	.72		3.85	.79	2.35
Television	3.44	.80	.754	2.58	.84	1.72	3.03	.80	2.00	3.99	.76	
Internet	3.31	1.06		2.67	.90		2.79	.75		3.69	.91	
Other	3.19	1.38		2.91	1.09		2.44	.63		3.33	1.33	
Income												
0-1000	3.53	1.06		2.58	.99		3.11	.85		3.87	.76	
1001-2000	3.54	1.04	1.84	2.52	.92	1.62	2.91	.78	1.63	3.93	.97	.429
2001-3000	3.16	.86		2.85	.84		2.91	.82		3.81	.82	
3001-4000	3.20	.95		2.85	.94		2.81	.66		3.75	.79	
4000 and above	3.25	.82		2.61	.77		2.67	.68		3.75	.87	

* p<.001, ** p<.01, ***p<.05

5.3.2. Correlations among the Study Variables

In order to examine the associations between variables used in the study, Pearson Bivariate Correlations were conducted. For further explorations of the variables, the relationships among demographic variables (gender, university, political view, income, newspaper read, source of information, and frequency of reading newspaper), sub-dimensions of Political Agenda and Expectations Scale, sub-dimensions of Individual and EU Scale, and sub-factors of Social Representations to EU Scale were investigated.

Results indicated that Europe as Disadvantageous dimension has a significant negative relationship with EU as Advantageous ($r = -.80$, $p<.01$), gender ($r = -.14$, $p<.05$), income ($r = -.13$, $p<.05$) and positive relationship with Religious and Cultural Threats ($r = .44$, $p<.01$), EU as Difficult ($r = .55$, $p<.01$) and Feelings toward EU ($r = .47$, $p<.01$). EU as Advantageous factor is in negative relationship with Threats ($r = -.31$, $p<.01$), EU as Difficult ($r = -.50$, $p<.01$) and Feelings ($r = -.35$, $p<.01$) and it has positive relationships with Evaluation of Membership ($r = .26$, $p<.01$), Climate of Expectations ($r = .15$, $p<.05$), and Gender ($r = .14$, $p<.05$). Religious and Cultural Threats dimension has positive relationships with EU as Difficult ($r = .32$, $p<.01$), Feelings towards EU ($r = .18$, $p<.01$), Gender ($r = .15$, $p<.05$), University ($r = .27$, $p<.01$), Political View ($r = .21$, $p<.01$), and Frequency of Newspaper Reading ($r = .16$, $p<.01$) and negative relationship with Level of Income ($r = -.15$, $p<.05$). EU as Difficult factor is significantly and positively correlated with Feeling towards EU (r

= .31, p<.01) and Frequency of Newspaper Reading (r = .12, p<.05) and negatively

correlated with Climate of Expectations (r = -.13, p<.01). Evaluation of Membership

has a positive significant relationship with Gender (r = .14, p<.05). Detailed

information about correlations is given in Table 5.6.

Table 5.5 Correlations among Study Variables

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.
1. DISADV	-														
2. ADV	-80**	-													
3. THREAT	.44**	-.31**	-												
4. DETENT	.55**	-.50**	.32**	-											
5. FEELING	.47**	-.35**	.18**	.31**	-										
6. EVALUA.	-.12	.26**	.05	-.09	.04	-									
7. EXPECT	-.12	.15*	.06	-.13*	.02	.11	-								
8. AGENDA	.04	.05	.11	.02	.11	.04	-.04	-							
9. GENDER	-.14*	.14*	.15*	-.07	-.10	.14*	.09	-.07	-						
10. UNIVERS.	.14*	-.06	.27**	.07	.07	.04	-.02	.05	.26**	-					
11. INCOME	-.13*	.08	-.15*	-.07	-.11	.04	.10	.01	-.08	-.47**	-				
12. POLITICS	-.04	.12	.21**	-.08	.02	.11	.20**	.01	.14*	.34**	-.19**	-			
13. NEWSP.	-.02	-.04	-.01	-.06	-.02	.03	-.05	-.04	.07	-.08	.16*	-.16*	-		
14. FREQ.	.07	-.00	.16**	.12*	.06	.12	-.11	.01	.03	.11	-.02	.04	.06	-	
15. SOURCE	.02	-.07	-.06	-.11	.01	.09	-.03	-.11	.01	-.15*	.05	-.02	.06	-.19	-

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

5.3.3. Regression Analyses Predicting the Dimensions of Social Representations

Multiple regression analyses were held in order to examine how well the sub dimensions of Social Representations of EU Scale are predicted by demographic variables (university, gender, political view, income, frequency of newspaper reading), perceived expectations and agenda, and individual attributes to EU (feelings and evaluation). In terms of demographic variables, only the variables that are significantly associated with the dimensions of Social Representations to EU Scale were entered into regression. Four multiple regressions were conducted for each sub-dimension of social representations to EU scale; namely, disadvantages, advantages, religious and cultural threats, and difficulty. The predictor variables were entered to equation hierarchically, where first the demographic variables, second the sub-dimensions of Political Agenda and Expectations, and finally, the sub-dimensions Individual and EU Scale were included into regression.

5.3.3.1. Predictors of EU Membership is Disadvantageous Representation

In order to examine how well the dimension of EU as Disadvantageous is predicted by demographic variables, Feelings towards EU, Climate of Expectations, Predicted Agenda and Evaluation of Membership, a hierarchical multiple regression was performed. The first block was demographic variables (level of income, gender, university). The second block was including the sub dimensions of Political Agenda and Expectations Scale (Predicted Agenda and Climate of Expectations) and the third

block was consisting of the sub dimensions of Individual and EU Scale (Feelings toward EU and Evaluation of Membership).

The standardized regression coefficients (β), t values, R, R^2, adjusted R^2 and F changes of all variables entered into equation in the third step are summarized in Table 5.6. However, the analysis indicated that only the first and third steps were able to contribute to the prediction of EU as disadvantageous representation and the second step was not contributive. After the third step, R = .53, F (7, 241) = 12.97, p<.0.001.

After step 1, where university, level of income, and gender entered into the equation, R^2 = .06, indicating that the 6% of the variance in terms of EU as disadvantageous dimension is accounted for the demographic variables. In this level, F change was also significant where, F (3, 238) = 5.138, p<.01. Although this result indicated a significant bivariate relationship between EU as Disadvantageous dimension and three demographic variables; two of them, namely gender (β = -.19, p<.01) and university (β = .15, p<.05) contributed to the prediction of Disadvantage. Because the second block could not predict EU as disadvantageous representation significantly, the variables in the third block examined. In the last step, the sub-dimensions of Individual and EU Scale; namely, Feelings towards EU and Evaluation of Membership were added to the equation which causes the R^2 to improve reliably, where R^2 change was .21; meaning that the 21% of variances in Disadvantage dimension is accounted for demographic variables, expectations, predicted agenda, feelings and evaluations of EU (F (7, 241) = 12.98, p<.001). An examination of each

116

variable at the third step indicated that university (β = .14, p<.05), feelings toward

EU (β = .46, p<.001) and evaluation of membership (β = -.12, p<.05) significantly

predicted EU as Disadvantageous representation.

Table 5.6 Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Predictors of EU Membership is Disadvantageous

	STEP1			STEP2			STEP3		
	β	t	p	β	t	p	β	t	p
Gender	-.19	-2.99**	.00	-	-	-	-.11	-1.84	ns
University	.15	2.13*	.00	-	-	-	.13	2.07***	.03
Level of Income	-.07	-1.07	ns	-	-	-	-.01	-.160	ns
Climate of Expectations							-.11	-1.88	ns
Predicted Agenda							-.02	-.416	ns
Feelings toward EU							.46	8.07**	.00
Evaluation of Membership							-.12	-2.07***	.03
R		.25			-			.53	
R^2		.06			-			.28	
Adjusted R^2		.05			-			.26	
R^2 Change		.06			-			.21	
F Change		5.19*			-			33.99**	

*p<.01, **p<.001, ***p<.05

5.3.3.2. Predictors of EU Membership is Advantageous Representation

A hierarchical multiple regression was conducted in order to see whether EU as

advantageous representation is predicted by gender, climate of expectations,

predicted agenda, feelings toward EU, and evaluation of membership dimensions.

The variables added into the equation as 1st block included gender, 2nd block

included climate of expectations and political agenda, and 3rd block included feelings

toward EU and evaluation of membership.

Table 5.7 shows the standardized regression coefficients (β), t values, R, R^2, adjusted R^2 and F changes after all of the independent variables entered into the equation. At the end of step 3, when all independent variables are included in the model; R = .48, F (5. 241) = 14.07, p<.001.

The first step of the analysis indicated R^2 of .02 meaning that 2% of the variance in EU as Advantageous representation is accounted for the effect of gender (β = .15, p<.05) with a significant F change of F (1, 241) = 5.41, p<.05. In the second step, climate of expectation and political agenda variables were added to the equation where R^2 change was .03 and F (3, 241) = 3.99, p<.01. In this step while gender (β = .14, p<.05) is still contributing to EU as Advantageous representation, the climate of expectations (β = .15, p<.05) also contributed to the predictability of dependent variable. Finally in the last step, the variables of feelings towards EU and evaluation of membership entered into the equation. An R^2 change of .18 and F (5. 241) = 14.07, p<.001 values was generated from the analysis. In this step, the contribution of the gender was insignificant however climate of expectations (β = .14, p<.05), feelings toward EU (β = -.37, p<.001), and evaluation of membership (β = .25, p<.001) factors significantly contributed to the dependent variable. After the final step, the contribution of feeling toward EU and evaluation of membership factors on EU as Advantageous representations was 18%, while all variables entered into equation indicated a contribution of 23%.

Table 5.7 Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Predictors of EU Membership is Advantageous

	STEP1			STEP2			STEP3		
	β	t	p	β	t	p	β	t	p
Gender	.15	2.32***	.02	.14	2.19***	.02	.07	1.16	ns
Climate of Expectations				.15	2.34***	.02	.14	2.37*	.01
Predicted Agenda				.68	1.08	ns	.09	1.62	ns
Feelings toward EU							-37	-6.33**	.00
Evaluation of Membership							.25	4.25**	.00
R		.15			.22			.48	
R^2		.02			.05			.23	
Adjusted R^2		.02			.04			.21	
R^2 Change		.02			.03			.18	
F Change		5.41***			3.23*			27.8**	

*p<.01, **p<.001, ***p<.05

5.3.3.3. Predictors of Religious and Cultural Threats Representation

In order to detect the contributions of feelings towards EU, evaluation of membership, and some demographic variables (gender, level of income, university, political view, and frequency of newspaper reading) on Religious and Cultural Threats representations, a hierarchical multiple regression was conducted. A two-step regression was performed where, the first block consisted of the demographic variables and the second block was consisted on the sub-dimensions of Individual and EU Scale.

Table 5.8 indicates the standardized regression coefficients (β), t values, R, R^2, adjusted R^2 and F changes after all of the independent variables entered into the equation. At the end of step 2, where all independent variables as gender, level of income, university, political view, frequency of newspaper reading, feelings to EU, and evaluations of membership entered into the equation, the values of R = .38, ad F (7, 241) = 5.75, p<.001 were generated.

The first step, where the demographic variables were included into the analysis had an R^2 of .11 and F (5, 241) = 6.30, p<.001 values. In this step, three demographic variables which were university (β = .18, p<.05), political view (β = .14, p<.05), and frequency of newspaper reading (β = .14, p<.05) were significantly contributed to Religious and Cultural Threats representation. In the second step, in which the sub dimensions of Individual and EU Scale, feelings toward EU and evaluation of membership variables were added to the equation; the value of R^2 was .14, and R^2 change was materialized at .03. The second step of the analysis revealed that together with the significant contributions of university (β = .17, p<.05), political view (β = .14, p<.05), and frequency of newspaper reading (β = .13, p<.05) which is the same as step 1, a significant contribution of feelings toward EU (β = .17, p<.01) to the prediction of Religious and Cultural Threats could be generated. However; gender, level of income, and evaluation of the membership variables did not significantly contributed to the prediction of dependent variable.

Table 5.8 Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Predictors of Religious and Cultural Threats

	STEP1			STEP2		
	β	t	p	β	t	p
Gender	.79	1.24	ns	.10	1.62	ns
Level of Income	-.34	-.484	ns	-.23	.820	ns
University	.18	2.32***	.02	.17	2.22***	.02
Table 5.8. (continued)						
Political View	.14	2.07***	.03	.14	2.10***	.03
Frequency of NP	.14	2.22***	.02	.13	2.08***	.03
Feelings toward EU				.17	2.82*	.00
Evaluation of Membership				-.10	-.159	ns
R		.34			.38	
R^2		.12			.15	
Adjusted R^2		.09			.12	
R^2 Change		.12			.03	
F Change		6.301**			3.991*	

*p<.01, **p<.001, ***p<.05

5.3.3.4. Predictors of EU Membership is Difficult Representation

The contributors of EU as Difficult representations were examined by hierarchical multiple regression analysis; where frequency of newspaper reading was entered first block as a demographic variable, climate of expectations and perceived agenda as the second block and feelings toward EU and evaluation of the membership as third block. The analysis indicated that the first (R = .13, F (1, 241) = 3.975, p<.05) and the third (R = .37, F (5, 241) = 7.697, p<.001) blocks contributed significantly to the prediction of EU as difficult.

The first step indicated that frequency of newspaper reading ($\beta = .13$, p<.05) is significantly contributing to the prediction of difficulty and 2% of the variance in the difficult representation is predicted from the frequency of newspaper reading. Because the second block did not predict the difficulty significantly, the variables on the third block were taken into consideration. The variables entered to the equation in the third block were feelings about EU and evaluation of membership. The analysis indicated that feelings about EU ($\beta = .32$, p<.001) is the only variable contributing to the prediction of difficulty representation. 14% of the variance in difficulty representation can be predicted by feelings about EU. Table 5.9 points out the standardized regression coefficients (β), t values, R, R^2, adjusted R^2 and F changes after all of the independent variables entered into the equation.

Table 5.9 Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Predictors of EU Membership is Difficult

	STEP1			STEP2			STEP3		
	β	t	p	β	t	p	β	t	p
Frequency of NP	.13	1,994	.04***				.11	1.722	ns
Climate of Expectations				-	-	-	-.12	-1.974	ns
Predicted Agenda							-.02	-.251	ns
Feelings toward EU							.32	5.23**	.00
Evaluation of Membership							-.10	-1.68	ns
R	.13			-			.37		
R²	.02			-			.14		
Adjusted R²	.02			-			.12		
R² Change	.02			-			.11		
F Change	3.975***						14.891**		

*p<.01, **p<.001, ***p<.05

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

The main aim of the study was to explore the prevailing social representations of EU and comprehend the central structures of the representations. It can be seen that consistent with the categories generated from the interviews and similar to the dimensions received from the media representations, four social representations concerning EU has been conceived namely, "EU as Disadvantageous", "EU as Advantageous", "Religious and Cultural Threats", and "EU as Difficult". Advantageous and disadvantageous dimensions were generated from the interviews in which the interviewees evaluate the possible yields and losses of Turkey in case of the full membership to EU. On the other hand, the representation concerning EU as a threat for religious and cultural affiliations of Turkey and the representation that consider EU membership as too difficult to reach were generated from the newspapers. The final social representations are thought to be comprehensive enough to reflect the individual and media representations of EU.

Within the first part of the study, the thematic units were classified under the categories of "Turkey's membership to EU", "Problems of Turkey", "Structure of EU", "Advantages of EU" and "Disadvantages of EU". The scope of the interview did not include a topic about the problems of Turkey but the category is anyway come out. However when the transcriptions are examined in detail to find out thematic units, it is seen that interviewees do talk about the problems of Turkey again

in the context of EU membership either in positive (advantageous) or negative (disadvantageous) manner. One of the most striking findings of the interview study was the dominance of disadvantages in the thematic units over the advantages; the interviewees reported more frequency of thematic units containing the disadvantageous than the units containing advantageous dimensions. The main reason for this situation might be stemmed from the two important and dominating thematic units of the first category, Turkey's membership to EU; which were "EU will not accept Turkey as a member" and "EU will continue to detain Turkey's membership". It is clear from the frequencies of these units that interviewees indicate a negative attribution to the EU membership of Turkey and they do not have the belief of Turkey's EU membership. Here the interviewees are a kind of using justification strategy, that is, a target that can be never reached is attributed as containing negative feature. Wagner and Hayes (2005) conclude that the justification strategies to reduce the cognitive dissonance might be used not only in terms of individual level but also in terms of collective level. Considering the category of "Structure of EU", the most prevailing representation was "EU is a Christian Community". A referral to religious affiliations was also present in terms of disadvantages premising that "EU membership would cause religious conflicts" and in terms of Turkey's membership to EU stating that "Cultural or religious differences and make Turkey's membership impossible". Therefore religious differences are attributed as an important dimension in terms of the conceptualization of EU.

The second part of the study indicated the media representation of EU within the newspapers having different political views. It was figured out that three

representations were produced in media concerning "EU as a must", "EU as a threat" and "EU as difficult". Islamic-right newspaper was more prone to use "EU as a threat" representation, primarily justifying threat in the religion affiliation. On the other hand, left-wing newspaper showed a tendency to consider EU as a must, primarily due to the governing of human rights and minority rights, which are both present in Copenhagen Political Criteria (Political Criteria: defines the conditions specifying a consistent corporate structure covering democracy, human rights, and the rule of law) and the negotiation topics (Chapter 23: Judiciary and fundamental rights). While left wing newspapers are indicating the compulsory situation of EU membership for Turkey in the context of fundamental rights and democracy, the prevailing representation in the liberal newspaper was EU as difficult with the referrals to the prolonged membership process and negative attitudes of EU states toward the membership of Turkey. Liberal press did not indicate an opposing view on the process of membership however the representation of EU as difficult did not found to be stemmed from support or opposition of the EU membership. Finally, a striking way of representation of EU was present in the Islamic-right wing newspaper which considers EU as a threat. Religious differences between EU and Turkey are thought to be the anchors of this representation. Analysis of the newspapers indicated that liberal viewed newspapers represent the EU in diffusion style in which no attempts were made to orientate the reader into a particular point of view. The propagation style was used by left-wing writers in representing the EU and they deal the knowledge to a well-structured group and selectively presentation of the knowledge. For the right-wing writers, in terms of the well-structured target group and denying the conflicting elements while classification of new social

125

phenomena to the pre-existing conceptualizations; propagation style seems to be convenient. However, a very specific process is generated in right-wing representation of EU, which is the creation of an external threat (Christian EU) for the in-group (Muslim Turkey), make the representation style more proper to propaganda.

Finally, in the third part of the study some measures were used to evaluate the dimensions that social representations differ. In order to examine this, three scales were used namely Political Agenda and Expectations, Individuals and EU, and Social Representations of EU. Items on the first two scales were originally placed in Standard Eurobarometer Public Opinion Surveys and adapted here in order to find out the predictors of the dimensions of social representations. Social representation of EU Scale was developed by the author and the items on the scale were generated from the content analysis of interview and media representation studies defined above. Factor structures of the scales were suggesting Climate of expectations and Predicted Agenda sub scales from PAES, Feelings towards EU and Evaluation of Membership sub-scales for Individual and EU Scale and finally EU as disadvantageous, EU as Advantageous, Religious-Cultural Threats, and EU as Difficult sub-scales from Social Representations of EU Scale.

Further analysis conducted on the four different social representations with various demographic variables indicated that, the universities that the data were collected (METU and GU) are significantly different in terms of EU as Disadvantageous and Cultural-Religious Threats, in which students from Gazi University consider EU as

126

disadvantageous and causing religious-cultural threat more than METU students did. While METU students reported more left-wing political affiliation than GU students; the results were thought to be explained in terms of political view as well. However, in terms of political views; only the Cultural-Religious Threat representation was found to be differed in which those are holding right-wing political affiliation were to consider EU in terms of cultural and religious threat than those from the left-wing. The differentiation in terms of political affiliation makes sense since the social representations of a political entity might differ in terms of the different political affiliations of individuals (Breakwell, 1993).

Considering the different political views of the newspapers read; the results indicated that the ideological dispersal of the newspapers read by participants was found to have a significant influence on the dimensions of social representations of EU. The exploration of this influence showed that participants who read liberal newspapers are to see EU membership as more disadvantageous than the readers of right-wing newspapers and those who read left wing newspapers are to consider EU membership as more disadvantageous than the right-wing readers. Here, in terms of left-wing readers, the an influence of media representation is not evident; which might be resulted from the interpretation of EU as an imperialist structure in terms of leftist ideology and the leftist media do not emphasize this point. Therefore the anchor of the social representation is not the same as the media representation. However, liberal readers considered EU membership as more disadvantageous than the right-wing newspaper readers in which the media representation seem to be effective on the production of social representation. Liberal media interpret EU

membership as a difficult situation and refer to the disadvantages of this situation therefore the representation is more overt in the newspapers. But for the right-wing newspaper readers who take EU membership less disadvantageous as compared to the other two groups; the media representation is not influential which can be explained as instead of explaining EU membership in disadvantageous terms; the readers choose to reflect another representation. In terms of EU membership is advantageous representation, the results of the EU membership is disadvantageous representation are verified and it was found to be the right-wing newspaper readers who consider EU membership as more advantageous. In this point, a justification of Copenhagen criteria concerning human rights might be influential especially considering the problem of Turban for the right-wing newspaper readers, therefore, current event seem to be standing on the forefront than the media representation. Coming to the social representation indicating EU membership as cultural and religious threat; right-wing newspaper readers are more to report this representation than liberal and left-wing newspaper readers; in which the media representation seem to be influential on the production of social representation. However, whether the media representation influence the representation or the already produced social representation influence the preference of the political view of the newspaper read should be analyzed in detail. On the other hand, the construction of EU as a threat for religion and culture by the individuals holding religious identities were evident in Hortaçsu and Cem-Ersoy (2005) study. Finally EU membership is difficult representation was more to be produced by the liberal-wing newspaper readers as anticipated in the media representation of EU. The evidence of the media influence in terms of EU membership is difficult and religious-cultural threats was consistent

with the literature proposing that media do have an influence on the production of social representations (Moscovici, 1984; Abric, 1993; Hodgetts et al., 2004; Gardikiotis et al., 2004; Foster, 2006; Stewart and Lacassagne, 2005, Wagner & Hayes, 2005).

On the other hand, religious-cultural threats representation was found to be produced more by participants who read newspaper everyday than those reading newspapers occasionally, once a week or never. This is evident in the literature also with a postulation of the intensity and quantity of the media exposure is related to the emergence of the social representations (Gardikiotis et al., 2004; Stewart and Lacassagne, 2005; Wagner & Hayes, 2005). Moreover, reading a newspaper everyday would enhance a mere exposure (Zajonc, 2001) and by the repetition of the same message; the representation would get stronger (Gardikiotis et al., 2004). On the other hand, it was resulted that no differentiation is evident in terms of social representations considering the exposure to different media that is no difference was generated among participants that prefer to view newspapers, television, internet or other sources of information.

Finally gender significantly differed along all of the dimensions of social representations to EU. Post-Hoc analyses indicated that females score more on the EU membership is Disadvantageous representation and less on the EU membership is Advantageous representation than males. This might be resulted from an idea of males, who give more importance to free movement of labor opportunity in case of the full membership, reflecting an easier way to find jobs. On the other hand, males

were more prone considering EU as religious-cultural threat than females which might be resulted from the fact that the number of male participants that reported to read right-wing newspapers were more than the females reading that right-wing newspapers. Finally, females show more tendencies to emerge EU as Difficult representation than did males, which seems to be reasonable considering that the proportion of female participants reading liberal newspapers generating this representation were greater than male proportion. On the other hand, when the public opinion studies conducted about the views about EU indicate variant results; where a study conducted in Cyprus (Standard Eurobarometer, 2006) showed that females consider EU as more trustworthy than males and attribute advantages to EU however, another study (Standard Eurobarometer, 2003) which conducted in EU member states indicated that males report more positive feelings about EU than females, where males specified more proud to be European and chose to emphasize European identity than did females. Therefore, further studies are needed to clarify the gender differences in social representations of European Union.

Considering the relationships between variables; EU as disadvantageous representation has a significant relationship with feelings toward EU. EU as Advantageous representation indicates a positive relationship with feelings about EU and negative relationship with Climate of Expectations and Evaluation of the Membership. Religious and Cultural Threats shows a significant relationship with feelings towards EU. Finally EU as Difficult representation indicated a positive relationship with the feelings toward EU.

EU as Disadvantageous representation was significantly predicted by the feelings towards EU and positively and evaluation of the membership negatively. In other words, the variations in disadvantageous centered representations are emanated from the several feelings about EU as hope, confidence or danger. The contribution of feelings to the social representations is evident, that is, social representations include both social and individual dynamics.

In terms EU as Advantageous representation, the contribution of the feelings is negative however the contribution of the evaluation of membership dimension is positive for the prediction. In this point, it can be said that, the perceived disadvantages stem from a more affective process while the advantages are assessed in terms of cognitive processes. Wagner and Hayes (2005) propose that social representations include both affective and cognitive elements in order to grasp the social construction of the reality.

The interplay among political view, media exposure, and feelings toward EU is significantly contributing to the prediction of Religious-Cultural Threats representation of EU. When a detailed examination is held; it can be seen that individuals who have right-wing political views and individuals who are more exposed to media are more prone to produce social representations of EU based on religious and cultural threat. Finally feelings toward EU is contributing to the prediction of EU as Difficult Representation, which indicate that the changes in terms of the EU as Difficult Representation might be predicted from various kinds of feelings like danger, hope, or confidence. The affective component of the social

representations of EU is clear in all dimensions of the representations.

In conclusion, it was clear that four different dimensions of social representations of EU are consistent with and comprehensive of the categories generated from interview and media representation studies. The central structures of the social representations of EU were disadvantageous, advantageous, threat, and difficulty. Especially with the threat dimension, the influence of the political view and media exposure was clear. Moreover the contribution of feelings toward EU and evaluation of the membership to the social representations of EU was evident.

The study might be contributive in terms of indicating the conceptualizations of European Union with the influence of different dynamics changing from feelings to media exposure and political involvement. It is clear that considering people's thoughts about EU just in terms of positive and negative attitudes toward membership of Turkey and toward the Union is not informative enough about the conceptualization of the Union. Therefore, lay theories of the people about EU would provide a deeper look at the issue. However, because the study is conducted in a period in which some other agendas shadowed the salience of the EU topic; the study should be replicated within a period in which the topic of EU is more apparent in terms of social and political agenda. Although the reliability of the social representations of EU scale was fair ($\alpha = .92$), further studies are needed for the exploration of validity of the scale and more clear conceptualizations.

REFERENCES

Abric, J.A. (1993). Central System, Peripheral System: The Functions and Roles in the Dynamics of Social Representations. <u>Papers on Social Representations, 2(2)</u>, 75-78.

Abric, J.C. (1996). Specific Processes of Social Representations. <u>Papers on Social Representations, 5</u>, 77-80.

Aktaş, V., Cirhinlioğlu, F., & Öner-Özkan, B. (2004). Türk Örnekleminde Avukat Olan ile Olmayanların Adalete ve Türkiye'deki Hukuk Sistemine İlişkin Sosyal Temsilleri. <u>Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 21</u>(2), 61–80.

Allansdotir, A., Jovchelovitch, S., & Stathopolou, A. (1993). Social Representations: The Versatility of a Concept. <u>Paper on Social Representations, 2</u>, 3-10.

Augoustinos, M. (1993). "Celebration of a Nation": Representations of Australian National Identity. <u>Paper on Social Representations, 2</u>, 33-39.

Augoustinos, M. & Walker, I. (1995). <u>Social Cognition: an Integrated Introduction</u>. Sage Publications: London.

Berger, P. L. & Luckmann, T. (1967). <u>The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge.</u> Anchor Books: Garden City, New York.

Bergmann, M.M. (1998). Social Representations as the Mother of all Behavioral Dispositions? The Relations between Social Representations, Attitudes, and Values. <u>Papers on Social Representations, 7</u>, 77-83.

Breakwell, G.M. (1993). Social Representation and Social Identity. <u>Papers on Social Representations, 2</u>, 198-217.

Breakwell, G.M. & Lyons, E. (1993). A Jigsaw Puzzle with Missing Pieces: An Argument with the Systematic Explanation of the Relationship between Processes of Representations and Identity: Discussion of M. Augoustinos. <u>Papers on Social Representations, 2(1)</u>, 44-47.

Christidou, V., Dimopoulos, K., & Koulaidis, V. (2004). Constructing Social Representations of Science and Technology: the Role of Metaphors in the Press and Popular Scientific Magazines. <u>Public Understanding of Science, 13</u>, 347-362.

Chryssochoou, X. (2000). Membership in a Superordinate Level: Rethinking European Union as a Multinational Society. <u>Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 10</u>, 403-420.

Cinirella, M. (1996). A Social Psychological Perspective on European Integration. In

G.M. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds). <u>Changing European Identities: Social Psychological Analyses of Social Change.</u> (pp. 381-402). Betterworth-Heinemann: Oxford.

Cirhinlioğlu, F., Aktaş, V., & Öner-Özkan, B. (2006). Sosyal Temsil Kuramına Genel Bir Bakış. <u>C.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 30, 2</u>, 163-174.

De Rosa, A.S. (1993). Social Representations and Attitudes: Problems of Coherence between the Theoretical Definition and Procedure of Research. <u>Papers on Social Representations, 2</u>(3), 178-192.

De Rosa, A.S. (1996). Reality Changes Faster than Research: National and Supranational Identity of the European Community in the context of Changes in International Relations. In G.M. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds). <u>Changing European Identities: Social Psychological Analyses of Social Change.</u> (pp. 381-402). Betterworth-Heinemann: Oxford.

Doise, W., Clemence, A., & Lorenzi-Cioldi, F. (1993). <u>The Quantitative Analysis of Social Representations.</u> Harvester Wheatsheaf: New York.

Doise, W., Spini, D., & Clémence, A. (1999). Human Rights Studied as Social Representations in a Cross-National Context. <u>European Journal of Social Psychology, 29</u>, 1-29.

Echebarría Echabe, A. (1995). Social Representations, Judgments, and Memory: A Comment on the Paper by R. Michit. Papers on Social Representations, 4, 199-203.

European Commission (2007). Standard Eurobarometer, No.67. http://ec.europa.eu.public_opinion/index_en.htm, 30th June 2007.

Farr, R. (1993). Common Sense, Science, and Social Representations. Public Understanding of Science, 2, 189-204.

Farr, R. (1994). Attitudes, Social Representations and Social Attitudes. Papers on Social Representations, 3(1), 33-37.

Farr, R. M. (1993). The Theory of Social Representations: Whence and Whither? Papers on Social Representations, 2, 130-138.

Flament, C. (1994). Consensus, Salience, and Necessity in Social Representations - Technical Note. Papers on Social Representations, 3, 97-105.

Foster, J. (2001). Unification and Differentiation: A Study of the Social Representations of Mental Illness. Papers on Social Representations, 10, 3.1-3.18.

Foster, J.L.H. (2006). Media Representation of the Mental Health Bill and Representations of Mental Health Problems. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 16, 285-300.

Fraser, C. (1994a). Attitudes, Social Representations, and Widespread Beliefs. Papers on Social Representations, 3(1), 13-25.

Gardikiotis, A., Martin, R., & Hewstone, M. (2004). The Representation of Majorities and Minorities in the British Press: A Content Analytic Approach. European Journal of Social Psychology, 34, 637-646.

Gencel-Bek, M. (2001). Media and the Representation of the European Union: An Analysis of Press Coverage of Turkey's European Union Candidacy. Kültür ve İletişim, 4(2), 121-146.

Guimelli, C. (1993). Concerning the Structure of Social Representations. Papers on Social Representations, 2, 85-92.

Guimelli, C. (1993). Locating the Central Core of Social Representations: Towards a Method. European Journal of Social Psychology, 23, 555-559.

Heider, F. (1958). The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: Wiley.

Hewstone, M. (1990). Causal Attribution: From Cognitive Processes to Collective Beliefs. Blackwell, Oxford.

Hilton, J. H., Erb, H., Dermot, M., & Molian, D. J. (1996). Social Representations of History and Attitudes to European Unification in Britain, France, and Germany. In G.M. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds). Changing European Identities: Social Psychological Analyses of Social Change. (pp. 381-402). Betterworth-Heinemann: Oxford.

Hodgetts, D., Masters, B., & Robertson, N. (2004). Media Coverage of "Decades of Disparity" in the Ethnic Mortality in Aotearoa. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 14, 455-472.

Hopkins, N. & Reicher, S. (1996). The Construction of Social Categories and Processes of Social Change: Arguing about National Identities. In G.M. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds). Changing European Identities: Social Psychological Analyses of Social Change. (pp. 69-93). Betterworth-Heinemann: Oxford

Horenczyk, G. & Bekerman, Z. (1995). The Pervasiveness of the Beliefs in Causality and Cognitive Consistency: Some Comments on a Paper by W. Wagner. Papers on Social Representations, 4, 105-110.

Hortaçsu, N. & Cem-Ersoy, N. (2003). Social Identity and Constructions of European Union among Turkish Youth. European Journal of Social Psychology, 35, 107–121.

Howarth, C. (2006). A Social Representation is not a Quiet Thing: Exploring the Critical Potential of Social Representation Theory. British Journal of Social Psychology, 45, 65-86.

Huici, C., Ros, M., Cano, I., Hopkins, N., Emler, N., & Carmona, M. (1997). Comparative Identity and Evaluation of Socio-Political Change: Perceptions of the European Community as a Function of Salience of Regional Identities. European Journal of Social Psychology, 27, 97-113.

Jaspars, J., & Fraser, C. (1984). Attitudes and Social Representations. In R. M. Farr & S. Moscovici (Eds), Social Representations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Joffe, H. (2003). Risk: From Perception to Social Representations. British Journal of Social Psychology, 42, 55-74.

Licata, L. (2003). Representing the Future of European Union: Consequences on National and European Identifications. Papers on Social Representations, 12, 5.1-5.22.

Liu, J. H., & Hilton D. J. (2005). How the Past weighs on the Present: Social Representations of History and their Role in Identity Politics. British Journal of Social Psychology, 44, 537-556.

Macek, P., Osecká, L., & Kostroň, L. (1997). Social Representations of Human Rights amongst Czech University Students. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 7, 65-76.

Molinari, L. & Emiliani, F. (1993). Structures and Functions of Social Representations: Theories of Development, Images of Child and Pupil. Papers on Social Representations, 2(2), 95-106.

Molinari, L. & Emiliani, F. (1996). More on the Structure of Social Representations: Central Core and Social Dynamics. Papers on Social Representations, 5, 41-50.

Moliner, P. & Tafani, E. (1997). Attitudes and Social Representations: A Theoretical and Experimental Approach. European Journal of Social Psychology, 27, 687–702.

Moliner, P. (1995). A Two-Dimensional Model of Social Representations. European Journal of Social Psychology, 25, 27-40.

Moloney, G., Hall, R., & Walker, I. (2005). Social Representations and Themata: the Construction and Functioning of Social Knowledge about Donation and Transplantation. British Journal of Social Psychology, 44, 415-441.

Moscovici, S. (1984). The Phenomenon of Social Representations. In R. Farr and S. Moscovici (Eds.), Social Representations. Cambridge Press: Cambridge.

Moscovici, S. (1988). Notes towards a Description of Social Representations. European Journal of Social Psychology, 18, 211-250.

Moscovici, S. & Perez, A.J. (1997). Representations of Society and Prejudices. Papers on Social Representations, 6, 27-36.

Moscovici, S. (1997). Social Representations Theory and Social Constructionism. http://psyberlink.flogiston.ru/internet/bits/mosc1.htm, 25th September 2006.

Öner-Özkan, B. (2002). Sosyal Temsiller. Kriz Dergisi, 10(1), 29–37.

Paker, O. (1999). Sosyal Temsiller Kuramının ve Epistemolojisinin Sosyal Psikoloji içerisindeki Yeri ve Önemi. In S. Erkonaç (Ed.) Psikolojide Yeni Tartışmalar. İstanbul: Alfa Basım, Yayın, Dağıtım. 45–64.

Rose, D., Efraim, D., Gervais, M.C., Joffe, H., Jovchelovitch, S., & Morant, N. (1995). Questioning Consensus in Social Representation Theory. Papers on Social Representations, 4(2), 150-176.

Rutland, A. (1998). Social Representations of Europe amongst 10-16 Years Old British Children. Papers on Social Representations, 7, 61-76.

Sen, R. & Wagner, W. (2005). History, Emotions, and Hetero-Referential Representations in Inter-Group Conflict: The Example of Hindu-Muslim Relations in India. Papers on Social Representations, 14, 2.1-2.23.

Sibley, C. G., Liu, J. H., & Kirkwood, S. (2006). Toward a Social Representations Theory of Attitude Change: the effect of Message Framing on General and Specific Attitudes toward Equality and Entitlement. New Zealand Journal of Social Psychology, 35, 3-13.

Sotirakopolou, K.P., & Breakwell, G.M. (1992). The Use of Different Methodological Approaches in the Study of Social Representations. Papers on Social Representations, 1, 29-38.

Spink, M.J.P. (1993). Qualitative Research on Social Representations: The Delightful World of Paradoxes. Papers on Social Representations, 2, 48-54.

Staerklé, C., Clemence, A., & Doise, W. (1998). Representations of Human Rights across Different National Contexts: the Role of Democratic and Non-Democratic Populations and Governments. European Journal of Social Psychology, 28, 207-226.

Stewart, I. & Lacassagne, M.F. (2005). Social Representations as a Diagnostic Tool for Identifying Cultural and Other Group Differences. Psychology and Marketing, 22(9), 721-738.

Wagner, W. (1993). Can Representations Explain Social Behavior? A Discussion of Social Representations as Rational Systems. Papers on Social Representations, 2, 236-249.

Wagner, W. (1995). Description, Explanation, and Method in Social Representations Research. Papers on Social Representations, 4, 156-176.

Wagner, W. (1995). Social Representations, Group Affiliation, and Projection: Knowing the Limits of Validity. European Journal of Social Psychology, 25, 125-139.

Wagner, W., Elejabarrieta, F., & Lahnsteiner, I. (1995). How the Sperm Dominates the Ovum: Objectification by Metaphor in the Social Representation of Conception. European Journal of Social Psychology, 25 (6), 671-688.

Wagner, W. & Hayes, N. (2005). Everyday Discourse and Common Sense: The Theory of Social Representations. Palgrave-Macmillan: New York.

Wahl, O.F. (1992). Mass Media Images of Mental Illness: A Review of the Literature. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 20, 343-352.

Witte, E.H. (1994). The Social Representation as a Consensual System and Correlation Analysis. Papers on Social Representations, 3, 47-51.

Zajonc, R. B. (2001) Mere Exposure: A Gateway to the Subliminal. <u>Current Directions in Psychological Science, 10 (6)</u>, 224–228.

Zeitlin, I. M. (1968). <u>Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory</u>. Prentice-Hall Inc.: New Jersey.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT

Sayın Katılımcı,

Bu araştırma Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Psikoloji Bölümü'nde Doç. Dr. Bengi Öner – Özkan'ın danışmanlığında sürdürülmekte olan "Avrupa Birliği'ne Yönelik Sosyal Temsiller" konulu yüksek lisans tezi çalışması kapsamında uygulanmaktadır. Soruların yanıtlanması yaklaşık 25–30 dakika sürmekte olup, ankette herhangi bir şekilde isminiz sorulmamakta ve kimliğinizi ortaya çıkarabilecek herhangi bir soru yer almamaktadır. Ankette vereceğiniz bilgiler tamamen gizli kalacak ve yalnızca adı geçen yüksek lisans tezi kapsamında değerlendirilecek; başka bir çalışmada kullanılmayacaktır.

Araştırmanın objektif olması ve elde edilecek sonuçların güvenirliği açısından tüm soruların dikkatlice okunarak eksiksiz biçimde yanıtlanması önemlidir.

Ankete katılım gönüllülük esası dâhilinde olduğundan, cevaplamak istemediğiniz soruları atlayabilir veya anketi doldurmayı bırakabilirsiniz.
Katılımınız için teşekkür ederiz.

Elif SANDAL ÖNAL
ODTÜ Psikoloji Bölümü Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi
Yazışma Adresi: elifsandal@gmail.com

APPENDIX B

1. YAŞINIZ: _____

2. CİNSİYETİNİZ:

__ Kadın __ Erkek

3. EĞİTİM DÜZEYİNİZ:

1) Okuryazar Değil	**5)** Lise
2) Okuryazar (Bir okul bitirmemiş)	**6)** Üniversite
3) İlkokul	**7)** Yüksek Lisans
4) İlköğretim veya Ortaokul	**8)** Doktora

4. AİLENİZİN GELİR DÜZEYİ (Aylık Ortalama Gelir Aralığı):

1) 0-1000 YTL   **2)** 1001-2000 YTL   **3)** 2001-3000 YTL

4) 3001-4000 YTL   **5)** 4000 YTL ve üzeri

5. OKUL VE BÖLÜMÜNÜZ: _____

_____

6. YAŞAMINIZIN ÇOĞUNUN GEÇTİĞİ YER:

1) Köy   **2)** Kasaba   **3)** Şehir   **4)** Metropol

7. ANNENİZİN EĞİTİM DÜZEYİ:

1) Okuryazar Değil	**5)** Lise
2) Okuryazar (Bir okul bitirmemiş)	**6)** Üniversite
3) İlkokul	**7)** Yüksek Lisans
4) İlköğretim veya Ortaokul	**8)** Doktora

8. BABANIZIN EĞİTİM DÜZEYİ:

1) Okuryazar Değil

2) Okuryazar (Bir okul bitirmemiş)

3) İlkokul

4) İlköğretim veya Ortaokul

5) Lise

6) Üniversite

7) Yüksek Lisans

8) Doktora

9. EN SIK KULLANDIĞINIZ HABER KAYNAĞI

1) Gazete   **2)** Televizyon   **3)** Internet   **4)** Diğer (Arkadaş, aile, vb)

10. GAZETE OKUMA SIKLIĞINIZ

1) Hiç   **2)** Ara sıra   **3)** Haftada bir   **4)** Haftada birkaç kez   **5)** Her gün

11. DÜZENLİ OLARAK OKUDUĞUNUZ GAZETE HANGİSİDİR?

1) Hürriyet **2)** Milliyet **3)** Zaman **4)** Cumhuriyet **5)** Yeni Şafak **6)** Radikal

7) Vakit **8)** Vatan **9)** Sabah **10)** Akşam **11)** Posta **12)** Star **13)** Türkiye

14) Diğer (Lütfen Belirtiniz) …………………

12. SİYASİ GÖRÜŞÜNÜZ

1) Radikal sol **2)** Sol **3)** Sola yakın **4)** Orta **5)** Sağa yakın **6)** Sağ **7)** Radikal sağ

POLITICAL AGENDA AND EXPECTATIONS SCALE (PAES)

Lütfen her bir ifade ile ne derece hemfikir olduğunuzu, verilen ölçekteki sayılardan uygun olanını ifadenin yanına yazarak belirtiniz.

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Hiç	Katılmıyorum	Fikrim Yok	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle
Katılmıyorum				Katılıyorum

__ 1) Genel olarak hayatımdan memnunum.

__ 2) Önümüzdeki 10 yıl içerisinde hayatımın **olumlu** yönde değişeceğine inanıyorum

__ 3) Şu an itibarı ile Türkiye'nin en önemli gündeminin **dış politika** olduğunu düşünüyorum.

__ 4) Önümüzdeki 10 yıl içerisinde Türkiye'nin en önemli gündeminin **Avrupa Birliği üyeliği** olacağını düşünüyorum.

__ 5) Şu an itibarı ile Türkiye'nin en önemli gündeminin **terör** olduğunu düşünüyorum.

__6) Son günlerde hayatımdan memnun değilim.

__7) Önümüzdeki 10 yıl içerisinde Türkiye'nin genel durumunun daha iyi olacağına inanıyorum.

__ 8) Şu an itibarı ile Türkiye'nin en önemli gündeminin **ekonomi** olduğunu düşünüyorum.

__ 9) Önümüzdeki 10 yıl içerisinde Türkiye'nin en önemli gündeminin **terör** olacağını düşünüyorum.

__ 10) Şu an itibarı ile Türkiye'nin genel durumundan memnunum.

__ 11) Önümüzdeki 10 yıl içerisinde Türkiye'nin genel durumunun daha kötü olacağına inanıyorum.

__ 12) Önümüzdeki 10 yıl içerisinde hayatımın **olumsuz** yönde değişeceğine inanıyorum.

__ 13) Önümüzdeki 10 yıl içerisinde Türkiye'nin en önemli gündeminin **ekonomi** olacağını düşünüyorum.

APPENDIX D

INDIVIDUALS AND EU SCALE (IEUS)

Lütfen her bir ifade ile ne derece hemfikir olduğunuzu, verilen ölçekteki sayılardan uygun olanını ifadenin yanına yazarak belirtiniz.

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Hiç Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Fikrim Yok	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

__ 1) Avrupa Birliği bana umut veriyor.

__ 2) Avrupa Birliği'nin tehlikeli olduğunu düşünüyorum.

__ 3) Avrupa Birliği'nin, Türkiye'nin görüşlerini dikkate **almadığını** düşünüyorum.

__ 4) Avrupa Birliği'ne güveniyorum.

__ 5) Avrupa Birliği bende umutsuzluk duygusu uyandırıyor.

__ 6) Avrupa Birliği'nin Türkiye'yi önemsediğini düşünüyorum.

__ 7) Türkiye'nin üyeliğinin Avrupa Birliği açısından **olumlu** olacağına inanıyorum.

__ 8) Kendimi Avrupalı olarak görüyorum.

__ 9) Türkiye'nin üyeliğinin Avrupa Birliği açısından **olumsuz** olacağına inanıyorum.

__ 10) Avrupa Birliği'nin Türkiye için bir tehdit olduğunu düşünüyorum.

__ 11) Kendimi yalnızca Türk vatandaşı olarak görüyorum.

SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS OF EU SCALE (SREUS)

Lütfen her bir ifade ile ne derece hemfikir olduğunuzu, verilen ölçekteki sayılardan uygun olanını ifadenin yanına yazarak belirtiniz.

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Hiç Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Fikrim Yok	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

__ 1) Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği üyeliğini destekliyorum.

__ 2) Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği üyeliğini avantajlı olarak görüyorum.

__ 3) Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği'ne tam üye olabileceğine inanıyorum.

__ 4) Avrupa Birliği'nin Türkiye'yi oyaladığına inanıyorum.

__ 5) Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği üyeliğine ihtiyacı yoktur.

__ 6) Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği'ne hiçbir zaman üye olamayacağını düşünüyorum.

__ 7) Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği üyeliğini desteklemiyorum.

__ 8) Türkiye'nin "çağdaş medeniyet olma" hedefi, AB'ye tam üyelikle gerçekleşecektir.

__ 9) Türkiye Avrupa Birliği yerine Doğu'da bir birliğe yönelmelidir.

__ 10) Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği'ne sınırlı üye olabileceğine inanıyorum.

__ 11) Avrupa Birliği üyeliğinin Türkiye açısından dezavantajlı olacağına inanıyorum.

__ 12) Türkiye'nin AB üyeliğini, müzakere sürecinin başından beri desteklemiyorum.

__ 13) Türkiye'nin AB üyeliği önündeki en büyük engelin din olduğunu düşünüyorum.

__ 14) Türkiye'nin AB üyeliğinin insan hakları konusunda avantaj sağlayacağına inanıyorum.

__ 15) Avrupa Birliği bir Hıristiyan topluluğudur.

__ 16) Avrupa Birliği'nin yakın zamanda ortadan kalkacağını düşünüyorum.

__ 17) Ekonomik gelişimin sağlanması için Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği üyeliği gereklidir.

__ 18) Müslüman Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği'nde yeri yoktur.

__ 19) Türkiye'nin AB üyeliği önündeki en büyük engelin kültürel farklılıklar olduğunu düşünüyorum.

__ 20) AB üyeliğinin sosyal yaşamda pek çok standardın gelmesini sağlayacağını düşünüyorum.

__ 21) Türkiye'nin AB üyeliği, ülkeyi ekonomik olarak dışa bağımlı hale getirecektir.

__ 22) AB üyeliği kültürel yozlaşmaya neden olacaktır.

__ 23) AB Türkiye'nin üyeliğini zora sokmak için gerçekleştirilmesi imkânsız isteklerde

bulunmaktadır.

__ 24) AB üyeliği eğitim alanında gelişim sağlayacaktır.

__ 25) Türkiye'nin AB üyeliği, ülke içindeki etnik grupların ayrılma isteğini artıracaktır.