DISCUSSING THE NEW AUDIENCE IN TURKEY IN THE EXAMPLE OF UNIVERSITY YOUTH: AN AREA STUDY

Assoc. Prof. Dr. ADEM YILMAZ
Atatürk University, Turkey
adem@atauni.edu.tr

Abstract: Change of point of view related to visual quality has made explicit the intervention and participation of the audience towards technological developments and cultural structures revealed by the change in technology. The new audience has become an identity which sends limited messages to a homogenous audience in temporal terms, gives feedbacks to TV channels, beyond the individual displaying an active cognition towards the message; transforming his targets of previous periods due to numerous messages and resources into the power of interpretation, choosing his own messages, pointing out the subjectivities between the sender and the receiver by separating from the whole. For that reason, in this study, by looking through the perspective of the audience answers have been looked for about how they received broadcast contents of a new generation born into a commercial and thematic broadcasting especially after 1990, around which contents they contrite on, from which aspects they differentiate from the traditional audience. The questionnaire which has been prepared within the scope of an area study towards the crowd called "New Audience" has been applied and their tendencies have been pointed out.
Keywords: Television, New Media, New Audience

INTRODUCTION

When we define the concept of communication as the individuals who would like to get into an interpersonal relationship, and as an integrated expression of their cultures and the situation that they are in; it has been seen that the dominant one in ways of communication is mass media, the dominant one in manners of communication is target-oriented approach. The fact that it is visual quality which gains today's communication paradigm a socio-cultural quality results in a transformation of symbols, products and individuals into a mediated message. In today's world, where consumption has become visual and symbolic, the position of media against power and authority has been presented as an undeniable fact. However, contrary to that assumption, politicians have been using media to manipulate public opinion, business world encourages the use of media as a way of marketing and purchasing through advertisements and social power actors try to activate media as an element which makes free time seem ideological and colonizer. Beyond all these, media, with its attributed characteristic called the 'forth power', expresses that it inspects authority groups and plays a balancer role between the powers for the sake of public opinion and civil society. But today, being under the domination of visual quality the manner of media that is presenting the audience and being put into the social relations functions for the benefit of dominant relations.

The fact that individuals establish the objective conditions of social environment they live in with their own acts and in return their orientation with the determination of their behaviours and opinions by those structures they established in the level of practical consciousness are important with regards to making sense of the new audience coming with the visual quality. Developments in communication technologies enable new flows and access opportunities besides traditional one-way information transmission, and it subjectifies the content by coalescing with sense-making. (Livingstone, 2005:17)

Traditionally, although media has been considered one of individual's socialization means throughout almost the entire twentieth century, in today's world, new communication technologies have been read as a part of individualism and subjective psychology. This has been the first discussion point that established the concept of the new audience: the audience, by getting free of objectivity in respect to socio-psychological aspect, has stepped in a process

of becoming an actor which has been put into a specific position. In Morley's terms "the notion of mass culture in the shape of audience who passively consumes belongs to the past". In addition, audience ethnography-reception studies has come out as a stance against not only Durkheimian concept of system which is internally self-sufficient and the expression of collectivized individuals emerging from cultural values, but also the structuralist approach which assumes that the meanings of the texts are within those texts. Reception studies often emphasize that the issues such as semantic discussions and shifts have nothing to do with the absolute social groups, and that they occur according to different context and situations. Beyond all these, that which text or which part of the text the audience encounters on TV and chooses to be interested in, and they create their own meaning sets by this way have become prominent in the discussions of new audience.

DISCUSSING THE NEW AUDIENCE IN TURKEY IN THE EXAMPLE OF UNIVERSITY YOUTH

Beyond all the interpretations that define physical and spiritual conditions, university youth which we can define as the natural extension of industrialization process has appeared in the last century as a new social category with the result of urbanization, educational reforms and cultural developments. In pre-industrial societies, children, teenagers and adults were living in the place, carrying out similar activities and duties in daily life and the teenagers were like miniature versions of adults in the society. As a result of industrialization and urbanization processes, activity and behaviour spaces of teenagers and adults started to become separate. This transitional process which has been defined as a threshold between childhood and adulthood can progress slowly or fast according to existent social and economic conditions (Neyzi, 2004). For example, it is known that city-dwellers and educated class experience a longer period of youth; in relatively poor and countryside areas transition from childhood to adulthood is shorter in Turkey.

According to modernization sociology, youth is a process in which the individual prepares for his/her future adult life and tries to connect with extensive socio-cultural structure and set of values. The role of academic education in individual's foundation of connection with his society is an indisputable fact. University education will, on the one hand, prepare young individuals for professional life by educating them about the subjects that the society needs, on the other hand, it will become a source for mental transaction –and social transformation- by creating an appropriate discussion platform for social development. The society young people are living in is sensitive to these necessities related to constructing youth politics and family's behaviours in daily life, equally, young people's fulfilling their developmental duties becomes easy. (Atikkan ve Tunç, 2011; Onat, 2010; Toruk, 2008) The approach of modernism towards the youth –especially young people at university- as an autonomous period puts young people in a process of having their own culture. This, in a sense, has come out of the necessity that young people would like to express themselves; because youth is a period when the necessity of identity achievement is intense. The fact that young people are intentionally kept apart from society's production and decision-making process in this same period made it inevitable for them to construct protest sub-culture groups which are reorganized outside of youth's dominant cultural taboos (Ercins, 2009). The practice which directs the youth transformed into sub-culture groups and is efficient upon their behaviours is university education. In Europe and United States, especially after the World War II, that university education became available for every segment of society enabled the break of discussion taboos and helped people coming from different economic, social and political ranges construct a common meta-structure. Since the second half of the 1960s, youth culture has been shaped rather around the cultural movements against the dominant political actors. During the period after 1980, youth made a claim to global

discussions such as postmodernism, feminism and eco-criticism, and started to adopt a new strategy which carried their own stance and agency from the streets to the electronic communication channels. From the point of view of twenty-first century's youth, having high qualities of communication technologies and using media is as important as –maybe more important than- participating in academic education processes.

AREA STUDY: FINDINGS AND EVALUATION

Within the scope of the carried out area study, that research population is too big to measuring the statistics caused pursuing non-parametrical measures rather than parametrical scaling. The fact that the research design has been built upon the assumption that is "the main population of the new audience is the university youth" made it obligatory to include only those young people who are still continuing their university education. Participation of formal education students who are continuing their 4-year under-graduate programs in the area study which was assumed to be directing the new audience group has been grounded on; students of associate degree programs, open university education and different distance education programs were not included in the sample. Accepting the fact that the level of homogeneity is high in the topics of university youth's watching habits and the way they use media, it has been calculated that in order to have a 95% of validity level (research population) among 4 million respondents in 5% of confidence interval, the sample should include 384 subjects. (NCS Pearson, 2013) As 563 volunteer students of undergraduate programs from different cities have been included in the study sample between 24 January and 12 March, (simple coincidental sample) sample validity in terms of statistics has been exceedingly achieved. The descriptive characteristic of the area study requires to be designed as a survey search (survey based on quantitative measurement) and university youth's watching habits to be executed through the prepared questionnaires. (TÜİK, 2013)

All 563 participant students of the area study are university students, 340 of them are male (60.4%), 223 of them are female (39.6%). Average of age is 21.3, subjects range between 18 and 35. 7 participants are 18 (1.3%), 72 of them are 19 (13.2%), 141 of them are 20 (25.8%), 102 of them are 21 (18.6%), 98 of them are 22 (17.9%), 62 of them are 23 (11.3%), 34 of them are 24 (6.2%), 19 of them are 25 (3.5%), 4 of them are 26 (0.7%), 3 of them are 27 (0.5%), 2 of them are 29 (0.4%), 1 of them is 30 (0.2%),1 of them is 34 (0.2%), 1 of them is 35 (0.2%) and 16 of them did not answer the question. Looking at the marital status of the participants, 561 of them said they are single and 2 of them said they are married. All the participants stated their profession as 'student'.

Within the scope of the area study, university students have been asked about how many hours on an average they watch TV per day; 531 students answered this question. The period of time university students watch television programs is 2 hours 47 minutes on an average per day. Similarly, they have been asked about when they most often watch TV during the day; 58.72 of 547 students who answered this question stated that they watch TV between 21.00 and 24.00 which is also called 'the prime time'. The average time of participants' watching TV is seen in Table 1, the period of time they mostly watch V during the day is seen in Table 2.

Table 1. Daily Average TV Time Tracking of Research Group (N=56)

Daily Average TV Time Tracking	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)	Daily Average TV Time Tracking (Hour)	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)
1 hour	142	26.7	6 hour	15	2.8
2 hour	117	22.0	7 hour	5	0.9
3 hour	107	20.2	8 hour	4	0.8
4 hour	95	17.9	10 hour	1	0.2
5 hour	43	8.1	12 hour	2	0.4

Table 2. The Most Frequently Watching TV Time Period of Research Group in Day (N=563)

The Most Watching TV Hours	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)	The Most Watching TV Hours	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)
06:00-09:00	8	1.5	18:00-21:00	127	23.2
09:00-12:00	25	4.6	21:00-24:00	321	58.7
12:00-15:00	23	4.2	00:00-03:00	23	4.2
15:00-18:00	18	3.3	03:00-06:00	2	0.4

While 24.7 % of the area study participating of university students said they regularly follow TV programs (139 participant), 75.3 % of student (424 participant) stated that they couldn't follow regular programs. 559 of students had responded tı questions most preferred kind of TV programs, the preferring to programs are shown distributions frequency in table 3.

Table 3. Most Preferred Type of Program TV of Research Group (N=563)

Program Type	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)	Program Type	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)
News programs	204	36.5	Competition programs	21	3.8
Spor programs	101	18.1	Open Session	11	2.0
Series	98	17.5	Art and Culture Programs	9	1.6
Movies	45	8.1	Magazine programs	6	1.1
Music programs	35	6.1	Reality Show	4	0.7
Entertainment programs	25	4.5	Total	559	100.0

Field research within the scope of university students whether you watching television alone with other people? directed question, 559 students (99.3 participant) in graded scale are shown given their responses distribution in table 4.

Table 4. Watching Experience of Television Programs (N=563)

Statement	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)
Always alone	**23**	**4.1**
Most of the time alone	**93**	**16.6**
Sometimes alone sometimes with others	**318**	**56.9**
Most of the time along with other people	**114**	**20.4**
Always along with other people	**11**	**2.0**
Total	**559**	**100.0**

Research group directed who determines preferences for television programs at home? To question responded 511 university students (%90.8).

Table 5.The Preferences of Television Programs Regarding Makers(N=563)

Statement	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)
I define myself	346	67.7
My parents define	95	18.6
My friends define	41	8.0
My siblings define	27	5.3
My partner define	1	0.2
My children define	1	0.2
Total	559	100.0

556' s of university students the scope of research expressed the view *"There are a place indispensable in our live" related to* judgment. The frequency distribution of the opinion the study group are shown in table 6.

Table 6. Place in Daily Life of Television (N=563)

Judgment	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent(%)
Strongly agree	**39**	**7.0**
Agree	**135**	**24.3**
Undecided	**75**	**13.5**
Disagree	**198**	**35.6**
Strongly disagree	**109**	**19.6**
Total	**556**	**100.0**

Table 7. Contribution of Personality Development to Television Programs (N=563)

Judgement	Frequency(Frekans)	Percent (%)
Strongly agree	**15**	**2.7**
Agree	**184**	**33.1**
Undecided	**113**	**20.3**
Disagree	**156**	**28.1**
Strongly disagree	**88**	**15.8**
Total	**556**	**100.0**

556's of university students in research group stated view *"I watch on television mobilization my desire to be like characters of television programs"* related to judgment. The frequency distribution of the opinion the study group are shown in table 8.

Table 8. The Role of Transfer Character Television Programs (N=563)

Judgement	Frequency(Frekans)	Percent (%)
Strongly agree	17	3.1
Agree	117	21.0
Undecided	60	10.8
Disagree	219	39.4
Strongly disagree	143	25.7
Total	556	100.0

557's of university students in research group stated view " *Television programs help to me determing my lifestyle*" related to judgment. The frequency distribution of the opinion the study group are shown in table 9.

Table 9. The Effect on Lifestyle of Television Programs (N=563)

Judgement	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent(%)
Strongly agree	7	1.3
Agree	145	26.0
Undecided	93	16.7
Disagree	217	38.9
Strongly disagree	95	17.1
Total	557	100.0

Table 10. The Impact of Preferences on Eating and Drinking Television Programs (N=563)

Judgement	Frequency(Frekans)	Percent(%)
Strongly agree	7	1.3
Agree	170	30.5
Undecided	56	10.1
Disagree	204	36.6
Strongly disagree	120	21.5
Total	557	100.0

Table 11. The ımpact on Dressing Preferences of Television Programs (N=563)

Judgement	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent(%)
Strongly agree	**14**	**2.5**
Agree	**230**	**41.3**
Undecided	**52**	**9.3**
Disagree	**171**	**30.7**
Strongly disagree	**90**	**16.2**
Total	**557**	**100.0**

Table 12. The Impact on Emotional Relief of Television Programs(N=563)

Judgement	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent(%)
Strongly agree	**24**	**4.3**
Agree	**187**	**33.6**
Undecided	**91**	**16.4**
Disagree	**166**	**29.9**
Strongly disagree	**88**	**15.8**
Total	**556**	**100.0**

556's of university students in research group stated view "*I watch television to increase level of education and knowledge* " related to judgment. The frequency distribution of the opinion of the study group are shown in table 13.

Table 13. The role of Individual Happiness of Television (N=563)

Judgement	Frequency(Frekans)	Percent(%)
Strongly agree	26	4.6
Agree	110	19.7
Undecided	114	20.5
Disagree	173	31.1
Strongly disagree	134	24.1
Total	557	100.0

Table 14. The Role on Individuals Psychological Distress and Contribution Leusire Time to Case Television(N=563)

Judgement	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)
Strongly agree	119	21.4
Agree	294	52.7
Undecided	34	6.1
Disagree	55	9.9
Strongly disagree	55	9.9
Total	557	100.0

Table 15. The Role of Education and Knowledge Level of Television Programs (N=563)

Judgement	Sıklık (Frekans)	Yüzde (%)
Strongly agree	32	5.8
Agree	220	39.6
Undecided	72	12.9
Disagree	143	25.7
Strongly disagree	89	16.0
Total	556	100.0

557's of university students in research group stated view "*I watch television to learn about the facts* related to judgement. The frequency distribution of the opinion of the study group are shown in table 16.

Table 16. The Role Access Fact of Television(N=563)

Judgement	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)
Strongly agree	32	5.7
Agree	234	42.0
Undecided	77	13.9
Disagree	128	23.0
Strongly disagree	86	15.4
Total	557	100.0

540's of university students in research group stated view shaped expressed and as open end by categorized " _____ *Television programs effect my preferences regarding to choose*". The frequency distribution of the opinion of the study group are shown in table 17.

Table 17. The Role of Social Statute on preferences Television Programs Open End Data(N=563)

Category	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)
Nobody Effect My Preferences	212	39.3
Publicity And Advertisement	61	11.3
My Social Environment	56	10.4
The Subject Experts	56	10.4
My Friends	42	7.8
My Parents	42	7.8
My Siblings	18	3.3
Famous People	16	3.0
Rating Rates	15	2.8
My Partner/My Darling	12	2.2
Other People	8	1.5
My Children	2	0.4
Total	554	100.0

Table 18.The Role of Social Statute on Preferences Television Programs (N=563)

Judgement	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)
It always effect	30	5.4
It frequently effect	150	27.1
It sometimes effect It doesn't' t sometimes effect	172	31.0
It doesn't' t always effect	105	19.0
It never effect	97	17.5
Total	554	100.0

555's of university students in research group stated view "*My past experiences effect my preferences regarding to television programs*" related to judgement. The frequency distribution of the opinion of the study group are shown in table 19

Table 19. The Role of Past Experiences on Preferences Television Programs(N=563)

Judgement	Frequency(Frekans)	Percent (%)
It always effect	24	4.3
It frequently effect	152	27.4
It sometimes effect It doesn't' t sometimes effect	220	39.6
It doesn't' t always effect	78	14.1
It never effect	81	14.6
Total	555	100.0

554's of university students in research group stated view "*Television Programs have a content of make gender based discrimination*" related to judgement. The frequency distribution of the opinion of the study group are shown in table 20.

Table 20. The Level of Gender Apartheid in Television Programs(N=563)

Judgement	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)
Strongly agree	79	14.3
Agree	137	24.7
Undecided	134	24.2
Disagree	167	30.1
Strongly disagree	37	6.7
Total	554	100.0

556's of university students in research group stated view related to judgement. "*Television Programs have a content directing violence of society*" The frequency distribution of the opinion of the study group are shown in table 21.

Table 21. The Impacts Router of Violence Television Programs(N=563)

Judgement	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)
Strongly agree	108	19.4
Agree	263	47.3
Undecided	101	18.2
Disagree	76	13.7
Strongly disagree	8	1.4
Total	554	100.0

556's of university students in research group stated view related to judgement "*Television Programs have a content cause of destroy the family structure*". The frequency distribution of the opinion of the study group are shown in table 22.

Table 22. The Negative Effect to Family Structure of Television Programs (N=563)

Judgement	Frequency(Frekans)	Percent (%)
Strongly agree	138	24.9
Agree	232	41.9
Undecided	121	21.8
Disagree	61	11.0
Strongly disagree	2	0.4
Total	554	100.0

554's of university students in research group stated view related to judgement "Television programs have a negatively content affecting moral development of children". The frequency distribution of the opinion of the study group are shown in table 23.

Table 23. The Negative Effects on Moral Development Children of Television Programs

Judgement	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)
Strongly agree	152	27.4
Agree	302	54.5
Undecided	58	10.5
Disagree	32	5.8
Strongly disagree	10	1.8
Total	554	100.0

554's of university students in research group stated view related to judgement "*I use social media to get rid of daily life from stress*". The frequency distribution of the opinion of the study group are shown in table 24.

Table 24. The Effect Repellant from Stress of Social Media (N=563)

Judgement	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)
Strongly agree	61	11.0
Agree	300	54.2
Undecided	73	13.2
Disagree	87	15.6
Strongly disagree	33	6.0
Total	554	100.0

554's of university students in research group stated view related to judgement "*I think that wasted my time on social media*. The frequency distribution of the opinion of the study group are shown in table 25.

Table 25. The Effect Time Consuming of Social Media (N=563)

Judgement	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)
Strongly agree	54	9.7
Agree	189	34.1
Undecided	151	27.3
Disagree	107	19.3
Strongly disagree	53	9.6
Total	554	100.0

548's of university students in research group stated view related to judgement "*I prefer that more access to television contents from social media*". The frequency distribution of the opinion of the study group are shown in table 26.

Table 26. The Access from Social Media to Television Media (N=563)

Judgement	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)
Strongly agree	48	8.8
Agree	202	36.9
Undecided	132	24.1
Disagree	134	24.4
Strongly disagree	32	5.8
Total	548	100.0

552's of university students in research group stated view related to judgement "*I think that easier participant and comment of contents in social media*". The frequency distribution of the opinion of the study group are shown in table 27.

Table 27. The Interpretation and Participation from Social Media to Television Content (N=563)

Judgement	Frequency (Frekans)	Percent (%)
Strongly agree	93	16.8
Agree	308	55.8
Undecided	104	18.8
Disagree	33	6.1
Strongly disagree	14	2.5
Total	552	100.0

CONCLUSION

Although media has been considered one of individual's means of socialization almost throughout the whole twentieth century, in today's world new communication technologies have been read as parts of individualism and subjective psychology. This has been the first discussion point that shaped the concept of new audience: the audience, by getting free of objectivity in respect to socio-psychological aspect, has stepped in a process of becoming an actor which has been put into a specific position. In Morley's terms "the notion of mass culture in the shape of audience who passively consumes belongs to the past". In addition, audience ethnography-reception studies has come out as a stance against not only Durkheimian concept of system which is internally self-sufficient and the expression of collectivized individuals emerging from cultural values, but also the structuralist approach which assumes that the meanings of the texts are within those texts. Reception studies often emphasize that the issues such as semantic discussions and shifts have nothing to do with the absolute social groups, and that they occur according to different context and situations. Beyond all these, that which text or which part of the text the audience encounters on TV and chooses to be interested in, and they create their own meaning sets by this way have become prominent in the discussions of new audience. (Morley, 1986, 161-163)

Within the scope of this study, the university students who we define as the "new audience":

Change of point of view related to visual quality has made explicit the intervention and participation of the audience towards technological developments and cultural structures revealed by the change in technology. (Mullan,1997. 34) The new audience has become an identity which sends limited messages to a homogenous audience in temporal terms, gives feedbacks to TV channels, beyond the individual displaying an active cognition towards the message; transforming his targets of previous periods due to numerous messages and resources into the power of interpretation, choosing his own messages, pointing out the subjectivities between the sender and the receiver by separating from the whole. The audience has melted the differences and individuality in the pot of technological developments and tries to perceive and interpret the content which coalesces with the flow. While technological developments reveal new relationalities in which the audience uses media as both channel and environment, this situation brings out new expansions in the mind of the audience. Individuals become active to the extent that the media allows for their opinions and refers to the truths of their own. The individual as an audience builds and reprocesses media messages not only by him but also "with the others".

Advertisers (and advertisement agencies with advertisement industry consisting advertisement designers) who make social relations directed and reproduced with visual-audial images in the formation of the new audience, media companies that provide the settlement and operability of broadcasting system, institutions like Radio and Television

Supreme Council (RTSC) that make the system sustainable, and audience measurement institutions like AGB which has been defined as the supporter of validity and reliability in broadcasting have a dominant position. The relations between these corporate structures and the relation between each structure and the audience require the questioning of the assumption of audience preference subjectivity.

REFERENCES

Atikkan, Z. ve Tunç, A. (2011). *Blogdan Al Haberi*. İstanbul: YKY.

Ercins, G. (2009). "Türkiye'de Popüler Kültür Görünümleri ve Gençliğe Yansımaları". VI. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi'nde Sunulan Bildiri. 1-3 Ekim 2009 Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi. http://www.sosyolojidernegi.org.tr/kutuphane/icerik/ercins_gulay.pdfErişim Tarihi=02.11.2012].

Morley, D. (1986). *Family Television: Cultural Power and Domestic Leisure*. London: Comedia Pub.

Mullan, B. (1997). *Consuming Television*. NY: Willey Blackwell.

NCS Pearson (2013). 'Sample Size and Confidence Interval Calculator' http://www.reedpetersen.com/portfolio/pe/ ncspearson-2/research-notes/sample-calc.htm

Neyzi, L. (2004). *'Ben Kimim?' Türkiye'de Sözlü Tarih, Kimlik ve Öznellik*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Livingstone, S. (2005). *Audiences and Publics: When Cultural Engagement Matters for the Public Sphere*, Bristol: Intellect Books.

Onat, F. (2010). "Bir Halkla İlişkiler Uygulama Alanı Olarak Sosyal Medya Kullanımı: Sivil Toplum Örgütleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme". *İletişim Kuram ve Araştırma Dergisi*. 2010/31. s.103-121.

Toruk, İ. (2008). "Üniversite Gençliğinin Medya Kullanma Alışkanlıkları Üzerine Bir Analiz". *Selçuk Üniversite Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*. 2008/1. s. 475-488.

TÜİK (2013). 'Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu Eğitim İstatistikleri'. http://www.tuik.gov.tr/ PreTablo.do?alt_id=1018. [Erişim Tarihi=10.02.2013].