



# Media, New Communication Technologies and Social Violence

**EDITORS**

**Can Bilgili**

**Arif Yıldırım**

**Richard Vickers**

**GUEST EDITORS**

**Georgeta Drulă**

**Will Straw**



**Journal of Media Critiques**  
Vol.1 No.2 December 2015

**EDITORS**

CAN BİLGİLİ  
ARİF YILDIRIM  
RICHARD VICKERS

**GUEST EDITORS**

GEORGETA DRULĂ  
WILL STRAW

**P-ISSN: 2056-9785**

**E-ISSN: 2056 9793**

© Journal of Media Critiques, December2015

doi: 10.17349/jmc115300

Vol.1 No.2 December 2015

Journal of Media Critiques

[www.mediacritiques.net](http://www.mediacritiques.net)

email: [jmc@mediacritiques.net](mailto:jmc@mediacritiques.net)

### **Editors**

Can Bilgili

Arif Yıldırım

Richard Vickers



## **EDITORS**

**PROF. DR. CAN BİLGİLİ** is an academician, researcher and founder WEC (World Experience Campus). He was born in 1968 in Izmir. Bilgili completed his B.A. at Istanbul University, Department of Journalism and PR, his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees at Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Journalism at the same university. He worked as faculty member of the Faculty of Communication at Istanbul University, (1991-1994), at Galatasaray University (1994-2008), at Yeditepe University (2008-2012) and Istanbul Commerce University (2012-2015) he also undertook administrative duties. Bilgili, who prepared many sectorial reports in the field of advertising, radio and television in Turkey, still gives communication consultancy services to various public and private institutions. He is the author of the book "Görsel İletişim ve Grafik Tasarım" (Visual Communication and Graphic Design) and editor of the book series "Medya Eleştirileri" (Media Critiques). He has several works and gives lectures on media management and organization, media industry, media economy, media ethics, marketing communication, competition strategies, health communication.

**ASST.PROF. ARİF YILDIRIM**, is an Assistant Professor, working as Head of the Departments of Cinema-TV, Namik Kemal University, Tekirdağ, Turkey holding a PhD in Informatics with the thesis subject as "Data Security Approach in Information Technology and Cryptography: DNA Algorithm". Yildirim established a faculty, two undergraduate departments, and one graduate department. Additionally worked as Vice Director of Institute of Social Sciences and the editor-in-chief of Journal of Social Sciences in Gaziantep University. He is founder Editor-in-Chief of Journal of Cyber Security, Privacy and eCrime ([www.jcspe.org](http://www.jcspe.org)). Dr.Yildirim teaches lectures as "Neurohacking with Social Media", "Social Media Journalism and Hacktivism", "Activism, Digital Activism and Hacktivism" and "Community Media and ICTs for Development and Social Transformation". His research focuses on social media, cryptography with genetics, neurohacking with social media, marketing, activism, digital activism, hacktivism, civil disobedience, privacy, P2P, online behavior and identity.

**RICHARD VICKERS**, is the Deputy Head of the Lincoln School of Film and Media at the University of Lincoln in the United Kingdom. He is an experienced digital media producer having undertaken leadership of complex projects, working with diverse multi-disciplinary teams, and has industry experience as a producer and consultant developing interactive projects for businesses and arts organizations, from concept through to launch and beyond. Richards's research has two main focuses; the first is at the intersection of media and

technology, focusing on the area of networked convergent/emerging media, exploring the creative opportunities and societal/cultural impact. The second focus of his research is that of exploring and utilizing digital technologies for innovations in learning. He is currently working on a number of projects that aim to develop more open, interdisciplinary and collaborative pedagogical frameworks. Much of this work is undertaken collaboratively between Richard and the co\_LAB team at LSFM, as well as a network of national and international partners.

## **ADVISORY BOARD of JMC**

Prof.Dr. Angeles Moreno, University Rey Juan Carlos, Spain  
Prof.Dr. Bernard D. Frischer, Department of Informatics, Indiana University, USA  
Prof.Dr. David J. Gunkel, Northern Illinois University, USA  
Prof.Dr. Erik Malcolm Champion, Curtin University, Australia  
Prof.Dr. Frank E Parcells, Austin Peay State University, USA  
Prof.Dr. John Chetro-Szivos, Fitchburg State University, USA  
Prof.Dr. Lars Rademacher, h\_da Darmstadt University of Applied Sciences, Germany  
Prof.Dr. Lutz M. Hagen, Technische Universität Dresden, Germany  
Prof.Dr. Mike Friedrichsen, Stuttgart Media University, Germany  
Prof.Dr. Noha Mellor, University of Bedfordshire, UK, United Kingdom  
Prof.Dr. Paaige Kelle Turner, Webster University, USA  
Prof.Dr. Toby Miller, Cardiff Univeristy, United Kingdom  
Prof.Dr. Urs Dahinden, University of Applied Sciences Chur, Switzerland  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Anthony Moretti, Robert Morris University, USA  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Charlton Mcllwain, New York University., USA  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Geri Alunit Zeldes, Michigan State University, USA  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Gordon Calleja, University of Malta ITU Copenhagen, Malta  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Judith Simon, IT University Copenhagen & University of Vienna, Austria  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Stephanie Ricker Schulte, University of Arkansas, USA  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Victoria Panova, MGIMO-University, Russian Federation  
Asst.Prof.Dr. David Harris Smith, McMaster University, Canada  
Asst.Prof.Dr. Erin Schauster, Bradley University, USA  
Asst.Prof.Dr. Lauren Jaclyn DeCarvalho, University of Arkansas, USA  
Asst.Prof.Dr. Rick Sheridan, Wilberforce University, USA  
Asst.Prof.Dr. Robert Mckeever, University of South Carolina, USA  
Asst.Prof.Dr. Ryan Rogers, Marist College, USA  
Dr. Margarita Kefalaki, Open University of Greece, Greece  
Dr. Panayiota Tsatsou, University of Leicester, United Kingdom

## **SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE (REFEREES) of JMC**

Prof.Dr. Angeles Moreno, University Rey Juan Carlos, Spain  
Prof.Dr. Bernard D. Frischer, Department of Informatics, Indiana University, USA  
Prof.Dr. Bonnie Rohde, Albright College, USA  
Prof.Dr. Emet Gürel, Ege University, Faculty of Communication, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Erik Malcolm Champion, Curtin University, Australia  
Prof.Dr. Frank E Parcells, Austin Peay State University, USA  
Prof.Dr. Georgeta Drulă, University of Bucharest, Romania  
Prof.Dr. Gilson Schwartz, University of São Paulo, Brazil  
Prof.Dr. Işık Özkan, T.C. Yaşar University Faculty of Communications, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. John Chetro-Szivos, Fitchburg State University, USA  
Prof.Dr. Lutz M. Hagen, Technische Universität Dresden, Germany  
Prof.Dr. Mike Friedrichsen, Stuttgart Media University, Germany  
Prof.Dr. Paaige Kelle Turner, Webster University, USA  
Prof.Dr. Semra Atılğan, Marmara University Faculty of Communications, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Stevenson Kohir, Osmania University, Hyderabad, India

Prof.Dr. Toby Miller, Cardiff Univeristy, United Kingdom  
Prof.Dr. Will Straw, McGill University, Canada  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Anthony Moretti, Robert Morris University, USA  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ayla Kanbur, Yeditepe University, Turkey  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Berrin YANIKKAYA, Yeditepe University, Turkey  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Charlton McIlwain, New York University., USA  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Debra Harkins, Suffolk University, USA  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Erhan Akyazi, Marmara University, Turkey  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Geri Alomit Zeldes, Michigan State University, USA  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Gordon Calleja, University of Malta ITU Copenhagen, Malta  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Gregory G. De Blasio, Northern Kentucky University, USA  
Assoc.Prof. Kirk Hazlett, Curry College, USA  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Natalia Piskunova, National Research University, Russian Federation  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Stephanie Ricker Schulte, University of Arkansas, USA  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Victoria Panova, MGIMO-University, Russian Federation  
Asst.Prof.Dr. Asta Zelenkauskaitė, Drexel University, USA  
Asst.Prof.Dr. David Harris Smith, McMaster University, Canada  
Asst.Prof.Dr. Erin Schauster, Bradley University, USA  
Asst.Prof.Dr. Lauren Jaclyn DeCarvalho, University of Arkansas, USA  
Asst.Prof.Dr. Perrin Öğün Emre, Kadir Has University, Turkey  
Asst.Prof.Dr. Rick Sheridan, Wilberforce University, USA  
Asst.Prof.Dr. Robert Mckeever, University of South Carolina, USA  
Asst.Prof.Dr. Ryan Rogers, Marist College, USA  
Asst.Prof.Dr. Timothy James Pasch, University of North Dakota, USA  
Dr. Carolina Oliveira Matos, City University London, United Kingdom  
Dr. Margarita Kefalaki, Open University of Greece, Greece  
Dr. Panayiota Tsatsou, University of Leicester, United Kingdom

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Al Jazeera and Qatari Foreign Policy: A Critical Approach	11
<hr/>	
<b>KARIM POURHAMZAVI</b>	
<hr/>	
A Research on Presentation of Violence in Social Media: Opinions of Facebook Users	25
<hr/>	
<b>GÜLSÜM ÇALIŞIR</b>	
<hr/>	
Violence Dressed in Humor: Comedic Violence in Advertising	55
<hr/>	
<b>CAMELIA GRADINARU</b>	
<hr/>	
Filtered Violence: Propaganda Model and Political Economy of the Indian Film Industry	75
<hr/>	
<b>AZMAT RASUL</b>	
<hr/>	
Corporate Social Responsibility Practices and Corporate Reputation in the Turkish Media Industry	93
<hr/>	
<b>DİNÇER ATLI</b>	
<hr/>	
Deprivation, Class and Identity Issue in Contemporary Turkish Cinema	111
<hr/>	
<b>NEŞE KAPLAN - ALİ BARIŞ KAPLAN</b>	
<hr/>	



# A RESEARCH ON PRESENTATION OF VIOLENCE IN SOCIAL MEDIA: OPINIONS OF FACEBOOK USERS

GÜLSÜM ÇALIŞIR\*

"Not to commit violence is the first item of my conviction. At the same time it is also the last item of my faith." M. Gandhi.

## ABSTRACT

Element of violence which was seen almost every day in all media but in no way could be prevented is reflecting a bitter side of life. Today that we called age of information, technology rapidly improved, and thanks to this there found solutions for a lot of matters, we are unfortunately are living violence more heavy day by day. Consequently, elements of violence lived are taking part in television and computer screens, and magazine and newspaper pages. Although it is an unapproved and unwanted matter of fact, violence's existing in life is keeping this phenomenon fresh in media's agenda.

It is known that there executed researches and studies about in what direction violence was presented in almost all units of media organs. In this study, how violence was used on Facebook that was used especially among young ones in last ten years and had high popularity had been searched. With this aim, a focus group study had been executed in November 2015 on university students. Information that representation of violence was done over Facebook had been obtained in the study. Violence done over Facebook is conceiving alienation, polarization and hate together with itself. As a consequence, shares done through Facebook can last with very close friends' erasing each other from their personal Facebook pages in time, and this situation is called as violence.

Keywords: Media, Violence, Social Media, Facebook, Focus Group Study

## INTRODUCTION

It is possible to talk about the existence of violence since the day mankind came into existence. Violence is a situation obliging an unwanted situation to be done by force and pressure. Under these circumstances constraint and fear are replacing with love. On that sense, things' being done by using violence is meaning to impede love which was the most beautiful feeling in the world.

---

\* Ass. Prof. Dr., Faculty Member, Gümüşhane University Communication Faculty Department of Public Relations and Publicity, [gulsumcalisir@yahoo.com](mailto:gulsumcalisir@yahoo.com), [gulsumcalisir@gumushane.edu.tr](mailto:gulsumcalisir@gumushane.edu.tr)

Violence is a phenomenon unwanted and unaccepted by society and human being who was the tiniest member of society. Despite all negativenesses and being unrecognized, violence is again one of the first referred ways in a chaos met in society. This situation, too, is showing that violence continued as a source of shame even today that we called age of information and technology, and witnessed many improvements. Even solution ways of problems must be solved humanely and conversationally, namely with communication, it is possible to see almost in all media organs that violence was appealed with all its savagery.

If it is needed to approach the issue in the context of media and violence, it is possible to say by searching literature that there executed many studies about related subject until today. However, violence's continuing its existence with all its velocity is also emerging new and new research topics together with its perpetuating media's nutrition through this phenomenon. Representation of violence in media was researched in this study. Accordingly there was done a focus interview with students from Gümüşhane University in November 2015 and their opinions about "violence" were received.

### **Institutional Framework and Literature Review**

Violence is a social problem that societies all over the world looked for its solution. Violence is a phenomenon that penetrating daily life, found itself a place, became a current issue, and disturbed the society. Dursun (2011: 3-4) had summarized word meaning of "violence" which could be defined as a social affair like that:

"The word violence is a word entered our language from Arabic. It has meanings like 'constipation', 'hardness', 'strictness'. Its meaning differs from its equivalents in English and German with some differences, with this aspect. For instance, English word 'violence' comes from Latin words 'violentus' and 'violare'. According to Wade, while the first one meaning compulsive, strong, hard, tough, expansive emphasizing 'the style to do something', the other, namely violare means injuring, damaging, spoiling, staining, intruding, compelling, violating, invading and emphasizes 'the thing done'. Hence, the first thing drawing the attention in Latin roots of English use of the word is that we see that the word has two main definitions which the first one required generally the verb force and the other included violation. Violence's meaning of force is mostly a meaning handled and analyzed by analytic tradition. Analyzing the meaning violation doesn't enter this tradition. As we look at the old Greek equivalent of violence, its meaning in the dictionary are 'force, power, compulsion, potency' and its verbal cases are 'constraining, forcing, restricting, pressurizing'. Accordingly, we can say that there existed originally the meanings force and violation in violence's Greek equivalent. We also can say that our Arabic use of violence was closer to the meaning 'force', because hardness, exactness was rather a specialty existed in force. At least in Arabic, violence refers 'the execution style' more than 'the thing done'. And with this it reflects the action itself. German equivalent of the term is 'Gewalt'. German dictionary Waldenfels expresses that Gewalt was uncertain. According to it, there is a double meaning; potestas in one hand and violentia in the other one. The words next to it are 'power, force, restricting, conflicting, compelling, and threatening'. It is also said that Gewalt was synonymous with the German word 'walten' and included the meaning law establishing violence."

It is not easy to make a whole definition of violence. There isn't just physical violence in the act of violence. Treatments including verbal and psychological

harassments and action of purposely giving harm to someone are also called “violence” (Ögel, Tari, Yılmazçetin Eke, 2006: 9).

Michaud (1991: 11), too, describe violence in a wider meaning like this: “If one or more of the sides in a mutual relationship act as giving harm directly or indirectly, commonly or individually no matter what its rate was to the others’ bodily wholeness or ritual (ethical/moralistic/spiritual) wholeness or goods and symbolical and cultural values, there is violence.” (Citer; Ayan, 2006: 198).

If it is needed to make an argument in the light of the definitions done, violence is entire of financial and personal adverse that would jeopardize the individual’s physical and spiritual health and give harm to that one.

There are various kinds of the said violence from physical to sexual, from psychological to economical. It is possible to see reflections of many violence events within society on traditional media. Together with technology’s seriously gaining acceleration today, shares over internet become the case. And together with internet’s spread a new media area is started to be talked. Mentioned new area is social media. It is instantly possible to reach many shares through social media that is one of the most demanded oftakes in the last era. It is also possible to encounter violence patterns in social media area which has a huge efficacy and usage area. Social media that is an oftake which users catch opportunity to express themselves conveniently is also efficient in spread of violence news that sometimes couldn’t resound in traditional media or restricted. After savage murder of a young girl mentioned as Özgecan event, many shares happened in social media, groups/communities were formed, there happened participations, many talks were done about the event, and agenda was set with the shares on this said oftakes. Again social media caused the event to resounded more in both the country and abroad, and all authorized ones to band together.

The thing making the concept called social media so important is its being one of the best ways to compromise with most part of followers or sharers, as being a new kind of online media. Because states of participation, openness, talk, community and connectedness are formed through social media (Myfield, 2008: 5). In this sense social media is a structure allowing users to make changes in content to form a group in an online medium by using internet based applications (Taylor, 2012: 3).

Social media idea had been improved emerging from the Web 2.0 concept. Chapman had examined the history of social media under eleven headlines in interest focused, friend focused, work focused, photograph and video based main categories. Together with World Wide Web’s (www) going public, foundation of social media had been laid (Gönenli ve Hürmeriç, 2012: 218, quoting from Chapman 2009).

Even being mostly used as a branch of social media in our language, Facebook that was actually a part of social Networks had become a rather frequently used oftake as it allow people unite, come together and form new groups as such. Accordingly, Facebook is giving opportunity to its users in loading profile information’s like user’s

name and photograph. Additionally, it is a community one can be active over internet and this community allows them to send and take messages and make online photograph changes from their main pages or special online message sections, and create communication mediums with the other users in their lists. It's a net past of which started from 2004 and established for raising social interaction (Pempek, Yermolayeva and Calver, 2009; Social Media, 2015: 31).

Facebook founded by Mark Zuckerberg and his friends in 2004 reached a large amount of users in a short period. It is known that there was increase in number of users day by day. Facebook application at first just aimed university students to communicate each other had become widespread along almost all masses by time.

As we look at the studies done on social media and social nets under different topics, it had been understood that common point of the studies was only as literature review or additional quantitative methods. According to this, it had been understood that studies of Eyrich et al. (2008), De Choudhury et al. (2010), Kaplan and Haenlein (2010), Xiang and Gretzel (2010), Correa et al. (2010), Kietzmann et al. (2011), Fischer and Reuber (2011), Akçay (2011), Marangoz, Yeşildağ, Arıkan Saltık (2012), Gönenli and Hürmeriç (2012), Yegen (2013), Dal and Dal (2014), Bulunmaz (2014), Otrar and Argın (2014), Ustakara and Türkoğlu (2015) and Göker (2015) were executed like this. In this context it had been seen that studies done as quantitative method were little or no. It had been understood that quantitative and qualitative methods were used together in Çalışır's (2015) study. Minority of studies executed with qualitative method is another explanation for this study to be done with qualitative method.

### **Method**

There always was human being as subject position in the foundation of socio-cultural and political changes lately lived, namely the events deeply affected all the society. So it is preferentially necessary to go down the foundation of emotion, thought and behavior models of human being as subject, and to recognize him closely. Just like that it is possible to understand to what human being responded and why, and what he thought about which issue. In this context importance of research methods directly taking human being's personal experiences, emotions, thoughts and behaviors in focus, namely qualitative research methods is an unquestionable fact. Although classification of information obtained with qualitative research is hard, it is important in terms of its providing opportunity to gain deeper information.

While explaining qualitative research, Yıldırım and Şimşek (2004) emphasized that it was an inductive approach which was grounded on understanding and reflecting the point of views of attendants, and events and facts were described in their natural mediums. Intention by saying sensibility to the natural medium is researchers having the role of attendant, his being totalitarian, perceptions' being revealed and research's having a flexible structure.

To closely understand the said human being's emotions and thoughts, concept of "violence" that closely applied for all the society and was a bleeding wound had been handled in this study. Opinions of university students about how this concept was handled in social media had been obtained through making focus group interviews.

Students from Gümüşhane University Communication Faculty Department of Public Relations and Publicity generate the sample of this study. As both day and night educations are done in related faculty, totally 8 students from 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th classes had been chosen to make focus group interview with. In order to establish an equivalence between them, a girl and a boy from each classes among daytime (normal education) and nighttime (2nd education) students had been chosen. Not to let students effect each other, we had been scrupulous for them not to know each other and choice process had been executed accordingly. Chosen students were interviewed in November 2015. Students' thoughts about how violence was presented on Facebook had been taken in the study. Reason that the study was done especially on Facebook social net is Facebook's providing special states like writing with more characters, loading in larger number of files and photographs than the other social networks. It is also another factor that Facebook was the most spreadly used social network among students. In this context, Facebook forms the restraint of the study.

Before starting the focus group interview, brief information about the content of the study had been given to the students attended the study. Informing the students that their names would pass in nowhere in the study, we wanted them to express their thought free during the interview. Author had taken part as moderator in the focus interview done with the students and had asked all the questions to all the students one by one. So, we had tried to take opinions of all students. Camera shooting had been done during the interview. Aim of this is not to cause a disorder in which student said what. Focus interview had lasted one hour. Information saved during the interview had been decoded by the author. Along the study names of the students had been ordered from 1 to 8 and their genders had been given together with their ages. They had been shown in related places like 1, 20, G (Girl) or 6, 20, B (Boy).

Focus group interview is generating ideas through reaching in-depth information in interview and discussion structured between a little group and the leader (Bowling, 2002). Also another definition made on this subject is that it was careful preparation process which a discussion medium individuals would freely be able to tell their thoughts (Krueger, 1994). Krueger (1994) had expressed that aim of focus group interview wasn't interpretation but understanding; not to generalize but to define variety; not to introduce the attendants but to explain how they understood and perceived the situation. Making an addition to the subject of attendants, Morgan (1997) also said that focus group interviews encouraged the attendants and made them contribute the interview according to their experiences. He also told that the most important aspects of focus group interview was that it provided to prevent involuntarily attendances as it making voluntarily attendance possible.

Çokluk, Yılmaz ve Oğuz (2011) had done a detailed research about the said method in their study titled "A Qualitative Interview Method: Focus Group Interview". As a conclusion of the research they did, they had reached a general explanation considering all the explanations. Accordingly, focus group interview (2011: 98) is used for the aim of discovering surface information. Knowledge, experience, emotion, thought, perception and attitude attendants had is important in focus group interview.

In this manner, staying away from generalizations, description of attendants' point of view is in question in focus group interview.

### Findings and Comment

Information obtained under this section were presented as sub-headings for relaying information more clearly.

### Personal Information:

Personal information of the students attending the focus group interview are as presented in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Personal Information of Students Attended to Focus Group Interview

Code	Sex	Age	City of Birth	Class	Situation
1	Girl	20	Trabzon	1	Normal Schooling
2	Boy	19	Hatay	1	2nd Schooling
3	Girl	21	Adana	2	Normal Schooling
4	Boy	21	Yalova	2	2nd Schooling
5	Girl	23	Trabzon	3	Normal Schooling
6	Boy	20	İzmir	3	2nd Schooling
7	Girl	23	Samsun	4	Normal Schooling
8	Boy	24	Bitlis/Tatvan	4	2nd Schooling

As we look at the information given in Table 1, it is seen that there was an equivalence in sex and education type. Ages of students attended are between 19 and 24, and average age is 21. As information about the cities of birth were examined, there we see a distribution ranging almost all regions from north to south and east to west.

### Definition of Violence

While before starting focus group interview explaining to the students the aim of the study, information that their opinions about presentation of violence in social media, especially in Facebook had been shared with them. Therefore, it had been firstly asked to them what they understood while violence was in question. It had been understood in the answers given that students were separated into two groups. Accordingly, while students in the first group explain violence as restraint, enforcement, disturbing, students in the second group talked about existence of physical and psychological violence.

#### *Violence definitions of students in the first group:*

"Violence is an oral, silent written situation started and continued on individuals or groups from the moment that the opposite individual felt himself uncomfortable." (6, 20, B)

"To me violence is restraint. This can be as organization. It is a fact done in oral, written way or by suppression, especially done by organizations. It is a perception including feelings like shame and embarrassment." (5, 23, G)

"To me, violence is to apply pressure against individual or group, and violate their rights." (1, 20, G)

"It can be described as individual's suffering damage materially or spiritually." (7, 23, G)

"As far as violence is concerned, a man's beating and grinding a woman comes to my." (2, 19, B)

*Violence definitions of students in the second group:*

"It is one's being disturbed and abused in physical, oral or silent way." (3, 21, G)

"Violence is a process to put pressure on person or people passing through stages like oral, physical, psychological." (8, 24, B)

"I, too, am thinking violence as physical and psychological. Physically, it is the violence a man applied to a woman or a woman to a man. The most troubled side of violence is psychological violence. This kind of violence is wholly applying pressure, humiliation and talking contemptuous." (4, 21, B)

Actually each of the students from the first and the second group had made explanations relevant to violence's explanation in literature. Common point of the explanations made are to densify, to enforce, damage, and annoy the opposite one. And appealing physical and psychological ways while doing these. Looking at the other side, it is possible to say that students approach violence with a more narrow point of view which Çelebi (2010: 12) indicated. Because, according to Çelebi, violence from a narrow point of view occurs as using force, giving harm, armed struggle etc. interpersonally happened.

As it is interpreted with this aspect, numerical superiority of students in the first group than the second one is drawing attention. But, as content evaluation was done, it is understood that psychological and physical violence were interlocked in violence definitions done by students in both groups. It doesn't matter if it was physical or psychological, destructive sides of violence are plenty. Yet, one gives serious harm to the body, and other to the soul. This point is remarkable as it shows why violence was an undesired situation.

As students made explanations about physical and psychological dimensions of violence, they also had been asked what they thought about economical and sexual violence. The answers accordingly given by them were classified like that:

"It's an economical violence if a woman who wouldn't gain her own production kept her pot boiling depending on her husband's income and he cut what she had in hand.

Because woman hadn't been able to gain her freedom. The most indecent sample to sexual violence is rape. It is woman's being exposed to sexual assault involuntarily." (6, 20, B)

"Today comparison is a situation in very front. With comparison people encounter situations including violence in economical meaning. Like she has, I haven't. Ambitions and these comparisons gradually raise economical violence among people. As sexual violence is in question, at first harassment and rape events come to mind." (5, 23, G)

"To me, economical violence is especially the situation that women and children were panhandled. Economical violence is the restriction of a woman's working. The first thing coming to mind in sexual violence are annoyance cases." (1, 20, G)

"Situations one encountered because of his monetary incapacity is economical violence. There is also something more than a man's harassing a woman in sexual: As a woman Works, she is perceived very different by society. This can be included in sexual violence, too." (3, 21, G)

"Sexual violence is the violence done against women today. Woman's being badly called upon because of the dress, the skirt she wore is sexual violence." (2, 19, B)

"Economical violence is one's being unable to receive a recompense for his services. There now is no difference in man and woman in sexual violence. Turkey came so a period that we see some situations that a man stared at a man and pass a word to him. To me, a woman's being unable to go out after 7 in the evening is also a violence." (7, 23, G)

"Economical violence is an embargo applied on individuals. Sexual violence is harassment or transgression done to a woman." (8, 24, B)

"The word said against women that is women don't look for jobs then there will be less inoccupation is an economical violence. And sexual violence is criticizing pregnant women's walking in the street." (4, 21, B)

As we look at the answers given by the students there seen an agreement especially about sexual violence. However, it is also seen that explanations about other kinds of violence also showed resemblance with the explanations in literature. As a matter of fact, results obtained in a research executed by Woman Strategies Directorate General of Prime Ministry of Republic of Turkey in 2009 had been classified like that (2009: 35-36): Situations of slapping, beating, dragging, throttling, threatening with gun or knife is physical violence. Having someone by force, forcing her or him to sexually contemptuous and injurious actions is sexual violence. Disallowing woman's working, leaving no money for home expenses, taking woman's money from her hand is economical violence. And outrage or use abusive language in front of others, injurious language, mobbing and patronizing is psychological violence.

Especially definitions done by students numbered 7, 4 and 2 are attracting notice among definitions students dis about economical and sexual violence. Things told by



student number 7 are different than the others. Because as sexual violence is in question, women being the subject had been at the forefront in other students' expressions. That is to say that it is seen that a definition materialized on the fact of abuse and offense against woman was always done. Though according to sayings of student number 7, existence of a world in which attitudes, behaviors and sexual orientations changed with changing structure of world, and so men, too, could be harassed is in question. Another two definitions drawing attention to the social structure are the definitions of students' number 2 and 4. In these definitions, it is implied that woman could be exposed to criticism and exclusion by society in many situations from her dress to her appearance. Hence, it is in question that situations like hemline etc. of a woman living especially in a society like Turkey still led comments in good-bad directions about that woman and evaluation of her with some adjectives. Also it is possible to make a similar comment about walk of a pregnant woman in the streets. Because this situation is unfortunately still not approved in our country that traditional values were dominate.

On the basis of sexual violence definitions done, it is possible to say that violence wasn't independent from social structure, and traditional values were standing in front of us as a mirror of society.

As it was asked from the students if there was another explanation of violence, that explanation about the subject had come from a student:

"We can count political violence. For instance, if one cannot freely express his or her own political thought, that can be political violence. If expressed, brute force or political restraint the one exposed to after he or she expressed his or her thought is also violence. Because, one can be exposed to physical or psychological violence when he or she expresses his or her thought. Therefore, to me, it is more possible to explain this situation as political violence rather than calling it only psychological violence." (8, 24, B)

From the point of view in this student's answer, it is seen that his sayings corresponded to physical violence and mobbing that is psychological violence. However, it is possible to explain this student's thoughts about the subject with the ethnical identity of the region he lived. Because information that his friends erased him from Facebook page because of his ethnical identity had been reached in his answer for another question. Accordingly, it is possible to predict that the region he lived and his ethnical identity would be able to cause him to hide his political identity. Therefore it is possible to interpret the student's interpreting this situation as political violence is possible to be interpreted as he favors an explanation like this on the basis of trails of his life.

Time Spent on Facebook and How Much of This Time the One Encountered with Elements of Violence:

To learn how much time students spend on Facebook for a day and the amount of elements of violence they encounter during this time are also among the questions of the study. The answers to this question are as follows:

"As I am the administrator, I spend 1,5 hours a day on Facebook. Except that, there is direct violence in the things I shared on face. It isn't a politic page, it's a platform. There occur shares directly criticizing people along what the agenda was that day and which way it required. Because, people want that. People like violence. How more people we can polarize on that page, this enjoys them more. They like more, they enter more conflict areas. We are definitely a nation loving chaos. We love it so, we had gone so far from peace... Our life is violence and we actually are fictionalizing violence through Facebook." (6, 20, B)

"I, too, spend approximately 2 hours on Facebook. These are of course part by part. Like 5 minutes, 10 minutes. However, I think that 15-20 minutes of this time include violence. Maybe I don't encounter shares every day, but situation is like that: I read headlines of all the newspapers over Facebook first thing as I wake up every day. Probably there is news with the content of violence in the headlines of five of them. Therefore, I am exposed to all kinds of violence during my news journey at Facebook. I don't share it, but I am exposed to it." (5, 23, G)

"There is actually no certain time zone since smartphones proceeded. We continuously are on Facebook. But I spend my full one hour in Facebook. I am exposed to violence during the time period I spent in Facebook. Especially shares about femicides are in the foreground in Facebook. There is discrimination between man and woman. Nowadays there are so many shares included violence in terms of politics. So half of one hour I spent there spends with news with contents of violence." (3, 21, G)

"I literally spend quite time in social media. Totally my 5 hours pass in Facebook. I don't make comments; but I encounter with violence included news on main page. I am mainly exposed to contents of violence against women and political violence." (1, 20, B)

"I spend time in Facebook in the evenings, too. I am busy daytime. I have 1-2 hours in the evenings. Between 22.00-23.00. I usually am exposed to violence against women on my main page. Like "You won't believe your ears! They did woman that!" Circulation of this kind of news makes people curious." (8, 23, G)

"I spend time in Facebook as long as my telephone stayed open. Violence changes according to the agenda. If it is politics then it becomes political violence, if it is violence against women it becomes a kind of violence accordingly. But, importance of the violence applied is important, too. Generally I don't see violence contended news much if there is no a high level election or activator events like a high level Özgecan case." (2, 19, B)

"I enter Facebook with the aim to follow the agenda. In the page, there occurs violence case about what the agenda was. Özgecan case, for instance. If there is political case then there is violence application among it." (8, 24, B)

"I also spend my 1 hour in Facebook. There is always violence. There are news shares I did about rigged game cases. I follow politics continuously. I think that violence was related to person himself or herself in social media. For instance, I have a friend who always follows peace contended pages over Facebook. This friend recommends peace and absolutely denies violence." (4, 21, B)

"To me, being member in certain groups wakens violence. For instance, as sports or matches is in question very heavy expressions find place in Facebook pages between the ones favoring different teams. To me, to be conservative isn't good." (7, 23, G)

Answers the students gave are showing that they all spend time in Facebook. Information that it was possible in each hour of the day especially thanks to smart phones which were the last version of technology is also understood from the answers the students gave. All students had expressed that they were exposed to violence during the time they spent at Facebook. Students expressing that contents of violence were unavoidable had told that violence was widely used through Facebook and people were polarized in this atmosphere. Signaling that this was done occasionally through a social event triggering masses (Özgecan Case), political issues or a football match, students had expressed that violence was densely used in Facebook. As a consequence to this, they uttered that state of being exposed to violence was unavoidable during the time spent at Facebook. Another point is to love chaos, depressions, shouting, yelling, and using slang expressions as nation. In this way, violence that was everywhere in life reflects itself with all its aspects over Facebook. This state, too, means that page owners who spent time at Facebook are exposed to violence even if they did not share of violence. As such violence takes place exactly in the very focus of life as a phenomenon penetrating all areas of life. Information obtained from here shows resemblance with the result 'Turkish People Love Violence' in Özer's (2010: 78) study titled "Production of News about Violence Events: Comments of Police-Courthouse Correspondents in Ankara".

As it will be understood from expressions stated, violence presentation is often done in Facebook. It doesn't matter how much time at Facebook, 5 minutes or 5 hours, there is situation to be exposed to elements of violence in aforementioned periods of time. Within this context, it is possible to say that Facebook, too, took nourishment from violence just like traditional media. It won't even be misleading that violence's penetration in Facebook was more as velocity and Access were in question. This situation is actually hosting a contradiction in it, too. Thus, as violence is in question, again exploitation situation is emerging mostly from it, although it was said that everyone was against violence. While this dimension of the fact finds its correspondence in traditional media as getting rating, it shows itself as increase in the number of shares-likes-comments in social media.

*Status of Sharing Violence Content in Facebook:*

How students attended in focus group interview allowed violence in their own Facebook pages is also another research question that we were looking for answer. 7 of 8 students attending the interview and explained that they made violence contented shares in their personal Facebook page.

"I share posts politically constraint. As I do not find every political party's sanctions and decisions correct, I don't make shares showing that they were wrong. I share posts appropriate with my own thought in my own page, too." (6, 20, B)

"There I made shares about Özgecan case lived recently among rape and harassment events. I went to a movement women did in Trabzon about this subject and I shared this on my own page. Of course I also added my comments and thoughts on it." (5, 23, G)

"I never shared before." (1, 20, G)

"I, too, had written a few thoughts in political manner of me about the terror organization in the country." (3, 21, G)

"I had shared Özgecan Arslan event. It was a huge drama consequently. I was shamed from my male identity that period. Because men's becoming so iniquate imposed me and I founded guilt in me. I did a self-critics, too, in this event." (2, 19, B)

"I am actually against these kind of shares. Because as these shares are done, I think these events of violence raised more. I too made a share in Özgecan Arslan event. I added my comment in the share. I think that women had to work more to jump to a level upper than men where they feel themselves precious socially. As we look today, perception about women is already like that: Woman will stay at home, cook the food, look after her children, that's all. However we see that there are some obstructions in front of women. There are corruptions. I think that we had to do different things to change the point of view of opposite sex over us. As there are sharing, I think that sharing of events like that woman was killed there, this woman was raped here in social media raised this situation." (7, 23, G)

"I mainly make shares about psychological and sexual violence. I write and share my own thoughts. Especially sexual harassment events touch me and there are sometimes moments that I was ashamed of my being a man." (8, 24, B)

"I believe that media covered most of the things. For instance I don't forget the event that the miner was kicked which happened in Soma. However I saw that those images weren't shown on channels. I shared videos about this in my page. Because people know only what was shared in media or social media." (4, 21, B)

As it will be understood from the answers the students gave, as violence is in question, they leave place in their pages especially to the reflections of violence which became a social event. Özgecan case standing out with the majority of shares done in Facebook and other social media mediums. A young girl's murder by exposing to

violence had drawn reaction from all sections of society and being widespread through social media's use, had caused all Turkey unite on this case. Share of tracks of this case in almost all students' Facebook pages is remarkable in terms of its showing that violence elements were used in these oftakes. However, it is again an information emerged as conclusion of the answers the students gave that they didn't make these shares with the aim of supporting violence, but playing a part against it. It can be evaluated as outpouring of this case as boy students told that they were ashamed of their masculinity as a conclusion of this violence application against women.

Again another remarkable point among the shares of students about violence had been politic, terror and psychological shares. Telling that some events that students claimed to be politically covered could be transmitted to the masses just through social media, especially Facebook, they expressed that they share those news in their pages. It is possible to understand that from here: Students are thinking that reaching a wider target audience would be easier if it was done through Facebook. From this point of view, it is seen that students tried to create an awareness stage by sharing the subjects they wanted to announce or to draw attention to. On the basis of this evaluation, it is possible to reach another conclusion, too. That conclusion is that social media was a platform freer than traditional media and its target market covered a broader area. Thus, Facebook is the shortest way for people who wanted to become popular. On the other hand, share of violence in the medium of Facebook means reinforcing the violence. Thus, as the student with number 7 indicated, violence's continuously being shared on Facebook makes violence got used to. This situation, too, means that violence gives birth to violence. It is extrapolated from the expression of this student that the ones who would be exposed to the shares with the subject of violence would affirm violence and they too would be able to apply violence by time. Especially share frequency of shares about femicides can be interpreted as an encouraging element for the ones committing these murders. This thought is supporting Özer's (2010) opinion that violence shares continuously done in media by popularization of presentation of violence gives birth to a new violence.

*State of Liking, Commenting and Sharing in Page the Shares Others Did:*

Answers to this question asked to learn how students evaluated violence over Facebook are as follows:

"I share. I usually follow my friends and groups. I like things that come true to me. I share them if I want people to know them. These shares are usually with political content. Because politics is in every area of our life. I am a member of We Will Stop Femicides Platform. Even moments that I talked face to face happened, too. I immediately share my thoughts in the group as femicides were in question. I do my shares for letting people know that there are femicides in this country. And I try to announce these femicides in social media." (4, 21, B)

"I make no comment. My comments are to criticize violence." (1, 20, G)

"It can't be said that I did much likes or shares. I especially made comments for one or two times to the persons who made shares on the subject of violence about

politics and harassment cases. And as the one feels that he or she became more sad and broken, he or she starts to give an end to this, too. Now I neither write comments nor another thing to the people. Because it comes to me like that some people had been fixed and enchanted on that opinion. Therefore, I say myself not to be tired. I prefer to be in more background because of this." (5, 23, G)

"I am of the ones using Facebook somehow frivolously. Like, share, comment, these are fine things, but I find myself closer to its troll dimension. Actually it can cause so serious problems, but it is somehow a frivolous medium. I handle it in its sauciness dimension as I said in a mostly frivolous language, mostly in criticizing dimension even if my thoughts fit or not with friends in states like political violence, politics etc." (6, 20, B)

"I like the shares if they are convenient with my own thought and leaning on my style. If they are against me, I never controversialize." (1, 20, G)

"I usually don't mess with these things. I previously had written something with political content. When you say something directly, people immediately appeal fighting, violence. Because there is a state not to show respect to others' opinions. Therefore, I stay away." (2, 19, B)

"I generally don't like anything. I also don't make comments; but when I make one, it is mostly drawn to other directions and I am misunderstood. So, I try not to involve." (8, 23, G)

It is understood that students attended the interview behaved hesitant in like, comment and share in their own pages. As it will be understood from students' expressions, they hold themselves back especially for escaping from polemics and misunderstandings when situations like that occur. Again it stands out that information they experienced from actions they did before were efficacious in this. It is also emerged from answers taken that they appealed this way not to sociologically strike a responsive chord among the society and go into struggle with others. It is also possible to say that occasionally state of self-restriction in respect of share, like or comment like this among youngsters caused a medium of anomy. (<https://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anomi>). It won't be exaggerative to say that this situation would create a mass who avoid meddling and conclusively form a basis for passive masses.

On the other hand it is also possible to see that some of the students did these kind of shares and comments in purpose. As we looked at in which matters students who did this like and comment did these actions; it is seen that predominantly matters of politics and sexual violence loomed large. Because, a share condemning terror is standing out in Facebook page of student number 3. Student number 4 had made explanations as "I do shares about femicides.". However it had been also seen in Facebook page of this student that there were shares with contents of Suruç, terror, politics, ethnic identity and revolt. A news about action to attend the walk arranged in Trabzon for Özgecan murder stands out in the share of student number 5. The said student had personally attended the walk, had written her comments about the matter

and had also shared its video in her page. It had been seen that student number 8 shared a quote from Charles Bukowski (“Which flower blames the other one because of coming into yellow flower? Which bird imposes a prohibition to the other one as it singed differently? People are killed because of their skins and tongues. Oh people! They who can’t find themselves, but everything...”) as a reference to oppositions, polarities, sexist expression to condemn Özgecan case in his own Facebook page. Also in Facebook page of student number 6, share of news of politics and martyrdoms stands out.

As especially expressions and also personal Facebook pages of students’ number 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8 are carefully examined, a table like above is emerging. It is understood that there exposed a stand against violence rather than adoption and approval of violence in the shares of the students mentioned. It is understood that students took it as an undesirable happening when physical dimension of violence came into prominence; but when state of alienation emerged, they disapproved it. When it is evaluated like this, it is drawing attention that all sections have a voice in society, however there was a medium that violation of their rights to speak was perceived as violence. Actually, it is seen that shares and comments done were outpourings of ideas of society and results of this reflected on Facebook.

*Resemblances’ and Differences about Violence’s Presentation in Traditional Media and Social Media:*

What students think about if there are resemblances or differences or not between traditional media and social media about presentation of violence had been also asked in the study.

“Absolutely there are differences. Although social media is more under control, it is a free medium. Because it is not possible to strictly follow everything. But traditional media is an area that penal sanctions were directly applied. It is an area continuously supervised and past very strict reviews by an institution named RTÜK (Supreme Board of Radio and Television). Accordingly it is a place where censorship could be applied more easily in violence events. Even if there were someone who took prison sentence because of their shares or that they declared their opinions in social media, it is a place that individuals expressed their thoughts more free and open.” (6, 20, B)

“To me also, there is a huge difference. Social media is used by individuals more loud and clear and through the desired direction. Traditional media isn’t like that, there are restrictions. It is difficult to follow what everyone shared in social media and it isn’t so easy to chase this. Therefore, people can easily express their opinions. And this shows the difference in between.” (5, 23, G)

“Social media is freer than traditional media. In terms of reaching the masses social media is more ahead than traditional media. Traditional media is more formal. Social media sometimes may twist the events. Situations like that don’t come into questioning traditional media.” (3, 21, G)

"Of course, differences are clear. But I caught a resemblance like that: They publish a new news about the previous one was wrong when there happened something wrong. In social media, when you complain about an unlike situation, they immediately remove it from their pages. For instance, I had complained a thing which I didn't like about violence. Then I controlled and saw that it had been removed. The one who made the share on Facebook immediately removes it." (1, 20, G)

"I approach both traditional media and social media prejudiced. There are names, institutions that traditional media had relations with. Two different news agencies transmit the same news completely different to each other. Therefore I approach prejudiced and prefer not to believe without exactly knowing the case. You can share feelings as you liked, without censorship in social media. It isn't closed as there is no so big event. As I remember, President of the Republic had Twitter shut down. Censorship doesn't easily happen. But it is easier in traditional media." (2, 19, B)

"There are many wrongs traditional media did. Because, there was a news about the marriage of two homosexual people last year. That news was so beautifully narrated and presented as if it was a very natural thing. Newspapers transmitted interviews etc. As my sister said met hat two men were married and I couldn't give an answer, in this case I think that RTÜK too had to do something here. Because they narrated it as if it is a right thing. News says, could beautiful things like that happen in Turkey, too? This state psychologically affected me very much. Generally there done fun aimed things in social media. Besides Twitter gives you 140 characters and tells you to say your trouble with this. To me, there are wrongs traditional media and social media are both in." (7, 23, G)

"There is such a difference in presenting violence between traditional media and social media: Traditional media tries to reflect what it desired to the society, not the things society wanted. They also transmit violence as they wanted. Individuals are freer in social media." (8, 24, B)

"I will evaluate it as relation of inferior-superior. I see social media as lower layer and traditional one as upper layer. Lower layer is community. Upper layer shows community the messages they wanted to give. For instance, it was defended that there was no violence in Soma in some traditional media. However, as other traditional media was reviews, it revealed that there was those images. I don't agree the idea that social media was dump. Because difference of social media from upper layer is its being transparent. Being cheated in social media can be like that: For example, if there uninterested images were shared in the images about a news, then this is a cheat. Photographs about massacres in Reyhanlı, Suruç, Ankara could be taken and shared in social media. Those places are already certain. There is Reyhanlı, Suruç. We see what traditional media want us to see in terms of violence. But we see what we wanted to see and if it is truth that we wanted to see, then we see truth in social media." (4, 21, B)

All of the students had emphasized that there were differences between traditional media and social media; and one of them had emphasized that additionally there was a resemblance. Accordingly, students had said that control of traditional media through



RTÜK and government was strictly executed. On the other hand, stating that social media was a free platform, its control wasn't easy and its dispersion effect was quick, they had drawn attention to the difference between them. However they also had emphasized that there were resemblances at the point that as there was any complaint content could be removed in each medium. Balta Pelteoğlu (2012: 7) had explained that freedom of virtual platform that students mentioned as that social media had changed the meanings of many concepts like share, friendship, freedom, security, fame. Relationships and freedoms continued in virtual platform had caused reality to gain a new meaning.

A subject especially told is as violence was presented to us violence after supervising it. Briefly, traditional media is presenting us the images it wanted while performing the presentation of violence. As the ones making the shares were themselves, reality of violence is presented from their point of view in social media. That is to say that sharer is sharing what he or she wanted in his or her page. This state, too, triggers off the thought that social media offers the individual freedom area.

Freedom area in question is a window offered by social media to its users. Everyone has right to see and Show everything through that window. It's being an area that control was mostly attached to the person himself or herself is a feature of social media distinctive than traditional one. This feature is effective for social media to be a more preferred channel. However, on the basis of responses given above by the students, conclusion that social media was an area that violence was presented as required and so was preferred shouldn't be amounted. On the contrary, it is known that all dimensions of violence existing in society were presented through draining before in traditional media, even were not presented most of the time. See, easiness to reach these untransmitted information through social media is important. In this manner, social media is seen as a channel which enlightened reality that wanted to be covered.

*Management of Communal Perception by Violence Presented at Facebook:*

It is wondered if the state emerged in the meaning individual loaded to the events with effect of the society he or she lived in was given a shape or not by Facebook. Shortly, information if Facebook create a communal perception or not had been desired to reach. Answers received about this subject are as follows.

"For instance, I can give Gezi Park case as an example. As all the world knows clearly and exactly, there was a use of disproportional force and physical violence there. Situation was occurred that people being organized through social media depending on their being affected from this violence bodily go down the streets. Violence's being directly shared through Facebook caused people to merge bodily to the crowd. Such an influence emerged." (6, 20, B)

"As personal shares through Facebook were widespread this much, everyone shared another information, another event, another photograph and news in Gezi Park Events, as my friend said. Everyone created a different perception. Everyone created a different perception in photograph seen, video seen, writings written and shares. To

me, communal perception is related with one sees what. Doesn't matter what you see, who you follow, psychological violence partakes and perception forms actually in the direction where this psychological violence pushes you through." (5, 23, G)

"As it is needed to make comment from Facebook shares, the thing directly shared in people's perception can be the pictures shared. As there is no writing or something, one interprets as how he or she psychologically perceived." (3, 21, G)

"To me, violence in social media affects society. Moreover, especially children are affected more from this. They see something in the site and it attracts them. Their brain don't know what was what as they are still children. What they see in social media, they see the same in the society, too. Children mock." (1, 20, G)

"I think that social media had huge effect on this matter. There is a thing named activity button in Facebook. So you can announce any activity you wanted them to hear to your friends around you. You can inform them its time, place, what will be done, everything. To me, social media is a huge area affording an opportunity to the people to organize. I think it has a great affect. It keeps communal perception alive." (2, 19, B)

"Actually perception management is beautifully done through social media, especially in Facebook. They try to inoculate a person how he or she must think. For instance, I have a political opinion. I can transmit this to the opposite ones through imposing, bullying, telling that one to think as I said and with shares I continuously made. I try to hold the agenda there. I think, especially the ones who knew perception management inoculate this to the people by using images and decorating it. It is taken not to show respect the one who commented under a political opinion and the other political opinion to each other, and to hit below the belt by using bad words and saying I don't show respect to your opinion. And they do this in comfort. These comments aren't removed. There is setting people against each other. Somehow people start to bear each other grudge. So these shares made in Facebook foments violence and makes violence permanent. For instance, during the shares, a person you liked very much makes a share against your opinion. I know friendships ended because of this." (7, 23, G)

"Social media groups the people. This, too, causes violence events to occur between the groups." (8, 24, B)

"Perception is a very important thing in social media. I can say something like that: For example, my father had seen me from social media in Gezi Park Events. So his perception changed. Although he was against the vent initially, he returned defending it as he saw me there for a moment. Because I was there, he had seen me at social media, and conclusively he had trusted me and his perception had changed. On the other hand, as Gezi Park Events spread in social media, especially in Facebook, state of othering, polarization emerged. This is also a violence. So, spreading of this kind of events in Facebook encouraged violence more and more." (4, 21, B)

Common point of the information taken from the students is that Facebook created a communal perception. Students generally made explanations through Gezi Park Events had expressed that Facebook was the means to collect people together in mentioned event. This had happened more easily especially through technical features Facebook had in announcing the activities. Result that Facebook had efficiency in presenting violence subjects and creating a perception had emerged. Also information that Facebook more increased the power of this efficacy through news, photographs, videos etc. the users shared in their pages.

Fact that Facebook gave an opportunity to make shares like numerous photographs, videos, comments at the same moment is making it efficacious in managing perceptions at the same time. Even though management of perception over masses was firstly started with traditional media, it is known that Facebook used this more effective lately. It especially has active role over masses in important social events. Things lived in Gezi Park Events that happened in our recent history and students often talked about are the most known sample to this.

A New Definition of Violence: Perception of Friend Prevention, Deleting from Friend List, Sending Negative Messages, Writing Negative Comments under the Comment in Facebook Page as Violence

While talking over Facebook and violence during the interview, we suddenly had started to talk about erasing friends from Facebook and evaluation of this as violence. Although there are different opinions in this matter, generally it influences strongly that mentioned state was perceived as violence.

"I will talk like that, now we have politics on agenda. Just 2 days past since November the 1st Elections done. I don't think that to make political shares in Facebook page wasn't so right. Because I think that this affected friendship. We are especially people working in government institutions. We are now students, and in an academic environment. We are friends with many academics through Facebook. But I encountered this event in the evening of October the 1st. An academic featured expressions like did you see, we have won, how beautiful there in his page in view of the result the political party he supported gained. And I saw that many comments have done under this. That academic can support that party, this is his free will. But it isn't pretty for him to hare this in his page. He's an academic then. And we students and many people see his page. This kind of shares bring together othering. Othering is also a violence. To make his over Facebook is to call violence. It is an advanced state of violence. This kind of shares are done mostly in Facebook. Because Facebook is enabling both video and writings, shortly many shares at the same moment. There is no word limitation. This is 140 characters in Twitter, and you have to send a photograph and then enter many pages under it to make people see. But Facebook isn't like that and it is more comprehensive. It offers opportunities in many ways. I believe that Facebook nestled more violence especially in Gezi Park Events, harassment cases and physical assaults, politic and psychologic press. When there are our friends thinking other than us and borders are transgressed, then there occurs states to delete them from the page. For instance there have been friends I erased

over Facebook because of their political violence shares. My friend shared something. This happened once, twice, and then for the third time. Many wrong things happened. He had shared a politic event about the previous election. He can tell his opinions by his free will. But the thing he told was a theoretically wrong information. Namely, he gave wrong information to people over Facebook. He had said something included violence with his own opinions. These don't interest me. But the ones who read it will think that it was true." (5, 23, G)

"Let me continue with my samples. I am not a conservative person. It doesn't affect me a very conservative person to make more conservative shares. Because if we are individuals running after freedom, then we can accept this as freedom. There is no problem in declaring opinions, offering them and sharing the situations about this. But when one shares bad words against the opinion opposite to his or her, and tries to mould it in a certain way, then comes the problem. If it is needed to give an example, although I am not on the side of AK Party, it is an exact violence to regard some titles to the ones on the side of AK Party and to hare the words of Aziz Nesin that 60 percent of this country were stupids after the election. There is no declaring an opinion or a state of restricting freedom, but it is an exact violence. No matter if my opinion is really opposite to this and this go to a disturbing scale, I write neither a message nor a comment. I directly delete from friendship, extract. Social media has an exact polarizing feature. You are polarized in an environment which wasn't agree with your opinion. Even if you are in the center, you need to slide to one side. Fanaticism of one side puts you under more pressure. With this aspect, social media polarizes people." (6, 20, B)

"I will give a so recent example now. A friend that I shared the same opinion with in November the 1st Elections we past, made a share about that party on my wall. Something like it won. I have closer friends that I knew since childhood. Although we are so good with each other, they are my friends having opinions opposite to me. These friends of mine had written silly comments about their opinions under that share. That had overrun the frame of respect. There were many people that I became bad with because of that. I erased these friends who I was very sincere with in normal life from Facebook. Because I perceived these comments done against mine as violence and deleted them." (1, 20, G)

"I deleted no one because of this until now. Because I am very open to argue, criticize and being criticized. I didn't erase, because I argue with the opposite one within the frame of respect. However if I encounter with a case like this, then I interpret this as violence and inhibit and delete my friend from my page." (3, 21, G)

"I deleted only one of my friends from my page because of this state until now. His labeling me in all the writings he wrote and this state's being seen by everyone around myself put me in a tight spot. Some of the people I know called me and told something like what kind of things I entered etc. Otherwise, I show respect to the opinions of all my friends. I don't see deleting friend from page as violence. This is my decision. I don't want him in my page from now. I don't want to see things he did. To me, this isn't a violence. I don't want to see him in my page with my free will. This may be a reaction, not a violence. There is something like that over Facebook. There is

always a state of pontification in question. He says only his opinion was right. He counts no one, just his opinions, talks, doings, applications, that's it, nothing more." (7, 23, G)

"I live in Hatay. People from different religion, language, race and sect live there together for years. I have many close friends with different opinions. When subject of politics opens, there be problems between me and my friends even if I like them more than my life. It turns to fight. There emerges vocal violence. There emerges psychological violence. I don't like to reflect my opinion in social media. I make neither comment nor like. I stay away. But there was a person during November the 1st Election and he exaggerated. He was my friend. How would he look at my face again then? I make no political share on my own behalf. Because I think the others, too. Therefore I deleted my friends making a share like that recently. This is not a violence. On the contrary, the thing done by him is violence. I swept that state in order to prevent violence." (2, 19, B)

"I erased no one; but there were many friends of mine erased me because of my thoughts and political opinion. I interpret this not as violence, but self-satisfaction of their egos." (8, 24, B)

"I see social media as a reflection of daily life. I delete no one until now, and I didn't need to delete, too. I interpret states like comment, erase, and inhibition as psychological violence." (4, 21, B)

As interview was made after November the 1st General Elections, that could be affective students' giving answers like those. Because almost all of the students expressed that there happened a problem with their friends in the result of politic shares done. Students had stated that situation of having different world views creates an othering and polarization environment. Actually there also emerged a hate expression in the answers students gave. It is expressed that often bringing forward the problem lived among people who didn't adopt the same opinion with each other over Facebook generated the concepts of othering and polarization. It is understood from the information given by students together with this concept that vocal and psychological violence elements come to the forefront through Facebook.

It is seen that hate expression was more widespread in social media, especially in Facebook. This state is also enabled by widespread use of smartphones and computers. Because by this means Access to social media becomes easy for every time and in every mediums. This state too lay the ground for spread of hate expression (Association of Alternative Informatics, 2013). Various polarization points in different zones in Turkey help hate expression to be created and distributed more easily because of idiosyncrasies of internet. Social media makes circulation of hate easy with this aspect. It is possible to see reflections of this especially in the events like Gezi Case (Hate Expressions and Hate Guilts Follow UpReport, 2013: 25).

Mentioning hate expression in the program named "Backyard" she attended, Inceoğlu (2015), too is drawing attention to tension lived in political matters. It is said

that hate expression contributed the existing politic polarization. It is emphasized that style became more and harder as the table emerged in June the 7th and November the 1st elections permanently discussed. Explaining that it became harder for people having different opinions to come together, she means that hate expression was getting higher and that brought together othering. She also is expressing that hate expression was produced as encourage violence among opponent groups on the basis of features like age, sex, social status etc.

It is possible to summarize the results obtained from the answers given by the students like that: Students are perceiving deleting their friends from their Facebook pages in the result of problem creating shares they did through Facebook with their friends having different world views as a violence. In this context, students are interpreting othering and polarization, erasing friends from the list, behaving conservative as violence. Related to this subject, especially as we look at the content of the share in personal Facebook page of student number 1 that he told above, a cartoon attracts notice. In the cartoon, there seen a behavior AK Party showed against the other party leaders after winning the election. As the student also stated, comments done under that cartoon had triggered hate expression and caused the student to erase her own close friends from her Facebook page. As it is seen realization of acts like this had emerged a new violence definition.

Facebook's being a virtual platform could have prepared foundation for mentioned form of violence to gain currency in this channel. Thus, as people feel themselves free on Facebook, they think that they had right to say what they want as they wanted. This, too, conceives free use of both words and shares. People also can move easy in virtual freedom area offered by virtual platform as they are not face to face with each other. So they can be more offending, too. People can perform the words they can't say or behaviors they can't do to the one in front of them in real life, without making no bones about in Facebook which was a virtual platform. These performances is ending with the fact of deleting unwanted persons from the page, as students expressed. Together with virtual platforms enter to our lives, new definitions related to it also is coming together. Just as the situations of deleting or avoiding the person from Facebook page as mentioned above for that person's unliked words and behaviors. This situation had added a new one to violence definitions we knew.

#### *Last Words on Presentation of Violence in Facebook:*

Taking the last words students wanted to add about presentation of violence, interview had ended. Accordingly received answers as follows:

"I, too, want to say something. People should not completely engaged with something. Every time and which opinion they have, this can be a political opinion, even a food site. They shouldn't say words like there is a site like this, I will follow this, and this is the most beautiful site. They should think that there always could be another opinion. Elders always says, I know something other than the things you knew. We should always be open to the other opinions. We see this over obedience on Facebook. When people became obedient with something, they think that it was absolute truth. Let us attach with something no matter if it is right or wrong. We should be able to say right and wrong sides of it. I personally think that I did this.

There can be violence between the ones who don't believe something blindfolded. This forms the violence. As if people become more patient and open minded being less obedient, then there be violence not as much as this." (5, 23, G)

"It is needed to be open to criticism." (3, 21, G)

"To me, one must be realistic, not imitator in cyber world." (1, 20, G)

"People must be inquiring. For example, when people follow something in Facebook, their followers can perceive that like that page shared this, then this is true. We all know that there shared many faux news in social media. We shouldn't say that this is written in Facebook, this is true. We must explore this also from other sites and then believe something. We should commit then." (5, 23, G)

"I use Facebook nearly for 5 years. I think needs were increased. I look at the past shares in between. I never have shares like a so strange politic event. But I look at the things the age required and see there are something violent, people had become so conservative that they say my opinion is the one and I think that took shape according to the age. Facebook takes a huge part in this matter, it undertakes something. Something like that it set the people at odds. Facebook lays ground for violence. People should show respect to each other's opinions, if there is no respect then there will be neither love nor friendship." (7, 23, G)

"I overrate people depending on a certain group, a team, a religion. To me, people must be able to depend on something he thought. They must be depended blindfolded. They must be supported. But this must be done within respect and with empathy. I think like that; but must say what the one under snow thinks. Actually by speaking more careful. If the opposite one had an opposite opinion, then we must try to talk more carefully. In this respect, Facebook has great importance." (2, 19, B)

"If I think or defend something, I always listen to the other side. Even if I don't support, I look from points of view of both me and them. If there is a wrong in respect of me or the opposite side, then I do what was needed in a more appropriate point of view." (3, 21, G)

"That we say the case to be obedient blindfolded, actually people should occupy with something; but they should also see their negative sides to be able to proceed. If there is only seeing the good sides and closing eyes to the bad sides, then there would be no proceeding. Otherwise there will be state to see only the good sides of self. As he or she tries to see negative sides too, and says "I had done wrong here, I won't do the wrong thing the next time.", then this indicates proceeding. (7, 23, G)

"Social media is a transparent medium. One sees what he or she wants to see in social media. If I want to see violence, then I see violence. If another person wants to see peace, then he or she sees peace. Violence is wholly up to the person." (4, 21, B)

"Say no to all kinds of violence." (8, 24, B)

Information that it was needed to get away from perceiving the freedom zone Facebook provided as an area to attack the others and to be able to normalize this had been obtained from expressions of students. It is good to believe something; however, as people believe blind folded, then there may occur problems. There should be more flexible borders. There will always be violence as polarizations, otherings stays in the shares executed through Facebook. Because these are triggering hate expression. Violence will be diminished just by sensitivity, flexibility and empathy that will be shown in these matters, and maybe it will be dissolved. Students are believing that violence could be dissolved so. They had given advices of self for ending violence by saying that it was needed to invite criticism and to keep in mind that there was a world out of ourselves and there were people who didn't believe the values we believed.

On the basis of expressions, result that reality should be reflected on Facebook, although it was virtual platform had been obtained. Besides that, fanaticism should be receded, because it can draw people to negative emotions. It is needed for people to interiorize the knowledge that there was a World flowing out of themselves. It is possible for us to miss reality out of ourselves as we put ourselves in the center of the world. However, real life isn't monotone, it is formed of different colors and scents. It will be possible to wander away the fact called violence as much as we accept these differences.

## **CONCLUSION**

Facebook is the most used social interaction area in our country as it was in all over the world because of the technical features it owned. It is used wide spread especially among young ones. As Facebook is used among youngsters and has opportunities to make many shares (photograph, writing, video etc.) over the page, this study had been executed over University students.

In this context, study had been done as focus group interview with a group of 8 persons formed from students of Gümüşhane University in November 2015. During the interview, it had been tried to learn students' thoughts in the direction how violence was presented on Facebook. So, not to miss any thought, answers given by each students had been transferred as they were.

Initially responses to what the thoughts about definition of violence were was looked for in this study which aimed to research representation of violence at Facebook. In this context, it had been understood that there was a consensus about definition of violence especially in daily life. Because it had been seen that almost all students came together around the same thought. According to the information obtained, it had been determined that oppression, strain, use of force, in other words primarily physical and psychological violence came into prominence as violence was in question. But, it had been predicted that students also had information about sexual and economical violence, too. It had attracted notice that standards of judgement of society reflected on answers given as especially sexual violence was in question. As evaluated within this frame, information that reflections of violence over Facebook weren't independent from definitions of violence accepted in general part of society. Thus, trails of daily life had been encountered as violence presentation at Facebook was evaluated.



In the end of focus group interview, information that state of being often exposed to violence that was in all areas of life in Facebook, too, had been obtained. It had been emerged that state to reach many people at the same time by the help of some features provided by Facebook have made it easy for violence and news about it to spread. Another information obtained is that Turkish people saw violence a life style and they didn't hesitate to reflect it through Facebook. The state that chaos and violence created in the said medium had a feature polarizing and othering people had emerged. Also information that these kind of violence contented shares done through Facebook encouraged hate expression had been obtained.

Students having opinions about what violence was had also done a new explanation of violence during the interview. Accordingly, students had interpreted deleting their friends who didn't have the same opinion with them from their pages through Facebook and inhibiting them as violence. This state, too, is bringing another point of view to the perception of violence in Facebook medium. Besides, Facebook is creating a communal perception medium as violence is in question. So, through reaching large number of people with the shares done in Facebook medium, an awareness about violence is also being created. The most important events students draw attention to had been Özgecan and Gezi Park Events. But also terror assaults happened in Suruç, Diyarbakır and Ankara is also among the matters that was accentuated and became the agenda by being shared on Facebook pages.

Students attending the interview had expressed that they often were exposed to violence contented shares, even they say that they usually deny to make violence contented shares in their own Facebook pages. With this aspect, Facebook offers violence opportunity to spread and reach every sections. Especially femicides and violence events that politic contents were densely used in were often shared through Facebook. Students giving some advices of self in the matter of dissolving violence in this manner had expressed that they think that violence could be dissolved just if people were careful about these things.

It had been understood that violence was an unwanted situation in this study that searched in what direction the thoughts of university students were about how violence was presented on Facebook. Facebook, too, takes an efficient role to announce this unwanted situation to the masses. While Facebook is sometimes used with the aim to bring the masses together (Özgecan and Gezi Park events), sometimes it is used as a discriminator to the people by being used in polarizing, othering style. As evaluated with this aspect, while helping violence to be told, at the same time Facebook it also causes violence. Therefore, it is possible to mention about both positive and negative uses of Facebook that was thought a more free area than traditional media.

As it is needed to briefly analyze the information obtained from the study, these results had been emerged: As definition of violence at Facebook was in question, it had been predicted that it wasn't independent from understanding of violence existing in social life. As in real life, situation to be frequently exposed to violence images also in Facebook which was a virtual platform had emerged. Thus, hate speech had gained

importance at the end of alienating, polarizing medium. This fact had led to a new violence definition named “deleting friend” or “avoiding” on Facebook to emerge. On the other hand, becoming successful in managing perceptions, Facebook which was seen as a freedom area had an integrative mission in togetherness of the masses. But, it again took nourishment from violence while developing an attitude against violence. As seen, information which could be interesting had been obtained in this study which aimed to search in what direction violence’s presentation at Facebook was.

As this study was executed only over university students, it includes information obtained from their comments about their perception of violence. Therefore, it can be illusive to generalize findings and information obtained in this study as if they were all Facebook users’ perception style to violence. However, it is thought that information obtained in this study were precious in respect of offering opinion to the researchers working on this subject. It can be possible to reach new results if related subject was applied over adults, academics etc. different groups during the studies that would be done later. Especially what kind of affects this subject would have in sociological dimension can be researched.

**REFERENCES**

Akçay, Habibe (2011). "Kullanımlar ve Doymalar Yaklaşımı Bağlamında Sosyal Medya Kullanımı: Gümüşhane Üniversitesi Üzerine Bir Araştırma", *Journal of Communication Theory and Research*, Autumn, Issue: 33, p. 137-162.

Alternative Informatics Association (2013). "2013 Report State of Internet in Turkey"  
[http://www.alternatifbilisim.org/wiki/T%C3%BCrkiye%27de\\_%C4%B0internet%27in\\_2013\\_Durumu](http://www.alternatifbilisim.org/wiki/T%C3%BCrkiye%27de_%C4%B0internet%27in_2013_Durumu) Access Date: 12 November 2015.

Ayan, Sezen (2006). "Şiddet ve Fanatizm", *C. U. Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, Volume: 7, Issue: 2, p. 191-209.

Balta Peltekoğlu, Filiz (2012). "Sosyal Medya-Sosyal Değişim", *Sosyal Medya-Akademi, İletişim-Pazarlama İletişimi-Ağ Toplumu-Teknoloji*, (Editors: Tolga Kara and Ebru Özgen), İstanbul: Beta Publishing, p. 3-20.

Bowling, A. (2002). *Research Methods in Health: Investigating Health and Health Services*, Philadelphia, PA: McGraw-Hill House.

Bulunmaz, Barış (2014). "New World Created by Social Media: Transmedia Storytelling", *Journal of Media Critiques JMC, Social Media and Network Society – I: Changes in Mass Communication* Special Issue 1.

Correa, Teresa; Willard Hinsley, Amber; Gil de Zúñiga, Homero (2010). "Who Interacts on the Web?: The Intersection of Users' Personality and Social Media Use", *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26, p. 247-253, journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/comphumbeh](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/comphumbeh).

Çalışır, Gülsüm (2015). "Kişilerarası İletişimde Kullanılan Bir Araç Olarak Sosyal Medya: Gümüşhane Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Öğrencilerine Yönelik Bir Araştırma", *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy, NWSA Humanities Sciences*, Cilt: 10, Sayı: 3, ss. 115-144, ISSN: 1306-3111/1308-7320, <http://dx.doi.org/10.12739/NWSA.2015.10.3.4C0197>.

Çelebi, Aykut (2010). *Şiddetin Eleştirisi Üzerine*, İstanbul: Metis Publishing.

Çokluk, Ömay; Yılmaz, Kürşad and Oğuz, Ebru (2011). "Nitel Bir Görüşme Yöntemi: Odak Grup Görüşmesi", *Journal of Theoretic Pedagogy*, Volume: 4, Issue: 1, p. 95-107, [www.keg.aku.edu.tr](http://www.keg.aku.edu.tr).

Dal, Nil Esra and Dal, Veysel (2014). "Kişilik Özellikleri ve Sosyal Ağ Sitesi Kullanım Alışkanlıkları: Üniversite Öğrencileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma", *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, Volume: 6, Issue: 11, p. 144-162.

De Choudhury, Munmun and others (2010). "Inferring Relevant Social Networks from Interpersonal Communication", Copyright is held by the International World Wide

Web Conference Committee (IW3C2). WWW 2010, April 26–30, 2010, Raleigh, North Carolina, USA, ACM 978-1-60558-799-8/10/04.

Dursun, Yücel (2011). "Şiddetin İzini Sürmek: Şiddet Nedir?", *Journal of Philosophy and Social Sciences*, Autumn, Issue: 12, p. 1-18. <http://www.flisdergisi.com/sayi12/1-18.pdf> Access Date: 12 October 2015.

Eyrich, Nina; Padman, Monica L.; Sweetser, Kaye D. (2008). "PR Practitioners' Use of Social Media Tools and Communication Technology, *Public Relations Review*, 34, p. 412-414.

Fischer, Eileen and Reuber, A. Rebecca (2011), "Social Interaction Via New Social Media: (How) Can Interactions on Twitter Affect Effectual Thinking and Behavior?", *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26, p. 1-18.

Göker, Göksel (2015). "İletişimin McDonaldlaşması: Sosyala Medya Üzerine Bir İnceleme", *Turkish Studies - International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* Volume 10/2 Winter 2015, p. 389-410.

Gönenli, Gülşah and Hürmeriç, Pelin (2012). "Sosyal Medya: Bir Alan Çalışması Olarak Facebook Kullanımı", *Sosyal Medya-Akademi, İletişim-Pazarlama İletişimi-Ağ Toplumu-Teknoloji*, (Editors: Tolga Kara-Ebru Özgen), İstanbul: Beta Publishing, p. 213-242.

İnceoğlu, Yasemin (2015). Backyard programme, <http://www.yasemininceoglu.com/default.aspx?cat=7> Access Date: 12 November 2015.

Kaplan, Andreas M. and Haenlein, Michael (2010). "Users of the World, Unite! The Challenges and Opportunities of Social Media", *Kelley School of Business, Indiana University, Business Horizons*, 53, p. 59-68.

Kietzmann, Jan H.; Hermkens, Kristopher; McCarthy, Ian P.; Silvestre, Bruno S. (2011). "Social Media? Get Serious! Understanding the Functional Building Blocks of Social Media", *Kelley School of Business, Indiana University, Business Horizons*, 54, p. 241-251.

Krueger, Richard A. (1994). *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide For Applied Research*, London: SAGE.

Marangoz, Yeşildağ, Arıkan Saltık (2012). E-Ticaret İşletmelerin Web Sosyal Ağ Sitelerinin İçerik Analizi Yöntemiyle İncelenmesi", *IUYD*, 3/2, p. 53-78.

Myfield, Antony (2008). *What Is Social Media?*, An e-book by Antony Myfield from iCrossing, Updated: 01.08.08. <http://www.slideshare.net/ngmkt/what-is-socialmediaicrossingebook-5344392> Access Date: 13 October 2015.

Nefret Söylemleri ve Nefret Suçları İzleme Raporu - Hate Expressions and Hate Guilts Follow UpReport (2013). <http://www.ihad.org.tr/file/reports/2013/2013%20NSraporu.pdf> Access Date: 13 November 2015.

Otrar, Mustafa and Argın, Ferhat Süleyman (2014). "Öğrencilerin Sosyal Medyaya İlişkin Tutumlarının Kullanım Alışkanlıkları Bağlamında İncelenmesi", Journal of Research in Education and Teaching, Volume: 3, Issue: 3, Article No: 1, p. 1-13.

Ögel, Kültegin; Tarı, İtir; Yılmazçetin Eke, Ceyda (2006). Okullarda Suç ve Şiddeti Önleme, İstanbul: Yeniden Publishing.

Özer, Ömer (2010). "Şiddet Olaylarına İlişkin Haberlerin Üretimi: Ankara'daki Polis-Adliye Muhabirlerinin Görüşleri", Medyada Şiddet Kültürü, (Editor: Ömer Özer), İstanbul: Literatürk, ss. 61-119.

Özer, Ömer (2010). Medyada Şiddet Kültürü, (Editor: Ömer Özer), İstanbul: Literatürk.

Pempek, Tiffany A., Yermolayeva, Yevdokiya. A. and Calvert, Sandra. L., (2009). "College Students' Social Networking Experiences on Facebook," Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 30, 2009, p. 227–238.

Social Media (2015). Welcome to The Beginner's Guide to Social Media! [http://d2eeipcrdle6.cloudfront.net/guides/beginners\\_guide\\_to\\_social\\_media.pdf](http://d2eeipcrdle6.cloudfront.net/guides/beginners_guide_to_social_media.pdf) Access Date: 17 October 2015.

Taylor, Hannah (2012). Social Media for Social Change, Using the Internet to Tackle Intolerance, Action Research Report, Institute for Strategic Dialogue.

T.C. Başbakanlık Kadın Strateji Genel Müdürlüğü (2009). Türkiye'de Kadına Yönelik Aile İçi Şiddet, Ankara: Public Sector, Hacettepe University Institute of Population Researches, BNB Consulting.

Ustakara, Fuat and Türkoğlu, Emir (2015). "Y Kuşağının Bir Gözetim Mekanizması Olarak Sosyal Ağlar Üzerine Algısı: Gaziantep Üniversitesi Araştırması", TURKISH STUDIES -International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, Volume 10/10 Summer 2015, p. 939-958.

Yegen, Ceren (2013). "Demokratik ve Yeni Kamusal Alan Olarak Sosyal Medya", Muş Alparslan University Social Sciences Journal, Volume: 1, Issue: 2, p. 119-135.

Yıldırım, Ali and Şimşek, Hasan (2004). Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri, 4th Edition, Ankara: Seçkin Publishing.

Xiang, Zheng and Gretzel, Ulrike (2010). "Role of Social Media in Online Travel Information Search", *Tourism Management*, 31, p. 179–188. journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/tourman](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/tourman).

<https://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anomi> Access Date: 13 November 2015.