

## POLITICIANS SHARE LOCAL ISSUES THROUGH TWITTER: A SAMPLE OF THE POLITICIANS OF EASTERN ANATOLIA REGION

*Nural İMİK TANYILDIZI\*, Gökhan ALPTEKİN\*\**

### Abstract

As a new media product, the Internet has great implications for the political sphere. The main purpose of the study is to determine whether the members of the Parliament use Twitter as a social media tool. Content analysis method was applied. In the research conducted between the dates of 01-31 May 2018, 48 deputies of the Eastern Anatolia Region shared their personal accounts through Twitter application. Accordingly, it was determined that the daily share rate of 48 deputies belonging to the Eastern Anatolia Region is 3.60 Tweets-Retweet. The province with the highest daily share is Erzurum. The minimum percentage of daily sharing is in Ardahan. "The development, environment and infrastructure" categories have a share ratio of 1.19 in total, while it is 2.55 in the "spore" category in the topics dealt with by parliamentarians in the tweets. As a result of the analyzes, it was seen that the application of Twitter did not use enough level by the deputies of Eastern Anatolia Region in order to inform the public and transfer the regional developments. However, it was found that the usage practices had more national sharing than the shares that they represent.

**Key Words:** Political Communication, Social Media, Twitter, Democracy

## SIYASİLERİN YEREL KONULARI TWİTTER ÜZERİNDEN AKTARIMI: DOĞU ANADOLU BÖLGESİ MİLLETVEKİLLERİ ÖRNEĞİ

### Öz

İnternetin bir yeni medya ürünü olarak siyasal alana uzanan büyük etkileri bulunmaktadır. Çalışmanın temel amacı TBMM üyelerinin bir sosyal medya aracı olan Twitter'ı aktif şekilde kullanıp kullanmadığını tespit etmektir. İçerik analizi yöntemine başvurulmuştur. Yapılan araştırmada 2018 yılının 01-31 Mayıs tarihleri arasında Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi'ne mensup 48 milletvekilinin Twitter uygulaması aracılığıyla şahsi hesaplarından yaptıkları paylaşımlar incelenmiştir. Buna göre Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi'ne mensup olan 48 milletvekilinin günlük paylaşım oranının 3.60 Tweet-Retweet olduğu saptanmıştır. Bölge illeri arasında en fazla günlük paylaşım oranına sahip il Erzurum'dur. En az günlük paylaşım yüzdesi ise Ardahan ilindedir. Milletvekillerinin tweetlerde ele aldığı konular içinde "imar, çevre ve altyapı" kategorisi toplamda 1.19'luk paylaşım oranına sahipken, "spor" kategorisinde ise bu oranın 2.55 olduğu görülmüştür. Yapılan analizler sonucunda Twitter uygulamasının kamuoyunu bilgilendirmek, bölgesel gelişmeleri aktarmak gibi amaçlarla, Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi milletvekilleri tarafından yeterli derece de kullanılmadığı görülmüştür. Kullanım pratiklerinin ise temsil ettikleri bölgelerle ilgili paylaşımlar dışında daha çok ulusal çapta paylaşımlar olduğu saptanmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Siyasal İletişim, Sosyal Medya, Twitter, Demokrasi

### قضايا محلية من السياسة على تويتر : حالة من منطقة شرق الأناضول

#### مقتطف

كنتجاء إعلامي جديد ، فإن الإنترنت نلتها تأثير كبير على المجال السياسي . الهدف الرئيسي من الدراسة هو تحديد ما إذا كان أعضاء البرلمان يسيئون استخدام تويتر كأداة للتواصل الاجتماعي . تم تطبيق طريقة تحليل المحتوى ، في الدراسة ، لتحليل 48 من أعضاء منطقة شرق الأناضول ، الذين هم أعضاء في منطقة الأناضول الشرقية ، بين 01-31 مايو 2014 Tweet-Retweet. عبر تطبيقهم على تويتر . وقال هذا ، كان معدل المشاركة اليومية من 48 نائباً من منطقة شرق الأناضول 3.60 المقاطعة التي تبادلها علم معدل للسهام اليومية مبهياً ضرور الحد الأدنى لنسبة المشاركة اليومية في أدهان . في حين أن تصنيف البيئة والبنية التحتية له حصة 1.19 في المواضيع التي ناقشها أعضاء البرلمان في التغريدات ، فمن الواضح أن هذه النسبة هي 2.55 في فئة "الرياضة الدخن" نتيجة لتحليلات ، كان ينظر إلى أن تطبيق تويتر لم يستخدم مستو كافي من قبلنا وإقليم شرق الأناضول من أجل إعلام الجمهور ونقل تطورنا الإقليمية ، وفقدوا جداً ممارساتنا لاستخدام ملديهم مشاركتهم وطنية أكثر من المشار كات التي تمثلها .

\* Doç. Dr., Fırat Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi, Halkla İlişkiler ve Tanıtım, [nimik@firat.edu.tr](mailto:nimik@firat.edu.tr), ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9177-759X>.

\*\* Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi, Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İletişim Bilimleri, [ghn.alptekin@gmail.com](mailto:ghn.alptekin@gmail.com), ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9374-5471>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Political communication is the expression of individuals as a special form of struggle of power among the communities. It is a concept that covers all communicative activities for political purposes in a very wide area. (Çankaya, 2015: 13). However, it is not easy to limit this area to a specific framework. (Mutlu, 2005: 363). Political communication studies define both political communication and political communication. (Tokgöz, 2010: 27). Big data has dramatically changed the study of political communications online as researchers access massive feeds of data on social media behavior, networks, and language. However, the nature of political communication remains inherently message-driven, where the composition, timing, and metaphor are necessary components of the overall message (Pal ve Gonavela, 2017: 97). As a new media product, the Internet has a great impact on the political sphere. Social media applications provided instant access to the masses. Thus, politicians communicate more easily with their voters.

When the literature on the subject is considered, it is seen that there are many studies in the field. It has reached the political parties and the leaders discussed the use of Twitter field work during the election period in Turkey (Genel, 2012; Bayraktutan vd. 2014; Keskin ve Sönmez, 2015). In other countries, studies on the use of social media in politics have been found. (Lutz, 2009; O'Donnell, 2011; Shirky, 2011; Vitak, vd, 2011, Momoc, 2013; Kasmani vd, 2014; Pal ve Gonavela, 2017; Weaver vd, 2018). In this study, the use of social media, one of the new media elements, in democratic political systems is examined. It has been moved a sample of the deputies from the Eastern Anatolia Region. In previous studies, the use of Twitter on political party leaders has been examined. In this study, a detailed analysis was made by using the sample of the deputies of Eastern Anatolia Region. Data was received over a more comprehensive time frame. Therefore, the study is important.

## 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Political communication is as old as political activities (Lilleker, 2013: 15). The concept of political communication began to develop and develop in the United States after the Second World War. It was widely used in Western European countries after the 1960s (Topuz, 1991: 7). Political communication is an interactive process concerning the transmission of information among politicians, the news media, and the public. The process operates downward from governing institutions toward citizens, horizontally in linkages among political actors, and also upward from public opinion toward authorities. Political communication has always been central to the electoral and policymaking process but since the early 1990s certain important developments have fundamentally altered this process, particularly postwar trends in the mass media moving from the traditional world of newspapers, radio, and television broadcasting toward the Internet (Norris, 2015: 342).

In the times of the printing machine and of the written information production, information consumers were more than the information producers, but today the number of those who generate news/events and disseminate them online for the large masses tend to become equal to the number of those who consume news/events. In the social media age, each citizen having access to an online communication platform turns into an information producer (Momoc, 2013: 117). The debate about the role of social media in supporting or discouraging exposure to various perspectives is pertinent to the argument of vigorous democracy. This relates to the potential of Internet-based media to create a vibrant public sphere, which is a key concept in contemporary political communication (Kasmani vd. , 2014: 348).

Social media is defined as a participant and a more mobile media type, which has its own specific rules and forms of communication (Büyükaşlan et al. 2013: 137). The election campaigns, which are based on communication, have started to change in recent years due to changes in digital technologies (Chadwick, 2014; Tanyıldızı & Ateş, 2018: 49). Social media sites, in particular, are becoming increasingly important as communication platforms that should be taken into account in the process of political communication because of the increasing number of user members (Bayraktutan et al., 2014: 59-96).

### 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The main purpose of this study is to determine whether the members of the TBMM actively use Twitter as a social media tool. The aim of the course is to determine how often the deputies share the developments about the regions they represent in their social media accounts. The study covers the share of 48 deputies of the Eastern Anatolia Region on Twitter accounts which has a Twitter account between May 01-31.

Content analysis method was used in the research. Content analysis is an observation technique used in social or sociological research (Aziz, 2017: 129). It has been used extensively since the last 40-50 years. The deputies were determined with the help of a computer. It was determined whether the deputies identified were active participants on Twitter. According to the provincial and political parties, it was written on the coding chart which was arranged on the computer in the period of 01-31 May. The tweet-retweet sharing data part of the study was counted by following the day. It is marked on the coding chart between the specified date range. A second coding table was created for the categories created for the study. The data collected here is systematically categorized. All data collected in the study were divided into several slices by using mathematical proportions. It was then turned into a table.

In the research, the topic examined in the content analysis coding form is divided into several categories. These categories are given below:

Zoning, environment and infrastructure issues / sharing with culture, art and historical content / education, / economic, / sports / public order, health / Shares other than regional issues.

The shares other than regional issues are included in the following subheadings: shares made on a national scale, headquarters shares, personal visits that are not within the constituency, all kinds of content and special day shares that are not related to the provinces they represent and all the shares outside the local.

The hypotheses of the research are given below:

**H<sup>0</sup>.** Deputies from the Eastern Anatolia Region are actively using Twitter, and the reason for the use of Twitter by deputies is to inform the public about local issues.

**H<sup>1</sup>.** The deputies of the Eastern Anatolia Region convey the developments about the province they represent to the public adequately through their personal accounts.

**H<sup>2</sup>.** In Eastern Anatolia, government party deputies are shared most on Twitter.

**H<sup>3</sup>.** Deputies of the Eastern Anatolia Region make the most shares on local issues about "Reconstruction Environment and Infrastructure" category.

#### 4. FINDINGS

**Table 1. The Rate of the Daily Tweet-RetweetSharingDeputies of Eastern Anatolia Region**

<b>Eastern Anatolia Region</b>	<b>Number of Deputies</b>	<b>Total Tweet-RetweetCount</b>	<b>Daily %</b>
Ağrı	3	236	<b>2.53</b>
Ardahan	2	58	<b>0.93</b>
Bingöl	3	288	<b>3.09</b>
Bitlis	3	151	<b>1.62</b>
Elazığ	4	274	<b>2.20</b>
Erzurum	6	1243	<b>6.68</b>
Erzincan	2	65	<b>1.04</b>
Hakkâri	3	104	<b>1.11</b>
Iğdır	2	165	<b>2.66</b>
Kars	3	613	<b>6.59</b>
Malatya	6	922	<b>4.95</b>
Muş	3	176	<b>1.89</b>
Tunceli	2	80	<b>1.29</b>
Van	6	989	<b>5.31</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>5364</b>	<b>3.60</b>

The rate of the daily tweet-retweet sharing deputies of Eastern Anatolia Region are given in Table 1. According to this data, the province with the highest share percentage was Erzurum. Kars was second in the region with 6.59 and third in Van with 5.31. Malatya was fourth with a rate of 4.95 and Bingöl was the fifth with a ratio of 3.09. Iğdır was the sixth in the 2.66s and Ağrı was the seventh in the 2.53. Elazığ was the eighth in the ratio of 2.20 and Muş was in the ninth in the ratio of 1.89. Bitlis was tenth compared to 1.62. Tunceli was the eleventh in 1.29, and Hakkâri in the 12 th. Erzincan ranked 13th with a rate of 1.04, while Ardahan, with a 0.93 daily Tweet-Retweet sharing rate, ranked last. In total, the daily sharing rate of 48 members of the Parliament was 3.60.

**Table 2. Distribution of Local Issues of “Ağrı” Deputies on Twitter**

Deputy	Berdan Öztürk	Cesim Gökçe	Dirayet Taşdemir	Total
<b>Political party</b>	<b>Halkların Demokratik Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	<b>Halkların Demokratik Party</b>	
Development, Environment and Infrastructure	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
Culture, art and historical	2	1	7	<b>10</b>
Education	0	0	3	<b>3</b>
Ekonomi	0	0	5	<b>5</b>
Spore	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Asayiş	0	1	3	<b>4</b>
Health	0	1	1	<b>2</b>
Shares other than regional issues	36	14	161	<b>211</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>236</b>

In Table 2, the distribution of local issues of the deputies of Ağrı province on Twitter is given. In the light of the information obtained, it is seen that “Shares other than regional issues” are more than the other categories and they rank first in terms of numerical multiplicity. According to this information, the spore category is the last. According to the deputies of Ağrı province, Dirayet Taşdemir shared regional issues more frequently than the other deputies.

**Table 3. Distribution of Local Issues of “Ardahan” Deputies on Twitter**

Deputy	Orhan Atalay	Öztürk Yılmaz	Total
<b>Political Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	<b>Cumhuriyet Halk Party</b>	
Development, Environment and Infrastructure	0	0	<b>0</b>

Culture,art andhistorical andhistorical	0	2	2
Education	0	0	0
Economic	0	0	0
Spore	0	0	0
Security	0	0	0
Health	0	1	1
Sharesotherthan regionalissues	18	37	55
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>58</b>

Accordingtothetable, it is seen that Shares other than regional issues are more than other categories and they are ranked first in terms of numerical multiplicity. Ardahan Deputy Ozturk Yilmaz's share of local content compared to the other regional deputy Orhan Atalay'da seen more sharing.

**Table 4. Distribution of Local Issues of “Bingöl” Deputies on Twitter**

Deputy	Cevdet Yılmaz	Enver Fehmioğlu	Hişyar Özsoy	Total
Political Party	Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party	Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party	Halkların Demokratik Party	
Development, Environment and Infrastructure	2	1	0	3
Culture, art and historical	10	0	0	10
Education	2	0	0	2
Economic	3	0	1	4
Spore	0	3	0	3

Security	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
Health	0	4	0	<b>4</b>
Shares other than regional issues	130	117	14	<b>261</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>288</b>

According to the table, the first order in terms of numerical multiplicity is “Shares other than regional issues”. Adalet ve Kalkınma Party’s deputy Cevdet Yılmaz has been found to share more regional direction than the other Bingöl deputies. Out of all “Shares other than regional issues”, it is concluded that most of the culture, art and historical categories were submitted. According to the table, the minimum transmission is in the security category.

**Table 5. Distribution of Local Issues of “Bitlis” Deputies on Twitter**

Deputy	Mahmut Gaydalı	Mizgin Irgat	Vedat Demiröz	Total
<b>Political Party</b>	<b>Halkların Demokratik Party</b>	<b>Halkların Demokratik Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	
Development, Environment and Infrastructure	0	0	2	<b>2</b>
Culture, art and historical	0	4	8	<b>12</b>
Education	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
Economic	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Spore	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Security	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Health	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Shares other than regional issues	0	33	103	<b>136</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>151</b>

As a result of the analysis, it is seen that “Shares other than regional issues” are more than the other categories. Adalet ve Kalkınma Party deputy Vedat Demiröz is a more active participant on Twitter than the other Bitlis deputies. It was also found that he made more local content.

**Table 6. Distribution of Local Issues of “Elazığ” Deputies on Twitter**

Deputy	Ejder Açıkkapı	Metin Bulut	Ömer Serdar	Tahir Öztürk	Total
<b>Political Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	
Development, Environment and Infrastructure	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Culture, art and historical	2	2	1	2	<b>7</b>
Education	0	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
Economic	1	2	0	1	<b>4</b>
Spore	1	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
Security	2	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
Health	1	1	3	2	<b>7</b>
Shares other than regional issues	68	72	52	60	<b>252</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>274</b>

Table 6 shows the distribution of local issues discussed by Elazığ deputies on Twitter. According to the data, “shares other than region” is more than other categories. It was found that Elazığ deputies were less involved in transferring local issues. Other most shared posts were made in “culture and health” categories.



**Table 7. Distribution of Local Issues of “Erzurum” Deputies on Twitter**

Deputy	İbrahim Aydemir	Kamil Aydın	Mustafa İlçalı	Orhan Deligöz	Recep Akdağ	Zehra Taşkesenlioğlu	Total
Political Party	Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party	Mhp	Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party	Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party	Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party	Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party	
Development, Environment and Infrastructure	2	0	8	4	1	3	18
Culture, art and historical	5	2	12	8	0	13	40
Education	3	0	13	2	0	4	22
Economic	4	0	9	1	1	8	23
Sport	8	6	74	19	6	9	122
Security	1	0	1	0	0	1	3
Health	4	0	7	4	0	1	16
Shares other than regional issues	154	109	221	181	31	303	999
<b>Total</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>1243</b>

In the table, it is seen that external sharing is more common than other categories. Mustafa İlçalı from Adalet ve Kalkınma Party was the name that shared the most of the local issues. “Sports” category is the first with 122 shares. The “safety” category with 3 shares was the last.

**Table 8. Distribution of Local Issues of “Erzincan” Deputies on Twitter**

<b>Deputy</b>	<b>Sebahattin Karakelle</b>	<b>Serkan Bayram</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Political Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	
Development, Environment and Infrastructure	0	3	<b>3</b>
Culture, art and historical	0	1	<b>1</b>
Education	0	1	<b>1</b>
Economic	0	2	<b>2</b>
Spore	0	2	<b>2</b>
Security	0	0	<b>0</b>
Health	0	0	<b>0</b>
Shares other than regional issues	0	56	<b>56</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>65</b>

According to Table 8, “shares other than region” is more common than other shares. It was found that Serkan Bayram from the Adalet ve Kalkınma Party made more regional content than the other deputy. “the development, environment and infrastructure” category was the most commonly used categories after “Shares other than regional issues”.

**Table 9. Distribution of Local Issues of “Hakkari” Deputies on Twitter**

<b>Deputy</b>	<b>Abdullah Zeydan</b>	<b>Nihat Akdoğan</b>	<b>Selma Irmak</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Political Party</b>	<b>Halkların Demokratik Party</b>	<b>Halkların Demokratik Party</b>	<b>Halkların Demokratik Party</b>	
Development, Environment and Infrastructure	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Culture, art and historical	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
Education	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Economic	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
Spore	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Security	0	2	0	<b>2</b>
Health	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
Shares other than regional issues	0	96	3	<b>99</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>104</b>

Table 9 shows the distribution of local issues discussed by Hakkari deputies on Twitter. Based on the available data, it is understood that “shares other than regional issues” are more numerical. Nihat Akdoğan, deputy of the Halkların Demokratik Party, shared the most local content.

**Table 10. Distribution of Local Issues of “İğdır” Deputies on Twitter**

<b>Deputy</b>	<b>Mehmet Emin Adıyaman</b>	<b>Nurettin Aras</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Political Party</b>	<b>Halkların Demokratik Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	
Development, Environment and Infrastructure	0	0	<b>0</b>
Culture, art and historical	2	0	<b>2</b>
Education	0	0	<b>0</b>
Economic	0	0	<b>0</b>
Spore	0	0	<b>0</b>
Security	7	0	<b>7</b>
Health	2	0	<b>2</b>
Shares other than regional issues	154	0	<b>154</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>165</b>

Table 10 shows the distribution of local issues discussed by İğdır deputies on Twitter. Within the scope of the research, the number of “shares other than regional issues” is higher than in other categories. Most categories have never been shared. It was determined that deputy Mehmet Emin Adıyaman shared more local content than the other district deputy. The “security” category was the second most commonly used category after “Shares other than regional issues”.

**Table 11. Distribution of Local Issues of “Kars” Deputies on Twitter**

<b>Deputy</b>	<b>Ahmet Arslan</b>	<b>Ayhan Bilgen</b>	<b>Selahattin Beyribey</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Political Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	<b>Halkların Demokratik Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	
Development, Environment and Infrastructure	10	0	3	13
Culture, art and historical	2	0	2	4
Education	3	0	3	6
Economic	0	1	0	1
Spore	0	1	2	3
Security	0	0	0	0
Health	1	0	3	4
Shares other than regional issues	246	216	120	582
<b>Total</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>613</b>

“Shares other than regional issue” have more shares than others. Ahmet Arslan, a member of the Adalet ve Kalkınma Party, was found to have a higher share of local affairs than other Kars deputies. There is no share in the “security” category.

**Tablo 12. Distribution of Local Issues of “Malatya” Deputies on Twitter**

Deputy	Bülent Tüfenkci	Mustafa Şahin	Nurettin Yaşar	Öznur Çalık	Taha Özhan	Veli Ağbaba	Total
<b>Political Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	<b>Cumhuriyet Halk Party</b>	
Development, Environment and Infrastructure	6	1	0	5	0	0	12
Culture, art and historical	2	2	0	5	0	5	14
Education	5	0	0	1	0	2	8
Economic	15	0	0	20	0	5	40
Spore	0	0	0	4	0	2	6
Security	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Health	4	1	0	5	0	0	10
Shares other than regional issues	203	27	0	362	3	36	831
<b>Total</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>922</b>

Table 12 shows the distribution of local issues discussed by Malatya deputies on Twitter. From the table data, it was found that “Shares other than regional issues” were higher than the share numbers made under other local topics. Öznur Çalık, one of the deputy of the Adalet ve Kalkınma Party, shared the most local content. The shares made in the local topics were mostly in the “economy” and the least in the “security” category.

**Table 13. Distribution of Local Issues of “Muş” Deputies on Twitter**

<b>Deputy</b>	<b>Ahmet Yıldırım</b>	<b>Burcu Özkan</b>	<b>Çelik Emin</b>	<b>Mehmet Şimşek</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Political Party</b>	<b>Halkların Demokratik Party</b>	<b>Halkların Demokratik Party</b>		<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	
Development, Environment and Infrastructure	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Culture, art and historical	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Education	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Economic	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Spore	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Security	0	0	0	2	<b>2</b>
Health	0	0	0	2	<b>2</b>
Shares other than regional issues	127	0	0	45	<b>172</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>176</b>

Table 13 shows the distribution of local issues discussed by Muş deputies on Twitter. Within the scope of the research, the number of “shares other than regional issues” is higher than in other categories. Most categories have never been shared. Adalet ve Kalkınma Party deputy Mehmet Emin Şimşek has more local content sharing than the other regional deputies.

**Table 14. Distribution of Local Issues of “Tunceli” Deputies on Twitter**

<b>Deputy</b>	<b>Alican Önlü</b>	<b>Gürsel Erol</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Political Party</b>	<b>Halkların Demokratik Party</b>	<b>Cumhuriyet Halk Party</b>	
Development, Environment and Infrastructure Sorunları	0	0	<b>0</b>
Culture, art and historical	4	1	<b>5</b>
Education	0	0	<b>0</b>
Economic	0	0	<b>0</b>
Spore	0	0	<b>0</b>
Security	0	0	<b>0</b>
Health	0	0	<b>0</b>
Shares other than regional issues	40	35	<b>75</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>80</b>

From the table data, it was found that “Shares other than regional issues” were higher than the share numbers made under other local topics as in other regional cities. It was found that Halkların Demokratik Party deputy Alican Önlü shared more local-based content than Gürsel Erol, who was the other regional deputy. The other sharing was done in “culture, art and historical” category.



**Table 15. Distribution of Local Issues of “Van” Deputies on Twitter**

Deputy	Adem Geveri	Bedia Özgökçe Ertan	Beşir Atalay	Burhan Kayatürk	Lezgin Botan	Nadir Yıldırım	Total
<b>Political Party</b>	<b>Halkların Demokratik Party</b>	<b>Halkların Demokratik Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	<b>Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party</b>	<b>Halkların Demokratik Party</b>	<b>Halkların Demokratik Party</b>	
Development, Environment and Infrastructure	0	8	0	4	0	0	<b>12</b>
Culture, art and historical	8	5	0	8	2	0	<b>23</b>
Education	0	0	0	2	1	0	<b>3</b>
Economic	2	5	0	3	2	0	<b>12</b>
Spore	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Security	5	0	0	0	1	0	<b>6</b>
Health	1	1	0	1	7	0	<b>10</b>
Shares other than regional issues	259	241	0	86	336	1	<b>923</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>989</b>

Table 15 shows the distribution of local issues discussed by Van deputies on Twitter. It was found that Halkların Demokratik Party deputy Bedia Özgökçe Ertan and Adalet ve Kalkınma Party deputy Burhan Kayatürk shared more local-based content than other deputies. The other sharing was done in “culture, art and historical” category.

**Table 16. Share Ratio of Deputies on Twitter by Category**

City	Development Environment and Infrastructure %	Culture, art and historical %	Education %	Economic %	Sports %	Security %	Health %	Shares other than regional issues %	Total %
Ağrı	0.42	4.23	1.27	2.11	0	1.69	0.84	89.4	100
Ardahan	0	3.44	0	0	0	0	1.72	94.8	100
Bingöl	1.04	3.47	0.69	1.38	1.04	0.34	1.38	90.6	100
Bitlis	1.32	7.94	0.66	0	0	0	0	90.0	100
Elazığ	0	2.55	0.36	1.45	0.36	0.72	2.55	91.9	100
Erzurum	1.44	3.21	1.76	1.85	9.81	0.24	1.28	80.3	100
Erzincan	4.61	1.53	1.53	3.07	3.07	0	0	86.1	100
Hakkâri	0	0.96	0	0.96	0	1.92	0.96	95.1	100
Kars	2.12	0.65	0.97	0.16	0.48	0	0.65	94.9	100
Iğdır	0	1.21	0	0	0	4.24	1.21	93.3	100
Tunceli	0	6.25	0	0	0	0	0	93.7	100
Malatya	1.30	1.51	0.86	4.33	0.65	0.10	1.08	90.1	100
Muş	0	0	0	0	0	1.13	1.13	97.7	100
Van	1.21	2.32	0.30	1.21	0	0.60	1.01	93.3	100
<b>Toplm</b>	<b>1.19</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>1.71</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>89.5</b>	<b>100</b>

The rates of sharing of the provinces in the Eastern Anatolia Region by category are given in Table 16. It is seen that the “Shares other than regional issues” is the first in all provinces. In the light of this information, when the other regional categories were evaluated among themselves, the most share was in the category of “culture, art and historical” with a ratio of 7.94. The least share was in the safety category with a ratio of 0.52.

**Table 17. Top 10 Members of Parliament by Total Share on Twitter**

Placement	Names Of Deputies	Total Sharing Number	City	Political party
-----------	-------------------	----------------------	------	-----------------

1	Öznur Çalık	402	Malatya	Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party
2	Lezgin Botan	349	Van	Halkların Demokratik Party
3	Mustafa Ilıcalı	345	Erzurum	Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party
4	Zehra Taşkesenlioğlu	342	Erzurum	Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party
5	Adem Geveri	275	Van	Halkların Demokratik Party
6	Ahmet Arslan	262	Kars	Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party
7	Bedi Özgökçe Ertan	260	Van	Halkların Demokratik Party
8	Veli Ağbaba	250	Malatya	Cumhuriyet Halk Party
9	Bülent Tüfenkci	235	Malatya	Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party
10	Orhan Deligöz	219	Erzurum	Adalet Ve Kalkınma Party

In Table 17, the list of the top 10 deputies who have shared most of their personal accounts is given. Öznur Çalık is a deputy who is the most widely shared members. Lezgin Botan is the second. Mustafa Ilıcalı is third. In the first 10, it was seen that the most shares were made by the Adalet ve Kalkınma Party deputies. From the Cumhuriyet Halk Party, only Veli Ağbaba was able to take part in the table.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The results of this study are given below

- As a result of the research, it was determined that deputies would not be able to adequately transfer the problems of the region they represent to their personal accounts. It is seen that deputies share more than. “shares other than regional issues” is higher than in other regional issues.
- This study showed that the deputies of the government party in the Eastern Anatolia Region have shared more than another party deputy on Twitter.
- After “Shares other than regional issues” category, among the local issues, the most sharing was in the category of “culture, art and historical”

One of the most important tasks of deputies is to express the problems of the province they represent. As a result of the research, the level of sharing the regional problems of the deputies of the Eastern Anatolia Region is low. Deputies share many twitter shares. But sharing is usually a daily political debate as content. It is recommended that new media technologies be used in place and frequently by politicians.

## REFERENCES

Aziz, A. (2017). Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri ve teknikleri. Ankara, Türkiye: Nobel Yayınları.

- Bayraktutan G. , Binark M. , Çomu T. , Doğu B. , İslamoğlu G. , Telli Büyükaslan, A., Kırık A. Mç., (2013). Sosyal Medya Araştırmaları Sosyalleşen birey, Konya, Türkiye: Çizgi Kitabevi.
- Chadwick, A.(2014). Thehybridmediasystem: politicsandpower. New York, Amerika: Oxford UniversityPress.
- Çankaya, E. (2015). Siyasal İletişim Dünyada Ve Türkiye’de, Ankara, Türkiye: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Genel, M. G. (2012). Siyasal iletişim kampanyalarında sosyal medyanın kullanımı (12 haziran 2011 seçimleri “twitter” örneği. *The Turkish Online Journal of Design, Art And Communication* -Tojdac, 2 (4), 23-31.
- Gökgül A. N. (2016). Sosyal Medyanın Siyasal İletişim Aracı Olarak Kullanılması 7 Haziran 2015 Genel Seçimleri Twitter Örneği. *Yeni Yüzyıl Üniversitesi Dergisi*, İstanbul, 59-156.
- Kasmani, M.F. ,Rosidayu S., Noradzrah R. (2014). Can Twitter Be An Effective Platform ForPoliticalDiscourse İn Malaysia? A Study Of #Pru13. *Procedia -SocialAndBehavioralSciences*, 155, 348 – 355.
- Keskin, S., Sönmez, F. (2015). Liderler ve Takipçileri: PoliticalParty Liderlerinin Twitter Performansları Ve Takip İlişkisi. *Selçuk İletişim*, 29 (1), 339-362.
- Köseoğlu, Y. , Al, H. (2013). Bir Siyasal Propaganda Aracı Olarak Sosyal Medya. *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi*, 8(3), 103-125.
- Lilleker, D. (2013). Siyasal İletişim Temel Kavramlar. İstanbul, Türkiye: Kaknüs Yayınları.
- Lutz, M. (2009). TheSocialPulpit Barack Obama’sSocial Media Toolkit. Svp-DigitalPublicAffairs, Edelman. Retrieve (2009), From <http://www.edelman.com/image/insights/content/social%20pulpit%20barack%20obamas%20social%20media%20toolkit%201.09.pdf>, (e.t. 02. 05. 2018)
- Momoc, A. (2013). SocialMedia - Pr Tools ForRomanianPoliticians?. *Procedia - SocialAndBehavioralSciences*, 81, 116 – 121
- Mutlu, E. (2005). Globalleşme, Popüler Kültür Ve Medya. Ankara, Türkiye: Ütopya Yayınevi
- Norris, P. (2015). PoliticalCommunication. *International Encyclopedia Of TheSocial&BehavioralSciences*, (Second Edition), 342-349
- O’donnel, C. (2011). New StudyQuantifiesUse Of Social Media İn Arab Spring.” *Sciencedaily*. RetrievedJanuary 5, From <Http://Www.Washington.Edu/News/Articles/New-Study-Quantifiesuse-Of-Social-Media-İn-Arab-Spring>, (E.T. 02. 05. 2018)
- Pal, J. ,A'ndreGonawela. (2017). StudyingPoliticalCommunication On Twitter: The Case For Small Data. *CurrentOpinion in BehavioralSciences*, 18, 97-102
- Shirky, C. (2011). ThePoliticalPower Of Social Media. *ForeignAffairs*, 90 (1), 28-41
- Tanyıldızıİ.N. , Ateş, T. Y. (2018). PoliticalParty Genel Başkanlarının 15 Temmuz Darbe Girişimi Sonrası Twitter Mesajlarına Yönelik İçerik Ve Söylem Çözümlemesi, *Assam International RefereedJournal*, 10, 46-63
- Tokgöz, O. (2010). Seçimler, Siyasal Reklamlar Ve Siyasal İletişim. Ankara,Türkiye: İmge Kitabevi
- Topuz H. (1991). Siyasal Reklamcılık: Dünya Ve Türkiye’den Örneklerle. İstanbul, Türkiye: Cem Yayınevi

- Vitak, J., Zube, P., Smock, A., Caleb, C.T., Ellison, N., Lampe, C. (2011). It's Complicated: Facebook Users' Political Participation in The 2008 Election. *Cyberpsychology Behavior And Social Networking*, 14, 107-114
- Weaver, Iain S., Hywel Williams, I. Cioroianu, M. Williams, Travis Coan, Banducci, S. (2018). Dynamic Social Media Affiliations Among UK Politicians. *Social Networks*, 54, 132-144.