

SURVEILLANCE CULTURE AND CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN POLICING
THROUGH TELEVISION: A CASE STUDY ON MÜGE ANLI İLE TATLI
SERT

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

BY

ALIM IRMAK METE

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL POLICY

SEPTEMBER 2021

Approval of the thesis:

**SURVEILLANCE CULTURE AND CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN
POLICING THROUGH TELEVISION: A CASE STUDY ON MÜGE ANLI
İLE TATLI SERT**

submitted by **ALIM IRMAK METE** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of **Master of Science in Social Policy, the Graduate School of Social
Sciences of Middle East Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşe İdil AYBARS
Head of Department
Department of Social Policy

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çağatay TOPAL
Supervisor
Department of Sociology

Examining Committee Members:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşe İdil AYBARS (Head of the Examining Committee)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Sociology

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çağatay TOPAL (Supervisor)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Sociology

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cenk SARAÇOĞLU
Ankara University
Department of Journalism

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

Name, Last Name: Alım Irmak METE

Signature:

ABSTRACT

SURVEILLANCE CULTURE AND CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN POLICING THROUGH TELEVISION: A CASE STUDY ON MÜGE ANLI İLE TATLI SERT

METE, Alım Irmak

M.S., The Department of Social Policy

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çağatay TOPAL

September 2021, 235 pages

The aim of this thesis was to illustrate the ways in which surveillance culture is utilized by Turkish crime-based reality TV programming in order to assure a surveillant form of citizen participation in policing, with a specific focus on the dynamics of the processes and their possible reflections on viewers' everyday lives. For this purpose, *Müge Anlı ile Tatlı Sert* was chosen for its steady success in ratings and mobilization of its audiences, and from the show, the 13-episode case of Atalay Filiz was selected for its representative nature of widespread and dedicated surveillant citizen participation. Qualitative data coding method was used with a critical and interpretative approach, and the resulting themes were analysed with respect to corresponding theoretical conceptualizations and in line with the research objectives. Thus, it was demonstrated that surveillance culture plays an important role in the provision of citizen participation in policing through crime-based reality TV programming, specifically in the interest of enforcing responsabilization,

security-orientation, and law and order ideologies. This process was operationalized as “social policing” where fear of crime and the criminal, excessive exposure of information pertaining to the cases, definition of the viewer as the citizen, and formation of a communal identity presented themselves as important elements to calibrate viewer perception of surveillance, policing, and their practical stance pertaining to both. Policy recommendations were discussed in relation to matters such as privacy, informativeness, citizen-police communications, policing, and the alternatives to the culture of surveillance.

Keywords: Surveillance Culture, Social Policing, Citizen Participation, Crime-based Reality Programming

ÖZ

GÖZETİM KÜLTÜRÜ VE TELEVİZYON ÜZERİNDEN POLİSLİĞE VATANDAŞ KATILIMI: MÜGE ANLI İLE TATLI SERT ÜZERİNE BİR VAKA ÇALIŞMASI

METE, Alım Irmak

Yüksek Lisans, Sosyal Politika Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Çağatay TOPAL

Eylül 2021, 235 sayfa

Bu tezin amacı, Türk suç temelli realite TV programlarının polisliğe gözetleyici bir tür vatandaş katılımı sağlamak amacıyla gözetim kültüründen ne şekillerde faydalandığını, özellikle süreçlerin dinamiklerine ve bunların izleyicilerin gündelik hayatlarındaki olası yansımalarına odaklanarak açıklamaktır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda, reytinglerdeki ve seyircilerini harekete geçirebilmekteki istikrarlı başarısı sebebiyle *Müge Anlı ile Tatlı Sert*, ve programdan da, yaygın ve adanmış bir gözetleyici vatandaş katılımını temsil edebilen yapısı sebebiyle, 13 bölümlük Atalay Filiz vakası seçilmiştir. Niteliksel veri kodlama metodu, eleştirel ve yorumlayıcı bir yaklaşımla kullanılmıştır ve elde edilen temalar, ilgili teorik kavramsallaştırmalar ve araştırmanın amaçları doğrultusunda analiz edilmiştir. Böylelikle gözetim kültürünün özellikle sorumlulaştırma, güvenlik odaklılık, ve kanun ve nizam ideolojileri yararına, suç temelli realite TV programları aracılığıyla polisliğe vatandaş katılımının sağlanmasında önemli bir rolü olduğu gösterilmiştir.

Bu sürecin operasyonel tanımı suç ve suçluya yönelik korkunun, vakalarla ilgili verilerin aşırı ifşasının, izleyicilerin vatandaş olarak tanımlanmasının, ve toplumsal bir kimlik inşasının önemli ögeler olarak ortaya çıktığı ve izleyicinin gözetim, polislik, ve kendilerinin bunlara göre pratik konumlarına yönelik algılarını ayarlamanın amaçlandığı “sosyal polislik” olarak yapılmıştır. Politika önerileri gizlilik, bilgilendiricilik, vatandaş-polis iletişimi, polislik, ve gözetim kültürüne alternatifler gibi konular üzerinden tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Gözetim Kültürü, Sosyal Polislik, Vatandaş Katılımı, Suç Temelli Realite Programları

To My Mother

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to thank my advisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çağatay TOPAL, for his unwavering support, patience, criticism and guidance from start to finish. He has been a source of stability from across international borders and throughout a global pandemic, and I am grateful for everything I learned from him as his student.

I would also like to offer my gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşe İdil AYBARS and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cenk SARAÇOĞLU, for their valid points of constructive criticism and suggestions. I consider myself lucky that our paths crossed.

I am, of course, endlessly thankful to my mother, Tülin YILMAZ. She has been my biggest supporter and the lone, long-suffering audience to all my ups and downs. She has always been an unyielding source of strength and inspiration for me, and for this, as well as for being lucky enough to be her daughter, I am forever grateful.

I need also to try and convey how much I appreciate my family, my big sisters Evren YILMAZ and Gökçen ÇİFTÇİ and my big brother Serkan ÇİFTÇİ; my dearest friends Ezgi KURT, Mert TOPÇU, Müge TOPAL, Ceyda KOCA, Gizem and Azad DEMİR, and Sema MUTLUER; and my thesis support group members Ecenaz GÖZE, Zeynep ÖZDEMİR, Berna ÇETİNALP, and Hasan Alper SÖNMEZ. These are the people who were with me through thick and thin, who were ready to lend an ear and offer their insights. Let me acknowledge that these words are nowhere near enough to convey my love and regard for them, but I consider myself immensely fortunate to have met and known each and every one of them.

Lastly, let me celebrate the life, mind, and successes of Thomas MATHIESEN. He will continue to inspire me daily.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xv
CHAPTERS	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background and Research Question.....	4
1.2. Key Concepts	13
1.3. Significance of Thesis	14
1.4. Outline of Thesis	17
2. SURVEILLANCE CULTURE	20
2.1. Surveillance as a Fact of Life	20
2.1.1. Panopticism: Where the Few Watch the Many	20
2.1.2. Synopticism: Where the Many Watch the Few	22
2.1.3. Society Through Surveillance	24
2.1.4. Organizations of Surveillance	27
2.2. Framing the Commodification of Surveillance	29
2.3. Experiencing Surveillance Cultures	32
2.3.1. Engagement.....	34

2.3.1.1. Fear.....	35
2.3.1.2. Familiarity	37
2.3.1.3. Fun.....	38
2.3.1.4. Surveillance Imaginaries	39
2.3.1.5. Surveillance Practices	41
2.3.2. Exposure.....	43
3. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN POLICING	48
3.1. Changing Strategies of Policing.....	48
3.2. Police Motivations for Cooperation with Citizens.....	50
3.3. Citizen Motivations for Cooperation with the Police.....	52
3.4. Ideal Types of Citizen Participation.....	53
3.5. Practical Types of Citizen Participation in the World.....	55
3.6. Practical Types of Citizen Participation in Turkey	58
3.7. Discussing Social Policing	61
4. CRIME-BASED REALITY TV PROGRAMMING.....	65
4.1. Reality TV and Crime as a Genre	65
4.1.1. Examples from the World	67
4.1.2. Examples from Turkey.....	70
4.2. Contextualizing Turkish Crime-Based Reality TV Programming.....	72
4.3. A Critical Reading of Crime-Based Reality TV Programming	75
4.4. Ideology of Law and Order	79
4.5. Relations with Surveillance Culture and Social Policing.....	82
5. METHODOLOGY	87
5.1. Research Design.....	87

5.2. Sampling Criteria	91
5.3. Data Collection.....	95
5.4. Analysis and Operationalization	98
5.5. Limitations, Strengths, and Author’s Position	105
6. MÜGE ANLI İLE TATLI SERT AND THE SEARCH FOR ATALAY FİLİZ	109
6.1. Compliance with Surveillance.....	112
6.1.1. Perpetuation of Bias about Crime	114
6.1.2. Fear of the Fugitive	119
6.1.3. Excessive Exposure.....	123
6.2. Assignment of Surveillance Imaginaries.....	130
6.2.1. Calls for İhbars	131
6.2.2. Responsibilization	140
6.2.3. Ideology of Law and Order	146
6.3. Surveillance Labour in Action	149
6.3.1. Realization of Surveillance Labour.....	159
6.4. Internalization of Surveillance Labour.....	163
6.4.1. Indirect Peer Pressure.....	163
6.4.2. Positive Association	166
6.4.3. Duty of the Citizen	169
6.5. Legitimizing Surveillance Culture	174
6.5.1. Statements	175
6.5.2. Recognition	177
6.5.3. Wishes	185

6.5.4. Lessons	187
7. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION	194
7.1. Exposure vs Privacy	194
7.2. Entertainment vs Information.....	197
7.3. Intermediation vs Direct Communication	200
7.4. Social Policing vs Community-based Policing	202
7.5. Surveillance Cultures vs A Culture of Solidarity	204
7.6. Concluding Remarks and Further Research.....	207
REFERENCES	211
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET	219
APPENDIX B: THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU	235

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Lyon's elements of engagement in surveillance cultures.....	35
Table 2. Elements of MATS.....	92
Table 3. Episode guide for MATS' case of Atalay Filiz.....	96

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AF	Atalay Filiz
CBRTV	Crime-Based Reality TV
CRP	Case-Related Personnas
MA	Müge Anlı
MATS	Müge Anlı ile Tatlı Sert

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Being surrounded by never-ending surveillance can desensitize one to its existence; overstimulation can bring about a blasé attitude towards the intricacies of surveillance as a way of life. However, once drawn aside, the proverbial curtain reveals many aspects of everyday life that are infused with surveillance. I was aware of how social media, for example, was built upon the premise of exposing aspects of one's life to others and peeking into others' lives in return. What was hiding under my nose was a much older media and its propensity for similarly producing, maintaining, and reproducing surveillance.

I connected the dots between reality TV shows, the surveillance culture they feed both from and into, and the extent of their effect and reach during the Irmak Kupal case *Müge Anlı ile Tatlı Sert* (MATS) handled in 2016. As a crime-based reality TV (CBRTV) program, it was delving into the disappearance of Irmak Kupal at hand as though it were an official investigation, complete with interrogations and collection of surveillance images and statements as evidence. All of these were brought together like the plot of a mystery novel, constantly revealing information about the case and case-related personas (CRP) that may or may not be relevant to solving the mystery. A little girl was missing, the show suspected a neighbour, while an entire neighbourhood was adamant about defending the suspect's innocence. I remember being glued to the screen, disapproving the show's suspicions on the ground that the man was supported by his neighbours who knew him for decades, while at the same time detecting the inconsistencies in his statements and doubting myself. One day, after that day's episode ended, I received a notification on my phone (because

somehow, somewhere, an algorithm that processed my web history knew I would be interested in clicking that link, and I really was) that the suspect confessed to assaulting and murdering the little girl. Footage of him during his confession, begging that they do not give him over to the police while there were undercover police in the studio right then and there, was released later during the following episode of the show: He described the route he followed to bury the girl while the show's crew followed the route on Google Maps on the big studio screen, and this led to security camera footage on the route to be found of him. The neighbours were interviewed afterwards, and they were ashamed of having defended him and opposing the show's conduct. While the perpetrator was being taken to court, local people gathered around the courthouse, fervently asking for him to be executed.

The show gave all these and more during their handling of the case and during all their other cases as well. Constant, and at times excessive, exposure of information related to criminal investigations and the people involved was the norm, even though the cases were not fictional and the CRP were not from a casting agency. The matters were quite dark as well, evoking moral outrage easily. The show's suspicion of the man's guilt from the start implied a kind of generalizability of the crime and its criminal, making me think if I watched further, I too could learn to detect the behavioural signs to avoid victimization by this kind of crime and criminal. The show felt like a public service announcement, warning its audience of the dangers they may face, dangers they made seem like its audience were likely to face. Overall, the narrative, the exposure of details, the moral sensitivity, the stance against crime, the investigative processes... They drew me in, just as it drew enough people to keep MATS at the top of the rating lists during the weekdays when it aired.

It was also the semester I was taking a course called "Sociology of Surveillance," so I was able to see that the show was not using surveillance only as a means to find evidence to solve unsolved murders and find missing persons. It was actively producing a culture of surveillance where they were well within their rights to expose investigative and personal data to a national audience, and the audience was

enculturated into finding this normal and becoming supportive of the conduct. The audience was warned to be constantly vigilant, see the world surveillantly, and share the results with the show (and therefore the police) so as to stay safe.

It was the growing awareness of how such a discourse affected the way I experienced day-to-day life that strengthened my interest in the topic. I was sensitized to paying attention to disorderly behaviour in public, taking care to try and memorize faces as well as the time and place in which the acts happened. Anything from noticing an unfamiliar car in front of my building to writing down its plate number was done with the wish to be prepared if a threat presented itself. Security and order became more important for me than ever before, and I began to live in a constant state of caution and surveillance.

Although that time is well in the past, it continues to fascinate me how one television show could induce such behavioural and perceptive change in me, and indeed, a national audience. Adding to this the existence of such shows almost in every mainstream TV channel, the steady popularity of the genre, and the justification of their existence due to their law and order stance and perceived benefits to criminal investigative processes, it is not surprising that this was the topic I chose for my thesis. How surveillance has amassed a culture of its own, how it became a way of life needed to be approached from the point of view of the mass media as well as the new media because they are still prevalent and widespread in their influence.

Audiences are drawn in by the mystery and the immoral and/or illegal topics of cases; their compliance with surveillance is ensured through the fear, fun, and familiarity aspects of surveillance; their surveillance imaginaries are shaped and honed to serve the show's aim to solve crimes; surveillance practices are expected from them as a requirement of their status as "citizens"; concerns for privacy are disregarded or belittled; security orientation and law and order are prioritized to ensure future participation. Most importantly, surveillance is burrowed deeper into the fabric of life, exceeding the air-time of the shows of this kind and spreading across other aspects of day-to-day experiences. Surveillance culture is produced,

maintained, and constantly reproduced through the satisfaction of the already existing voyeuristic and surveillant tendencies within the public. The audience/citizenry is envisioned as a law-abiding, compliant reserve army of surveillance labourers who can be called upon when the need arises and who can be trusted to fulfill duties traditionally associated with the law enforcement. The aim of this thesis, then, is to try and identify the ways in which surveillance culture is utilized to create surveillance labourers through crime reality TV programming in Turkey, with a case study of MATS and the nationwide search it started for Atalay Filiz (AF).

1.1. Background and Research Question

CBRTV genre is characterized firstly by the topics they choose. Every weekday, they handle unsolved murder cases, find missing persons, and focus on other petty criminal, deviant, or simply unusual matters such as marriage frauds, treasure hunts gone wrong, and dysfunctional family relations. Criminal or deviant actions and behaviours that would otherwise have been a matter of official investigation (and therefore would have remained largely unseen) are turned into content for a national audience. Some of the cases they handle may include sensitive topics that spark moral outrage, interest, and dedication to see the matters resolved. Investigations of the cases are carried out live in front an in-studio audience and broadcast on national channels. They usually have a team of experts in crime-related professions such as law, forensics, and psychiatry, and with the host, they elaborate on the evidence they receive. CRP are the primary source of information on the cases while ihbar-makers call the show to impart their knowledge to the shows as well. There is a constant exposure of information concerning the cases that, without such shows, would otherwise remain unknown to the public, as well as demands from the audiences to share their knowledge with the shows and the police.

The popularity of the genre in Turkish daytime television is well-known. The rating success of the genre as well as the ban on the other most popular genre of marriage shows in April 2017 (Özgenç, 2017), led to a myriad of examples of CBRTV

programming across many channels; *Gerçeğin Peşinde*, *Balçiçek İlter ile Olay Yeri*, *Seda ve Uğur'la Artık Susma*, *İnci Ertuğrul ile Kaybolan Çiçekler*, *Seda Akgül ile Her Şey Gerçek*, *Lerzan'la Yalnız Değilsin*, *Hayatın Penceresinden*, *Lütfiye Pekcan ile Yaşamdan Hikayeler* ve *Didem Arslan Yılmaz'la Vazgeçme* are among the many examples. While some survived and some failed, the popularity of the genre remained, and among the shows, one is set apart from the others due to its longevity and popularity, and that show is *Müge Anlı ile Tatlı Sert* (MATS).

MATS has been on air since 2008 and has built up a dedicated following. As well as the crime-related content, the show executes social responsibility projects and philanthropy for which they are commended. It acts as a platform that receives and distributes donations from audience members and prompts further donations. Just as in criminal investigations, the show encourages audience participation in the charity projects and compliments the donators (of clothes, wheelchairs for the differently-abled, stationary for students, etc.) by name. The distribution of the donations by the show crew is filmed and aired, providing the audience with visual validation of MATS' intermediary role and the donations reaching their intended recipients.

The same manner of conduct can be seen during the show's criminal investigations. Here, the type of donation the audience is expected to make is not material but informative: Members in the audience are expected to be forthcoming with any information related to the criminal case, just as is expected of the CRP. Anyone familiar with the case at hand or the persons involved are encouraged to contact the show and share what they know: Should their information prove to be of importance to the solution of the case, the informants are also encouraged to give official statements. The information reiterated on the show remains anonymous unless or until the informant wants their identity to be known. However, each ihbar received by the show has attached the identity of the informants, which is revealed only to the police eyes, ready to be called upon should the police deem it necessary. If the show manages to solve a case or bring it to the point that the police are ready to make arrests, the persons who gave information that contributed to the solution are

thanked profusely, along with the police, the prosecutors, and the judges. This declares MATS' effectiveness in criminal investigations in the same breath it reiterates the importance of audience participation, ensuring future participants.

Audience participation can happen on a broad scale, ranging from keeping up with the show to physically mobilizing in search of information, which would then be relayed by them to the show and by the show to the police. The show is vocal about its desire for the audience's surveillance practices in general and tells which kinds of data it wants in specific. For example, during a search for a missing person or a runaway murder suspect, the show may want its viewers to check their security cameras and look around with attention for the person. During an investigation about an unsolved murder, they may ask for the individuals who have knowledge concerning the case to contact the show.

In time and with continuous reminders as well as pleas from the show, the audience is eased into "seeing surveillantly." Finn operationalizes the term as surveillance images being an aesthetic concept, a rhetoric, and a way to participate in public life. The participation he means is one where individuals, with an understanding of the value of surveillance images in an insecure and threatening environment, make the "conscious and overt decision to record events for public distribution" to ensure safety (2012, p. 77). His example is one of citizens digitally recording police brutality to ensure awareness of citizens witnessing an incident and recognizing the value of procuring visual evidence as a result of the surveillant way of seeing that is predominant and widespread. In the case of MATS, the audience's attention is directed towards the cases that already took place, and information relating to them are expected as personal accounts, retrospective searches for visual evidence like photographs and videos, or the capture of such evidence upon an encounter with the wanted individual(s). The audience is taught to recognize which person or event is worthy of being remembered and commemorated; their perceptions of everyday life are filtered with a concern for surveillance in accordance with what the show sets as criminal or deviant and therefore worthy of being surveilled.

Lyon provides the theoretical distinction to approach the matter of seeing surveillantly. He recognizes the role of personal experiences as well as media in shaping one's perceptions regarding surveillance and uses the theoretical term of "surveillance imaginaries" to describe the general consciousness regarding surveillance and its effects on many aspects of everyday life. Surveillance imaginaries include "dynamics of surveillance," which means to know how surveillance takes place, and "duties of surveillance," which means to know how one can position themselves in regards to surveillance (2017, pp. 829-830). The shows such as MATS aim to shape the audience's surveillance imaginaries in order to realize their goals and finalize their cases. The audience is told and shown the ways in which surveillance can be used, and is expected to be approving of the conduct as well as to practice surveillance in a way that benefits the show and the law enforcement authorities. A heightened awareness of details that are important for a criminal investigation is sought, and sharing the information drawn from such surveillant perusal with a TV show is normalized.

Based on surveillance imaginaries, one can exercise surveillance practices and justify them. Lyon's classification of surveillance practices into "responsive practices" (where one acts upon being surveilled) and "initiatory practices" (where one enacts their own surveillance) (2017, p. 830) is quite useful. While the responsive practices of those under the surveillance encouraged by MATS are not observable through a viewing of the show, the initiatory practices are openly recognized and praised on broadcasts. Some viewers initiate surveillance themselves upon prompt. In line with the show's goals, they pay specific attention to their surroundings just in case they can be the ones to detect a missing person or a perpetrator wanted by the show. In one extreme case that is also included in this thesis' case study, members organized amongst each other and patrolled possible hiding spots, distributed the pictures of the perpetrator around their city, and interviewed prospective witnesses themselves, only to later on call the show and relay the result of these initiatory surveillance practices with the show.

Surveillance practices reflect positively on the surveillance imaginaries when they result in a positive manner, like solved cases, arrested criminals, or found missing persons. This, in turn, justifies further surveillance practices. This reflexivity goes a long way to explain the continuous nature and popularity of the genre in Turkish daytime television and the prevalence of surveillance cultures that are systematically produced, maintained, and reproduced by the mass media.

Another aspect to be considered here is the reconstruction of surveillance practices as civic duties. These shows can only address their audiences directly, but through a redefinition of the individual viewer as “the citizen,” and with the reiteration of a law and order stance throughout the run time, surveillance practices in accordance with such surveillance imaginaries become responsibilities. This is reminiscent of the strategy of policing called “responsibilization.”

Garland described responsibilization as a strategy of governing where governmental authorities choose indirect ways to address criminal matters through non-governmental platforms. The main concern here “is to devolve responsibility for crime prevention on to agencies, organizations and individuals which are quite outside the state and to persuade them to act appropriately” (1996, p. 452). For this aim, mass media campaigns were made for the public to become aware of the demand for them to behave dutifully. Participation in community policing practices like neighbourhood watches were supported. In time, the objective expanded from mere crime prevention to include control of crime and deviance as well. Community-based policing became popularized as a way to include the citizenry in the provision of safety, and responsibilization came to include citizens as well as private agencies.

The CBRTV programming in Turkey does behave as a responsibilization agent in mass media, although not with open governmental support. Police as a state agency are not officially affiliated with the shows, and the exact nature of their communication or cooperation with the shows is not disclosed. However, the

popularity and longevity of the genre imply covert approval or at least impartiality, seeing as the disapproved shows like the marriage genre have been known to be terminated by law.

MATS, as the most prominent and popular of the genre, reveals many ways in which responsabilization is carried out through mass media. A discourse on law and order is constantly relayed, with victimization as a result of insufficient compliance with the law and nonconformity with bureaucratic surveillance. The viewers are told it is their duty as citizens to help the show help the police. The police are constantly praised and thanked for their hard work, but at the same time, the audience is encouraged to “make it easier” for the police. Constant vigilance on the part of the audience is demanded, as well as inbars to the show and the police concerning the case at hand. Information is desired and exposed during broadcasts at the show’s discretion. However, the procurement of this information requires surveillance practices on the part of the viewers who are asked to watch the show, learn about the case, familiarize themselves with the perpetrator’s face, keep their distinctive physical features in mind as they go about their days, and call the show if they detect them or someone similar to them with visual evidence in the form of photographs or videos, as well as specific details like when and where they were seen. Viewers are also asked to check security cameras, tell people they know who have security cameras to check them, and if they knew the perpetrator beforehand, to share their memories of past encounters with the show. Personal and surveillant data are thus gathered together with the show, relayed to the police, and exposed to some degree on national television as a part of the show’s investigation of the case. This eliminates the time and space restraints for the police and is also cost-efficient, seeing as the information that otherwise would need to be sought after instead comes to the show upon televised prompts. If the cases are thus solved, and the perpetrators are arrested, it is presented as a win-win-win situation for all three parties: Better public image and higher clearance rates for the police with lower effort, higher ratings for the show due to the spectacle of justice and the justification of its

mediatory existence, and a safer environment and a sense of accomplishment for the audience.

MATS' responsabilization endeavours are based mostly on face-to-face surveillance and the obtainment of visual surveillance evidence. However, this is not the full scope of the surveillance practices from the audiences. The surveillance cultures that already exist within all nooks of life provide fertile ground upon which the show's constant pro-surveillance and control talk can take root. Surveillance does not end when cases do. On the contrary, the conclusion of cases along with praise for surveillance practices for that aim work towards justifying and normalizing further surveillance practices; they can become habitual and spread across other parts of everyday life. Interpersonal interactions and observations may be honed by and filtered through the surveillance imaginaries set by the show, and the security-oriented discourse may influence individual and communal behaviour.

Long-term viewers of MATS know to expect many pleas for calls to the show with information regarding the case, whether of the perpetrator, victim, or the CRP. Some of these calls are broadcast live, the host interrogating the caller on the information they revealed. There are also off-screen interviews which are recorded, edited, and later broadcast in the form of video clips, where the interviewees also impart their personal experiences with the case or the hearsay they possess with the show. These reveal the accumulation of previous surveillant practices, mainly face-to-face. Other calls by the show concern the active surveillance of the audience of their surroundings to detect ihbar-worthy incidents like seeing the wanted person in the streets or controlling their surveillance cameras in hopes of finding the person amongst the footage. Paying surveillant attention to kith and kin with regards to the show's understanding of criminality and deviance, revealing them on a national broadcast, and spending time and effort to supply such a show with surveillance images are considered tame and normal, regardless of whether or not such actions actually contributed to the show's proclaimed causes.

However, the show receives more than they ask for in some cases. For example, in the case of AF, shopkeepers in İzmir organized amongst themselves to prepare images of him in possible disguises, distribute his pictures in areas he may be expected to go, interview possible witnesses, and patrol remote hiding spots to find him themselves. These were not specifically required of them by the show, but they were praised by the show's host and commended for how correctly they followed the show. An instance such as this is indicative of the impact of the show on the cultures of surveillance and their normalization, as well as the citizens fulfilling duties traditionally associated with the police.

MATS takes upon the responsibility to investigate cases along with the police, and gives the audience the responsibility to contribute in ways that are defined explicitly or implicitly. Behaviours are judged in dual terms like right and wrong, normal and abnormal, and audience attention is honed towards the unwanted and unusual with specific concerns about the five Ws and one H. Much like journalists or police, the viewer is asked to relay information that can help solve a case, which is redefined as a responsibility and a civic duty. Moreover, this overall conduct and normalization of all things surveillance produce further surveillant practices. Viewers are mobilized, either individually or *en masse*, to think and act surveillantly for cases that they would otherwise not have known or become involved in if it were not for the show.

The surveillance practices done by the audience upon the show's prompt and specifically for the show's cases are operationalized in this thesis as "surveillance labour." The entire conduct of responsabilization and mobilization of surveillant labour, the rebranding of the audiences as "citizens" in accordance with the law and order ideology donned by the show, and the probable effects of these in how individuals live their day-to-day lives are operationalized as "social policing."

The *research question*, then, is how surveillance culture helps create "social policing" through CBRTV shows in Turkey. In other words, the topic of interest

here is how a TV show on a national channel benefits from the surveillance cultures that exist within the society and further alters, magnifies, maintains, and reproduces such cultures to activate citizens to canalize their surveillant labour into policing. The ultimate goal is to come up with social policy recommendations to lessen mass-mediated attempts at social policing. In order to do that, it is necessary to detect the implicit or explicit but always deliberate ways utilized by the shows to create the desired behaviour and consciousness in the viewer/citizens.

For this aim, the most popular programme of the crime-based reality genre, MATS, was chosen. On air since 2008, the show has been successful in ratings and popularity as well as in being a well-trusted household name. It is known as a platform where criminal cases of ordinary people are finalized through on-air investigation and interrogation of the case-related personas and, at times, the suspects themselves, by the show host and experts. And among MATS' many investigations, the case of Atalay Filiz (AF) was chosen. This was due to the fact that he had just committed murder and was on the run, while the crime scene investigations and eyewitness accounts identified him as the perpetrator. He was also wanted for two more murders; therefore, his identification was of utmost importance. Through extensive media attention and MATS' broadcasts, a nationwide search was started to detect his likeness amongst a crowd. MATS introduced the case as urgent, referring to the details of his past as well as the information regarding his crimes, to amass the audience's attention and surveillance practices for his arrest. His pictures were shown, his past interactions were delved into and exposed to the audience. Due to the risk of him escaping abroad along with Syrian refugees in 2016 and the security camera footage found of him in the coastal city of İzmir, the urgent status of his search was constantly reiterated. Responsibilized with the civic duty of offering their surveillance labour to the police and the show, the viewers became eyes and ears for them both within and exceeding national borders. The surveillance labour as a concept, along with the entire processes to establish social policing, were most visible in this case, where the immediate nature of the search yielded the most ihbars in a short span of time. For

this reason; for its representative nature of the role surveillance culture utilized by the show played in mobilizing surveillance labour on a national (and even international) scale, AF's case was chosen as the case study.

1.2. Key Concepts

This thesis aims to explore the ways in which citizens are asked to give “surveillance labour” as a part of a reality TV show's efforts at “responsibilization,” and how this produces “social policing” that is deeply entwined with cultures of “surveillance.” Below are the explanations of how these concepts were operationalized and how they relate to one another.

Surveillance is defined by Lyon as “the focused, systematic and routine attention to personal details for purposes of influence, management, protection or direction” (2007, p. 14). He acknowledges that this definition is most in line with information technologies, but that surveillance can also be conducted in person and that it can occur randomly as well. In this thesis, surveillance is regarded as an everyday, mostly face-to-face occurrence that is calibrated by mass media to be as focused and systematic as possible for policing, and that becomes routine over time on an individual basis as a result of continuous exposure to such discourses.

Surveillance labour is used to describe the efforts to acquire and share hard visual evidence or hearsay evidence through surveillance practices in line with the approved surveillance imaginaries. That surveillance is conducted for a cause and prompted by a mass-mediated platform in accordance with specificities and goals that are not intrinsic to the individuals who perform them required a new term for the phenomena. “Surveillance practice” by itself makes up the skeleton of the particular actions of individuals, whereas “surveillance labour” adds flesh to the bone. This is due to the fact that the information gathered through surveillance is used for the particular goal of finalizing investigations. The individual decision-making process on whether or not to perform surveillance is intercepted by persistent, mass-mediated pleas for surveillant action. The surveillance practices are

demanded, prompted, and utilized by an outside influencer, a television show in this case, for this very aim.

Responsibilization was first discussed by Garland (1996) as a strategy of governance where the state approaches crime not directly with state agencies but indirectly through private actors. Terpstra notes that the “(T)asks that were formerly the monopoly of the police and criminal justice agencies are now presented as the moral duty of other agencies and citizens” (2008, p. 214). In this context, responsibilization is used to describe the surveillance-related practices that were most traditionally associated with the law enforcement authorities being conducted by the viewer-turned-citizens, who are tasked to do so by mass media programming on criminal investigations. Individuals are expected to feel ethically responsible due to their status as citizens as well as their status as viewers to be surveillant, both in general and especially when prompted through TV shows.

Social policing¹ entails the processes through which the dormant or unfocused surveillant potential of the audiences is realized by media for policing and their impacts on both the individual viewers and the public in general. In other words, social policing is the derivation of surveillance labour through mass-mediated narratives on law and order and the lasting effect these have on how cultures of surveillance are interpreted and experienced on both personal and societal levels.

1.3. Significance of Thesis

The current studies on surveillance culture are mainly focused on digital technologies and the new media, most prominently due to their increasingly widespread and popular existence as well as the individuality and interactivity they afford. However, as this thesis aims to underline, mass media remains quite virile in benefiting from and contributing to the surveillance imaginaries and practices (i.e.,

¹ This term is meant to unite the social policy and policing practices together, and should not be confused with the practices of community-based policing or other “social policing” conceptualizations in the literature.

surveillance cultures) of both its consumers and the public in general. Mass media, and television in particular, are available on a wide scale still, and they offer many platforms that contribute to the teaching and experience of surveillance and its cultures. While the study of digital modernity and social media are significant areas of study, television may be found to hold just as much importance in its relation to cultures of surveillance, and so, just as impactful in the experience of daily life in relation to surveillance. Here, through the case of MATS as a CBRTV program, the goal is to showcase the still relevant role of television in producing, reproducing, and maintaining surveillance culture, and diversifying “the kinds of social relationships that are possible within a surveillance culture” (Lyon, 2018, p. 33).

This thesis has operationalized two terms to better understand the dynamics of mass-mediated production of surveillance culture for their utilization by law enforcement authorities. “Surveillance labour” refers not only to the understanding and due practicing of surveillance but also to doing so when prompted by the intermediary authority of television in the canalization of surveillance into criminal investigations. Within the schemes of neoliberalism, globalization, and the ensuing retreat of the state from its traditional roles of welfare and service provision, surveillance too is a market. The production of the means of surveillance, their general use, and the use of surveillance within everyday life are subject to commodification. The generation of surveillance data is profitable and valuable for both state and non-state actors within the market. The maximization of profit can be established when the conveyance of intelligence and information occurs unprompted on a widespread nature and without the restraints of time and space. Surveillance labour, as is operationalized within this thesis, refers to the actions of the viewers of the CBRTV who are prompted and responsabilized by the CBRTV to offer the information they gather at the end of their surveillance labour to the shows and the law enforcement authorities. It is labour because its use generates value; the temporal and spatial constraints that hinder criminal investigations of the state are eliminated or lessened. The use of the term surveillance labour is meant to situate

surveillance culture and its relation to the mass media within the general scheme of the surveillance market.

“Social policing” refers to the ways in which surveillance labour is produced, the viewer is redefined as the citizen, and the public is encouraged to live surveillantly in accordance with law and order ideology. It is a concept born out of the argument that the establishment of surveillance labour relies, in part, on the internalization of responsibility on an individual and communal level to establish security and social order in accordance with the hegemonic values of the state and the surveillance market. The viewer that watches a television show becomes a responsible citizen, whose repeated surveillance labour for one-off cases turns habitual and seeps into areas that are beyond the televised portion.

These terms are approached from an interdisciplinary stance: Concepts of citizen participation in policing and community-based policing are borrowed from the field of criminology, surveillance culture from sociology, and the redefinition of citizenship and its duties from social policy. These concepts help explain the ways surveillance culture is produced and made habitual through mass media. The main issues are about the normalization of exposure and disregard for privacy; commodification of crime for entertainment instead of producing informative and precautionary content; the mass-mediated intermediation between state agencies and the citizens; individuals being encouraged towards social policing instead of official participation with community-based policing activities; and the overall magnification of surveillance cultures as opposed to a culture of solidarity. A critical approach with social policy-related concerns is donned against the production of social policing agents; i.e., viewers sensitized to matters of crime and surveillance, indoctrinated into a security-oriented and law-and-order way of seeing the world, and that surveillance with the intent to report unusual behaviour is normalized and justified with little room for criticism or resistance. Social policing makes police-like individuals whose untrained surveillance labour may place them in dangerous situations and may universalize surveillance both as a way of life and as a means to

an end to the extent that surveillance itself becomes an end in itself. This thesis offers changes to the conditions and contributing factors to the production of social policing, and in that, attempts to raise awareness on the possible impacts of the concept.

Last but not least, this thesis brings together mass-mediated reality TV, its endeavours to produce surveillance labour and social policing, the utilization of surveillance in this conduct, and the prevalent as well as liquid nature of surveillance cultures together within the Turkish context. An in-depth analysis of the MATS' case of AF, from start to finish, is meant to make clear the dynamics and methods in the utilization of surveillance culture for the production of surveillance labour and social policing. A critical reading of these concepts in relation to each other is significant and is a less trodden path to be taken in social policy studies.

1.4. Outline of Thesis

The second chapter, "Surveillance Culture," will introduce surveillance as it is most commonly experienced in the form of panopticism and synopticism. It draws connections between the ideal types and organizations of surveillance and their reflections on society as a whole. Then the commodification of surveillance will be framed within changing governmentalities, and the changes undergone by the welfare state, the surveillance market, the media contents, and the responsibilities of the citizen. Their relation to each other will be further discussed, as well as the factors pertaining to widespread compliance with, and performance of, surveillance; overall aiding to an understanding of how surveillance generates a culture of its own.

The third chapter, "Citizen Participation in Policing," will explain the changes in policing that led to an increase in citizen participation in criminal investigation processes. Motivations for such participation, both on the side of the police and the citizen, will be elaborated upon, and the ideal types of citizen participation will be presented along with the forms in which citizen participation takes place in practice,

both in the world and in Turkey. The phenomenon of citizen participation in policing will then be discussed in relation to the operationalization of social policing.

The fourth chapter, “Crime-Based Reality TV Programming,” will deal with the characteristics of the genre, its formats, their representation of crime. Their positioning with regards to journalism, law enforcement, and the ideology of law and order will be elaborated upon with examples given from the world and Turkey. Turkey’s specific affinity for the genre will be explored in line with historical and national experiences, and trends of globalization, neo-liberalism, neo-conservatism, privatization, individualism, civil society and discipline. Lastly, the CBRTV shows’ relations to surveillance culture and social policing will be discussed.

The fifth chapter, “Methodology,” will inform the reader of the research design of this thesis. How the topic of the case study was chosen, how the data was collected and analyzed will be explained, along with the operational definitions utilized in the thesis. The limitations concerning the study and the position of the author will be discussed, and a brief theoretical framework for the case study will be offered.

The sixth chapter, “*Müge Anlı ile Tatlı Sert* and the Search for Atalay Filiz,” will contain the analysis of the case at hand. Certain methods and dynamics concerning how the show ensures viewer compliance with surveillance, how it assigns certain surveillance imaginaries to the viewers, how it mobilizes and prompts surveillance labour from its audience, how surveillance labour is internalized, and how a specific kind of surveillance culture is legitimized will be explained.

The seventh and last chapter, “Conclusion and Social Policy Recommendations,” will identify major notions from the case that may be enhanced through a policy-related approach. These are excessive exposure, crime as a topic of entertainment, TV intermediation between police and citizen, social policing, and the reproduction of surveillance cultures. In policy considerations, the discussion will revolve around the notion of privacy in mass media, the informative nature of TV programming on

crime, the direct communication between citizens and law enforcement authorities, community-based policing, and an alternative to surveillance cultures on the basis of solidarity. Lastly, the matters that arose during the writing process and can offer inspiration for future research will be presented.

CHAPTER 2

SURVEILLANCE CULTURE

2.1. Surveillance as a Fact of Life

2.1.1. Panopticism: Where the Few Watch the Many

Jeremy Bentham's prison building was aptly named panopticon: *Pan* standing for "all" and *opticon* for all things visual (Mathiesen, 2006, p. 43); *panopticon* meant the "all-seeing place" (Lyon, 1994, p. 63). The cells surrounded a tower, which was the place in which a warden may or may not be surveilling the populace, hidden behind sources of light that made the warden invisible while making the prisoners completely visible. Foucault described the panopticon as follows:

By the effect of backlighting, one can observe from the tower, standing out precisely against the light, the small captive shadows in the cells of the periphery. They are like so many cages, so many small theatres, in which each actor is alone, perfectly individualized and constantly visible. (...) Visibility is a trap... (2007, p. 70)

According to Foucault (2007), the power here is both *visible* to the prisoners (in that they can all see the tower) and *unverifiable* (in that they have no way of knowing if they are being watched.) Prisoners are urged by the architecture to always assume the warden is watching without ever knowing if they themselves are being watched at any given time. The warden may not even be there at all, and the prisoners would be none the wiser. Thus unsure, cautious, and trapped under revealing light, the prisoners are disciplined to be pliant to the rules and regulations of the prison. Panopticon does not depend on guardians to control and maintain order; it depends

on the prisoners' fear and anticipation of being watched and detected, on the self-disciplining power of surveillance.

Panopticism implies one central authority overlooking its subjects: The few watch the many through asymmetrical surveillance. The hierarchy of power is definite and indisputable. One never knows when they are being watched. The ambiguity propels the person to see oneself through the all-seeing eye, making them more inclined to obey just in case they are under surveillance. But not everything is ambiguous. As Lyon explains (1994, p. 65): "Certainty resides in the system, and (...) with the inspector, the one 'in the know.'" Being in a position to watch and observe, and being able to do so systematically and with certain goals in mind, places considerable power to the watching party.

The object of surveillance, on the other hand, is urged strongly by ambiguity towards self-discipline and observable changes in behaviour. Gone are the vicious, very public, and spectacular punishments of antiquity. The modern mind produced ways to eliminate unwanted behaviour with its use of modern values such as rationalization and visibility. Now, in order to establish control and order, one can turn the individuals that make up a society into self-disciplining agents who behave because they never know that the all-seeing eye is, for a fact, *not* surveilling them.

Panoptic surveillance in twenty-first century has many "wardens". When a traffic camera does the watching, passing a red light is recorded to be processed. When advertisers do the watching, one's internet activity or purchase history is documented for future algorithmic reference. When banks do the watching, one's credit note changes in accordance with their consistency in paying on time. When the police are watching, there is always the possibility that one can be stopped for an ID check at random. Whether the institution is that of education or penal system, or health or social services, personal data is regularly collected as a way of control and discipline. We are treated like what McGrath describes as "potential wrongdoers" (2004, p. 22) before the panoptic eye, always on edge about taking a

wrong turn for fear of it being seen and documented, and kept in line by the surveillant nature of many overlapping systems of control.

Being under constant and delocalized surveillance may warn each of its subjects to behave, but it also creates paranoia in the sense that “some hidden demon” (McGrath, 2004, p. 31) inside us all will choose that moment to push us past the line, tarnishing our good name with documented misbehaviour. It goes beyond a simple warning and creates a fear of ourselves. Such is the self-disciplinary power of panoptic surveillance.

Mathiesen (2006, p. 44) claims that “It is the normalizing gaze of panopticism which presumably produces that subjectivity, that self-control, which disciplines people to fit into a democratic capitalist society.” This implies that panopticism is a way of control to shape the individual to fit into an ideal of social order. With panoptic surveillance so widespread and normalized, so are the lines of thought and behaviour it embodies. The simple fact of being under surveillance at every turn leads to a habitual conformation on the side of the surveilled, while the surveillant takes on a legislative and judgmental role. However, panopticism is but one side of the dialectical coin.

2.1.2. Synopticism: Where the Many Watch the Few

The few in positions of power watch the many in Foucault’s panopticism. However, Mathiesen (2006) believes that Foucault’s analysis of the phenomena in *Discipline and Punish* would have been vastly different had he included the mass media of modern times in his analysis. He defends that a linear understanding of passage from the age of spectacles to the age of panopticism would lack in veridicality and that synopticism developed concurrently in the 19th and 20th centuries. While institutions took to collecting extensive data of the many, people found the reciprocal opportunity to watch the few in mass media.

Similarly of Greek origin, *syn* indicating both simultaneity and a sense of being “together” (Mathiesen, 2006, p. 45), *synopticism* is the surveillance of the many on the few. From the newspaper to the television, mass media enabled the eyes of the many to gaze upon the lives of the few in the forms of news, movies, and the like. Foucault had claimed that the age of spectacle was surpassed by the rational disciplinary functions of modernity, and yet mass media was a precursor to society’s desire to keep watching. With the privatization and decentralization of television, the public was given many synopticons, i.e., private channels, to enjoy, while TV as a medium found itself to be “the clearest contrast to Foucault’s panopticism” (Mathiesen, 2006, p. 47).

Mathiesen lists parallels between synopticism and panopticism other than their concurrent developments. Both panopticism and synopticism existed way before modern times as possible foci of power, albeit in different forms. Synopticism existed in ancient times in the form of spectacles, where the audience gathered in the same location as the performers of a spectacle. Modern synopticism, through technological developments that allowed for delocalization, has its performers and viewers, and indeed the viewers themselves, detached from one another. Another parallel is that the concurrent nature of development between panopticism and synopticism was also conjoined in practice. To give one of his own examples, the institution of the church made it so that the priest could surveil the community via confessions (panoptical) while the community could gather together to watch the priest during sermons (synoptical).

In sum, it may not be wise to believe either panopticism or synopticism to have the upper hand on the other. They are concurrent and conjoined practices blurring into each other, each with their own strength in terms of the power of control they bear. A great case in point comes from Lyon, who exemplifies the synopticon through the events of 9/11 in terms of the media attention it received and its timing that helped reach the maximum amount of viewers. The violent nature of the footage helped the audience experience the event themselves, while the decontextualization of the

event by the media made the experience that much more fascinating and opinion-forming. In the end, the media coverage and the synoptic viewing of the events led to tangible policy changes in favour of panoptic surveillance that would affect the rest of the world as well as the people of America (Lyon, 2006).

With better systems in place, their promoters insist, the risks of another attack could be drastically reduced. With better means of identifying, classifying, profiling, assessing, and tracking the population, the chances of preventing future attacks may be increased. Such means are provided by surveillance systems, suitably automated to allow a few inspectors to watch many people (Lyon, 2006, p. 39).

The transition from an attack that was *screened*, to the *screening* of people by the law enforcement authorities did not stop there. The people began to screen other people as well, a fact that was utilized “to encourage ordinary citizens to become the ‘eyes and ears’ of intelligence and law enforcement authorities” (Lyon, 2006, p. 39). However, while the synoptic reach of 9/11 may have worked to justify panoptic measures to be taken by the governments, it should also be considered that the people, too, put governmental acts under scrutiny. The processes of the panopticon and the synopticon occur together and in complementation to each other.

2.1.3. Society Through Surveillance

The concept of panopticism and synopticism as two sides of a very dialectical coin brings about questions on the nature of the society. Mathiesen believes that it is “*the viewer society*.” The viewer society is one that is trained through “the total pattern of surveillance measures or media messages,” or as Mathiesen also calls, “the vast hidden apparatus” (2006, p. 54). What this implies is that the control over people is stealthily established through an overarching structure rather than specific broadcasts. The desired result here is to at least guide individuals’ behaviours in the favoured manner if their beliefs and inclinations cannot be budged. The simple knowledge of being under many a *panoptic* surveillance for any aspect of one’s life can change how that person behaves; homosexuals hide their sexuality in a society where it is shunned, political beliefs are concealed if opposition is frowned upon.

Mathiesen adds that this kind of discipline of the society is vastly conducted through *synoptic* means, most prominent of which is modern mass media with its subtext on how one should be and how one should behave; what is praised and what is punished.

What makes individuals with differences into a viewer society is that people want to escape their realities. Media, with its many contents that satisfy the need for escapism for individuals of varying tastes and interests, also give its audience a “world paradigm” (Mathiesen, 2006, p. 56); it creates a way of making sense of life that, should one agree with, would help one belong into a society of others just like them. Furthermore, such a paradigm shuns the vocalization of contrary beliefs.

(S)urveillance, panopticon, makes us silent about that which breaks fundamentally with the taken-for-granted because we are afraid to break with it. Modern television, synopticon, makes us silent because we do not have anything to talk about that might initiate the break. (Mathiesen, 2006, pp. 56-57)

And the media sure has developed an allure to draw in the modern society: They both trigger and satisfy the audience’s need to look, to watch. The Lacanian psychological approach offers *scopophilia*, the love of looking/watching as a theoretical tool to understand such inclinations. By watching, people try to overcome the trauma from seeing themselves as a separate being from their mother, from the shattered illusion of being joined as a whole. The formation of identity as a different being demands an understanding of how others see us, and thus it is by watching that the child tries to make sense of its existence. In other words, watching and being watched in return become predominant formative factors on an individual basis.

Through movies and television, the society too experiences scopophilia, mostly through gendered lenses: The footages of objectified women and their bodily parts departed from their personalities -products of the “male gaze”- aim to please the

male viewers' need for visual satisfaction, lending them the feeling of being in control over someone else who is, unlike the watcher, objectified (Lyon, 2006).

Visual stimulus, voyeurism, Norman Denzin's "voyeur gaze"; Lyon argues that their predominance in modern culture help explain why surveillance is so widely received with acceptance "as a viable mode of social ordering, management, and control. It fits the cultural paradigm (...)" (2006, p. 49). However, such systematic and focused meeting of the need to watch and see may have an objectifying effect; the looking is conducted with the desire to control, and through looking, the society is objectified (Lyon, 2006). It may be said that the looking freezes the society at the moment of the gaze and endeavours to address it not as it is, but as it was, with much regard paid to what it should be.

Satisfaction of the want to watch through media content would ensure that media functions as a shaping force at the same time it ensures its existence through ratings. Such endeavours drive media content to be increasingly invasive and constantly revealing, through "'reality'-based 'voyeurism TV' (VTV) television programmes" (Metzl, 2004a) that claim to offer limitless visual input about other people's so-called real lives. Clay Calvert names a "voyeur nation," where everyone has an obsession to devour as much detail as possible on people's lives, presented by TV as authentic (Metzl, 2004b). From then on, "...the feedback loop is self-reinforcing. The more that can be seen, the more we want to see." (Lyon, 2006, p. 49).

In sum, it can be argued that synoptic surveillance through mass media, and especially through TV, offers an outlet for voyeuristic needs at the same time it normalizes panoptic surveillance. Such normalization of surveillance, both panoptic and synoptic, legitimizes the ever more invasive forms of surveillance. Preached to a scopophilic choir is a world paradigm that, if accepted, extends the possibility of fitting into modern society. A break from such paradigm is shunned and avoided due to the comfort of belonging and the continuity of the status quo.

2.1.4. Organizations of Surveillance

While the types of surveillance in the form of panoptic and synoptic sheds light upon the general schemes of surveillance, how surveillance is carried out requires further attention. Lyon (2007) presents three ideal types of *organization* of surveillance.

Pre-modern (face-to-face) surveillance is located at a certain time in a certain place, with the roles of the watcher and the watched clearly defined. The information needed is gathered through visual and auditory means such as one-on-one watching, un/intentionally overhearing, and carrying out confessions, as well as record-keeping such as censuses.

Modern (file-based) surveillance needs documentation of the past and the present, of the local and the national, under rational categorization and methods. It prefers its objects to be similar and, if possible, homogeneous. Fitting very well with the Weberian understanding of bureaucracy, this mode of surveillance organization is dependent on the modern concepts of rationalization and calculability, with a central, hierarchical system of regulation. Classification of the society is carried out accordingly, with the aim of managing and controlling the population efficiently. The crime control approach has deep roots in how such classifications are set and utilized in a bid to mete out the society into deserving and undeserving subjects.

Postmodern (interface) surveillance is focused on the global digital databases of individuals in terms of the possible future implications of their actions and behaviour. Systems collect bodily data and aim to differentiate one individual from the other. As such, there exists a data-double for every individual, which is composed of all the relevant information on the individual with which they may or may not agree.

Television media utilizes the organizations of surveillance to reveal unto their audience's information about the lives of other people; lived far away but brought close enough to watch, with details even knowing those individuals personally

sometimes could not reveal. It should be kept in mind, however, that the satisfaction of the need to watch is accompanied by the covert training to behave in a way befitting of the media's portrayal of the ideal citizen.

Let us briefly go over how MATS, the case study of this thesis, utilizes all three of these organizations of surveillance. Face-to-face surveillance is most commonly seen on air during interrogations of the CRP in the studio, and through the ihbars given to the show by viewers who relay the results of their own face-to-face surveillance practices. File-based information, as far as a viewer such as myself can observe only from the broadcasts, is in the form of official investigation files of the cases they handle; whether or not the access is established through the police, lawyers, or the CRP is left vague. However, the host often says that she read their case file before allowing the CRP into the studio and refers to such files during the show's investigation process. Interface surveillance measures utilized by the show are in the form of CCTV footage, and the databases they've formed on their own. The two known databases compiled by the show are as follows: The "Sevgi İzi" database contains the tattoos made to individuals at risk of becoming lost, and the contact information of their carers. The citizens or law enforcement officers who find the lost individuals check their wrist for the tattoo and call the show in order to bring together the person with their carer. The other database is for the adopted children or lost family members and is made up of statements of the people looking for their family members. Adopted people looking for their biological families, vice versa, and family members looking for other estranged relatives call and tell the show all they know, and it is aimed through a crosschecking of the database to bring these people together. With the use of such organizations of surveillance, the scopophilic tendencies of the audiences are sated while at the same time the widespread normalization and domestication of surveillance is conducted through mass-mediated programming. A particular "world paradigm" around security and safety is relayed alongside this process, propagating for lawfulness and the use of surveillance for a kind of social order that is approved.

2.2. Framing the Commodification of Surveillance

Since the 1980s, the effects of the neoliberal shift have been observed in the retreat of the state from duties of welfare and provision of social rights that were previously associated with it. Those who opposed the state's intervention defended that such endeavours caused "government overload, fiscal crisis, dependency, and rigidity" (Rose et al., 2006, p. 91). This line of thought incrementally led to the withdrawal of the state from its responsibilities and the rising private sector as well as other non-governmental agencies to present themselves as authorities in the provision of many services. This indicated a shift in what Foucault called 'governmentality' and defined as follows:

The ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses, and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its target population, as its principal form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security. (Foucault, 2001, pp. 219-220)

The mindset and overall conduct of governing changed, and it did not remain strictly within the governmental bodies; each section of this ensemble had to alter and redefine its responsibilities. For the purposes of this thesis, let us look at how the welfare state, surveillance, media, and the citizen can be approached within this schema.

Welfare state has often been a title readily taken on by states, and the term itself implies a state with the responsibilities for establishing welfare, but a further, critical look reveals many distinctions made concerning their conducts. Esping-Andersen, in his classical work of "The Three Welfare-State Regimes," offers an ideal type classification of conservative, liberal, and social-democratic regimes while recognizing other distinctions such as those based on budget distribution and the temporal aspects of state intervention (1990). Although the topic of welfare states is still deliberated about and expanded, the fact remains that each state has its own formulation specific to their respective historical, political, cultural, social, and

economic backgrounds. Each has been affected, one way or another, by globalization and neo-liberal concerns that require their economy to be under scrutiny for accountability (Wood, 2012). Employment, gender, income, ethnic and regional inequalities, as well as institutional inequalities concerning, for example, criminal justice, have been documented within this new governmentality. The non-governmental authorities involved within this governmentality hold considerable power due to the fact that the provision of certain services has become profitable businesses, like security and surveillance.

As the heightened post-9/11 sensitivity and financial resources focused on security, surveillance became an important matter of investment for “population control, policing and intelligence gathering” (Hayes, 2012, p. 167). Hayes, in his discussion of the “surveillance-industrial complex,” explains that the relationship between state and corporations influence governmental decision-making processes in the favour of the non-governmental partners’ profit, which in turn yields technological advancements to be used to reinforce state’s powers, and the ensuing profit/benefit cycle leading to the production of more extensive and penetrative surveillance measures (2012). This security orientation and the state’s desire to establish social control put forth surveillance as a profitable market for the non-governmental agencies, and in a dialectical relationship, they feed off of each other. Surveillance becomes an arena of state/private sector hegemony and profit simultaneously, and neoliberal concerns for profit maximization lead to endeavours to decrease the price of the surveillance labour. A widespread compliance, not only on the state and business level but on the level of the community as well, would be beneficial for that aim; acceptance of security as a priority and surveillance as one of the most prominent means to eliminate possible threats as well as to minimize the risk of victimization would make a surveillance labourer out of the ordinary citizen, thus creating what could almost be called a reserve army of surveillance labourers.

Media, mass and social, is an arena of visibility, celebrity, spectacle, entertainment. As mentioned above, the commodification of such satisfies escapist and voyeuristic

urges of the consumers; it also produces hegemonic narratives and discourses and seeks to shape behaviour and consciousness alike accordingly. It relays the message that surveillance for the sake of safety and risk minimization (on individual, communal and national levels) is not only encouraged but also a responsibility of the citizens. In 1996, Garland mentioned the use of publicity campaigns to responsabilize the citizens with duties traditionally associated with the police, which “...involve extensive mass media advertising or else the mass leafleting of households, aim to raise consciousness, create a sense of duty, and thus change practices” (p. 452). Since then, with the proliferation of both the technologies and the use of surveillance, the understanding of and reactions to surveillance changed as well; such campaigns are much more encompassing and engrained within many different media contents, reaching a wider population much more effectively.

Mathiesen’s approach to synoptic consumption of media is as a shaper of consciousness, presenting an opportunity to escape real-life while sliding along a “world paradigm” to shape the individual in the desired ways (Mathiesen, 2006, p. 56). This world paradigm, in many media content but particularly in reality TV, can be observed to have “moralization, responsabilization, and prudentialism” (Erol Işık & Yaman, 2017, p. 70) as focal points to be relayed to the citizens. Schreurs et al.’s community psychology research on what motivates citizens to offer their help to the police, for example, tentatively suggests that for more participation, the police may try to rouse within the community “feelings of disgust and anger toward the perpetrator” through the use of “leaflets or commercials” as well as face-to-face interactions with the citizens (2018, p. 12). The individual viewer is regarded and responsabilized as the moral, dutiful citizen whose internalization of hegemonic values and offers of willing, unpaid surveillance labour can support governmental as well as non-governmental efforts towards social order and safety. This way of understanding and positioning oneself within surveillance produces surveillance labourers out of citizenry; perpetuates the vitality of surveillance for social order and security as understood by authorities of power; and benefits the grand surveillance market in the long run.

In sum, within the governmentality that prioritizes an alignment with globalization and neo-liberal values of profit maximization and retreat from welfare provision, surveillance can be elaborated as a profitable business to ensure widespread compliance to hegemonic impressions of power and social control. Media is utilized to establish not only this compliance but also active participation in the form of surveillance labour by redefining the responsibilities and moralities of citizenship. In other words, the citizens' "surveillance imaginaries" (an understanding of the dynamics and duties of surveillance) are shaped to procure "surveillance practices" (responsive and/or initiatory) (Lyon, 2017) that complement national and global governmentalities and benefit the profitable market of surveillance.

2.3. Experiencing Surveillance Cultures

The extent to which surveillance has come in the 21st century sparked discussions on technological advancements, the possibilities and conveniences they afford, and how individuals interact with them. In the middle of a global pandemic, one can always pick up their smartphone to order massive amounts of food, and for some reason, toilet paper. If your personal information, explicit address, and credit card data are tucked away for future use of- Do you even know who has your data double? Does it even matter? It is all just so convenient! So is checking your e-gov page and getting a HES code that will track your status in terms of the disease, so you will be safe. After sharing the photo of your meal on social media, scroll through the lives of your friends and acquaintances, and perhaps even complete strangers! That filter that scanned your face into a database you know nothing about and added puppy ears and nose, that one is sure to collect some likes. Maybe afterwards you can take refuge in a survival TV show containing people trapped on an island and watch them as they bickered and fought and competed against each other. Or maybe a crime show, to see if they caught that one killer, whose high school diary entries you know now by heart. You saw someone who looked like the guy exiting your neighbour's house when you received your toilet paper order today. Maybe you should call the show and let them know what the guy was wearing and how he acted as he walked past you?

Surveillance comes as second nature, so much that one may not notice how ingrained it is in everyday life. According to Lyon, such immersion of the ordinary citizen in surveillance goes beyond the discussions of a surveillance state or a surveillance society because both concepts underplay the individuals' part in dealing with surveillance and assume that surveillance is something imposed upon the people and not something that can be interacted with agency (2017). Surveillance as a culture, though, as an evolving, adapting, becoming concept, gives the individual due agency in how each person takes surveillance and how they interact with it.

Hence, my use of the word *culture*. It is no longer merely something external that impinges on our lives. It is something that everyday citizens comply with - willingly and wittingly, or not - negotiate, resist, engage with, and, in novel ways, even initiate and desire. (Lyon, 2017, p. 825)

As Lyon focuses more and more on people's immersion and active involvement in surveillance activities, be it responsive or initiatory, the term most useful to understand how surveillance is produced, maintained and reproduced, becomes *surveillance culture*.

Lyon likened the culture of surveillance to a crucible (2018), seeing as different elements of social and technological advancements are brought together in a way that makes it hard to distinguish where one ends and the other begins. It is an apt analogy for the concept of culture in general and the culture of surveillance in particular: The process is liquid, ever-flowing and in a constant state of change, therefore making it somewhat harder to grasp and define accurately; in specific contexts, it might be more befitting to use "a culture of surveillance" instead of "the surveillance culture" for this very reason.

The cultures of surveillance must be regarded not as a closed-up system with its own dynamics separated from life as we live it. Quite the opposite; the cultures of surveillance are what we experience and reproduce on a daily basis. Surveillance has become an indivisible part of everyday life, and our actions within it are in

accordance with, or at the very least, in awareness of its existence. Every decision is made with the awareness or inkling that we are being surveilled, even when the surveillant is not state-sanctioned as they traditionally are believed to be. Steps are taken with the consideration that it can become a piece of public knowledge at some point: By simply walking down a street, we might become a part of the background of a viral video that is to be viewed by perhaps millions of people, or we might receive the weather forecast for our changing locations as a notification when we travel. Our neighbours might know we had friends over at our house, and a CCTV camera might catch us driving past red lights. Surveillance is an overarching theme in the lives of 21st-century societies, and it has been that way in the past, just as it will be for the foreseeable future. What changed is the way and the number of individual interactions with it and the role of agency in the process. As Lyon put it more aptly, “Surveillance has become a part of a way of seeing and of being in the world” (2018, p. 30)

Lyon’s operationalization of surveillance culture has three main aspects: Engagement, exposure, and ethics (2017). Engagement deals with why individuals are complacent with surveillance and why they take part in it. Exposure deals with the importance of sharing in surveillance cultures. Ethics deals with the ethical aspects of behaving in a culture of surveillance. Seeing as the research topic here is the production of surveillance culture through CBRTV shows and their audiences, engagement and exposure will be elaborated upon in order to expose the dynamics that perpetuate their specific kind of surveillance culture.

2.3.1. Engagement

Engagement is an umbrella term for the specific ways that individuals experience and interact with surveillance in their everyday lives. It is concerned mainly with two questions: What is it that makes people accept surveillance in such a wide scheme, and why do people take part in surveillance themselves? Table 1, “Lyon’s elements of engagement in surveillance cultures” is adapted from Lyon’s

explanations for the factors for compliance as well as the factors contributing to the participation in the cultures of surveillance (2017)

Table 1. Lyon’s elements of engagement in surveillance cultures

Factors for compliance	Factors for participation	
1. Fear 2. Familiarity 3. Fun	Surveillance imaginaries <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dynamics of surveillance 2. Duties of surveillance 	Surveillance practices <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Responsive practices 2. Initiatory practices

Note. Adapted from “Surveillance Culture: Engagement, Exposure, and Ethics in Digital Modernity,” by David Lyon, 2017, *International Journal of Communication*, 11, pp. 824–842.

The first question aims to understand the reasons behind people’s common adoption of and adaptation to surveillance in their everyday lives. What is the allure behind watching reality TV, spying on neighbours or fetishizing the widespread use of CCTV cameras? Lyon offers three factors as an answer: *Fear, familiarity, and fun* (2017).

2.3.1.1. Fear

Fear is utilized by the media and the political authorities as a way of making the public more likely to accept heightened security measures, which undoubtedly include more severe surveillance-related activities. Having CCTV at every corner, for example, may be advertised in the media as a way to avoid crime on streets; that few researches actually condone this claim is left strategically unmentioned. As a result, the general public -left in obscurity as to the exact dangers they face- is either not too loud in their opposition to heightened surveillance measures, or in some cases, they embrace the pro-surveillance attitude with the firm belief that more surveillance measures would provide more safety.

The media's utilization of fear for broader political agendas exceeds past simple showcasing of individual incidents and security-oriented discourses accompanying them. Under the title of journalism, even CBRTV plays a role in taking up interpersonal crimes and presenting them as an epidemic; the common message is that anyone can become the victim of the criminal case at hand. These violent, petty criminal cases are turned into "experienced" and "known" matters, not through a live relay of the occurrence itself but through the excessive interrogation and information gathering processes that involve the participation of CRP and the audiences. While second-hand, the confrontation of the audiences with those harmed by the crime triggers emotions, one of which is fear.

Genre programs make use of fear to collect more viewers, strengthen viewer loyalty and increase ratings. They also use fear to justify their demands for more surveillance labour from their audiences; the object of fear can only be eliminated through widespread individual participation in surveillance. Viewers are empowered through such statements, made to believe that looking out the windows or checking their security camera feed would help tackle a major threat to them and to public safety.

Genre shows emphasize and may exaggerate the levels of danger one case or one individual pose. However, in the process, they become a primary source in the eyes of the audience that informs on the possible threats to one's own safety and that of the society at large. They set a fearful agenda, and the audience learns what to be on the lookout for, how to react in case of an encounter, and which particular surveillance practices can promote their safety. This eases the acceptance of all-encompassing surveillance conducted upon themselves, that they conduct upon others, and the overall exposing nature of the shows of the data gathered from those surveillant acts. The exploitation of fear, then, appears as a fruitful endeavour to produce widespread audience compliance to surveillance, the production of a culture of surveillance, and the attainment of audience participation in the show and the criminal investigative processes with surveillance labour.

2.3.1.2. Familiarity

The familiarity aspect points to how internalized surveillance has become in societies; people do not find it odd that they must go through an x-ray machine to be admitted into a mall or a public institution. Similarly, it is not too out of place to make a search on the internet and come across ads that promote products related to the search for the foreseeable future. Lyon describes this state of habituation as a “domestication of surveillance” (2018, p. 40) which in the end decreases the likelihood of opposing surveillance measures.

The everyday experiences and understandings of surveillance can be likened to that which is promoted and demanded by genre shows. Individuals are used to face-to-face surveillance, be it in the form of supervision at work or taking notice of the behaviours of those around them. They are also constantly surveilled as such; it is normal to keep an eye out for actions out of the norm and the individuals performing them. Being a citizen also requires being under file-based surveillance. They have an ID number, their residence addresses are known, their educational backgrounds or health-related activities are recorded by governmental bodies as well as private institutions. Interface surveillance is observed in the form of CCTV, GPS, or the “data doubles” (Haggerty & Ericson, 2000) to a general extent. The body, its data, and the acquisition of it are always valuable in order for the object of surveillance to be managed and influenced in ways that are compatible with political and social interests.

The frequency and diversity with which one encounters surveillance normalize the shows’ conduct. What is expected from the audiences and exposure with which the show deals with the information gathered through the meeting of those expectations is familiar. The audience and, indeed, the citizens are no strangers to all that surveillance entails due to the enculturation of it by the governmental bodies, by the media, and by their everyday interactions with each other. Seeing and living

surveillantly, exposing the unknown and watching the spectacles of surveillance; these are nothing out of the ordinary.

The overall popularity of the CBRTV genre, as well as the specific popularity of MATS, should be considered as factors that contribute to the matter of familiarity. MATS has evidence for the success of its conduct in closure rates of unsolved criminal cases, arrested perpetrators, found missing persons, and the social responsibility projects they carry out; it is reiterated that such results could not be reached without the viewers' participation. Since 2008, the exchange of surveillance labour for results broadcast on national TV has been established. Faith in the show's capabilities has resulted from a long period of familiarization and enculturation. Thus, the general compliance to the show's particular ways of reproducing surveillance as a culture and the audience's compliance with it draws levels of critical feedback that are easily disregarded by the show and its dedicated following, and even used to strengthen a community identity. Such an identity is one of the law-abiding surveillance labourers whose main concerns are security, lawful behaviour, and the solution of consecutive cases instead of a structural approach to structural problems. Affirmative actions of this identity expand over time and space, and become habitual.

2.3.1.3. Fun

Fun, by which is meant the enjoyment of utilizing surveillance measures for one's own amusement, is one of the most important factors that make surveillance accepted and utilized so widely. Active and informed participants find ways by which they can spend their time with recreational surveilling and building their image to their own liking by being surveilled.

Social media platforms serve as the most common example for such fun-time endeavours, but mass media's capacity to invoke surveillance actions is also vast. The difference in the case of the CBRTV genre is that the acts of surveillance are canalized into criminal investigation processes and honed to fit a specific standard

so they can yield useful information. However much it is given a new purpose, surveillance remains a part of life, and the acts reproducing it remain just as fun, if not more, considering the televised nature of its results.

Image building, or identity formation, is an important aspect as well. The positive way the show represents its participants is conducive to a communal identity where being law-abiding and surveillant is accepted and encouraged. This perpetuates surveillance as a culture and surveillance labour as a justified endeavour. The order-oriented narratives relayed in relation to such labour and along with positive attributes, too, create social policing.

The second question of engagement, why people participate in surveillance themselves, is answered by the concepts of *surveillance imaginaries* and *surveillance practices*: Described by Lyon himself as “analytically distinguishable, but not separable” (2017, p. 824), these concepts further our understanding of people’s willingness to not only be surveilled but also to become surveillant themselves.

2.3.1.4. Surveillance Imaginaries

Lyon presents the surveillance imaginaries as related to “shared understandings about certain aspects of visibility in daily life, and in social relationships, expectations and normative commitments” (2018, p. 41). What is experienced in daily life in terms of surveillance forms people’s understanding of what surveillance is, how it should or could be carried out, and what the possible consequences to a myriad of actions may be.

The concept of surveillance imaginaries allows comprehension of dynamics and duties of surveillance (Lyon, 2017). The *dynamics of surveillance* refers to surveillance in action; Through surveillance imaginaries, one can fathom the many ways surveillant acts can take place. The awareness comes from experiencing or learning about surveillance in everyday lives. We know from the news that a CCTV

camera can record unlawful behaviour. We learn from social media that everything shared is a link in the chain that is our presented persona. We know that we are under surveillance and that any and every bit of information about us can and will be used against us if need be.

Knowing how surveillance happens, however, is not enough by itself to get a firm grasp on surveillance. It is important to know how to perceive and respond to this dynamic nature. So the mall is filled to the brim with security cameras; formulating what that means for us requires an understanding of the *duties of surveillance*. In an alternate universe, the cams could have been there as talent scouts and people would be acting out their skills in the mall to be discovered. However, in this universe, the cameras are there to regulate customer and worker behaviour, discourage stealing and robbery, and to make it easier to find the culprit should the discouragement effect prove to be futile. Duties of surveillance mean knowing that singing to the cameras will (probably) not bring a life of fame, and that stealing will (probably) bring about some quality time in the courthouse.

Including the dynamics and duties of surveillance, Lyon describes his concept of surveillance imaginary as follows:

The surveillance imaginary, then, is my shorthand for how various features of what has been called the surveillance society influence how people picture themselves in their social arrangements and relationships, such that in ordinary everyday life they include and even embrace surveillance in their vision of how societies are ordered and their roles within that. (2018, pp. 44-45)

The widespread nature of surveillance has created many new understandings and interpretations of surveillance, and the discourse of social control is inseparable from that of surveillance imaginaries. As Gary T. Marx comments, “the increased number of watchers (...) have recreated, in today’s metropolis, some of the dense controls characteristics of the small, closely watched village” (2006, p. 8). The prevalent approach to crime and the criminal, while primarily political in nature,

deeply affects the ways in which surveillance is understood as a means to avoid victimization of self and/or community. Media plays an important role in shaping the public's reactions to crime platforming "hypercriticism" and "the generation of public outrage" (Reisinger, 2007) to list some. This contributes to the conceptualization of surveillance not only as a necessary evil to avoid crime and victimization but also to become normalized and even desired by the audiences.

The CBRTV genre is an area where such normalization and guidance of audiences in terms of surveillance is most visible. Due to frequent broadcasts that detach crime from its social, political, and economic contexts and focus on individual instances of crime as things that can happen to anyone, the conveyance of pro-surveillance and law and order ideologies is smooth. Surveillance becomes a protective measure, and if it fails to accomplish that, it can serve as a tool for justice after the fact. And the interactive nature of these televised shows strengthens and broadens the audience's surveillance imaginaries, i.e., how surveillance can be carried out and for which aims. The audience learns to position themselves within a broader culture of surveillance as well as within that of these show's control narratives. This leads to changes in behaviour that surveil for the sake of social control and security, and these practices, in turn, affect the imaginaries that paved their way. A dialectic interaction such as this produces social policing, where both crime and surveillance are understood in ways that are approved explicitly by the shows and implicitly by the state agencies of crime control and prevention. This specific understanding requires citizen participation, and the individual is redefined from the viewer to the responsible citizen, whose duty is to offer the fruits of their shaped surveillance imaginaries to the mass-mediated shows and to the police.

2.3.1.5. Surveillance Practices

Surveillance practices, both a preceding and a subsequent counterpart to surveillance imaginaries, are what "we *do* in relation to surveillance" (2018, p. 42). These might range from outright defiance against surveillance to strategic participation. Making sure to log out from one's social media accounts in a public

computer, setting a password to one's laptops and phones, turning off GPS instead of using it to find the shortest route, putting stickers over webcams... The list goes on and on, and each one of them is easily experienced in the everyday lives of people within a surveillance culture. The focal point is that all these actions are taken in accordance with one's surveillance imaginaries. People can imagine that leaving an account open in public might tempt someone to snoop around, that access without a password might end up revealing personal data otherwise meant to be kept concealed, that their phone may be traced in exchange for small conveniences, and those suspicious of surveillance enough may imagine that their webcams can be hacked to violate their privacy. Whatever is thought possible and plausible within cultures of surveillance are taken into consideration in individual actions; in surrender, in defiance, or anything in between.

Surveillance practices take two forms: Responsive and initiatory. *Responsive practices* are how one responds to being the object of surveillance. This may vary from not accepting cookies to abstaining from being surveilled as much as possible. *Initiatory practices* refer to how one starts an action of surveillance of their own accord. From posting a selfie or eavesdropping on neighbours to purposefully being seen by a CCTV cam so as to later present the footage as evidence of innocence, these actions have an underlying theme of willingness to surveil and be surveilled.

Only taking into account the episodes, the responsive practices of the audience members (or as they are redefined by the show, "citizens") are hard to observe due to the facts that a) the resistant actions detected by the show would not be broadcast lest it promotes behaviour against surveillance, and b) those who get into contact with the show can be assumed to be mostly in agreement with the show's surveillant conduct. As a result, what is most observable and open to analysis is the initiatory practices of the audience. These practices are done in compliance with the surveillance imaginaries set up by the show, and for the purpose of sharing with the show. Viewers are asked to be constantly vigilant, looking around to detect a perpetrator or a missing person, checking security cameras to find these people, and

keeping up with the show to further hone how they should practice surveillance themselves.

The required practices may change from case to case, but what remains the same is surveillance becoming habitual and done without conscious thought. Many times, the ihbars that come to the show for a new case are from viewers who (due to their dedicated following of the show and the surveillance imaginaries they received in the process) paid attention to abnormal behaviours around themselves and took note of what they could in case they later became important. In MATS, some interviewees express how they knew to pay attention even before they knew this matter would be brought up by the show as part of an investigation. Practicing surveillance on an individual basis is integral to the concept of social policing, where the desired practice of surveillance becomes habitual and repetitive even without the prompting of the show and also without specific cases on which one is expected to focus. It is a general state of constant awareness of and deliberate attention to matters that appear to be contrary to social order, the expected behaviour, and the law. The citizen, through viewing, sees, thinks, and most importantly, acts surveillantly in order to ensure order or help punish those who disrupt it.

2.3.2. Exposure

Exposure is the concept that entails how surveillance cultures can be elaborated upon through visibility. Current literature is heavily doused with online activities as the ground upon which exposure is discussed. These arguments will nonetheless prove to be invaluable when the discussion is around the exposure carried out through television, CBRTV shows in particular. What motivates the audience to expose certain information to the show (and therefore to the rest of the audience), the CRP who apply to the show for their cases to be investigated on live national television, or the CBRTV shows to expose all that it can?

On the part of the audience's acts of exposure, I believe Lupton's study on "data communities" can be enlightening. Lupton focuses on the applications through

which people get information on their bodies, like the step-counters or pulse-trackers. The bodily information people gather from the use of such apps are called “lively digital data assemblages.” The data is lively because it is collected from the physical bodies of the users, it is digital as it quantifies bodily indicators, and it is assembled in that the personal data is accessible to both the generator and the other users. It is in this sharing part that exposure becomes a matter of discussion. In platforms that gather personal information, sharing means more than the simple act of exposing information about oneself. Lupton underlines that sharing in such contexts can also build towards “developing social bonds, networks, and communities” (2017, p. 347). Accordingly, the common interest of self-tracking and sharing in such platforms allows users to give and receive emotional support, as well as feel belonging in a community of individuals with similar experiences. They compare their personal data in a competitive manner as well, seeing as their bodily information is quantified through the use of technology and is easily comparable. Users also treat their sharing as a performance of sorts, where achievements can add up to one’s preferred online image. From Lupton’s study, it can be said that the aggregated exposure can also be a source of information for other users, letting them learn from each other’s experiences.

It may seem to be incomparable to the experiences of the participants in CBRTV shows, but it is not: Expanding the exposure to include the information on other people and changing the platform of exposure from apps to television broadcasts goes a long way. Let us ponder upon a metaphorical missing person case on MATS. Participants do not self-track in that they quantify their bodily functions, but they do (with the vehement encouragements from the show) keep track of their surroundings with a keen gaze, on the lookout for that missing person. The act of surveillance is ever-present, but instead of the eye turned inwards to quantifiable bodily information, it is turned outwards to the observation of others’ whereabouts. They gather the information offered by the show and discuss the case with other viewers face-to-face or on social media accounts that are dedicated to the show’s proceedings. They call the show to tell them what they observed by themselves, or

what they heard other people observed, or what they know (or heard) about the conditions under which the person went missing. The platform of television offers a simultaneous update to all viewers. Should the information they offer the show prove to be important or useful, they are praised for the success of their surveillant labour by the show's host and experts. The information given to the show on the case creates a pool that helps other surveillant labourers and the show to finalize the case. The "data community" in this instance becomes the entirety of the audience where individuals receive praise for their watchful behaviour, cement their identity as vigilant citizens, participate in a collective endeavour, learn from each other, and derive conclusions from the information provided to the show.

Exposure on the part of the CRP who apply to the show for their cases to be investigated and broadcast may be approached by Furedi's concept of "therapy culture." Accordingly, the private sphere (and by that is mainly meant the domestic, family-related matters) being exposed with emotion is accepted and encouraged. Exposure of familial matters in such a culture is expected to entail issues with negative associations that should be bettered. As such, the private subject is commodified into an object that is watched and found lacking: It is criticized, redefined, and reclassified. (2004, as cited in Ball, 2009)

It is no wonder that the CBRTV shows base their existence on the exposure of familial matters or cases that are dominated by family disputes. The Palu family, for example, achieved mainstream popularity after being on MATS. As the show investigated the disappearance of two members of the family (a mother and her daughter), secret after sensational secret was spilled about the rest of the family and their relationships to each other. Rape, domestic violence, incest, pedophilia, torture, emotional and religious abuse, and eventually murder... Each was concealed within the family, hidden from the outside world until the case was taken up by MATS. The exposure of such deeds was met with the emotional outbursts of the host and the show experts. The family was found in dire need of professional mental help, their conduct was severely criticized, and the therapeutical cleansing took place in

the family's collective arrest as well as their consecutive (and broadcast) court cases. The Palu family became one of MATS' most popular cases, with high media coverage and mainstream air time, integrating into the popular culture through derisive reinterpretations and condemning mentions. However, they are not the only instance where the private, domestic sphere was exposed to be criticized by MATS or other CBRTV shows or, indeed, many day-time television programmes in Turkey.

The reality TV shows' stance on exposure might have inklings to how they position themselves as a media platform before the public's eye, and the position of the CRP as those in need of exposure to assume innocence. Exposure is located by Dean within an information economy and technoculture, where the revealed and concealed are viewed with certain bias. Revealed information plays into the understanding that the public is entitled to be informed, whereas concealed information raises suspicions as to what it might be hiding. This leads to persons who believe themselves to be specifically under surveillance to expose more about themselves in hopes of avoiding suspicious attention and control what is known about them. The public, eager to uncover secrets, watches raptly for more exposure. Dean claims that such an understanding dictates that democracy and justice will come to be when all is exposed.

(2001)

It is truly easy to see how exposure of the self is the main defense mechanism in CBRTV shows. In MATS, each CRP or other participants are approached, first and foremost, with suspicion and an encouragement to reveal information about the case, and about themselves in relation to the case. The case of Himmət Aktürk can exemplify this. The youngest of the Kupal Family, Irmak Kupal, disappeared from the front of the family house. The family applied to MATS to find her. The investigation resulted in a live confession from the main suspect, the neighbour Himmət Aktürk, who kidnapped and killed Irmak Kupal. However, until such a confession came, the Kupal family was put under pressure by their neighbourhood

to reveal more about their lives, because the neighbourhood believed the main suspect Himmet to be innocent and the parents to somehow be guilty of their daughter's disappearance. The neighbours relayed hearsay about Kupal family's domestic violence and Mrs. Kupal's infidelity to the show, and even confidential conversations of Mrs. Kupal with her acquaintances were brought up on the show, where she admitted to having unfavourable thoughts about her husband. The exposure may be linked to the events that followed months after the arrest and the investigative broadcasts, when Mr. Kupal murdered his pregnant wife and remaining daughter- this was featured on the show as an update on the Kupal family as well. The drive to reveal all that was hidden was done with the declared intention to solve the crime and to inform the audience of all facts. That it was irrelevant to the actual crime and that it would be disruptive to the CRP to this degree, I suppose, could not have been known from the start. However, exposure into the lives of real people (as opposed to actors cast for a role) is known to have negative reflections on reputation, especially if the subject matter is of crime. The stigmatization of such exposure on a nationally broadcast CBRTV program, and in any other media platform for that matter, should not be disregarded in the slightest.

CHAPTER 3

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN POLICING

3.1. Changing Strategies of Policing

Early 20th-century American police worked on foot and had no direct and instant technology to communicate with their commanders. Emboldened by lack of control and closeness to the public, the police were mostly known for their political policing and corruption. In the three decades following 1930, however, advances in communication technology and utilization of Weberian bureaucracy affected major changes in the police organizations. Policing came to be regarded as a profession, which meant politicians and ordinary citizens were distanced from policing procedures. The police now used cars to patrol, putting further distance between themselves and the citizens. Stricter communicative and bureaucratic control by commanders as well as the standardization of occupational measures also meant a decrease in corruption, but overall, the exclusion of the citizens from professional policing led to a search for a different type of policing (Duru & Çam, 2015).

After the 1960s, duties and the responsibilities of the police became open to discussion with the rising demands on the police, especially during the turn of the 21st century. The police, as an extension of the state, faced the public demand for problems of crime and feelings of insecurity that was experienced thoroughly in what Garland called “high crime societies” where crime was regarded to be of high rates, responded to with emotive tendencies and interest, security became a dominant topic of general and political discourse through media, the state is found

lacking in criminal justice, and private sector of security establishment thrived as a consequence. (2001)

Unable to meet such requirements with the extant resources available, the traditional form of policing (reactive and mobilized upon calls for help) began to transition into a proactive, constantly vigilant stance whose exact characteristics have yet to be refined because of the changing ways of implementation worldwide. Loosely named “community-based policing,” this new understanding of policing acknowledged the shortcomings of previous approaches, and sought to remedy that through allowing (or encouraging) citizen participation in policing.

As one of the areas in which citizen participation is most visible and encouraged, community-based policing entails close community relations between police and the community. Such close relations require police forces to be tasked in certain areas. The police have to be up to date with the local occurrences, and accountable to the citizens in the community. It goes beyond simply gathering information regarding the local crimes and deviances; the police must also be supportive of the community’s own actions for the purposes of crime control and prevention. As Grabosky comments, “(...) this entails close consultation with local communities, to enable local citizens to define what their crime problems are and to suggest what remedial approaches might be most appropriate” (1992, p. 254).

Community-based policing as a modern policing approach was taken by Turkey as well. Owing to its ambitions to join the EU in the early 21st century, the Turkish law enforcement agencies started to establish pilot community-based policing offices in selected provinces, which proved to be effective. By 2009, each province had a community-based policing office of its own (Duru & Çam, 2015). However, these offices were observed to aim to undertake different types of policing such as problem-oriented, democratic, and proactive policing. While those are modern approaches as well, this showed confusion about the responsibilities of community-

based policing offices and prevented all law enforcement offices from adopting community-based policing as a paradigm (Kula, 2015).

Although the efficacy of community-based policing has been a popular topic of debate, police forces all around the world are vocally aspiring to accomplish the ideal. The key word here is vocally: There are concerns that attempts at community-based policing may be little more than window dressing (Grabosky, 1992). However, what matters most here is that the inclination towards community-based policing paved the way for the widespread recognition of communal response to crime and deviance. This recognition brought along an encouragement for the citizens to become active participants in investigative processes, which require a heavily surveillant behaviour. The meaning of being a “citizen” expanded to include surveillance duties, under community-based policing and surveillance cultures of the society. Whereas, in terms safety, the government was the supplier and the citizen receiver, now citizen participation towards that end proved to enhance security with the much-appreciated benefit of cost efficiency on the part of the government (Skogan, et al., 2019). In turn, citizens felt competence and belonging (Grabosky, 1992). In theory, everything seems to work out well for all parties included. Practice, however, yields problems about organization, division of labour, and effectiveness (Terpstra, 2008). For now, it would be helpful to look further into the underlying motivators for citizen participation in community-based policing.

3.2. Police Motivations for Cooperation with Citizens

The cooperation between police and citizens (and in some cases, other governmental and/or private bodies) necessitates varying motivations for each participant. It should be kept in mind that motivations can vary according to cultural and historical backgrounds as well as the particular political climates and location.

The police, as the state agency tasked with crime control and prevention, could not, by themselves, answer the community’s demands for a solution to the perceived crime, deviance, and disorder issues in the society for lack of infrastructure and

resources. Instead of declaring the entire law enforcement institution obsolete, the idea was to lighten the police responsibilities and mete out such responsibilities upon the non-governmental agencies. Garland (2001, p. 124) called this “a responsabilization strategy.” In Terpstra’s words:

With this strategy the government tries to promote the active involvement of other actors and agencies in the prevention and control of crime and insecurity. Tasks that were formerly the monopoly of the police and criminal justice agencies are now presented as the moral duty of other agencies and citizens. (2008, p. 214)

Responsibilization meant that the police were no longer the sole authority that could (or would) strive for crime control and prevention. It was assumed that those who wanted safety should contribute to it with their participation in policing. The conundrum is that the entire *raison d’être* of the police was so that the non-police would not have to be engaged in matters of crime control and prevention. The police admit to being inefficient on their own in the same breath they assume the authority to push responsibilities onto agencies that previously were exempt from them.

The police, in practical community-based policing organizations such as the local security networks in Netherlands, also ask for a “management of expectations” (Crawford, 1997, as cited in Terpstra, 2008, p. 218) from the cooperative bodies. This entails that the rest must respect the lessening participation of the police in the security networks and accept that they have better things to do such as what Terpstra (2008, p. 219) calls “core business” of the police. This means even further de-responsibilization on the part of the police: First, they were no longer the sole authority on crime control, now they are no longer the leader of community-based policing organizations.

The *financial relief* that accompanies citizen participation should also be kept in mind. Grabosky recognizes the citizen provision of intelligence (whether in exchange for rewards or not) as “valuable public service” (1992, p. 261) that would

have surely cost more had it been done by the public law enforcement authorities. It matters not whether the informant citizen is materially rewarded or not; both possible outcomes end up benefitting the public authorities in terms of economy and criminal justice.

3.3. Citizen Motivations for Cooperation with the Police

Citizen participation may take different shapes and forms mainly in relation to the community's perception of the levels of crime and disorder in their environs, and the efficacy of the state, as well as social factors that also vary in time and space, and even crime itself can be an endeavour for crime control in cases where the official institutions fail to prevent personal injustice (Grabosky, 1992). As such, there can be a myriad of motivators, some of which were classified by Choi and Lee as a) past personal exposure to crime, b) a general understanding and care about public safety in relation to crime, c) faith in state agencies of law enforcement, d) individual benefits to be gained such as future employment with the police, e) feeling of communal belonging, f) the levels of crime extant within the community, g) already participating in different practices against crime on a local scale (2016).

Another motivation, one of more material benefits, may be included to this list especially if the citizen participation takes the shape of feeding information to the police. The surveillant labour of the citizens may be enticed through the promise of a hefty sum as well. While the police may occasionally reward a particularly useful ihbar, examples like Crimestoppers (a multinational CBRTV series) offer one for each sound ihbar that leads to the sentencing of a perpetrator. This reward system indicates, according to Grabosky, the acknowledgment that citizen participation is, in fact, of economic value (1992).

However, it should be kept in mind that in the related literature, these motivations and their strength vary greatly due to the cultural, locational, and procedural differences of the units of analysis. Also important is that the motivations may stem

from the many aspects of the cultures of surveillance as well; therefore the list above should not be taken either as the only motivators or universal ones.

3.4. Ideal Types of Citizen Participation

Terpstra, in his research on Netherland's local security networks, identified four types of citizen participation. These are a combination of factors of "limited" and "extended," versus "talking" and "doing," and include citizens or local businesses a) giving relevant information to the police, b) advising the police in decision processes, c) being urged to handle crime on their own, and d) being the sole providers of safety-related practices (2008, p. 221). Grabosky also offers a four-fold classification and defended that citizen participation differed in terms of governmental approaches (in terms of democratic or repressive) and types of gain (as in voluntary or commercial). Democratic approaches to citizen participants take the shape of neighbourhood watches if voluntary, and private security services if commercial, whereas repressive approaches yield vigilantism if voluntary, and police informers in exchange for money in commercial (1992).

For the purposes of this study, however, a classification that gives ample space for surveillance is preferred. Schreurs et al. (2018) offer yet another four-fold classification of ideal types of citizen participation in policing, and it is as follows:

1. "Collaborative participation": Ranging from answering police questions to participating in policy-making, this type of participation indicates close cooperation with the police.
2. "Social control": Being constantly on the lookout for unwelcome actions, and being ready to warn people off on such actions if necessary, may be given as an example to citizens' implementation of social control.
3. "Responsive participation": Responding to a crime by calling it in and keeping an eye on the event's progression, among other possible actions, are considered as responsive participation.

4. “Detection”: Perpetrators and criminal actions can be spotted through participation in organizations such as the neighbourhood watch or individual endeavours.

Psychological research had taken an interest in motivators of citizen participation as well. According to Schreurs et al., types of participation more likely to be triggered more often by one’s moral emotions are social control and responsive participation. The types of participation that require less moral emotions and a more positive perception of citizen participation, on the other hand, are collaborative participation and detection. The article even suggests that the police could aim for the related emotional state of the citizens in order to get the kind of participation they need (2018), and by shaping the perception of citizen participation through an emphasis placed on its general usefulness.

An implication of our finding would be that influencing attitudes toward citizen participation can stimulate behavior. This could be done, for example, by stressing the usefulness of citizens’ participation to the police as well as to citizens themselves, or to accentuate the responsibility citizens have to participate in society. (Schreurs et al., 2018, p. 11)

This suggestion itself emphasizes the ever-changing state of citizens’ moral emotions and attitudes concerning citizen participation. It can be said that such emotions and attitudes are necessary for participation, and in a dialectical fashion, they can be provoked and manipulated so as to meet police demands.

The goal appears to ensure citizen participation in policing through responsabilization, the enforcement of which Garland states can be achieved through “publicity campaigns” (1996, p. 452) that aim for citizenry’s behavioural and consciousness changes by the implication of citizen responsibility for crime control. It would thus make sense that, as television is a mass media platform, with the CBRTV genre as its most suitable and far-reaching agent, they are directly or indirectly utilized for the obtainment of the kinds of citizen participation in policing that is regarded as the most beneficial for the law enforcement agencies.

3.5. Practical Types of Citizen Participation in the World

Citizen participation in the prevention and control of crime, as explained above, is desirable both by the law enforcement authorities and the citizens for a myriad of motivations. As a result, different kinds of participation opportunities were established. Citizen police academies and police community support officers are examples of the police actively seeking the participation of the citizens with matters that directly relate to crime, whereas neighbourhood watches present themselves as a less official but more communal means of citizen participation in crime prevention activities. A classification of citizen participation in policing on a more individual level is concerned with the types of informants that offer information to the investigative processes, and below, they will be explained succinctly.

Britain's *citizen police academies* (CPA), for example, became popular enough to be integrated into the US police offices due to their aim for the citizen graduates to "bridge the gap" between the police and the rest of the community after attending the lectures about policing and accompanying the police in patrols (Palmiotto & Unninthan, 2002). Research conducted on the CPA participants shows that the graduates are more likely to give the police information on crimes, cooperate with and defend the police, and take part in crime prevention activities overall. (Brewster et al., 2005) The CPA are seen as a means to shape the public's perception of the police as an efficient and beneficial agency through the word of the participants. However, CPA are also given a criticism of political motives overriding the articulated aim for communal cooperation. The issue of a possible "preaching to the choir" was raised after research showed that the CPA participants were already viewing the police under a positive light and that lower SES groups were underrepresented, leading the Palmiotto and Unninthan to consider that CPAs' apparent effectiveness in enhancing community relations and educating the community may be influenced by the particular characteristics of the participating citizens and not due to an innate inclination of success (2002).

Police Community Support Officers are civilians with limited authority to accompany the police in arrests and investigations. In their analysis of British PCSOs, Choi et al. (2014, p. 288) say that “(...) they can not only take preventive measures but also react to criminal behaviour.” They also participate in police investigations and are allowed to search and fine people when faced with anti-social behaviour.

On a less structured note, the *neighbourhood watches* can be given as an example. These were formed upon the common understanding that police patrols were not enough of a deterrent for criminal activities in the neighbourhoods. Citizens develop a communication network for possible suspicious individuals or actions, keep each other up to date, and thus aim to keep their neighbourhood safe. In other words, they become their own police, supported and encouraged by the actual police. “When it is operating successfully,” says Grabosky (1992, p. 253), “the eyes and ears of neighbourhood watch participants provide surveillance services which would cost thousands of dollars if delivered by police or private security agents.” The economic benefits for the governments aside, the neighbourhood watch does not yield significant degrees of crime decline, and in fact, does not work efficiently in heterogeneous settlements in which organization is harder to achieve. Also, seeing as there is no supervisory control, the surveillance conducted by the neighbours carries the danger of becoming too intrusive (1992).

It has also been the case where the police enlist the help of individuals whose surveillant services may prove useful due to their particular occupations or positions. Law enforcement authorities may sometimes enlist the aid of individuals in particular positions (such as the taxi drivers) to constantly keep in communication with them in the efforts to apprehend perpetrators. (Grabosky, 1992)

This brings the matter to the individuals who aid the policing processes through the information they provide. Steven Greer’s classification of the police informant (2006) and definition of them as someone who gives the police any kind of

information on any kind of issue -criminal or not- is enlightening in that matter. This broad definition enables him to classify the informant into two main categories: the outsiders, i.e., people who give information on matters they were mere observers of, vs the insiders, i.e., people from within the matter the police are interested in having more information on. Greer then deliberates upon this classification with regards to the number of events the said informants pass information to the police, and lastly discusses the confession informant who conforms neither to the insider nor the outsider.

The *Outside Single Event Informant* is “the casual observer” who happened upon an occurrence the information about which they think could benefit the police. The *Outside Multiple Event Informant* is “the Snoop,” which indicates a person who provides a one-way information flow to the police from many occurrences with a common theme. As previously mentioned by Grabosky (1992), Greer too gives the example of the taxi drivers as persons in a position to surveil many without being too obvious about it and could relay information to the police about the possibly criminal events that they witness. The snoop can also be a local gossip ratting out their neighbours, among many others. The *Inside Single Event Informant*, “the one off accomplice witness” is someone most frequently convinced by the police after their arrest that giving information about the crime and fellow criminals would be in their best interest. The *Inside Multiple Event Informant* are those who are planted, for lack of a better word, into suspicious networks of criminal, political, or social organizations for the purpose of conveying relevant information to the police. Outside the boundaries of the insider and the outsiders is the criminals who confess their crimes: Greer’s fifth and final category of the police informant is the *Confession Informant*.

As can be seen above, and regardless of how official or grassroots the participation appears to be, the citizen cooperation in policing seems to rely to some great extent on the surveillance labour the citizens can offer the investigative processes or to establish security against the threat of crime. Surveillance towards criminal or

deviant behaviour is necessary from the get-go, and the conveyance of these observations to the police or to other members of the community are the common factors within the practical types of citizen participation in policing.

3.6. Practical Types of Citizen Participation in Turkey

Apart from CBRTV programming in mass media, information on citizen participation in policing is most visible and accessible in the community-based policing endeavours of the Turkish police forces.

Turkish e-government website offers a service called “Community-based Policing Service of Neighbourhood Police” as well as general information on community-based policing, with emphasis on pro-activity and the importance of communal participation and support. The Neighbourhood Police service, reached through login with ID numbers, offers the citizen a chance to send your *requests, recommendations or complaints* to the police of the neighbourhood you reside in, as well as other neighbourhoods. Petitions, ihbars, and requests for information are not accepted in this application. Although citizens are given an opportunity to contact their neighbourhood police online, it appears as a one-way communication in which the police gather neighbourhood members’ personal thoughts and wishes. Such participation hardly reminds one of the citizen patrols or citizen police academies of worldwide community-based policing enforcements.

The interactive Turkish governmental website lists the general aims of Turkish community-based policing as; detection of communities’ expectations in terms of security through security satisfaction surveys; developing customer-based service approach; meeting periodically with the communal representatives on security-related issues; detecting factors contributing to crime with the help of individuals and organizations; raising community awareness on security; and organizing social and cultural activities to enhance community-police relations. (e-Devlet Kapısı Devletin Kısayolu, n.d.) The e-gov page counts the following activities as part of the police’s enactment of community-based policing:

- Area of Responsibility Meetings of Peace (Sorumluluk Alanı Huzur Toplantıları - SAHT) in which the police evaluate extant security services and discuss solutions about security service problems with the citizens,
- Communal contact meetings in which citizens are notified of general and personal safety,
- Preparation of materials to raise awareness about security services, crime prevention, protection from crime, and individual safety measures against street crimes,
- Individual communications and human affairs to increase trust in police, and thus, enhance security in the long run,
- Receiving and solving problems faced in everyday life, as well as informing and mobilizing relevant departments for further improvement on citizenry's issues,
- Close attention to institutions of education and participation in PTA meetings,
- Coordination of social activities and encouragement of citizens' voluntary participation,
- Prompting welfare activities for individuals in need, especially for victims of crime.
- Visitations to victims of crime and institutions of care for children and elderly, which include informative consultancy services. (e-Devlet Kapısı Devletin Kısayolu, n.d.)

Searching for the community-based policing practices of the entire nation of Turkey is a long and tedious process due to the fact that each province has a community-based policing office of its own and no kind of standardization when it comes to sharing relevant information about them. The search itself, however, yields the results that community-based policing activities in Turkey are mostly concerned with raising citizen awareness about crime and crime prevention, and becoming partners with organizations in social support projects; the citizen appears mostly as a passive recipient of information and social aid. Active citizen participation in

policing on the basis of surveillance labour, if it does occur, is not deliberated upon in detail.

The activity by Turkish community-based policing offices that includes citizen participation most obviously, mentioned in few provincial police office websites, is meetings called Sorumluluk Alanı Huzur Toplantısı (SAHT) (one translation can be ‘Area of Responsibility Meeting of Peace’) which was defined as follows:

SAHT are meetings based on the areas of jurisdiction of police departments, organized with citizen participation, for evaluation and problem-solving about security services. Participation in these meetings is entirely voluntary, and citizens are free to share the problems they experience (Hakkari Emniyet Müdürlüğü, n.d.).²

It should be kept in mind that while very similar, community-based policing and citizen participation in policing are different concepts with differing practices. Community-based policing’s first and foremost concern is establishing close relations between the local police and the local people concerning local matters of crime. Citizen participation in policing includes this, while it also envisions active citizen participation with regard to crime prevention and control on a nationwide scale. In the Turkish case of community-based policing, the matters concerning active citizen participation are not shared online or publicly accessible. Community-based policing appears as the most concrete form of accessible citizen participation activities, where participation is mostly limited to attending informative meetings and keeping good relations with the police. However, while quite unofficial and unrecognized by official agencies, CBRTV shows offer ample incidents where citizens participate in matters of policing and criminal investigations.

² “SAHT, Polis Merkezlerinin görev alanı esas alınarak, vatandaşın katılımı ile düzenlenen değerlendirme ve güvenlik hizmetlerine ilişkin sorun çözme toplantıdır. Bu toplantılara katılım gönüllüdür ve vatandaşlarımız yaşadıkları sorunları gönül rahatlığıyla dile getirebilmektedir.” (Hakkari Emniyet Müdürlüğü, n.d.)

It is argued in this thesis that CBRTV programs in Turkey act as informal branches of community-based policing where citizens are notified on criminal cases and are directed towards participation in the manner of doing surveillance labour and sharing the information they gather as a result on national broadcasts, providing help and support to policing through intermediary platforms. It is not the police contacting individuals who may prove useful for investigations; it is a TV show that announces the demand for information and the viewers who call the show to impart their information. This may be interpreted either as a deviation from community-based policing as it is traditionally known or an entirely new process of citizen participation in matters pertaining to policing. This thesis defends that it is the latter, and conceptualizes the process as “social policing.”

3.7. Discussing Social Policing

Social policing is mainly concerned with the processes in which surveillance culture is utilized by mass-mediated television programs on crime in order to mobilize the viewership into surveillance labour whose results would, in return, benefit the police as evidence. The viewer is expected not only to watch the show but also to feel responsible as a citizen to take from the show information that they can use to enact surveillance practices. The viewer becomes the citizen; their understanding of surveillance becomes utilitarian and is fed with concerns about social order; importance is given heavily to law-abiding behaviour and tolerance of deviance diminishes to a level that deviant behaviour becomes the subject of keen observation and announcement on national broadcasts if prompted. A general law and order ideology accompanies the defence of surveillance as a culture, and the viewer/citizen is expected to carry out surveillance practices in line with them. Sharing information gained through surveillance for policing is a sort of citizen participation and is considered to be part of the duties of being a citizen. When this is done through television, it aims to create a police-like audience whose surveillance labour is demanded due to their primary identification as citizens. That these shows are not endorsed by the police in an official manner creates a vagueness as to the exact justification of demands for surveillance labour, which the shows try

to remedy with continuous praise and support for the law enforcement authorities. While it should be questioned whether such shows are justified in their endeavours to mobilize their audiences into social policing, the fact remains that viewers do provide the show with surveillance labour upon prompt, and are encouraged frequently to subscribe to a law and order ideology for the sake of social order and security.

The viewer becomes the citizen, and the citizen becomes responsible for matters that are traditionally under the sole jurisdiction of policing, like the utilization of surveillance for the conclusion of criminal investigations, and the contact with individuals who may have relevant information. Changing the scope and content of “the citizen” is not an unfamiliar matter, however. T. H. Marshall, when he was discussing the matter of education being both free and mandatory at the end of the 18th century, underlined the fact that certain rights can be accompanied by “a public duty to exercise the right” (1983, p. 253). Reasons for this necessity goes beyond the benefits individual citizens may reap for having exercised their rights; it must serve a bigger, systematic purpose. In the case of education, this was the production of educated people that would vote in a democratic regime and work for better productivity (Marshall, 1983). From then to the 21st century, what remained the same was that the changes in the meaning of and expectations from citizenship used rights as a means of reproduction of the desired social systems.

The *de facto* meaning of citizenship now entails a responsibility and a willingness to offer surveillance labour to those who were trained and employed for the use of surveillance in criminal justice. Whereas once it was the duty of the governments to protect its citizens, now the citizens must bear (at least some of) the burden of protecting themselves by aiding the protectors with relevant information gained from their own surveillance practices as unofficial surveillant labour. This, with a strong emphasis on the righteousness of law and order, a sensitivity towards crime and an intolerance for deviance, shapes the citizen into someone who must police their own behaviour as well as surveil others’ behaviours in line with the

responsibilities that currently accompany being a citizen. Surveillance for the sake of policing seeps further than the occasional participation in policing; it exceeds incidental limits and becomes articulated into the intricacies of everyday life. The world is seen surveillantly in order to detect and, if possible expose the details and information on crimes and deviances one can gather information on, due mainly to being under a strategy of responsabilization, especially through mass-mediated intermediators between the law enforcement authorities and the citizenry.

Some aspects of citizen participation that require careful elaboration were presented by Grabosky in that citizens cannot be expected to uphold the levels of “detachment and neutrality” as well as have the “skills and resources” (1992, p. 251) demanded by matters pertaining to criminal justice. Also, considering that citizen participation in policing is unremunerated in most cases, the citizens may be open to exploitation in relation to the labour they afford and the conditions in which they provide that labour.

Citizen participation in processes of criminal justice may also damage the thoughtless trust between members of a community. As Grabosky (1992, p. 266) so aptly put it, “(...) the frank and uninhibited exchange which characterizes normal discourse in a free society can be chilled by the suspicion that anyone may be a spy.” This is especially the case when the information shared by the citizen participant does not remain within police confidentiality. Exposure of information, whether incriminating or not, on a national TV broadcast, for example, may have ramifications beyond the broadcast or investigation and may harm the related persons in ways previously unpredicted. Adding to this the ever-present possibility that the citizen participants may fabricate or embellish the data they share on third parties for personal reasons like revenge or rewards, the ensuing criminalization may lead to unfounded victimization.

Lastly, the effects of prolonged exposure to demands for citizen participation in policing (or “social policing” as a more inclusive, comprehensive name for the entire

processes and their effects on the participants) must be considered. Participation, if presented as a possibility for the voluntary, may have different effects than if expected and demanded frequently and from platforms that are far-reaching in scope and impression. A continuous enlisting of media for ensuring citizen participation necessitate a certain kind of enculturation of the citizen to security-orientation in everyday life, an enhanced fear of crime, and dedication to using one's own capabilities to bring about social order. It may be the case that this leads individuals to police each other's actions and take surveillant note of any deviances; the approved set of behaviours may exceed those particular cases with which the law enforcement authorities need help, and spill over to interpersonal conducts and cement a general world paradigm where crime is divorced from contributing factors and conditions, limited to morals and actions of individuals. An overall crime prevention or control may be the aim, but social policing may work as a palliative solution for specific cases and lead to judgemental conduct that sees no further than the surveillance of single, custom instances of deviance.

All in all, the retreat of the welfare state from the law enforcement and security (Terpstra, 2008) as well as many other areas, must be considered in detail in terms of how it may reflect upon the citizens. Treating the citizenry as a reserve army of labour places severe responsibilities on the ordinary, untrained people and doing so with the intermediation of mass-mediated reality TV requires its own investigation altogether.

CHAPTER 4

CRIME-BASED REALITY TV PROGRAMMING

4.1. Reality TV and Crime as a Genre

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (n.d.) defines "reality TV" as "television shows that are based on real people (not actors) in real situations, presented as entertainment." Imagining a reality TV show about crime, we can assume that there would be ordinary people in the context of a criminal case or investigation, and that it would be televised for entertainment purposes.

Sounding like a specific and clear-cut genre, CBRTV shows prove to be somewhat difficult to define. The range of shows with the category has relatively different positions in terms of their relationship to reality. The one safe factor common to the genre, however, appears to be that they offer their audiences what is presented as real criminal cases and real, ordinary people who are involved in them.

Cavender and Fishman have poised the CBRTV shows as a hybrid between news and entertainment: Whereas they claim to give news, unlike the news, they predominantly take place on 'prime time' (1998), which is basically the time slot between people arriving from work and going to sleep and the perfect time for entertainment. Cavender also considers some of these shows as exemplifying public service (1998) as well, with their declared goal and desired end being catching the criminals.

The shows are classified into two main formats (Cavender & Fishman, 1998). The first one has actor re-enactments, vignettes of interviews with the CRP, and pictures of the wanted persons. This format encourages its audience to relay case-related information, or ihbars, to the show or the police, and it updates its audience on the stance of previously handled cases. The second format revolves around cameras following the police, making the audience feel like part of the patrol as the police do their jobs. Action scenes are edited together and the static scenes are edited out to present the job of the police as very interesting.

The more popular of the two formats is the first one, and there are a plethora of examples for such shows in many countries and in their many TV channels. Re-enactment has three components (Corner, 1995) as reportage, interview, and dramatization. This was found to blur the line between what is real and what is not, as is characteristic of Eco's conceptualization of "neo-TV," where the increase in private channels and the desire to hold the audience results in an emphasis on interactions with the audiences. Instead of focusing on the world that exists outside the realm of television, "Neo-TV talks about itself and about the contact that it establishes with its own public" (Eco, 1990, p. 246). Fact and fiction blur together in this representation and televisualization in the shows, and this aspect of neo-TV can be most easily observed in products that mix reporting and entertainment together, especially with topics as attention-grabbing and open to sensationalization as crime.

The popularity of the genre is highly debated and will be discussed further within this chapter. However, objectification of crime for televisual entertainment of the masses can be approached from a more structural standpoint, as Dobash et al. have, discussing the matter through a duality between the extant problems concerning crime in real life and its representation on the TV where victories against it are made visible.

Perhaps it is also linked to disillusionment with the realities of policing, the failures of law and order, and a kind of correlative rise in fictive success. The more the failures of law and order become evident, the greater the interest in a resolution of these problems on television. (1998, p. 39)

Regardless, there is a negative perception of these shows and their audiences, not only in the Turkish context but worldwide as well. Infotainment shows were dubbed as “trash TV” (Cavender & Fishman, 1998, p. 12) by some, with a national instead of local audience of low socioeconomic status. An analysis of ratings of these CBRTV shows (Fishman, 1998) indicated that their audience consists of women more than men, and older people more than the young. Crimewatch UK’s ratings, for example, had peaked in 1993 at an impressive 12 million, however in terms of its time of broadcast during the day, the rating data showed that “the audience is downmarket and biased towards women” (Dobash et al., 1998, p. 38). Targeted for their focus on the scandalous and likened to tabloid journalism for its transformation of crime into entertainment, the CBRTV shows draw many more criticisms which are expanded in the following section.

4.1.1. Examples from the World

CBRTV shows are very common worldwide, although related literature is mostly on examples from the USA and Europe. Cavender and Fishman explain that “(...) crime policy, ideological notions about crime, and television crime shows are interrelated; they occur within a particular social context” (1998, p. 5). That particular social context is usually dominated by a fear of crime, and a consensus that it has to be interfered with. However, the fact that the same genre has been popular in different parts of the world suggests that different contextual backgrounds can also bring forth a similar popularity for these shows.

In Europe, it was Germany that started the crime-based reality shows with *Aktenzeichen XY... Ungelöst* in 1967, a show that mixed fact and fiction with an aim to apprehend political criminals foremost. Taking inspiration from the show was the

Netherlands in 1975 with *Opsporing Verzocht*, followed by the United Kingdom in 1984 with its *Crimewatch UK* (Cavender & Fishman, 1998).

Crimewatch UK, as relayed by Dobash et al., “first achieved popularity in a period of law and order politics, a growing concern about fear of crime, and a new wave of ‘participative’ television” (1998, p. 38). It aired only after ensuring police cooperation in 1984 and features re-enactments of crimes, interviews with witnesses, victims and the police, as well as updates on previous and present cases. The widely followed show was criticized for its reconstructive formula and inflammatory approach to the fear of crime (Leishman & Mason, 2003). The focus on reconstructing crimes against the person was explained by the producers and presenters of the show as conducive to high amounts of publicity, which led viewers with information to help the show help the police solve the case (Leishman & Mason, 2003).

In the USA, the humane and rehabilitative approach to crime of the 1960s was slowly replaced in the following two decades with a crime control model that became punitive; the harsh means of stopping crime was justified by the justice prevailing. Failing in the 20-year Vietnam War, the American society tried to mend its pride with the following wars: Internationally, the USA was attempting to win back its pride by the invasion of Panama in 1989 and the Persian Gulf War in 1990. Nationally, however, citizens were living precarious lives, facing a myriad of social problems like unemployment and poverty. The consumption of the televised wars with pleasure was contrasted with the troubles of everyday life. It was around this time in the 90s that the genre of CBRTV shows took off. Starting with 1987’s *Unsolved Mysteries*, and 1988’s *America’s Most Wanted*, the USA produced many CBRTV shows.

These programs are a display of the worst in us. Drugs, crime, and threats to the family and to safety generally are the stock-in-trade of these shows. However, programs like ‘Cops’ depict the police as the front line of defense against such threats. ‘America’s Most Wanted’ gives viewers a sense of

empowerment as they fight back with telephone calls that help to capture dangerous criminals. (Cavender & Fishman, 1998, p. 7)

The popularity of the genre was and still is quite high. One of the most popular examples is *Crime Stoppers*, which was borne out of a Detective MacAleese's idea about solving a shooting in Albuquerque in 1976: What if the news reports on TV included re-enactments of certain crimes and asked its audience for reports to solve them. With the promise that the callers remain anonymous, he was reached by an eye-witness. His book, "Crime Stoppers: The Inside Story" professes that: "(...) today it is cited along with fingerprinting and DNA as the top three innovations in modern day policing" (MacAleese, 2016). Today, Crime Stoppers International is an NGO spanning over the USA, Canada, Caribbean, Bermuda, Latin America, Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Pacific, and Africa. Their model consists of media providing publicity to the public, which in turn give tips to *Crime Stoppers*, who reports it to law enforcement, which give the results back to *Crime Stoppers*, who give stories and statistics to the media; and then the cycle starts all over again (Crime Stoppers International, n.d.). They have exceeded interpersonal violent crimes and deal with transnational and organized crimes as well, mobilizing persons and communities alike to give anonymous tips, through their "the unique tripartite model of law enforcement, media and the community" (Crime Stoppers International, n.d.).

Another representative example is *Crimewatch UK*, which opens their program with the following statement: "Good evening, and welcome to the program where once a month instead of just hearing about crimes you can perhaps actually do something about them" (Dobash et al., 1998, p. 42). This show is mostly concerned with interpersonal crimes and relies heavily on the reconstructive formula and encouragements of its audience to contact the in-studio police with relevant information. 'Photo Calls' or, as Doyle refers to them, "video wanted posters" (2003, p. 66) are broadcast, containing pictures and CCTV footages of the wanted suspects or criminals. There are live interviews with the police in charge about the details of the case. Telephone numbers are given, with the promise of awards in case

the ihbar checks out. The show ends with a reminder by the hosts that the events in the show are singular, exceptional cases that people should not generalize and fear. A short update is offered by the same evening about the cases and their progression, with emphasis on the aid of the incoming ihbars, which are, of course great in number. The updates are finalized with yet another justification and legitimization of the show: Even though the cases are quite uncommon “(...) the whole purpose of ‘Crimewatch’ is that with your help we can perhaps make them even more rare” (Dobash, Schlesinger, Dobash, & Weaver, 1998, p. 44).

4.1.2. Examples from Turkey

In Turkey, *Sıcağı Sıcağına* is the first CBRTV show, lasting from 1993 to 1998. It used journalistic elements for a sensationalist representation of crime on television. (Göker, 2015). It aimed to solve unsolved murders and defended that the broadcast was for public good, but was most prominently known for making violent re-enactions of crime for entertainment. (Aksop, 1998) With male actors as hosts, the show set a precedent for others to come. Due to what may be nostalgic affinities and the show’s past popularity, it aired again in 2009 but was cancelled before the season was finalized. *Gerçek Kesit*, airing in 1993 and having an on-again, off-again broadcast past until the mid-2000s, is another of the genre. It was heavily dependent on a reconstructive, episodic formulation concerning true crime. With the female host Perihan Savaş, *Gerçek Kesit* amassed a cult following with many re-enactors becoming publicly known. *Söz Fato’da* is a similar example from 1993-1996, although it was mostly centred around a reconstructive formula and relied on hidden cameras revealing sensationalized criminal acts on site. (Aksop, 1998) The host was a famous Turkish cinema star, Fatma Girik.

Over time, it became a kind of a norm for CBRTV shows in Turkey to have female hosts. Recent examples of the genre (*Müge Anlı ile Tatlı Sert*, *Gerçeğin Peşinde*, *Balçişek İlder ile Olay Yeri*, *İnci Ertuğrul ile Kaybolan Çiçekler*, and *Didem Arslan Yılmaz’la Vazgeçme* to list some) had female hosts, with a significant change to the formats in comparison to the early 1990s. Now the reconstruction formula is

abandoned in favour of on-air broadcasts of CRP interrogations, with the violent nature of crimes being limited to oral narrations instead of visual depictions. It became more common to have an in-studio team of experts made up of mostly male professionals from fields with direct relation to crime, such as law, psychiatry, and forensics. The shows are aired during the daytime and are primarily concerned with solving unsolved murders, finding missing persons, bringing families together, revealing DNA test results to determine blood relation, and exposing individuals or networks who do marriage or treasure scams.

Although the genre was popular already, Turkish daytime television underwent a drastic change in 2017, when the other popular genre of friendship/dating/marriage shows was banned by the 690th decree-law. This meant that channels and producers had to find another format so as not to lose their air-time. As was mentioned in the 2018 Television Viewing Trends Research, the new format became one of “new productions about police and court-related news about murder, kidnapping, finding missing people etc.”³ (RTÜK, 2018, p. 61). This explained the sudden increase in MATS-like CBRTV shows in Turkish television:

Turkish Radio and Television Supreme Council (RTÜK) has done research concerning the audience perceptions for these kinds of shows. Due to the case of this thesis being from MATS, the relevant data concerning the show in official RTÜK research and reports. In the 2016 and 2018 volumes of Citizen Feedback Evaluation, MATS was categorized as a reality show. Meanwhile, in their “Television Viewing Trends Research” (Televizyon İzleme Eğilimleri Araştırması), which took place in 2006, 2009, 2012 and 2018, “reality shows” was not a category about which data was collected from the participants. However, in the 2018 TVTR, “daytime programming” (“kuşak programları”) was poised as the category under

³ “Bu yapımların sona ermesi ile bunların yerini cinayet, çocuk kaçırma, kayıp bulma vb. polis adliye haberlerinden oluşan konuların işlendiği yeni yapımlar almıştır.” (RTÜK, 2018, p. 61)

which MATS fell, seeing as the category was operationalized to include shows about “criminal cases, murder, kidnapping etc.”⁴ (RTÜK, 2018, p. 59) The contradictory stance of RTÜK on the classification of MATS made it nearly impossible to distinguish which data to analyse.

In “Women’s Television Viewing Trends Research -2” of 2010, MATS was categorized as a program specifically made for women. The show ranked 9th (with %4,2 of audience preference) most viewed program in a list that included prime time TV series, game shows and talk shows, and the first amongst the CBRTV shows (RTÜK, 2010, p. 65). MATS was one of the reasons the channel ATV was preferred; %1,7 of the audience listed MATS as a reason for preferring ATV if they were given only one choice (RTÜK, 2010, p. 58). The other channels did not have answers explaining the audience’s preference of them due to a specific programme.

The same research reveals that the female audience liked MATS in the 3rd rank with %13,4 of the participants justifying their appreciation as follows: “I like it. It is informative / educational. I find it realistic. They find the missing people and bring people together”⁵ (RTÜK, 2010, p. 75). Among the audience’s least liked shows for women, MATS ranked 5th, with the %6,4 of the participants saying that “I find it nonsensical. It is unnecessary. It is a bad example for kids. It is demoralizing. I don’t like it”⁶ (RTÜK, 2010, p. 76).

4.2. Contextualizing Turkish Crime-Based Reality TV Programming

Due to the success of the genre in ratings and popularity within the Turkish context, CBRTV has been the focus of considerable academic interest. Early examples of the

⁴ “...adli olayları, cinayet, çocuk kaçırma vb.” (RTÜK, 2018, p. 59)

⁵ “Hoşuma gidiyor, Bilgilendirici / eğitici, Gerçekçi buluyorum, Kaybolanları buluyor, ayrılanları kavuşturuyor,” (RTÜK, 2010, p. 75)

⁶ “Saçma buluyorum, Gereksiz, Çocuklara kötü örnek oluyor, Moral bozucu, Sevmiyorum,” (RTÜK, 2010, p. 76)

genre were discussed by Aksop in relation to the privatization of Turkish television and the ensuing plethora of private channels that aimed for profit maximization; this led the private channels to implement successful show formats in the world. Criminal matters shifted from news to examples of early CBRTV programs, which presented themselves as serving public interest due to their investigative endeavours. Aksop approached reality television as part of an industrial, political and economic context; as a platform that produced for consumption and reproduced the protection of the status quo with an ideology of law and order (1998).

The genre was also analysed from the Foucauldian perspective. Yaman discusses power and its disciplinary implications, and approaches the case of MATS with an aim at how neoliberal governance could be detected within the show's conduct which is influenced by cultural and political concerns. She addresses the neoliberal governance's non-intervention state, the self-responsible individual it envisions, and the effects of neo-conservatism on Turkish reality TV, emphasizing the national experience of the 80s coup and the conflicting ideologies and the rising neoliberal trends. Yaman states that "neoliberalism in Turkey has evolved with the interference of local sensitiveness and with the dominance of neoconservative values" (2013, p. 54). The ensuing mixture of individualism, neo-conservatism and extant cultural values were reflected in the media as well. The reality genre, which required little budget and allowed for a wide range of themes to be handled (Aksop, 1998), was not exempt from this.

Çoban approached the genre from the Habermasian aspect of public and private spheres, the operation of civil society within the public sphere, and the exposure of the private with the media within this dynamic. Accordingly, in the post-coup era and the heterogeneous cultural values therein, media played a part in bringing the public and private together with little consideration for privacy, especially in the reality genre where the priority is addressing the general audiences. The audiences, influenced by the individualism due to heightened global and national neoliberal and capitalist tendencies, took an interest in seeing into the lives of others and reality

programming provided that as well as became problem-solving platforms where individuals could defend their rights as well, lending itself to civil society attributes. This indicates a new conduct; when the law fails, the individuals seek to resolve their problems in the public sphere at the expense of privacy (2019).

The reality aspect of reality TV has also been a matter of interest within the Turkish context. The proliferation of the genre is based, in part, on its claim to be presenting reality as closely as possible, and it, in turn, affects the viewers' understanding of reality. Göker explains that the footage is of people behaving as though the cameras are not there, and it is subjected to elimination and choosing during the editing process to make both the viewer and the viewed experience a hyperreality where the hidden fictional elements and the heightened sense of reality coexist. He also recognizes the role of surveillance in the setting of this hyperreality, approaching mass-mediated acts of surveillance as the transformation of control into entertainment that is pleasurable both for the surveillant and the surveilled (2015). An analysis of how the reality construction process takes place, how individual realities are reproduced by mediated narratives in reality TV was offered by Bulut in a case of MATS (2020) and Elitaş and Keskin in a study of non-CBRTV shows in Turkey (2019).

Further research on MATS as a prominent example of Turkish CBRTV programming include that of their reproduction of gender inequalities (Çavdar, 2019), their discourse of fear towards women (Kaya, 2012), their format (Tetik & Özgüven, 2021), and their televising of morality and prudentialism (Erol Işık & Yaman, 2017) to list some.

This study aims to further the related literature by approaching reality TV from the surveillance aspect, specifically from the surveillance culture. By focusing on the role of surveillance culture, the set of relations where surveillance as a commodity is expected of the viewer in the form of surveillance labour is explored. It is defended that surveillance culture is reproduced by the CBRTV shows to uphold the

surveillance market by producing surveillance labourers; to establish self-discipline and social order; and to garner an audience that accepts surveillance as a civic duty and habitually behaves in a way that benefits the shows and the law enforcement authorities in the absence of an involved welfare state.

4.3. A Critical Reading of Crime-Based Reality TV Programming

CBRTV shows are believed to exemplify “a novel set of relations between the criminal justice system, the media, and the audience” (Dobash et al., 1998, p. 39). Although it is widely recognized that such shows captivate the attention of their audiences with their exposure of the investigative processes, retain high ratings nationwide, and mobilize the viewers with considerable effervescence, they have also been the focal point of many criticisms in terms of their possible negative implications and ramifications.

One of the most criticized aspects of the genre is its claims of journalism. Critics desire to differentiate such shows from journalism because the actor involvement in re-enactments, as well as the filming and editing techniques that aim for an effect of authenticity and thrill, do not abide by the rules of objective and professional journalism (Cavender & Fishman, 1998). Another point at which CBRTV shows separate from journalism is on its ideological stand. While it is expected from journalism to monitor governmental actions and decisions with a critical stance and in favour of the public, these shows display clear partiality to, if not outright advocacy of, state agencies of criminal justice.

Reality-based crime programming is, in fact, a collaborative product of media organizations and law enforcement agencies... In exchange for this cooperation, those who produce reality programs cannot or will not exercise independent and critical judgment of law enforcement agencies. The producers of reality crime shows identify with the police, viewing their role as one of combatting crime, aiding law enforcement, and showing police work in a positive and engaging way. (Cavender & Fishman, 1998, p. 11)

This partiality may breed hierarchical differences between the journalists, as in “inner and outer circles” (Cavender & Fishman, 1998, pp. 11-12), where the inner circle are those closer to the law enforcement agencies for their positive portrayal of criminal investigative processes, and those who remain impartial and objective are kept at a distance in terms of communication and information sharing.

Such a case would undoubtedly tip the scales against journalists determined to uphold journalistic integrity; the overall conduct would conceal wrongdoings. Reiman (2000, as cited in Leishman and Mason, 2003) too, criticizes the media dependence on law enforcement agencies for their quest for content, which stops them from being critical of police misconduct and causes an obstacle for journalistic access to information. Innes (1999, as cited in Leishman and Mason, 2003) emphasizes that the opposite is also possible, where the unequal relationship between the producers of the show and the law enforcement authorities may limit the show crews to produce content in compliance with the preferences of the police.

It is thus understandable, within this operation and conduct, that genre programs show the police in a favourable light. However, the representation of the police in these shows, whether they are of a more reconstructive format or of those that follow the police around, offer a narration of the police as faultless, portrayed as substitutable parts of a harmonious whole, “an abstract form of heroic consistency” (Fishman, 1999, as cited in Leishman and Mason, 2003, p. 113) in which all parts carry the same characteristics regardless of time, space, and context.

The subject matter of crime also raises questions in the way it is approached within the genre, leading at times to a simplified and decontextualized representation, devoid of causes and contributing factors and shown as examples of good and evil (Leishman & Mason, 2003, p. 112). The criminal is treated as the other, either due to intersectional factors such as their class, race, ethnicity, or due to their physiological or mental status (Kooistra et al., 1998). Adding to this the simple fact that they are platformed and broadcast to a national audience with their on-air

interrogations and statements concerning a criminal investigation (whereas a police investigation would not proceed so publicly), it is understandable for stigmatization and incrimination for the CRP. The crime, too, remains with few facets and intricacies, an extraordinary occasion that is only as important as its effects of victimization.

Tracing the roots of the CBRTV genre back to the tabloid newspapers and talk shows that place entertainment before being informative, Cavender and Fishman defend that, “in new ways, reality programming exploits the possibilities of crime and punishment as spectacle” (1998, p. 12). Foucault had argued that the spectacle of punishment for public discipline through bodily torture was removed from the public gaze. Punishment had been shifted into the walls of the panopticon, the focus of the disciplining power shifting from the body to the mind in order to produce self-discipline through surveillance. However, as Mathiesen argues, the synoptic developments of the media made use of crime and punishment as very popular subjects of spectacle.

News from these parts of panopticon- news about prisoners, escapes, robberies, murder- are the best pieces of news which synopticon- television and tabloid newspapers- can find. Inside synopticon, which devours this news, the material is purged of everything but the purely criminal- what was originally a small segment of a human being becomes the whole human being- whereupon the material is hurled back into the open society as stereotypes and panic-like, terrifying stories about individual cases, thus completely contradicting Foucault’s thesis that punishment tends to become the most hidden part of the penal process. (Mathiesen, 2006, p. 57)

The portrayal of the CRP is another matter of concern due to possible ramifications such as the invasion of their privacy on broadcast, leading to multiple victimizations; once during the statements given to the shows and the rest during the repetitive use of such footage on the show. However, these statements, which relate to one criminal investigation or other, may result in complications concerning the CRP’s position in the court processes. While keeping in mind the differing laws in different countries on contempt of law, that the broadcasting of the footage may change public

opinion on an active case must be considered. There may be negative impacts on the court proceedings, such as swaying opinions on the verdict and the defendants applying for an appeal on the grounds of the bias caused by their arrest footage being broadcast. There may also be cases where individuals, due to their representation on CBRTV shows, are wrongly incriminated or acquitted if the show's footage are considered as evidence, both in the public eye and in the court. There is also the matter of "trial by media," which Doyle (2003, pp. 69-71) suggests might make punishments harsher for the perpetrators, leaving little to no room for pleading or bargaining or being given exemplary verdicts by judges seeking media recognition.

The light under which crime is held is dim and narrow, especially in comparison to the wide range of criminal activities. CBRTV shows are focused on interpersonal crimes most of the time; violence, murder, sexual assault, robbery and scamming appear as prominent themes around which the criminal cases to be investigated on the shows are chosen. This results in a pretty limited representation of crime, excluding organized, political, corporate, or white-collar crimes. On a CBRTV show called "Cops," Kooistra, Mahoney, and Westervelt have observed that the types of crime within the show are overly represented of the violent variety, whereas "crimes by organizations and the affluent are not portrayed" (1998, p. 153). In terms of crime statistics as well, Kooistra et al. found a discrepancy between the statistically prevalent types of crime and the crime featured on the show, and defend that it is not the crime as it is but "as a caricature" (1998, p. 153) that is in line with the standards and dynamics of broadcasting.

In Turkey, the early examples of the genre were criticized mostly due to labelling; Aksop describes that individuals had difficulties with their reputation when the shows presented them as criminals upon interpersonal accounts of an incident, unable to prove innocence with hard evidence. The programs were also criticized due to their disregard of presenting individuals as innocent until proven guilty (1998, p. 93). Other criticisms were concerning the hidden cooperation between the law enforcement authorities and the show producers; the violent content the shows

produced, and the shows' defence of the sensationalist content on the grounds of their rating success (Aksop, 1998).

Specific criticisms towards MATS as a prominent example of contemporary CBRTV programming include (but are not limited to) the portrayal of the world as dangerous and victimization as probable to establish self-discipline in its audience; the assignment of protection of the self to the individual in line with the neoliberal thought; the validation of state non-interference in welfare and justice by taking on part of these responsibilities; the expectation for the viewers to participate in the show's conduct as responsible citizens with the moral obligation to do so (Yaman, 2013); de-sensitization towards victimization, shifting of the blame on the victim or the case-related personas; detachment of crime from its causes like income inequality; narration of fear towards women (Kaya, 2012); definition of moral codes around citizens' "prudence, awareness, and responsibility"; and normalization of confession and fear cultures (Erol Işık & Yaman, 2017).

4.4. Ideology of Law and Order

There is a reason why the genre is sometimes dubbed as "crime control pornography" (Koskela, 2004, p. 200). It places excessive importance upon crime management that is at times disproportionate to the relevant crime rates. The realistic styles of the genre programming are cited as the reason why the ideology of law and order appears inherent and fitting (Cavender, 1998), making it appear as though the genre does not actively propagate for punishing and controlling crime through the surveillance labour of audiences that it enlists and actively reproduces. And although the crimes in question are mostly interpersonal, they are treated as imminent, vastly impactful, and in dire need of treatment.

It is the way crime is presented that is effective in strengthening the law and order ideologies. Through a symbolic reading of examples from the genre (namely America's Most Wanted -AMW- and Unsolved Mysteries -UM,) Cavender detects two main symbols: Crime was a symbol for "social malaise," by which is meant the

hardships of modern living such as the disappointments, the inability to predict down the line, and the many ways in which people, communities, and families can be deceived, misled, or hurt. The apprehensions, trials, and penalizations of the perpetrators symbolize the restructuring of the previously disrupted order of social harmony. These programs displace contemporary fears and frustrations onto the criminal, allowing viewers to vent their anger by fighting back against the crime. Updates that delight in captured or imprisoned criminals offer a resolution, and symbolically herald the restoration of the social order (1998).

Crime in these vignettes symbolizes such contemporary concerns as the breakdown of the family, lack of trust, and loss of community. (...) Their hosts offer a running tab of successes -crimes solved, captures, lengthy prison terms- all credited to the audience, and accompanied by the gratitude of the host, the police, or the victim's family. AMW and UM signal empowerment and community in a society where the viewer all too often has little of either. (Cavender, 1998, p. 91)

The symbolism of the dual nature of the genre (crime and the collective fight against it) reveals the ideologies that lay behind the smartly tailored spectacles. The audience is believed to feel justified when justice, as is commonly perceived, prevails. The crime control ideology, which necessarily depends on reiteration and acceptance, finds its perfect partner with the CBRTV shows. The cooperation is clearest when the host and the police compliment and complement each other on-air, along with the message that as long as the public helps them, the social order that was ruined with the criminals' ("the other's") acts will be rebuilt. A distinction is set between the good citizens and the bad: While this creates a sense of community, it simultaneously creates a discriminatory approach towards the suspects of crime. These shows "(...) foster a notion of community to which the audience can belong by watching the programs and by participating in the common effort to capture fugitives" (Cavender, 1998, p. 87).

The construction of this community, which is united in its determination to see justice prevail, is meticulously conducted by the shows and the police. It is heavily

emphasized that public help is needed and appreciated, and the information that would otherwise be limited to the investigating authorities is shared with the audience. A sense of “being there” (Cavender, 1998, p. 89) is created for the audience, being in an alternate existence where a fight for criminal justice is underway with the collective endeavours of the audience, the show, and the law enforcement authorities.

The ideology of law and order is easy to detect within the genre: Once the crime is solved and the perpetrator caught, the audience is meant to feel as though the problems they face in their everyday lives will also be solved, as though the reason for those problems is a crime that was committed elsewhere, by someone else, and against someone else. As Cavender so aptly puts it, “These programs blame crime for society’s ills, ranging from loss of community to the alienation and frustration that characterize contemporary life, and pin their hopes for a better future on catching and punishing criminals” (1998, p. 92). It is presented as so common-sensical that when the offer to have a harsher attitude towards crime, and therefore to have a stronger law and order ideology towards crime, is not at all challenged by the audiences trained to accept the idea with fervour.

The ideology of law and order preaches a tougher hand around crime’s metaphorical neck. While tougher approaches carry within themselves a possibility for misconduct, they also do not yield the desired end result. The position of CBRTV shows in this ideological formation is pondered upon by Doyle, who wonders whether people approve of law and order because they watch these shows, or they watch these shows because they approve of the law and order ideology. He also answers: It is a mutually reinforcing relationship in which people with an inclination towards such ideologies are addressed in these programs, and their conceptions are reinforced (Doyle, 2003).

It should also be remembered that while the genre produces the ideology of law and order, it does so to produce a reality that aims to alter the meaning of citizenship and

publicity (Donovan, 1998). The ideology of law and order is treated like the template into which the everyday life and the ordinary citizen should fit. How this reflects on the audiences, on the other hand, remains a different matter altogether.

4.5. Relations with Surveillance Culture and Social Policing

CBRTV programs are heavily dependent on the existence and thriving of cultures of surveillance. First, it is the synoptic and voyeuristic urges of the audiences that are necessary for a successful production. Then, it is their format that needs constant exposure of information to be surveilled and some if not most of this information is expected to come from the audience's calls to the show in the format of ihbars⁷.

Donovan (1998) lists witness participation as well as viewer participation as the show's goals, along with other characteristics such as a constant desire to advertise the law enforcement authorities, solving crimes but particularly in the form of arrests or punishments of the culprits, and helping the audience "see how the other half lives." It is clear that the exposure of information related to the case is vital to the show's conduct- information in exchange for information- and that this incites certain reactions with the audiences that ensure continued viewership.

Hoggart argues that one CBRTV shows' success in holding the audience captive depends on "the schoolchild's peculiar delight in seeing someone else get in trouble", "seeing justice in action", and "the power of watching what we were not intended to see" (1998, as cited in Leishman and Mason, 2003, pp. 120-122). These shows can be said to provide a safe way to be a part of crime, if only during the investigation processes. Through participation, whether simply by watching or by providing ihbars as well, the viewer finds the chance to feel useful, powerful, empowered by the effect of what sharing a single, simple observation of theirs can

⁷ By "ihbar" is meant the viewer conveyance of information from the citizen to the show in the form of phone calls. These calls include information known before the case was taken on by the show, or information gathered through surveillance labour after viewing the show. Due to slight differences in meaning and detachment from the context, words like "tip, notice, denunciation, denouncement" etc. were not preferred in this thesis, especially in the case study.

have, or simply feeling like a part of the investigation by having kept up with the episodes dutifully. And in this entire conduct, the viewer hears and sees things that, without viewing the shows, they would not be privy to as ordinary citizens. They may be kept up-to-date on measures taken by the law enforcement authorities, notified of the legal and procedural aspects of previously handled cases, and have evidence relating to the crime exposed to them verbally or visually. These cannot be defined as information that unauthorized persons may have access to, and their exposure is accompanied only by demands from the audience for more information to expose. And in the end, it is said that such contribution helps justice prevail.

The sense of empowerment with the audience members can be explained by the expansion of ways and means one can realize their surveillance potential in recent decades due to mass and social media, i.e. platforms characterized as much by synopticism as panopticism. Panopticon, as interpreted by Foucault, was a normalizing agent for individuals with unwanted past or present behaviours. Synopticons, on the other hand, are many in number and allow for the previously surveilled to become surveillants themselves. This indicates a shift in power dynamics to a multi-sided level, where the individual viewer yields the power to impact the lives of others through the surveillance they conduct. However, it must be kept in mind that while select few individuals can influence the criminal investigation through CBRTV shows because they have “been there” or “seen something suspicious” (Dobash et al., 1998, p. 52), the rest of the audience is there solely for the spectacle, the entertainment.

Speaking of power, the power of the show hosts must be discussed as well as those of the show experts. As the many watch the few in this synoptic system of television, the watched few are visible with considerable power to shape public opinion. Mathiesen lists media personalities as figures of importance who “filter and shape information”, set the agenda with regards to “a broader hidden agenda of political and economic interests... behind the media”, and also, hold the profound trust of their audiences (2006, p. 52). He also discusses informational professionals in the

media, who take on an informative role on media to the extent that it becomes an occupation for them. These professionals are predominantly found to be male, held in high esteem due to their social status and their considerable weight in political, business, and bureaucratic arenas (2006). Their capability to enforce change and discipline is reflected upon the public in general (Lyon, 2006).

The regard afforded by the audiences to the hosts and experts within CBRTV shows may be seen as exemplary of their power to influence. Müge Anlı (MA) from MATS, for example, has become a household name, their trust in her vocalized in statements like “I had said it, that he was going to be caught now that Müge Anlı was onto him; we are so relieved that she would not let this go.”⁸ Likewise, the team of experts in the show are professionals from fields like law, psychiatry, and forensic sciences. They are consulted on cases handled by the shows, and give their professional opinions as well as their personal elaborations on the matters. This smoothly transitions into conversations where the topic is discussed by all media personalities in the studio, most often resulting in a consensus, further solidifying the message at hand. When the consensus is repeatedly and frequently on the benefits of most kinds of surveillance (face-to-face, file-based, interface; by and for the citizen, the state, and its agencies), then the fact that the message is delivered by trusted media personalities and information professionals strengthens its receptiveness.

Surveillance is the backbone of most CBRTV programs due to their investigative endeavours. The information the audience could impart to the show is ideally conducive to the spectacular solution of the cases, and such information can be collected by the viewer through their surveillance practices. The conveyance of an understanding of how surveillance works, what it is for, and how it can be carried out is one of the most important aspects of the genre programs, and it aids its

⁸ Orta yaşlı kadın: “Müge Anlı’ya dedim zaten düşüyse kessinlikle yakalanacak dedim, bunun peşini bırakmayacak diye çok rahatladık.” (Episode 1654)

audiences –educates them, if you will- in practising surveillance for the aims of the shows.

Surveillance is presented as a protective, preventive and reactionary mechanism against crime and victimization. It is protective in that the show uses the results of surveillance to give retrospective lessons on how to avoid victimization in the future and preaches for the use of more surveillance for safety. Prevention is the result of the implication that anyone can turn out to be a surveilling agent, who may later relay their observations as evidence for incrimination. It is reactionary in that it aids the law enforcement authorities after the fact but also creating a nationwide policing effect amongst the citizens. Overall, that trusted media personalities defend surveillance has an enculturating and utilitarian effect where surveillance develops its own culture and is utilized for goals preached by the media.

Surveillance is a fact of life, and it burrows deeper into the capillaries of everyday conduct of ordinary citizens with mediated propaganda. It becomes accepted to behave like a spy and store information on others with the understanding that it may be relayed upon prompt to be broadcast to a national audience. A heightened sense of crime leads to attention to minute details with an almost standard quality; the five Ws and one H of events are observed in detail. That it is expected of those in possession of such information to disclose them on national broadcasts for millions to watch, and all the praise and positive identification that accompanies the action, is a matter that should be approached with interest, for it reveals police-like inclinations for surveillance within communities local or national.

Through the indoctrination of what the audiences should beware to avoid victimization, the CBRTV shows claim to be raising consciousness about personal safety and protection, especially for women. However, it must be kept in mind that a significant part of the fear of crime and victimization within the audiences stems from the handling of the matters in these shows. Dobash et al. claim that, specifically with women, there is a constant state of reminders for what could threaten them, and

how they should, in order to remain safe, always be vigilant and mindful of their safety, adding that “(...) television provides one medium that conveys messages about risk and about strategies for avoiding danger” (1998, p. 55). The medium of television, and in particular the CBRTV shows, add to the narrative that avoiding victimization by crime can be conducted most productively through adopting individual surveillance as a habitual state of being.

Regardless of which medium is used, and as well as the ensuing responsabilization of sharing the surveillant observations, this “suggests that extant crime policies, by inviting citizen surveillance and reporting, redistribute the state’s control wider and deeper into society” (Cohen, 1985, as cited in Cavender, 1998, pp. 79-80). This was shown as a gateway to harsher crime control ideologies being utilized to bring about order. It may be said that in order to create a responsible, surveillant and dedicated public sensitive to crime and its prevention/control, an ideological assistance must accompany the media representations of crime.

CHAPTER 5

METHODOLOGY

5.1. Research Design

This thesis aims to understand how CBRTV shows produce specifically surveillance labour and, more broadly, social policing in their audiences in Turkey. The particular methods with which a mass media product can and does raise widespread mobilization of its viewers depends heavily on the general propensity for cultures of surveillance that already exist in the society. The detection of such methods is found to be of utmost importance to approach the matter critically and within the framework of critical surveillance culture studies. The study of surveillance culture with regards to its utilization in mass media and for the purpose of social policing has ample room for growth, especially in the Turkish context and with a social policy related point of view. A *qualitative study* offers the best ways to discover and dissect each intricacy of the subject matter and the field, for it allows one case to be examined in detail and the discourses to be interpreted with descriptive and narrative liberties.

Due to the complexities involving the analysis of media narratives, I follow a *nonlinear research path*, which;

(...) requires us to make successive passes through the steps. We may move forward, backward, and sideways before advancing again. (...) The nonlinear path can be highly effective in creating an authentic feeling for understanding an entire setting, for grasping subtle shades of meaning, for integrating divergent bits of information, and for switching perspectives. (Neuman, 2014, p. 170)

This cyclical process allows for further elaboration on the contents of the cases. Each statement in the case data is intertwined with a myriad of theoretically significant implications, building up a comprehensive whole whose classification into distinctive analytical categories requires both an attention to and a detachment from the details. The back and forth help patterns emerge and find their places within the broader theoretical framework.

Methodologically, a *critical and interpretative* approach is necessary. This thesis is critical in that it envisions policy-related changes concerning the utilization of surveillance cultures as well as the surveillance labour and social policing that they are used to instil within the audiences. The surveillance labour individuals are expected to give, as well as the social policing attitudes that are encouraged to become habitual in their lives, are relevant more to the law enforcement agents and agencies instead of the citizens. The argument here is that surveillance culture should not be reproduced by mass media in order to a) perpetuate bias about (interpersonal and petty) crime to instil fear of crime and deepen a security-oriented understanding, b) redefine the viewer as the social policing citizen whose world paradigm is centred around possible threats, intolerance for any deviance, and the normalization of exposure in order to maintain safety and justice. The process yields result for individual cases instead of a general change and benefits from the continuation of crime instead of its elimination or control. The viewer/citizen and their surveillance labour remain in vain, like treating only the symptom while on the show they are presented as major contributions to a cure. The actual conditions contributing to criminal matters (poverty, gender inequality, migration and displacement, lack of access to education, employment, health, agriculture, to list some) remain unaddressed from a macro perspective. This overall conduct perpetuates the continuation and commodification of crime for entertainment. The illusion that social policing can help control crime in its entirety should be shattered both in the eyes of the audiences as well as the public and private agencies; efforts should be directed towards the dissemination of constructive, informative and

change-oriented content. Policy actions must be taken in order to avoid the reproduction of surveillance cultures for such palliative endeavours and to use mass media platforms such as daytime television to educate the audiences about the structural conditions of and contributors to crime.

The interpretative approach is necessary to understand the specific ways in which surveillance labour and social policing are encouraged. The meanings and values created within the show through interaction with audiences must be understood with as much clarity as possible if any policy-related action is to be taken. What is being encouraged and praised is a surveillance culture, and culture inherently implies continuous and ever-changing reinterpretations of everyday reality. In this case, a culture of surveillance is produced, reproduced and maintained by MATS, and in a roundabout way, by the law enforcement authorities with which the show cooperates. Two hours per episode, five episodes a week and every week in a broadcast season, the show conduces towards multifaceted interaction: Within the audience members, between the audience members and the show staff, within the show staff, and between the show staff and law enforcement authorities. Such intricate webs of interactions, narratives and the underlying discourses need to be made comprehensible.

Thus, a cooperation of both the interpretative and critical approaches are necessary to address the production of “social policing” within the framework of surveillance culture. Only then could it be possible to offer recommendations for long-term, profound changes instead of palliative solutions to a symptom.

The initial research design had three different MATS cases in order to give a time series study, depicting cases that lasted for days, weeks, and months respectively. However, due to considerations of length and one case’s specific capability to elaborate the processes of social policing most clearly, two cases were eliminated. The remaining case is of AF and the search for him that MATS popularized on a

national and, at times international, scale. It is a *case study* aiming to capture in-depth the intricacies of the processes where social policing and surveillance cultures are brought together through mass media.

Neuman lists six aspects to the case study (2014, p. 42) that played a role in the decision of case study research for this thesis, and they are; 1) *conceptual validity* - to identify theoretically significant concepts, 2) *heuristic impact* - to add to theoretical concepts and how they relate to each other, 3) *causal mechanisms identification* – to clarify the web of influence of social practices, 4) *ability to capture complexity and trace processes* – to describe how each incident interacts in time and space, 5) *calibration*- to link theory to personal accounts, and 6) *holistic elaboration* – to allow for many outlooks to be integrated into the case in its entirety. Through a case study, the aim is to display the varied and complex methods utilized to achieve social policing within the relevant theoretical framework and to do so comprehensively, descriptively and in a manner conducive to both an elaboration of theory and a consideration for social policy.

The case study has *exploratory, descriptive, and explanatory* concerns simultaneously. It is *exploratory*, seeing as the concept of “social policing,” a peculiar mixture of surveillance culture and citizen participation in policing, is an underrated topic of research, especially in Turkey. Also, adding the dimension of CBRTV shows and their simultaneously mediatory and productive stance in this equation, exploration was necessary. In a dense, complex and prolific area such as this, it should be safe to say that the research route forked and forked until it finally began to make sense. The thesis is also *descriptive* in a complementary way to its exploration, especially about the particular dynamics within the framework.

Surveillance culture, both produced and maintained by TV shows, is utilized for the benefit of the police, who, in turn, justifies the existences of both itself, the shows, and the civilian citizens. Detecting and presenting the intricate and oft veiled

relations that take place between these parties, however, was not enough. There had to be an *explanatory* endeavour at the end of which the relationships and their dynamics in particular contexts could be understood as clearly as possible. After all, this thesis has a concern for *social policy* and possible recommendations, both of which require extensive understanding and deliberation.

5.2. Sampling Criteria

MATS is a CBRTV show in Turkey and is perceived as so successful in solving unsolved murder cases, finding missing persons, and exposing scam schemes that, at times, people ask, “Why haven’t you applied to Müge Anlı?” when others have an unsolved case at hand. The show intermediates between the audiences and the law enforcement authorities in that it relays the information given to them by the former to the latter in order to finalize its investigations. The show’s scope and popularity let matters raised by the show be quickly given attention by relevant authorities. They “take the broadcast as *ihbar*,” as the host would say, and promptly mobilize.

By utilizing and reproducing cultures of surveillance, MATS makes visible the roles of the state, the governments, and the law enforcement authorities in keeping the public safe. Police arrest people on live television, the broadcasts are used as evidence in judicial processes, reporters report sentences given to the perpetrators live from the courthouse. The exposure is done to the audience, and the audience is expected to contribute to the processes by lending their surveillance labour to the show. This system requires a viewer that is enculturated to view surveillance as a means to an end, which is the justice prevailing and the ensuing spectacle of it being broadcast. It necessitates a perspective shift that includes surveillance even more predominantly than before; the eye that sees surveillantly begins to see the world through a lens of crime and deviance, where any unbecoming behaviour is worthy of being surveilled to be later on relayed to another authority if needed. This shift in the viewer towards security orientation, social order, law and order ideologies, and

surveillance labour by the efforts of a CBRTV show is operationalized as “social policing” here, and will be further elaborated in the upcoming chapters. For now, a more structural look at the show’s format should be beneficial to understand how this process works.

As was visualized in Table 2 titled “Elements of MATS,” the show has permanent elements that are onstage (host, experts, and the studio audience) as well as offstage (crew, reporters, and the general audience.) These remain constant regardless of which case is being handled at the moment. And there are the people who take place in the show due to a case. Onstage are the *applicants* who apply to MATS for their case to be investigated; the *interviewees* who participate in the show through interviews; the *suspects* who are CRP that the show’s investigation reveals as suspicious or who were already suspected of wrongdoing before the matter was taken to the show. Offstage, there are the *surveillants*; audience members who, urged by the show, pay surveillant attention to their surroundings in order to find information that may benefit the show. If the surveillants find the desired information regarding the case and its investigation, they call the show to share and become *ihbar-makers*.

Table 2. Elements of MATS

Permanent Elements		Case-Related Personas (CRP)	
1) Onstage: a- Host b- Experts c- Studio Audience	2) Offstage: a- Crew b- Reporters c- General Audience	1) Onstage a- Applicants b- Interviewees c- Suspects	2) Offstage a- Surveillants b- Ihbar-makers

This thesis is mostly concerned with the offstage CRP because they are the section of the general audience whose participation in the show's conduct is the most observable aspect of social policing. The realization of the show's responsabilization endeavours is seen in the form of the ihbars the show receives, and the comments from the viewers that they look around very attentively in line with the show's directives. They keep up with the show and watch the broadcast investigation critically to detect inconsistencies. In the meanwhile, they are subjected to reconstructions of their surveillance imaginaries and are prompted to enact surveillance practices. It is for these reasons that MATS was chosen as a case study.

MATS has been the most popular of the CBRTV genre in Turkey for years now. A yearly comparative rating data for these shows could not be attained. However, on a day to day basis, it can be seen that MATS is consistently within the top ten both in overall and in specific measurements, and predominantly more popular than its contemporaries. It also has a good reputation for closing cases, solving unsolved murders, finding missing persons as well as carrying out social responsibility projects. This popularity, positive public opinion, and high levels of audience participation meant that, in order to look into the CBRTV programmes and analyse their utilization of surveillance cultures for the production of social policing, MATS would be the ideal candidate. However, MATS has been on air since 2008, with one broadcast season starting at the beginning of September and end at the end of June. This means approximately 40 weeks of the show, five episodes per week, and 130 minutes (excluding two long ad breaks) per episode. The case of MATS had to be narrowed down to a case within MATS.

When the research topic was first determined, I had thought three MATS cases would be fitting: The search for AF (2016), the murder of Irmak Kupal (2016), and the Palu Family (2018) were chosen both for their availability online, and their condense and representative nature of the show's utilization of surveillance cultures for their conduct. All three were of the more popular cases of MATS and demanded

widespread participation (AF) as well as spectacular fascination (Irmak Kupal and Palu). They were cases where the show's interaction with the audience was high and fervent. With AF, a nationwide (and at times, international) search was conducted. With Irmak Kupal, a live confession was received from the perpetrator himself. With the Palu family, the spectacle of casual cruelty and crime drew national attention.

Meanwhile, reading the literature further and discussions with my advisor narrowed the research interest from a general spectacularity and to the demands for surveillance labour that accompanied such fascination with the cases. The research question became how surveillance cultures help produce social policing through MATS, and due to AF's relatively more elaborative nature of this process, the other two were eliminated from the analysis. Considering that these three cases made up 39 episodes and only the watch-time was 86 hours in total, the concern for brevity also influenced this decision.

The search for AF was illustrative of how audience compliance to surveillance was established through fun, fear and familiarity aspects of surveillance cultures. Surveillance as a fact of life was already familiar to the audience; it was fun to build up an identity around the surveillance, and it was fearful to have a killer on the loose whose capture was presented as possible if only the viewers relayed the results of their surveillance to the show (and to the police.) The audience's surveillance imaginaries were shaped to include how the desired surveillance could be conducted and what the results could be utilized for to reach the desired ends. Surveillance practices were demanded repeatedly from the audience members, using a language of responsabilization and a constant undercurrent of security-oriented narration and law-and-order ideology. While these are ever-present in most if not all MATS episodes, it was heightened in intensity in AF's case. There was an urgency due to him being on the run and the possibility of him escaping abroad along with the refugees through human trafficking routes. It was relayed that catching him before he could escape was of utmost importance, and his search was prioritized over the

other cases MATS handled. To my knowledge, AF was the first time a perpetrator was searched for (by the police and the show) while a proverbial clock ticked away with such urgency. This led to a high level of viewer participation in the form of surveillance labour, ihbars, and a constant flow of surveillance data being flown into and exposed on the show.

One more aspect of the case, in particular, played an important role in this decision. Unlike the many other MATS cases, this case had viewer participation in a form unlike most the show receives. There happened an organized search, most similar to that of a citizen's patrol, in İzmir. Viewers who attentively followed the show brought together pieces of information they received from the televised ihbars and went (untrained, unaccompanied) to forestry lands to find AF themselves. They also printed out his pictures and distributed them in the city, and conducted their own interviews with probable witnesses. One representative of this "civil initiative" (as the host called them) contacted the show to relay their actions thus far. This was social policing in practice; the show never demanded such active surveillance labour, and yet, on the basis of voluntariness, people did organize to carry out surveillance and surveillance-inducing practices together. Their surveillance imaginaries were fully informed by the show, and their actions were highly commended once revealed on the show. This example alone may be enough to illustrate the significance of the case of AF.

Overall, AF was chosen due to the case's nationwide scope, urgent status, and popularity, as well as the levels of audience participation, surveillance labour, and the easily observable nature of social policing therein.

5.3. Data Collection

The case of AF, then, lasted for 13 episodes (all of which could be found on the channel's official website.) The first nine episodes were for AF's actual search while he was on the run, and the remaining four episodes were post-arrest and could be

described as “retrospective”. The net calculation of related episodes gives a result of 1659 minutes, which takes 27 hours and 39 minutes of content without ads.

The episodes were semi-transcribed by hand. Semi, because the show is very much repetitive, with constant clips shown of interviews and sneak-peeks, and because the show handles more than one case at a time. Also considering the fact that the host and show experts tend to talk about matters unrelated to the cases at hand from time to time, some of their conversations was left out as well. During the coding analysis, relevant texts were grouped by themes, and relevant quotes were used as illustration.

Below is Table 3, titled “Episode guide for MATS’ case of Atalay Filiz.” In it, the episodes numbers within the investigation for AF, the episode numbers within the MATS broadcasts in general, the air dates for the episodes, the duration of the episode in hour:minute format, and the episode titles both in English and Turkish can be found in that order.

Table 3. Episode guide for MATS’ case of Atalay Filiz

#	Episode	Air Date	Ep. Length	Episode Title
1	1645	31 May 2016 - Tue.	2:17	“İstanbul’da kan donduran seri katil” (“Blood-chilling serial killer in İstanbul”)
2	1646	1 June 2016 - Wed.	2:15	“Seri katil Atalay Filiz her yerde aranıyor...” (“Serial killer Atalay Filiz is being searched for everywhere...”)

Table 3. Episode guide for MATS' case of Atalay Filiz (cont'd)

3	1647	2 June 2016 - Thu.	2:14	“Atalay Filiz için çember daralıyor...” (“The circle tightens for Atalay Filiz...”)
4	1648	3 June 2016 - Fri.	2:18	“Sevgi İzi sayesinde 23. kaybımız da bulundu” (“Our 23 rd missing person was found as well thanks to Sevgi İzi”)
5	1649	6 June 2016 - Mon	2:15	“Atalay Filiz 5 gündür neden hiçbir yerde görünmüyor?” (“Why hasn't Atalay Filiz been seen anywhere for 5 days?”)
6	1650	7 June 2016 - Tue.	2:15	“Peter Heinzl ve Yücel Üstündağ'ın kardeş oldukları ortaya çıktı.” (“It turned out that Peter Heinzl and Yücel Üstündağ are siblings.”)
7	1651	8 June 2016 - Wed.	2:14	“Seri katil 13 gündür aranıyor.” (“Serial killer has been sought for 13 days.”)
8	1652	9 June 2016 - Thu.	2:12	“13 yaşındaki Esin Emre'nin başına ne geldi?” (“What happened to 13 year-old Esin Emre?”)
9	1653	10 June 2016 - Fri.	2:14	“Annesi Türkiye'ye kaçtı, Esin İran'da kaldı.” (“Her mother escaped to Turkey, Esin stayed in Iran.”)

Table 3. Episode guide for MATS' case of Atalay Filiz (cont'd)

10	1654	13 June 2016 - Mon	2:16	“Seri katil Atalay Filiz yakalandı!” (“Serial killer Atalay Filiz is caught!”)
11	1655	14 June 2016 - Tue.	2:16	“Uğur’un annesi bulunacak mı? Uğur ve annesi kavuşacak mı?” (“Will Uğur’s mother be found? Will Uğur and his mother meet?”)
12	1656	15 June 2016 - Wed.	2:18	“Atalay Filiz’in ifadesinin altında ne yatıyor?” (“What does Atalay Filiz’s statement actually mean?”)
13	1657	16 June 2016 - Thu.	2:15	“Merve Aydın, annesini arıyor!” (“Merve Aydın is looking for her mother!”)

5.4. Analysis and Operationalization

The entire fieldwork was based on the transcription and analysis of episodes first broadcast on national TV and later uploaded online. The field was remote from me; it could not be controlled or manipulated, nor could it be calculated or measured. I could not ask it questions and receive answers that were not my own interpretations. However, this did not change the fact that these episodes, and indeed this show, were produced and marketed for public consumption as they were. They were the symbols from which the public was read. In this sense, and as Neuman defends, they were as eligible as any field for further attention:

Qualitative data may appear to be soft, intangible, and elusive. This does not mean that we cannot capture them. (...) These are specific, concrete aspects of the social world. As we closely scrutinize photos or videotapes of people or social events, we are looking at “hard” physical evidence. The evidence

is just as “hard” and physical as the numeric measures of attitudes, social pressure, intelligence, and the like found in a quantitative study (2014, p. 177).

With this in mind, let us continue with the analysis method. Once the episodes were transcribed, the raw text was broken down with Auerbach and Silverstein’s qualitative data coding method. From the grounded theory perspective, they present this method as “(...) a procedure for organizing the text of the transcripts, and discovering patterns within that organizational structure” (2003, p. 31). This envisions a process starting from gathering the *raw text* and selecting the *relevant text* with their relevance to the research question in mind. Then the *repeating ideas* are detected, which are grouped together into *themes*. Themes brought together with a theoretical perspective are *theoretical constructs*. The step of *theoretical narrative* is concerned with presenting both the field data and the theoretical application in a comprehensive, coherent narration. (2003, pp. 35-41)

In the case analysis of MATS’ AF investigation, first the contents of episodes were written down manually, which formed the raw text. The next step was to eliminate the other cases that MATS handled simultaneously with AF, and also the conversations that took place within AF’s investigation but were irrelevant to the case. Then, the remaining text was dissected and regrouped into themes where certain concepts, statements or discourses repeated. These themes were then approached with the theoretical framework provided by the literature review conducted beforehand and placed under the relevant theoretical concepts. Through it all, a concern for the logical flow of events and examples was kept in mind while bringing theoretical explanations and quotations together. I should mention that this was an arduous process because of the show’s format; it is loosely constructed with a lot of room for spontaneity. Conversations can change topics in the blink of an eye, and even one monologue can refer to many themes with many theoretical implications. The show’s general discourse is woven with too many strands all at

once, which strengthens its impact on surveillance cultures at the same time it distracts the viewer (and in this instance, the researcher) with many twists and turns. This, however, should be interpreted as how ample and rich of a unit of analysis it is and how it can inform many different pieces of research in the future as well.

This case was heavily guided by the theoretical framework of surveillance culture. The themes achieved through coding were classified in accordance with their relevancy to the theories.

Section one, “Compliance with Surveillance,” aims to illustrate how the show accomplishes the audience’s compliance with surveillance cultures. Lyon’s three factors for compliance (2017) - fear, fun, and familiarity- inform this section, with the predominant factor presenting itself as fear. These ensure audience compliance to surveillance in general, and their conviction to do surveillance labour in particular. Fear was managed by presenting the target as the extraordinary criminal, which perpetuated the stereotypical criminal in negation. Statements about how dangerous he was and how everyone, including the host, feared him provided verbal confirmation of and emphasis on how fear was justified in this case. Thus justified to reveal all about him, the show utilized detailed surveillance into his past and present without much regard for how useful this would be for the search for him. CRP were also drawn into this process of exposure, whether by exposing more about him or by exposing more about themselves in order to clear their names. While this fits well within the surveillance culture, it is also explained by Dean’s claim that (2001) technoculture’s inclinations to reveal secrets and inform the public to create public opinion.

Section two, “Assignment of Surveillance Imaginaries,” is mainly concerned with how the surveillance imaginaries of the audiences are shaped through the show. It is argued that MATS shapes the audience’s understanding of duties and dynamics

of surveillance (Lyon, 2018), meaning that the viewer associates surveillance with certain protocols and responsibilities. The prominent themes turned out to be repetitive demands for *ihbars*, a discourse of responsabilization, and the perpetuation of an ideology of law and order. Surveillance was presented as the duty of the viewers as citizens so they could help the police. This process is conducted to achieve what Garland (1996) calls a “strategy of responsabilization,” where the duties of the police (the surveillance duties of the police in this case,) are instilled into the audience’s imaginaries as duties that come with being citizens. However, while responsabilization is a strategy utilized by state agencies, in the case of MATS, it is utilized by a CBRTV program, which opens to questions the status of the show, the state’s stance on it, processes through which viewers are redefined as citizens, and the citizens’ compliance to the show’s general conduct with surveillance labour. The unofficiality is aimed to be balanced by praise and vocalized trust in the law enforcement authorities, presenting participation as a civic duty in the eyes of the audience. Here, Schreurs et al.’s (2018) classification of ideal types of citizen participation in policing is adapted to the case of MATS. It is argued that these four types of participation, to some extent, are expected from the citizen, and steps are taken to ensure that surveillance imaginaries of the audiences include these as duties, or at least normalized practices under cultures of surveillance. This overall conduct is then justified under the ideology of law and order, which is most observable through the constant praise and thankfulness the show offers to the law enforcement authorities, associating surveillance labour with policing.

Section three, “Surveillance Labour in Action,” is meant to exemplify Lyon’s conceptualization of initiatory surveillance practices (2018) in the form of surveillance labour for citizen participation. In this case, surveillance labour is done in accordance with the surveillance imaginaries given by the show, and for the purpose of policing. Surveillance labour is operationalized here as surveillance practices that are demanded by the show, offered by the audiences, and utilized for the closure of criminal investigations. Many examples of the *ihbars* and their

conformity to the standards set by the show work to illustrate how surveillance imaginaries inform surveillance practices and vice versa in a dialectical relation, especially considering the televisualization and mass consumption of the overall conduct. This is most observable in the main example of social policing within the Section.

Section four, “Internalization of Surveillance Labour,” focuses on the aspects that contribute to the viewer’s incorporation of surveillance in their lives. Besides the personal stances and previous experiences of the viewers as determined by Choi and Lee (2016), peer pressure, positive associations, and perception of citizen’s duties are seen to be contributing factors. (Let us note that while section two is focused on the show’s conduct and the messages it wishes to relay, this section is mainly concerned with the individual effects of such methods in terms of the formation of personal and communal identities.) Participation is rewarded with praise and confirmation of positive attributions both on an individual and public aspect. The viewers’ status as citizens are emphasized often, appealing to the previously established sensibilities of being a citizen; lending one’s surveillance labour to the show is then justified as a civic duty, which also builds the desirable public persona and identity a viewer might wish to accomplish and maintain. These help build a communal identity as well as enhance individual identities and personas that are approved, justified, and praised on mass media platforms, working to ensure the continuation of surveillance labour for future cases while, within the viewers’ lives, the behaviour becomes habitual and essential for identity formation.

Section five, “Legitimizing Surveillance Culture,” is interested mainly in the strategies of the show to ensure its longevity through the cultures of surveillance. A “ritualistic catharsis” (Cavender, 1998) is sought even after the perpetrator is captured, the discourse of social order is relayed as part of a wider “world paradigm” (Mathiesen, 2006). The show uses the verbatim reading of official statements to enhance the cathartic experience of the audiences, to offer closure, and to justify its

existence through more familiar exposure. The overall conduct is also justified through thanks and praise for every agency involved within the case and through giving voice to the audience's wishes for the future of the case. At last, the show uses retrospective lectures to stop future victimizations; this adds up to the pro-surveillance and security-oriented discourses. Let us keep in mind that the case of AF was only one of the many that MATS undertakes. Some if not all of these methods in every case, but also in one that was as popularized as AF's, work to allow the show's continued existence, to continue to produce-maintain-reproduce its particular culture of surveillance.

In the light of the section-by-section framing of the case, the explanation of the operationalization of "social policing" should be grounded further in practicality. "Social policing" in this thesis is operationalized as the compliance with surveillance, the surveillance images and practices, the internalization of surveillance labour and the legitimization of this overall conduct. It refers to the mechanisms where surveillance culture is turned by mass media shows into a means to an end, the end being benefitting policing. It also includes the effects these have on audiences and the public in the long run. Social policing envisions a viewer/citizenry that attributes innate righteousness to social order and lawfulness, that internalizes the approved surveillance imaginaries to view the world from a security-oriented and protective point of view, and that can be mobilized at the moment with televised calls to surveillance labour.

Social policing depends heavily on the extant proclivity for surveillance in Turkish society, and envisions the utilization of the dormant surveillance potential therein for law enforcement processes through CBRTV programmes. The approved surveillance imaginaries and practices are honed and strengthened to increase the surveillance labour. Aspects of surveillance cultures that ensure compliance such as fun and familiarity but most importantly fear are emphasized, ways to perceive and understand surveillance are expanded and adjusted to fit the agenda, and action is

asked in return for praise, a sense of righteousness and belonging, and the spectacle of justice in a case solved or a perpetrator found. Surveillance is fervently normalized, and privacy is regarded as an obstacle on the way to justice, while the fruits of the surveillant labour are shared not only privately with the police but also publicly on a national broadcast.

It is distinguished from citizen participation in policing in the form of community-based policing where participation is done directly with the law enforcement authorities and with full acknowledgement of one's role as a citizen participant. In social policing, the participant is first and foremost a viewer; their initial contact is a television show, which then assumes an intermediary role and redefines their position from viewer to the citizen. The shift in status is deliberate to invoke surveillance labour more traditionally associated with the police and to persuade the viewer to become compliant to the show's demands, as well as approving of the show's pro-surveillance and law and order conduct. The viewers are regarded as responsible citizens who are tasked with duties traditionally associated with the police, which entails establishing law-abiding behaviour as well as documenting deviations from it. Surveillance of such actions in one's immediate environment is normalized, documentation of them is encouraged, and sharing the knowledge gained from such surveillance on public platforms is rewarded with praise. The viewers are included in investigative processes whether or not they yield surveillance labour and are the recipients of zero-tolerance talk and arguments for harsher punishments to the criminals and for deterrent laws being applied without mitigation.

Due to the nature of television programming that makes temporal and spatial restraints obsolete, it is not only the cases at hand at the moment that are available for viewing. Uploads to online video streaming platforms allow these discourses and narratives to reach a national audience that can access the content whenever and wherever. This detachment and the flexibility it affords help make everyday

experiences and observations of individuals become important regardless of constraints; any detail can become invaluable at any time, and therefore everything requires a surveillant eye and ear on it. The citizen, the society, is thus made responsible for surveillance labour in line with the law and order ideologies of the show.

Social policing has many contributors like the show, the law enforcement authorities, the viewer/citizens themselves. The show's contribution to social policing has been explained in detail. State agencies of law enforcement contribute to its production through non-interference; their stance on the shows are unknown. When they refer to social policing, they refer to the citizens and their participation that led to a case being closed. Such statements are those of appreciation and praise concerning the surveillance labour of the citizens (not "audience members") who were mobilized into action by TV shows. The viewer/citizens, their status open to contextual interpretations, contribute to social policing by lending their surveillant labour to the show and to the police, and by perpetuating the endorsed surveillance imaginaries and practices in general and not only on the basis of specific cases. It becomes a way of being and a part of a general cultural requirement. "Social policing," then, is operationalized here as a systematic process of harnessing the potentials of surveillance cultures through mass media productions like MATS towards policing.

5.5. Limitations, Strengths, and Author's Position

The research design changed considerably after the research question was determined. The initial idea was to conduct interviews with the show's crew on how they interacted with the audience, CRP, and the law enforcement authorities, as well as their stance on "social policing" and their view of cultures of surveillance. This would have given insight into the 'kitchen,' as the saying goes. However, my attempts at contacting the show's producers, crew, experts, and host proved to be

futile. The closest contact was with Arif Verimli, one of the show's experts, whose assistants informed me that he was not about to make any comment on the show.

This led me to make a comparison between MATS seasons, old and new. However, the channel's official website and Youtube accounts would not allow access to seasons before 2015, which meant that only the recent seasons could be compared to each other. Having been a semi-regular viewer myself, I knew that such a study would not yield as clear results as a comparison between, say, the first and the most recent season. The research had to be redesigned.

Being unable to communicate with the show also meant that I would have no inside information, only what was in the episodes and what I knew from my position as a member of their audience. Many questions were left hanging in the air. For example, what is the extent of their cooperation with the law enforcement authorities? How do they pick and choose which cases to investigate? Do they have direct access to the case files with the police, or do they only have access to the documents the participants bring with them? How much of the ihbars they receive (and the caller information) reach the police, and in accordance with which criteria? These questions and many others, had they been answered by the show, would have made for a more comprehensive and grounded analysis of the show's conduct. However, the visible and observable aspects that the show chooses to broadcast prove significant as well. The way they prefer to define and build their own identity reveals, from the point of view of the viewers/citizens, the intricacies of surveillance cultures and how they contribute to the production of social policing in everyday life. This was, in itself, a matter worthy of approach as well.

One more constraint in the writing process was the fact that some of it was spent in quarantine due to the spread of Covid-19. My advisor and I were stranded in lockdown in different countries and could communicate slowly by e-mail. Reaching most resources online was impossible, and going to the library was out of the

question. It felt unwise to be in public spaces due to the rising numbers of cases even after the lockdown officially ended. It is also safe to say that the emotional and economic strain of this national and global pandemic was not making the process any easier.

As the author of this thesis, my position as a member of MATS audience deserves further elaboration. I was, by no means, a stranger to the show and its flow when I chose MATS as my case study. I view this as an advantage because being familiar with the genre and this show, in particular, helped me choose the instances to be studied with considerable ease. I could make sense of the subtle shifts of tones and predict the way things would progress better than someone who never watched the show. Being also familiar with cases other than the one I was analysing allowed me to know which aspects of the show's discourse were of importance in general and not only in that specific instance, which could help present how each factor within the show interacted to provide a comprehensive discourse and social practice.

One considerable element of being a viewer, however, is my awareness of the show's teachings in my own life. When I describe "social policing" as a constant state of keenness and surveillance, I speak from both self-observation and observation of other viewers. I was in İstanbul when the search for AF was ongoing, and I did keep an eye out on the streets for anyone who looked like him, for example. Any case that takes place in the province I live becomes inherently more interesting for me: What of the five Ws and one H do I know? Is there a way my knowledge can contribute to the solution of this case? Mostly, the answer to these questions is a big, resounding "no." However, that does not stop me when I check the time upon noticing an unfamiliar visitor to my apartment building or seeking a street sign when I see someone looking lost. Years of viewing the show have given me an awareness these can be of importance in case things progress to a criminal level and are then carried on to the platforms CBRTV shows offer. Because if the cases are not

broadcast or otherwise shared with the public, I would have no way of knowing if I have any information on the cases; I would simply not know the cases even existed.

In a way, this is just as a sign of domestication of the cultures of surveillance as scrolling through social media feeds to check friends' updates. It is fun to watch, fearful to know crime can happen, and familiar after all these years of being both an object and a subject of surveillance. I am not alone in my state of constant vigilance. Personal experience, as well as interest in topics, have important roles in the thesis-writing process, and I believe my own experiences of social policing provide significant strength to deciphering the meaning of the concepts. With my position as a viewer, the observer, and the author, I offer the distinct advantage of giving a) *first-order interpretation*, i.e. the meanings attributed to the processes by the viewers, b) *second-order interpretation*, i.e. the meanings I draw from my position as the researcher, and c) *third-order interpretation*, i.e. the theoretical connections that can be reached through the process of writing (Neuman, 2014, pp. 179-180). All in all, knowing my position in this particular culture of surveillance and my disposition towards "social policing" helped me try to keep the analysis as relevant and relatable as possible during the writing process.

CHAPTER 6

MÜGE ANLI İLE TATLI SERT AND THE SEARCH FOR ATALAY FİLİZ

The show's intro constitutes of the host walking in a studio street between residential houses. The windows show various highlight scenes from the show's previous episodes. The host starts to walk alone, but as the theme music plays a jingly tune, she is joined by others. As title cards come and fade, starting from 2008 and counting up to 2016, people of different ages, as well as differently-abled persons, join her. As the host reaches the camera, with now a great many people behind her, her name pops up: Müge Anlı.

This 33-second clip goes to show a great many things. First, the show started in 2008, and at the time of this clip (2016), it was still running.⁹ Second, the support of the people, who are both audience members and perhaps unrelated personas that ended up helping the show, is emphasized. Third, the differently-abled persons, for whom the show has run social responsibility projects such as "Sevgi İzi"¹⁰ are at the front behind the host. Fourth, the host who leads them appears sure of herself and the people, folding her arms and smiling as her name appears on the scene. The show's full name is *Müge Anlı ile Tatlı Sert*, (may be translated as "Sweet and Sour with Müge Anlı" (Erol Işık & Yaman, 2017, p. 73) or "Kind but Firm with Müge

⁹ As of 2021-2022, the show is still running, albeit with a minor break in spring of 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

¹⁰ "Sevgi İzi" is a project started by MATS where individuals with a risk of getting lost are tattooed a code on their left wrists, which is later used by the show and the police to reunite them with their families.

Anlı”) but only her name is visible, meaning that the show brands itself with her name and image. A strong, just woman with the masses behind her, head held high and confident. She and, by proxy, the show, must be charitable and trustworthy. But what do they do?

The permanent onstage persons in the show are the host and the show experts. The host is journalist Müge Anlı (MA), and the experts are Psychiatrist Prof. Dr. Arif Verimli¹¹, lawyer Rahmi Özkan, and forensic scientist Prof. Dr. Şevki Sözen. Along with the offstage staff and the CRP (including applicants, interviewees and suspects onstage, as well as surveillant viewers and ihbar-makers offstage), the show focuses predominantly on unsolved murders, missing persons, family-related issues, and frauds.

Below, you will find the show’s investigation of the case of AF. The transcriptions of the related episodes (1645 to 1657) were held to qualitative data coding method and classified in terms of their relevance to themes as well as theoretical directives. While the quotations used hereby are sorted out with their relevance in mind, it will be clear during the read that the show is inclined to offer as many details to its audience as possible on the cases. Each speech is filled to the brim with implications of significance. However, for the sake of an orderly format and fluent reading experience, I tried to keep them brief and to the point. Even so, seeing as this show is based mostly on commentary and dialogues, they are quite significant in establishing a certain narrative and culture of surveillance in the audience. The discourse set by MATS in the quotes will link together into a clear picture of how they produce, maintain, and reproduce the culture of surveillance best fitting to their agenda.

¹¹ As of 2021, Prof. Dr. Arif Verimli is no longer affiliated with the show. However, he was still a show expert during the case of AF in 2016.

The first part, “Compliance with Surveillance,” will include how the show uses information about AF to establish why it is important for him to be found, and thus, why the show needs its audience’s surveillant labour. The narrative surrounding AF as a dangerous person who comes from a good family, as well as similar dualities, will be used to incite fear. Aiding this narrative will be intensive information on his personal encounters with his acquaintances as well as detailed peeps into his living spaces and even the blurred crime scene. Such revelation of information the audience could not have reached without the show work to establish main factors of the surveillance culture as detected by Lyon: Fun, familiarity, and fear.

The second part, “Assignment of Surveillance Imaginaries,” will go over the show’s endeavours to establish social policing. The calls for ihbars, the show’s constant vote of confidence towards the security forces, and the efforts to implement responsabilization will be examined. Here, the controversial nature of the show’s conduct as well as the show’s efforts to engage its audience in the cultures of surveillance will be examined. The show’s efforts to form a communal identity through the legitimization that comes from aiding the police will be further inspected.

The third part, “Surveillance Labour in Action,” will be solely for the ihbars received by the show. Here, the focal point will be how the show shapes the surveillant imaginaries and practices of the audience through its pro-surveillance narrative. This part will also show how the culture of surveillance, which already exists in society, is heightened and honed for the specific purpose to support the security forces and bring the culprit to justice. The ihbars will exemplify the fruits of “social policing” as was operationalized in this thesis.

The fourth part, “Internalization of Surveillance Labour,” will work to give more subtlety to the show’s tactics to ensure audience participation in the search for AF. The show uses peer pressure, positive association, and a discourse of “citizen’s

duty” to engage its audience in surveillance culture. The summit the show reaches with such conduct, a civil initiative group forming to use surveillance in order to catch AF, will exemplify the success of the show in achieving its goal.

The fifth and final part, “Legitimizing Surveillance Culture,” will include first the show’s efforts to inform its audience of the processes post-arrest, and second how, through the vocalization of gratitude, the show firmly establishes its legitimacy and justifies its existence. This web of thanks includes the show, the police, the CRP, and street interviewees. The feedback and information loops that ensure the longevity of the show, as well as the topics upon which the audience is educated and steered towards a law-abiding path, will be covered. Overall, this part will present how the show warrants audience loyalty and, thus the continuation of the circle of surveillance culture, through elements of exposure.

6.1. Compliance with Surveillance

The case of AF was first broadcast on May 31, 2016, on the 1645th episode of MATS. After 13 days of searching for the culprit, the show announced his arrest on episode 1654, and the following three episodes were comprised of the retrospective arguments concerning the case as well as prospective elaborations on lessons learned.

AF had been in a relationship with Olga Seregina, and shared a house with Göktuğ Demirarslan in France, where they all were university students. Göktuğ was in a relationship with Olga’s friend, Elena Radchikova. Olga went missing without a trace, and Göktuğ and Elena pestered AF with questions as well as accusations. After completing their education in France, Göktuğ and Elena moved to Ankara, Turkey. AF, as later revealed in his testimony to the police (read on air by MA,) was determined to blackmail the couple into a compliant silence. When his endeavours to gather private footage that could be used as blackmail failed, AF tracked them with planted a GPS signal and shot them both in front of their home in Ankara in

2013. There was a broadcast ban about the double murder then, which the host explained was because Gökтуğ was employed by The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey. AF's tracks ended in Kütahya, where he left behind a car filled to the brim with survival tools and disguise materials. AF was, from then on, sought with red notice by Interpol.

AF hid in Tuzla, İstanbul. He changed his name to Furkan Altın, and had a myriad of fake ID cards with him. He approached the Kayıkçı family, who took him under their wings. They gave him a flat to stay rent-free in their family apartment and a job at the tea garden they owned. AF avoided being revealed to them through bureaucracy by stating that he was willing to work unregistered. Fatma Kayıkçı, a history teacher and the wife of the tea garden owner, grew more and more suspicious of his avoidance of talking about himself, and wanted him out of the flat soon.

Fatma Kayıkçı was murdered in İstanbul, Tuzla on May 27, 2016. Her family called the show the next day when they thought she had simply gone missing, but as the MATS team travelled to the location, her body was discovered. She was half a kilometre away from her home and hidden inside bushes. When the police found fingerprints at the scene of the crime, the possible suspect was revealed to be none other than AF, who was already wanted for his double murder in 2013 in Ankara. Now wanted for (at least) three murders, Filiz caused a nationwide search by the police forces and, consequently, by the mass media.

MATS used CCTV footage to track AF's route, as well as the footage from privately owned security cameras that the audience provided upon the show's request. Some (if not all) of this footage was broadcast and shared with the show's audience. An ihbar to the show revealed that AF had gone to İzmir, and more ihbars tracked him to a market, an internet café, and a student's flat. Unrelated to AF's route on the run, the audience was also made privy to footages of the bushes that hid Fatma Kayıkçı's body, the room AF lived in during his time in Tuzla, the site of the double murder,

the dumpster AF dumped Fatma Kayıkçı's purse, security cam footage from the gas station he stopped by after his double murder in Ankara, the love note he wrote to his crush in Tuzla, as well as narrations of the e-mails he sent to Elena by Gökтуğ's friends, to mention a few.

The 13-day search came to an end when two separate dolmush drivers recognized Filiz from his images shown at MATS. The show's audience was fundamental in locating and apprehending him, and was kept up-to-date about the course of events following his arrest as well.

6.1.1. Perpetuation of Bias about Crime

MATS has the ideal platform to set the narrative of the culprit: It airs every weekday for two-plus hours where it can reveal all the information they collect from CRP interviews, ihbars, and other investigative strains. The show chose to portray AF dualistically and as an outlier, which increased shock value, attracted higher ratings and audience awareness, and reproduced bias about "the criminal."

"Profile of serial killer surprised everyone! AF, wanted for 3 murders, is someone who knows 4 languages, and has been educated in top-notch high school and universities...¹²" This was the title card while the host introduced him as follows: "I mean, this profile is very interesting, as I said, maybe we will now talk about a murder suspect profile the likes of which we have never seen until today. He belongs to a very respectable family."¹³

¹² "SERİ KATİLİN PROFİLİ HERKESİ ŞAŞIRTTI!3 CİNAYETTEN ARANAN ATALAY FİLİZ, 4 YABANCI DİL BİLEN, ÇOK İYİ LİSE VE ÜNİVERSİTELERDE EĞİTİM GÖRMÜŞ BİRİ..." (Episode 1646)

¹³ "Yani bu profil çok enteresan, dediğim gibi belki de bugüne kadar hani hiç görmediğimiz bir katil zanlısı profilinden bahsedeceğiz az sonra. Çok saygıdeğer bir aileye mensup." (Episode 1645)

Let us first note that AF's murders do not fit perfectly into the more traditional classification of the serial killer. One of the most prevalent classifications for the serial killer states that there has to be at least three victims, events, and locations, as well as a cool-off period in between murders (Douglas et al., 1986). AF has three confirmed victims in two events and two locations, and what could be seen as his cool-off period was spent in hiding, under a different name in a different city. According to his initial statements, which were read aloud at the show, the reasoning for both the inactive periods and the murders was not due to a psychological need cycle resetting but a necessity for continued freedom as well as frustrations born out of interpersonal relationships. This is nothing out of the ordinary, according to the Turkish General Directorate of Security Affairs, which counts grudge, sudden bouts of anger, romantic relations and interpersonal hostilities amongst the most prevalent motivators for Turkish murderers (Demirbaş, 2014). They also list appearing innocent, having respectable jobs, and people around them having a hard time believing the person to be a murderer amongst the serial killers in Turkey (Demirbaş, 2014). This, too, was conveyed by the CRP, and the discourse was of him as an unsuspecting person until after it was proved that he did commit those murders. However, he was still labelled as a serial killer, and the show was commended later on by the CRP for doing so; it brought a high amount of attention to the case. This leads one to think that the particular narration of AF's person and past may stem from more utility-oriented concerns.

AF was known as Furkan Altın in Tuzla, and people around him knew him as a calm, quiet, and moderately respectful person. The victim's stepson said this on the show to convey the incongruence between AF's appearance and actions:

Had there been no eye-witnesses, this person would have been mourning with us. I mean, should the police have asked to get his statement as well, we would have said this guy would not have done it, that he is mild-mannered, that he is our employee, our guy; we might have stopped them.¹⁴

¹⁴ Bekir Kayıkçı (Kurbanın üvey oğlu): (...) Görgü tanığı olmasa bu şahıs bizle beraber yas tutuyor olacaktı. Yani polisler bunun da ifadesini alalım dediğinde ya bu adam yapmaz, bu adam mülayim,

The show emphasized the dualities in AF to a great extent, citing as proof his affinity for order in his living space as in direct contrast to his unclean appearance, as well as his respectable family and education background in contrast to his violent actions. This implied a discrepancy between the observable and the hidden, the appearance and the essence; it gave a message of mistrust and paranoia, for the people we deem respectable and accomplished can turn out to be disruptive or outright dangerous individuals as well. That it was someone like AF who murdered people was presented as a phenomenon that required keen attention, setting him apart from the “usual suspects” by his distinguished educational background and his respectable parentage. This emphasis perpetuated the understanding of the criminal as uneducated and unrespected; crime was reiterated as unbecoming to distinguished members of the society.

In terms of family, the show host and experts were adamant not to imply any involvement in AF’s crimes, and the show was thanked by a family friend for representing the family well. AF’s father was a military pilot, and he was mentioned with his achievements. The host and experts were generally protective of the family’s reputation, like when the show’s lawyer expert Rahmi Özkan said,

I mean; I personally do not find it likely that the family would aid their child in a murder such as this. Would a family like this go and help their child commit murder, or hide the incident, that appears as a question mark to me.¹⁵

GD’s family lawyer and Fatma Kayıkçı’s family gave voice to their suspicions about the family’s neutrality as the investigation continued, but the host mentioned that

bizim elemanımız bizim adamımız deyip belki de engel olacaktık biz buna. (...) Kimseye karışmaz, tartışmaz, kavga etmez, biriyle münakaşaya girmez. Gayet sakin, kendi halinde. (Episode 1645)

¹⁵ Rahmi Özkan: Yani ailenin çocuklarına böyle bir cinayette yardımcı olacağına ben şahsen pek ihtimal vermiyorum. Yani böyle bir aile, kalkıp da çocuklarının cinayet işlemesine yardımcı olurlar mı, o olayı örtbas ederler mi, bana biraz soru işareti geliyor. (Episode 1645)

families could sometimes do wrong by the law in their hope to do right by their children, indicating her reluctance to put blame on the family and contrasting with the lawful stance of the show. Unlike the many instances in the show where the suspects' families were interviewed and accommodated in the studio, the Filiz family refrained from any participation in the show, and the show only made calls to them to be on the side of the law.

In terms of education, the show emphasized AF's (at times unfounded) educational achievements strongly. According to the show, he graduated first from Galatasaray High School, then from a French university, and then began his doctorate in METU Department of Biology. The host utilized these achievements to support the narrative of AF as a very smart and extraordinary criminal, citing his high school peers' success and his family's esteemed stance to further distinguish AF from the norm:

I mean this guy gets in [Galatasaray High School], graduates in the third place, and as I said, all his classmates have come to hold important positions. This is why we have nothing to say to his family. May God help them; may God not bestow this upon anyone.¹⁶

Later it turned out that he never finished his undergraduate studies in France, and according to a statement issued by METU, had never been affiliated with the university either. Until METU refuted the claim, he was cited as "METU Graduate Serial Killer"¹⁷ on the basis that his parents believed these about him. This indicates a lack of verification and fact-checking on the part of the show, which even initially misnamed Atalay as Atılay.

¹⁶ MA: Yani bu çocuk oraya giriyor, oradan da üçüncülükle mezun oluyor, bütün arkadaşları dediğim gibi sınıf arkadaşları çok önemli yerlere gelmiş. O yüzden bizim onun ailesine söyleyecek lafımız yok. Allah yardımcıları olsun, Allah hiç kimsenin başına vermesin. (Episode 1646)

¹⁷ "ODTÜ Mezunu Seri Katil" (Episode 1645)

METU's refutation was later joined by a declaration from the rental depot in which ihbars revealed that AF had rented a storage room, stating that they were in no way associated with AF. This showed their conception of MATS as a platform that could redeem their names and reach a wide audience. And while the statements were given voice by the host, she also felt the need to underline that a criminal does not incriminate anyone but themselves.

Somebody committing a murder does not harm a firm, or a city, a country, a university or a firm. I think nobody should display touchiness like this. It seems absurd to me. I mean, this is why we always underline that crime is personal.¹⁸

While it was claimed that "crime is personal," the criminal in question was approached with emphasized awareness of his certain educational and familial affiliations. The mentions of the contrast between family/education and criminal action worked to incite attention and trigger a deep-seated fear that harm may come from most unexpected persons, which in turn justified the urgency of a nationwide search for he-who-can-be-anywhere, and the demands for surveillant labour from the show's audience. However, it also perpetuated bias about the criminals as less privileged, less respected, less educated people in negation.

This narrative also added into the dichotomized approach to the criminal and the non-criminal. The audience of law-abiding citizens were tasked with surveillant labour to help catch the criminal. This divide, according to Cavender, "speaks to a perceived cohesive social order, which the criminal threatens" (1998, p. 87). He also points at the possessive word choices of reality crime shows and how they add to the discourse of solidarity with the show, its audience, and the law enforcement authorities. The language used in MATS, in this AF case and in others as well, is possessive of the law enforcement and the audience, placing the criminal firmly as

¹⁸ MA: (...) Şimdi birinin cinayet işlemesi bir firmayı, işte bir şehri, bir ülkeyi, bir üniversiteyi ya da firmayı zedelemes. Hiç kimsenin böyle bir alınganlığa girmemesi lazım diye düşünüyorum. Bana saçma geliyor bu. Yani "suç kişiseldir" in hep altını çizmemizin nedeni o. (Episode 1648)

the other and creating a divide between its audience (whose help the show enlists) and the criminals (whose arrest is the goal). This, as with many others, is another way in which the show positions itself and its audience, guiding the latter into surveillance labour in accordance with law and order.

6.1.2. Fear of the Fugitive

MATS distinguished AF from the usual killers, who were said to be more rage-motivated. AF was smart and organized, had the urge to kill and plan to do so. Setting him apart like this right from the start worked perfectly well to garner attention to the case and the ensuing chase because it caused fear.

According to Lyon, fear of probable danger was often utilized to ensure new and more surveillance measures, most notably after 9/11 (2018), which was a spectacular and unexpected violent occurrence. Fear is an incentivizing agent, urging the individuals and the societies as a whole to embrace more and more surveillance in everyday lives in the hope for safety. In the case of MATS, establishing AF as the indisputable and very probable danger justified the show's own surveillance into AF's life in detail, and the show's calls for the surveillant labour of its own audience.

MATS allocated time to broadcast interviews where the people expressed their fear: Acquaintances were afraid AF might come back to hurt them, people in Tuzla were afraid that AF never really left and could harm them, people he interacted with on the run asked for security details. The show made it a point to frequently showcase and verbally reiterate how scared everyone was of AF and how scary he was. These, whether or not they were accompanied by placating remarks, still worked to maintain a constant state of unease. The insistence with which this was carried out can mean that it was intentional, for such footage could have been edited out, and mentions of people in fear could have been lessened. More fear meant more ratings

for the show, more vigilance on the part of the audience, and more ihbars for the police.

It should be noted that the fear generated by the show and media in general added to reluctance in some prospective ihbar makers, strengthening the fear for their safety in case they gave ihbars. The shopkeepers in İzmir who sold AF clothes, for example, refused to say so to the show even though they told their acquaintances about their interactions with AF, and even though these encounters were later proven by camera footage. Considering the lengths, the show and the rest of the media went to present AF as a conniving killer who felt an impulse to kill and went after people who posed a threat to him in his mind, blaming the civilians for feeling the prompted emotions could be considered a tautological error.

While it appeared counterproductive for the show to continue emphasizing how smart and dangerous AF was for the reasons mentioned above, they continued to do so. The paranoia experienced and expressed by CRP about AF coming back to kill them was given air time in the form of interviews, with the host saying one version or the other of, “We are talking about a very dangerous person.”

Fear and anxiety were widespread throughout the run of the search for AF. The student who unknowingly rented one of his rooms to AF on his run, later on, demanded security detail and expressed his fear, and was met with admonishments concerning his lack of attention to the media and the news (for he would not have failed to recognize AF had he been up-to-date with current news). In Tuzla, many people expressed the fear they had felt for AF harming them even though it was documented that he was hiding in İzmir. These statements do well to display the fear that was spread by the media through the society at large, inciting anxiety while the available evidence suggested no immediate reason to feel so. The fear and the ensuing paranoia as a result of AF’s portrayal by the media as well as the inordinate amount of attention given to catching one culprit while murder and murderers at

large are not at all an extraordinary occurrence, and this was perhaps most aptly put by this street interviewee, who said: “Imagine that a person near you is a potential murderer, and living like that is really very scary. Imagine that they are a neighbour, but you are living with a potential murderer in the same area. What inevitably happens is it restricts your life.”¹⁹

The show broadcast the Tuzla neighbours’ retrospective dwellings about cats disappearing from the neighbourhood and AF sometimes going somewhere unknown with his bags. When the show recorded a cat leash in AF’s room in Tuzla and someone recognized it as their missing cat’s leash, the image of AF as a bloodthirsty killer was further cemented. This and many other instances relayed by the show increased fear in the general public and instilled the idea that keeping up with CBRTV shows was the way to be up-to-date on the current murderous dangers.

CBRTV shows nowadays are utilized as means to change the general public opinion concerning the nature and valence of crime and to engage the public in crime control. According to Garland, this is most commonly done for responsabilization through “publicity campaigns” targeted towards the general public through mass media, with the “aim to raise public consciousness, interpolate the citizen as a potential victim, create a sense of duty, connect the population to crime control agencies, and help change the thinking and practices of those involved” (2001, p. 125). MATS, conducting such a campaign, made use of fear as a way of cementing the idea of potential victimhood in its audience through the discourse of this one dangerous individual running amok within the public. Thus frightened for their safety, the audience was drawn into taking on the responsibility to offer their surveillant labour to the show and the law enforcement authorities.

¹⁹ Orta yaşlı kadın: Yanınızdaki bir insanın potansiyel bir katil olduğunu düşünün, ki böyle bir şey yaşamak hakikaten çok ürkütücü. Düşünün o bir komşunuz, ama potansiyel bir katille yaşıyorsunuz aynı çevrede, öyle söyleyeyim. Bu sefer ne oluyor, ister istemez yaşamınızı hapsediyor. (Episode 1654)

The fanning of fear comes with the cost of the implicit focus on the criminal and not the crime or, more accurately, on the specifics of a crime and not on the underlying causes of crime in general. The surveillant focus is on that criminal and that crime in particular, and this has been a reoccurring theme throughout the show's air time. Portrayals of each case give off the feeling that it is the most interesting of them all, the criminals or deviants the worthiest of audience attention. This distracts the audience from having a realistic grasp of the nature of crime. Therefore the thought process that could have led to ways to prevent the crime is cut short. AF was not the only murderer on the loose; his were not the only unsolved murders, his motives and his capabilities were not specific to him alone. But he was the focus of the show, his arrest the end in itself. Considering the major effort and time discrepancy on the part of the show between villainizing AF and educating the audience for prevention or protection, it can be said that the show's general aim is case-specific attention, and not purely crime prevention.

Fear is nurtured and utilized as a means to an end by the CBRTV programming, and it increases the demand for the genre's continued existence; people want to be aware of the dangers they might face regardless of said danger's statistical unlikeliness. Having thus created itself a place, programs need an endless supply of cases they can market to their audience. It necessitates not the prevention or the extermination but the continuation of crime. Not just any crime, however. White-collar or organized crimes, or even theft and property crimes, are not nearly as capable of inducing fear as violent, vicious, arbitrary murder (which is, coincidentally, a favourite of the genre.) The more fear-inducing, the better for ratings and for a memorable place in the minds of the audience.

Not only was the general audience made afraid and thus constantly vigilant, but also the simple facts of broadcasting their interviews and reiterating the widespread nature of fear ensured its continuation. Repetitive reminders by the host and the experts of the danger AF posed emphasized the importance of the continued search

for AF, ensured continued viewership and legitimized the show's utilization of surveillant labour for catching the criminal.

6.1.3. Excessive Exposure

Thus justified in going after AF, MATS proceeded to use the audience's and their own surveillance measures to reveal as much of AF as possible. That his living spaces, his storage room, the contents of his car etc. were visually revealed was not found strange at all because, as Lyon (2017) states, surveillance has been so ingrained that most people go along with it without question, and the factors contributing to this compliance are fear, fun, and familiarity or partaking in the cultures of surveillance.

In the previous part, the aspect of fear and how it was utilized as a means to perpetuate the culture of surveillance and to draw the audience into taking part in responsabilization were explained. In this section, through the unabashed exposure of every aspect of AF's life, we will delve into the factors of fun and familiarity. It should be kept in mind that all three factors are deeply intertwined with each other and can feed each other immensely.

According to Lyon (2018), surveillance has become domesticated and normalized, which leads to a general deference towards it most of the time. This breeds familiarity with the acts of surveillance one can encounter in their lives or in mass media such as the television. While the CBRTV genre is widespread globally, it has been especially popular since the 1990s in Turkey, with some of the most prevalent channels making sure to produce and broadcast their own programmes. It should also not be forgotten that news, movies and TV series, or in other words most of the television content, has been quite taken to choosing criminal or deviant behaviour like domestic violence, weapon use, sexual assault, murder etc. as their subject; crime is not under the sole jurisdiction of the CBRTV programming. The use of surveillance about crime and all things related to crime, therefore, is not out of the

ordinary for the general audiences. Details of crimes, regardless of (or because of) how brutal or vicious they may be, are shared as well as details that can be related to crime and the criminal. The latter usually does not have to directly correlate to the investigative processes or the surveillance labour put forward to catch the perpetrators. In this section, the extensive surveillance into AF's life will serve to exemplify how surveillance for the sake of it takes prevalence over surveillance as a means for crime control.

The fun factor can be found in the fact that this genre provides entertainment to some degree. Whether it be the act of seeing into the lives of others, participating from the comfort of one's own in a criminal investigation, or the thrill of being empowered through the possibility of perhaps becoming the person whose surveillant labour ends up catching the criminal, MATS and its ilk offer an escapist opportunity for the audience members. It helps that the show has developed over the years its own jargon and inside jokes, with each member of the cast predictable to an extent in terms of their reactions and values. The plots thicken, and the viewer is drawn into the mystery or the chase. CBRTV programs and the cases they handle resemble mystery novels or movies in their conduct. Audiences' voyeuristic need to see and know is satisfied through the provision of visual and verbal information that they could otherwise not been able to access.

Even fear itself at the exposed information can be found ordinary and entertaining within the particular culture of surveillance of the genre. The audience of MATS was given extensive and invasive looks into AF's life that fit very well into the fun-familiarity-fear triangle of compliance with surveillance. It should be noted, however, that most of the information about AF relayed to the viewership could not be justified by the show as honing the audience's surveillant perceptions and labour in order to apprehend him. Rather than help the viewers spot his likeness in the streets, these pieces of information were given to feed into the factors of compliance and to produce, maintain and reproduce a culture of surveillance.

MATS compiled a vast array of visuals on AF's room at Tuzla, with special attention paid to the odd placement of stuff, a cat leash, and a bottle of what the reporter believed to be urine from the smell. A CRP showed the murder scene, with patches of blood on the floor thoughtfully blurred in editing. The storage room he rented was off the limits for the show, but to calm down the public frenzy that a body was found there, they let everyone know that "Murder movies, bicycle, sports implements, books and CDs found in the depot rented by the serial killer..."²⁰

Similarly, the items from the car AF abandoned after his double murder in Ankara were listed, with a dentist from the audience calling the show to let them know that the tool kit he had there was a dentist's kit. The host commented as follows: "This killer is very scary, very much scary. I mean, really, this killer began to become even scarier. He scares people."²¹ This and many such comments as the show kept revealing more of AF were meant to keep the attention on the case, to drive in the point that AF's capture was of utmost importance.

However, the show kept revealing even once AF was arrested. The admittedly extensive array of contents of his luggage was accessed after his arrest, and they too were shown as well as listed one by one. Some of the most prominent items were the fake ID cards, credit cards, weapons, books on campsites, and firms abroad that listed for au-pairs. That he had these prior to Fatma Kayıkçı's murder showed his readiness to flee if the need arose, and the nature of such possessions also indicated that he was cognizant of ways in which he could avoid file-based surveillance. Fake cards for a random ID control, credit cards to spend money undetected, weapons to survive in the wild, information on campsites to hide in, listings for under-regulated

²⁰ "Seri katilin kiraladığı depodan cinayet filmleri, bisiklet, spor aleti, kitap ve CD'ler çıktı..." (Episode 1648)

²¹ MA: (...) Bu katil çok korkutucu, çok korkutucu. Yani gerçekten, bu katil gittikçe daha ürkütücü, daha doğru, ürkütücü bir hale gelmeye başladı yani. İnsanları ürkütüyor. (Episode 1649)

occupations abroad to make a living for himself... While these justified the show's attempts to catch AF, it also broadened the surveillance imaginaries of the viewers: What should one do, if one is on the run, to avoid law enforcement and civilian surveillance? Now, the MATS viewers knew.

AF was revealed to be aware and avoidant of the camera surveillance he was under as well. Even as far back as his Tuzla years, according to one of his former employers, who in retrospect recalled AF's routes to and from work as follows:

Fifty meters from our business are the city surveillance cameras. His house is about 800 meters ahead. He never once came into our shop from the street with the cameras. He always used the byroad you see across from here.²²

This, coupled with the security cam footage from the internet cafe in İzmir of him keeping an eye on the café's security cameras, strengthened the narrative of AF as a perceptive and smart person who could avoid being under surveillance. He was now an even more elusive target, and the citizen participation in the investigation was that much more needed.

The exposure of AF's life was not limited to his living spaces, rental depot, or his luggage. The show went so far as to read AF's yearbook from Galatasaray High School, delve into the memories of his problematic love interests and his fights. They included in air time many a recounting of people's past interactions with AF, all of which were reinterpreted in retrospect by the interviewees and fed into the fear-inducing ambience surrounding the case.

²² "İşletmemizin 50 metre ilerisinde mobese kameraları var. Bulunduğu ev de yaklaşık 800 metre ileride. O kameraların olduğu yoldan bizim dükkanımıza hiç bir gün giriş yapmadı. Sürekli bu karşıda gördüğümüz ara yoldan giriş yaptı." (Episode 1648)

One female co-worker relayed in a VTR interview the time AF attacked her when she made a dubious comment on his attractiveness to his crush. While it could be considered as a warning to the audience not to engage him in a discussion of his masculinity so as not to provoke him into a fight, this also fed into the narrative of a dangerous person who has no control over his impulses. The aforementioned “crush” felt the need to write a letter to the show afterwards to give her own story and clear the air about the fact that she never willingly accepted his courting gifts or gave AF hope. This letter was read aloud verbatim. Another past acquaintance, after telling the story of AF bringing knives to a game table in the tea garden, said the following:

I think he has an affinity for knives, that he has a psychology that derives pleasure from watching people commit murder. (...) Now that we look at it, I think that it was no joke, that he perhaps wanted us to use the knives on each other, that he wanted us to hurt each other. In his subconscious, he might have planned to trigger or encourage our urge for violence, just as he did himself.²³

The person relaying this memory was quick to retrospectively psychoanalyze AF after his murders were made a matter of national agenda, and his statements were included in the MATS broadcast instead of being edited out. This suggests that the show had a certain vision for how they wanted to take on this case. Considering that knowing about this tidbit could only increase the fear the audience felt and make it scarier for them to come forward with whatever knowledge they might have pertaining to AF, the reasons behind have to be less about the desire to mobilize surveillant masses and more about attracting higher ratings. Establishing oneself as an authority that educates society on what should and should not be viewed as deadly threats can and does do wonders to stay on the forefront of the audience’s minds and be the focal point of attention.

²³ Ahmet Koçin (VTR): Bıçaklara karşı bir zaafı, insanların cinayet işlemelerini izlemekten keyif alan bir psikolojisini olduğunu düşünüyorum. (...). İşte şu anda baktığımız zaman bunun şaka olmadığını, birbirimize belki bunu kullanmamızı, birbirimize zarar vermemizi istediğini düşünüyorum. Bilinç altında, bizim de onun yaptığı gibi, şiddet dürtümüzün harekete geçmesini planlamış ya da bunu teşvik etmiş olabilir. (Episode 1646)

It should also be considered that the show offers a platform for the CRP to build their own narratives about their pasts with AF. Once his case was so popularized, and he was revealed to be the smart, educated, “serial killer” child of a respectable family, it should not come as a surprise that his friends and acquaintances would want to clear themselves of any suspicion and reinterpret their memories under the light of the new evidence. This brings to mind Dean’s statement that: “Publicity is the organizing element of democratic politics and the golden ring of infotainment society” (2001, p. 624). Democracy in itself presupposes the existence of secrets so that they can be exposed and inform public opinion. The necessity of the binary distinction of the disclosed and the revealed is also a necessity for the trends of publicity in the contemporary technoculture, according to Dean, where revealing more means the public’s right to know is fulfilled. In this example, by offering a narrative of their own, the CRP managed to a) answer to the democratic demand to inform the public by revealing more details and information on the case, b) absolved themselves of any suspicions through the exposure and publicity of their experiences, and thus, c) contributed to the culture of surveillance of Lyon and the democratic technoculture of Dean. The show did not disregard these interviews; they paid special attention to them, simply for the fact that while the show states its main goal as catching the criminal, its implicit goal and *raison d’être* is to produce, maintain, and reproduce a culture of surveillance that thrives on exposure. The existence of interchangeable crime is as vital for the continuation of their endeavours as is the existence of secrets, so they can be respectively solved and exposed, perpetuating the cycle.

Detecting the initial source, that first domino to set off this chain of events, would be a wild goose chase. However, they all relate significantly within a culture where surveillance, from the points of view of the surveillant and the surveilled, the revealer and the receiver, the object of focus and the beholder, and beyond any such dichotomies one can come up with. The motivations of each agency therein are compatible with each other and work to enhance and reproduce the concept through

which nourishment can be found. Surveillance is simultaneously conducted to satisfy the desired ends of each one, and at the same time, it is conducted for the sake of surveillance itself.

The show, when asked, claims to offer these details to the audience in a bid to solidify the cases in their eyes and help along the investigative processes. With AF, it was his possible triggers, motives, behaviours, veneer that were presented to the audience supposedly for the sake of the investigation. It is true that some viewers follow all enclosed information to deduce the killers' motivations and possible courses of action and that they call the show to share their guesses. However, if cases are solved by the deductive contributions of such viewers, it is not expressed clearly by the show. Therefore, such efforts remain mostly for the sake of exposing details that would otherwise remain concealed. The fun factor of delving into the mind and life of this "serial killer," of exposing info about him even as he was as a teenager that would otherwise be unreachable to the audience, could not be ignored regardless of how helpful it actually would be to the audience during their surveillant labour. Hearing about how his friends disliked his miscreant behaviour, the many recounting of his out-of-line actions, and his fondness for Anthony Hopkins' Hannibal Lecter would not, after all, help anyone spot him in the streets. However, it would tie the audience to the screen, lure them with the promise of a safe kind of horror: The viewer can experience the thrill of the crime and the chase from the comfort of their homes, and be further drawn into a culture of surveillance that does not allow questions about the excessive nature of these expositions.

Such depictions also succeed in representing the culprit as being intrinsically deviant and miscreant; he was always like this. He is successfully detached from factors in his life that might have contributed to his actions, and in this one-dimensional representation, he fascinates the audience like a caricature. Peering into his past loses the significance of the invasion of privacy; he forfeited his right to it when he misbehaved. Such is the objectification and commodification afforded by the show.

And if the audience could also keep an eye out for his likeness and help the show (and consequently the police), then that's even better, but not the direct aim of the show. The detection of AF by the audience is almost a by-product, for if it was the main objective, such details as his previous love letters or yearbook entries would not be given on national broadcast. The hard focus would be on his images, his probable disguises, or on areas he was likely to visit. While such attention was not absent, it was also certainly accompanied by relatively irrelevant and intrusive information regarding his past. Therefore, it could be said that the show, regardless of how altruistic it presented itself, its aims and actions, was at least equally invested in the entertainment it provided through arbitrary invasions of privacy.

6.2. Assignment of Surveillance Imaginaries

Lyon defines surveillance imaginaries as;

(...) shared understandings about certain aspects of visibility in daily life, and in social relationships, expectations and normative commitments. They provide a capacity to act, to engage in, and to legitimate surveillance practices (2017, p. 829).

Surveillance imaginaries have two main aspects to it. Dynamics of surveillance is knowing how surveillance works, while duties of surveillance dictate how one can understand and act surveillantly (Lyon, 2018). Surveillance imaginaries enable enculturation; we then know how we can position ourselves within a particular culture of surveillance through surveillance practices. Surveillance imaginaries and practices constantly feed into each other, further strengthening the cultural hold.

In the case of MATS, the audience's surveillance imaginaries are shaped with a specific goal in mind. The show requires its audience to use particular imaginaries in their surveillance practices. The wilful utilization of the audience's surveillance practices points at a process of labour where the surveillance practices are encouraged to help the law enforcement, their ihbars gathered, and the result

(solving a case, a culprit's arrest, or finding a missing person) is treated as the reward for the actions. The return of labour is not monetary but it is valuable nonetheless. In the long run, such conduct leads the audience to pay that attention to their surroundings constantly and without prompt, like a learned behaviour: People are then ready to call the show and give ihbars if the person they noticed acting suspiciously happened to be the person for whom the show started a search. Surveillance becomes even more of a way of life; this time honed to capture unlawful individuals or to find missing persons. In this section, the ways in which the show shapes the surveillance imaginaries of its audience, the dynamics and the duties, will be elaborated.

6.2.1. Calls for Ihbars

The calls for ihbars are a major component of shaping the surveillance imaginaries. They affect the surveillance imaginaries of the audience in that the viewers find out how the surveillance specifically expected by the show can be carried out (i.e., dynamics of surveillance) and why it should be carried out (i.e., duties of surveillance.) These, in turn, are expected to mobilize the audience into surveillance practices in ways approved and desired by the show.

The status of the search as urgent and the culprit as dangerous are repeated as CCTV footage of AF plays in the background, with the host verbally describing his appearance, behaviour and possessions. These hone the audience's perception of AF and are aimed to make it easier for the audience members to detect him within a crowd, out in the streets, or in surveillance camera recordings. The dynamics of surveillance relayed henceforth is that surveillance can be carried out by looking around carefully with the aim of recognition and detection.

The duties of surveillance are developed off of the duality between concepts of danger and safety. The prospect that one's surveillance potential can be useful to establish security is often emphasized. In the show, many variations of "There is no

guarantee what will happen today. This is why I tell you, agitatedly and insistently to please, look around with more vigilance,”²⁴ were given, and a detailed quote such as the one below should articulate the point further:

MA: Now, the reason I bend over backwards in every murder, saying, “Guys, let us find them, catch them, help, call the police, call the gendarmerie, call us,” is this: (...) This guy has committed at least three murders. (...) A guy who hasn’t been caught in three years could, of course, kill another very easily. Because he thinks, “I will kill again, and they won’t catch me all the same.” This is why catching killers, and doing it as soon as possible, and bringing them to justice is such an important thing.²⁵

Audience surveillance was presented here as something done to catch criminals; it is a means to build a safer society. The killer was often mentioned as volatile, prone to lashing out and killing wherever or whenever, even though anything that could be claimed on AF could only be a judgment made from limited information. However, by the implication that surveillance in the form of simply looking around and giving ihbars (to the police and/or the show) can make for a safer environment, the audience’s perspective on how and why surveillance could be used was changed.

It should be kept in mind that the show addressed the civilians for surveillance labour. Seeing as investigation of crimes and search for criminals are supposed to be, by definition, strictly within the jurisdiction of law enforcement, outsourcing through the inclusion of civilians in such endeavours should presuppose a healthy dose of caution and self-preservation. How to act upon detecting such a criminal, what to do and what not to do, or in other words, the know-how is missing from the

²⁴ MA: Bugün ne olacağının da garantisi yok işte. O yüzden zaten çok heyecanla ve ısrarla aman nolur, lütfen, hani, daha, etrafımıza daha dikkatli bakalım diyorum. (Episode 1647)

²⁵ MA: Şimdi benim, bir cinayet işlendiğinde “Aman arkadaşlar, bulalım, yakalayalım, yardım edin, polisi arayın, jandarmayı arayın, bizi arayın,” diye kendi hep çırpınmamın sebebi şu: (...) En az üç cinayet işledi bu çocuk. (...) Üç yıldır yakalanmayan bu çocuk, tabii ki bir başkasını öldürebilir rahatlıkla. Çünkü şöyle düşünüyor: “Yine öldüreceğim, yine yakalamayacaklar.” İşte o yüzden bu katillerin yakalanması, bir an evvel yakalanması, adalete teslim edilmesi o kadar önemli bir duygu ki, önemli bir olay ki. (Episode 1645)

audience. It would be safe to assume that, what most of them do know, they know from CBRTV shows and other crime-related content for mass consumption. Leaving aside these programmes' relation to factuality, these are not valid and approved platforms from which civilians can learn how to behave in regards to surveilling or facing a known and wanted criminal. This puts the audiences in a vulnerable spot where, in their wish to have AF apprehended, they could end up hurt or worse. The volatile and dangerous status of AF, through the show's reminders then, could have worked as a caution, regardless of whether or not they were valid.

Another point where the show adjusted its audience's surveillance imaginaries was about how the end justified the means to attain surveillance data. Calls were made respectively to the lawful viewers and the unlawful viewers, the latter being the human traffickers. The search for AF took place in 2016, a year in which the news media was often reporting on the smuggling of Syrians from Turkey to Europe. This, coupled with the ihbars that warned that AF was moving towards the coastline and could, in fact, successfully escape from Turkish jurisdiction, led the show to appeal to the human traffickers as well.

MA: A human trafficker, for example, we call them that because what they are doing is illegal, but I am sure that even those guys would not help him escape. Come now. They wouldn't, because everyone who helps this person would be complicit both in the previous murders, the number of which we do not know, and in the possible murders from now on. Leave aside the law and all, and the prison; would the human consciousness, the human heart, allow this?²⁶

²⁶ MA: Ben eminim, yani adam hani diyelim ki mülteci, insan kaçakçısı falan diyoruz ya yani, şimdi bizim insan kaçakçısı dediğimiz yasa dışı bir iş yaptığı için söylüyorum, o adamlar bile bunu kaçırmazlar. O kadar değil yani. Kaçırmazlar, çünkü bu kişiye yardım ve yataklık eden herkes, hem önceki cinayetlerin, ki kaç tane var şu anda bilemiyoruz, hem de bundan sonra işlenmesi muhtemel olan cinayetlerin de ortağı. Ya bırakın yasayı masayı hapisi, insanın vicdanı, kalbi buna el verir mi? (Episode 1645)

Besides strengthening AF's villainous status with the explicit claim that even human traffickers would not help him, there is also the matter of perpetuating certain biases about crime and criminals again. The audience was divided into two groups; the lawful and the lawless, both of which were expected to help the show with ihbars. However, while the law-abiding half was warned for their safety, the human trafficking portion was underhandedly reminded of the possibility of prison and becoming accomplices to AF's crimes. The following appeal to their human side reveals another prejudice concerning criminals, namely that without such reminders, they may not make lawful decisions on the occasion. Many calls were made to human traffickers that consistently acknowledged the unlawfulness of their profession in the same breath they urged them not to help AF.

Two human traffickers called the show to assure everyone that they would not let AF go abroad and that they even went so far as to organize amongst the "illegal circle" (including the traffickers, bus drivers and even escorts) and passed each other his pictures and video footages. They also gave information on how human trafficking worked, how much it cost to cross the borders illegally, and the locations they went to and came from in detail. Human trafficker #1 informed the host and the audience that the routes were then closed because the government would not allow them to pass due to "a state of showdown with the UN." The host, impressed by the inside information this conversation provided, was upset that the show had to have a commercial break that would cut their conversation short.

Human trafficker #1: (...) We all know each other. The pictures of this person, his footage, are circling within the illegal circle right now. I mean, if one of us sees him before the citizens, the intervention would be swift.

MA: You are amazing; I don't know what to say. Thank you very much. The business you are conducting is a different matter, and this is a different matter.²⁷

²⁷ İnsan kaçakçısı #1: Ve biz hepimiz birbirimizi tanırız. Bu kişinin resmi, görüntüleri, şu anda bütün illegal kesimde dolaşiyor. Yani vatandaşın önce birisi, birimiz görse hemen müdahale yapılır. MA: Ya valla harikasınız, ne diyeyim yani. Çok teşekkür ediyorum. Şimdi yaptığınız iş ayrı bir konu, bu ayrı bir konu. (Episode 1648)

Human trafficker #2 also showed his support for the show and its cause, and added to the previous conversation by saying that, now that AF was missing and wanted, they started to check each refugee's faces before allowing them on the boats. "(...) When we get them on bus or boats, we personally look at their faces. We let them on after checking their identity."²⁸ He would not speak AF's name for how much he disapproved AF's actions, and upon the host's prompt, also used MATS almost as a public relations enhancement platform, saying that the refugees' lives were their responsibility and correcting the word trafficker with that of the "benefactors". He was given gratitude and reminders on AF's possible disguises by the host.

Such confrontation strengthened MATS' stance that the human traffickers, AKA "benefactors," can be trusted to behave in a way that fit the show's agenda. Before, they were addressed condescendingly, with reminders of ramifications of possible unlawful actions and as a kind of "other." However, there was now an alliance against the common enemy. Firstly, they showed a willingness to offer not only their individual surveillant labour but also their collective endeavours to share AF's pictures amongst themselves. This behaviour is directly in line with what MATS aims, in general, to achieve with its audience. Secondly, they agreed to show a glimpse beyond the veil; they gave information about the processes of human trafficking that the ordinary citizen would not know, such as locations for gathering and departing, as well as the cost and the inner politics of such procedures. Lastly, they utilized the phone connection to control the narrative about themselves; they were "benefactors"²⁹ who cared very much for the lives of the refugees, and they strongly disapproved of AF's actions.

²⁸ İnsan kaçakçısı #2: (...) Şimdi otobüse binerken ya da bota bindirirken bizzat suratlarına bakıyoruz yani. Teşhis ederek bindiriyoruz. (Episode 1648)

²⁹ "Benefactors" ("yardımsever") was what the human traffickers preferred to call themselves instead of "human traffickers."

Surveillance imaginaries of the audience were shaped to accommodate a grey area concerning the source of the surveillance information. As long as the information could be useful, the source's ethical conduct or lack thereof could be inconsequential. This, coming from a show known for its relentless law and order ideology and preaching, was important to note. The show's target was not organized crime or human trafficking; shows of the CBRTV genre prefer to tackle interpersonal crimes to any other. Their target was a man who murdered three people on his own, and his capture was presented as such an important matter that human traffickers' help and support became valuable. That it was a live reality TV show that communicated with and could come to terms with human traffickers to catch one person could not conceivably reflect well on the capabilities of the law enforcement, whose support is very important to the show, to ensure safety. However, the voyeuristic value of finding out the routes of human trafficking and the insurance that the target would be stopped by human traffickers must have been considerable. The aim was not to fight all crime; it was to fight this specific crime after the fact, and the audience was expected to understand that giving a platform to the human traffickers to achieve this aim was perfectly acceptable.

From this point on, the host kept giving a vote of confidence to the human traffickers to keep their words, and said she appreciated their efforts to send his photos to each other. "The criminal" was thus reconstructed, as possibly trustworthy people that had their own set of ethical principles.

AV: Look here. The types of people who conduct illegal businesses, those who have served time, have some inner rules in their way. The maltreatment that we see in prisons, for example. Do not get me wrong, the person has committed a crime, killed someone, and so is in prison. But he may still kill another criminal for a crime. (...) These trafficking organizations have their own ethical rules in their past illegal conducts. (...) This is why we believe what they say.

MA: And, he said that they call themselves "benefactors," as you said they see human trafficking as such, but they say that when it is about a serial killer, they wouldn't let him pass just as the other citizens wouldn't. (...) What should we do when the man says that he is a human trafficker but

would not let the killer pass, should we curse at him? I mean, these are different matters.³⁰

The shift in the show's discourse on lawfulness received its fair share of criticism, and was addressed by the host on numerous occasions. However, the defence of the cooperation prevailed. On one occasion, the host described the critics as "people who try to hear with organs other than ears"³¹ and continued in the same vein on other points as well. One memorable rant is as follows:

MA: Honestly, whether the catcher is good or bad is not my priority now. What matters is that he is caught. Whoever contributes to that or plans to contribute to that is, in the end, valuable for me. That is another matter, but this is another matter. (...) But we try to carry on with sensible people. And everybody should be sensible. Especially as there are rare instances that interests society as a whole. Many things can happen in life, and they may or may not interest us, but this case interests us all. Why? Anyone could encounter a serial killer. And then things like this could happen.³²

³⁰ Arif Verimli: Şimdi bakın. Yasa dışı iş yapan bir takım insanların, ceza görmüş insanların, kendilerine göre de bir takım iç kuralları vardır. Örnek olarak cezaevlerinde gördüğümüz kötü muamele. Yanlış anlaşılmasın, cezaevinde adam suç işlemiş, adam öldürmüş, cezaevinde yatıyor. Ama bir başka suçluyu işlediği için öldürebiliyor. (...) Dolayısıyla bu kaçakçılık örgütlerinin yasa dışı bir biçimde geçmişte yapmış oldukları hadisede bir kendilerine göre bir ahlak kuralı vardır. (...) O yüzden inanıyoruz yani dedikleri lafa.

MA: Ki biz kendimize yardımsever diyoruz dedi, sizin dediğiniz gibi onlar insan kaçakçılığına bu şekilde bakıyorlar ama söz konusu olan bir seri katil olduğunda onlar da, tıpkı diğer vatandaşlarımız gibi, geçit vermeyeceklerini söylüyorlar. (...) Adam şimdi ben insan kaçakçısıyım ama katili geçirmiyorum dediğinde küfür mü edeceğiz ona yani. Yani o iş ayrı o iş ayrı. (Episode 1651)

³¹ "Kulak yerine başka organlarıyla duymaya çalışanlar" (Episode 1649)

³² MA: (...) Yakalayan kişinin yaptığı işin iyi veya kötü olması değil benim şu andaki açıkçası düşüncem. Önemli olan yakalanmasıdır. Onun yakalanmasına da kim katkı veriyorsa ya da kim katkı vermeyi planlıyorsa sonuçta benim için değerlidir. O iş ayrı iş, bu iş ayrı mesele. (...) Ama biz, akliselim insanlarla hayatı sürdürmeye çalışıyoruz. Herkesin de akliselim davranması gerekiyor. Özellikle, bunlar toplumu ilgilendiren bakın ender olaylar vardır. Şimdi bir sürü şey hayatta yaşanabilir, bizi ilgilendirir ya da ilgilendirmez ama bu olay hepimizi ilgilendiriyor. Neden? Bir seri katil herkesin karşısına çıkabilir. Daha sonra da böyle şeyler olabilir. (Episode 1651)

This was a declaration that the end justified the means. Anyone, whether part of an organized crime group or not, could be valuable as long as they offer surveillance labour to catch the show's established target. Others who found a problem with this was deemed insensible and scolded into compliance with the show's conduct. One man who killed three people and was on the run interested the entire society because *anyone could encounter him*. Then the question becomes, were the people who had to encounter organized human traffickers not one of "us"? What are the factors determining one kind of crime more immediate or more of a common concern than others?

MA (Continued): As a society, we must learn to come together at certain times. You know how everyone is trying to polarize society, which I think is a great project, but if you look, our society does not become polarized. The people don't get polarized. This is how we always are; we see it in all cases, in everything we experience. I can see that everyone is coming together as one for Atalay as well, and we will continue to see it. (...) What do those who argue do? Let them go and find him. This is all from me, I mean, this is it from me. I have 2000 missing persons, 60 murders; this is it. Let someone else do this then, let them. It is very easy to sit back and criticize someone. What have you done in this life? First show what you have accomplished, then criticize others.³³

The "society" was polarized, according to the host, because there were criticisms about the show's broadcast praise and cooperation with human traffickers. The blatant disdain towards critics undermined the objections of some viewers and distinguished clearly which type of audience is desired; one that is willing to cooperate with, and approve of, the show's actions towards its end goal. This

³³ MA (Devam): Biz toplumsal olarak bir takım şeylerde bir araya gelmeyi öğrenmeliyiz. Hani herkes toplumu ayrıştırmaya çalışıyor ya, ben bunun da büyük bir proje olduğunu düşünüyorum zaten ama bizim halkımız farkındaysanız ayrışmıyor. Halk ayrışmıyor. Biz hep böyleyiz, biz bunu bütün olaylarda görüyoruz, bütün yaşadığımız olaylarda görüyoruz. Yine Atalay için de ben herkesin bir yumruk haline gelerek onun peşine düştüğünü zaten görüyorum, düşmeye de devam ettiğini yine takip edeceğiz. (...) Tartışanların eli armut mu topluyor? Gitsinler onlar bulsunlar. Benden bu kadar, yani benden bu kadar yani. Benden hani 2000 kayıp, 60 cinayet, bu kadar yani. Birileri de ona el atsin, atsinlar yani. Hani birileri oturup birilerine laf söylemek çok kolay. Sen ne yaptın hayatta? Önce sen bir hayatta ne yaptığını ortaya koy, sonra başkalarına laf söyle. (Episode 1651)

unassuming compliance is then subtly redefined as sensibility and for the benefit of the society. Having thus polarized its own audience into two (one-part insensible and one-part sensible people,) the show then indicated that the criticism they received is somehow indicative of a societal coherence under threat of polarization and justified its actions the closure rates of the show. After the conversation with human traffickers and as the criticisms were received, the part of the audience who approved of the show's conduct was verbally and publicly supported with phrases like, "Without your support, they would eat us alive."³⁴

Overall, the choir was preached to, further cooperation was encouraged, and surveillance imaginaries of the audience was shaped to justify both the show's declared intention (an arrest and the consequent end to social unrest) and the underlying intention (the satisfaction of voyeuristic needs and the perpetuation of surveillant labour.) The duties of surveillance now included an easing of ethical concerns if it was justified by the end.

Admittedly, publicly cooperating with criminals has never been the show's preferred method of handling their cases, and this was an outlier. The norm has mostly been the emphasis on the law and order ideologies and the implication of cooperation with the police. This establishes a perception of structural validation.

The show's communication with the security forces was made overt by relaying demands from the police to the audience. For example, when the police deduced that AF might have rented a flat and stayed there as he avoided capture, they asked the show to relay to the audience a message of caution and a call for ihbars: Anyone who remotely rented out their lodgings to come forward with their ihbars to the police.

³⁴ MA: (...) Yoksa yer bitirirler bizi sizlerin desteği olmasa. (Episode 1649)

MA: The authorities have called out to all our citizens as follows. (...) The authorities say (...) could he have rented a house through the internet, or phone, or by paying his money in a different way, again? Is there anyone who, in the last week, rented their houses, hostel, or room? (...) They say that anyone who rented their house to a man should notify them.³⁵

The police, as seen in the example above, used the platform of MATS for their aims. This conveyance of demands on the police's side is as far as the police go in taking part in the show. However, while law enforcement may be legally bound against speaking to the show about the case, they may talk behind the scenes with the show staff and ask for specific information from the show's audience. This was indicated by the host sometimes chiming in with what the security forces believed was happening or what the police were saying. Although the exact nature and extent of their communication were left unclear, it can be said that, beyond layers of concealment, the show and the police benefit each other to some degree.

The show's reiteration and implication of inside knowledge from the police add to the surveillance imaginaries in that surveillance labour is demanded not only from the show but also from the law enforcement authorities. It adds another layer of justification to the show's conduct and demands for surveillance practices.

6.2.2. Responsibilization

Described as a neoliberal practice, responsabilization leads to a citizenship "where citizens provide extensions of law enforcement and state surveillance and security." (Walsh, 2014, p. 246) The process envisions an empowered citizen, who is made a willing participant "often through extensive technical, logistical and financial support" (Walsh, 2014, p. 242). The goal is to enlist the citizen's volitional labour to aid governing authorities with certain tasks. Being a citizen now includes surveillance practices for crime control or management purposes. Such citizen

³⁵ MA: Şöyle bir çağrıda bulundu emniyet yetkilileri tüm vatandaşlarımıza. (...) Emniyet yetkilileri de diyorlar ki (...) internet yoluyla, telefonla, parasını başka bir şekilde ödeyerek birinden birisi ev kiraladı mı? Son bir hafta içinde, evini kiralayan, pansiyonunu kiralayan, odasını kiralayan kimse var mı? (...) Şöyle diyorlar yani, son bir hafta içinde bir erkeğe evini kiralayan kimse varsa bize bildirin. (Episode 1649)

participation can be placed in a wide spectrum, ranging from a deficiency on the part of the governing bodies to function, to full citizen empowerment and realization of their potential. Below, a more critical approach will be utilized.

The existence of MATS and its ilk, by itself, is indicative of more than a mere favourite daytime genre. These shows take on unsolved cases as per the CRP's application and carry out a live investigation alongside that of the police. İhbars are made to the show, where they are deliberated upon extensively and systematically to solve the case. In-studio interrogations of suspects sometimes yield results in the form of confessions, at which point the police utilizes the show's footage as evidence. The show, then, does some of what the police do during an investigation, only it does so with a national audience. Whether or not they do so as a result of the police's endeavours at responsabilization is left vague. However, it should be kept in mind that such shows play an important part in responsabilization, in the management of public expectations regarding police work, and in financially benefiting the investigation processes conducted by the law enforcement. These are among the core motivations for community-based policing practices and must also contribute to the popularity and longevity of such shows in Turkey.

These shows' audiences are openly given directives for participation; in fact, their participation ensures the closure rates of the shows and justifies their existence. Without the audience's ihbars and surveillant labour, many cases could not have reached their end, and this is a matter fervently repeated by the MATS host at the successful conclusion of every case.

What MATS and its ilk demand from their audiences in terms of community participation is most in line with Schreurs, Kerstholt, Vries and Giebels' ideal types of citizen collaboration with the police (2018, pp. 5-6), which is a four-fold classification. The first is collaborative participation, where individuals are involved with the policies, gather together with the local police, and are open to giving

information to the police if they ask for it. The second one is social control, where individuals try to set a lawful example, keep an eye out for untoward actions, and communicate with their neighbours on crime-related matters. The third one is responsive participation, where the individuals are expected to call in crimes or disturbances after they happen, and to try to stop or at least observe local disputes. The last one, detection, is where individuals participate in neighbourhood watches or online platforms to find criminals or offenders.

MATS requires all these aspects from its audience to some degree, both for itself and for the police. Collaborative participation is demanded in the form of answering questions asked by the police and the show; the refusal to participate in the show and its interrogation processes upon the show's requests, for example, is mostly taken as a sign of suspicion and guilt, hinting at something to hide. Social control is in the form of expecting all members of the audience to be law-abiding citizens who are perceptive of unusual or suspicious behaviour around them and who talk to each other about matters of crime and deviance. Responsive participation is asked for in the form of ihbars upon encountering a crime or, in the case of the case here, upon detecting AF among the crowds. Detection comes as citizens organizing amongst each other with the aim of locating or exposing the perpetrators. Detection, admittedly, is not demanded vocally; instead, it is desired but left up to the audience's discretion.

The audience's surveillance imaginaries are shaped according to the citizen participation expected by the show. They are given the ways in which they can participate in "social control," "responsive participation," and "detection" aspects of aiding the police through surveillant labour. The show is meticulous in its updates to the audience concerning AF's most defining features. Both verbally and visually, he is repeatedly described, with reminders of where he was last seen to calibrate the surveillant labour. Such details like how many bags he carried were given in hopes that the audience would recognize him on sight, whether in real life or through the

screens of surveillance camera footage. Since it was determined through cam recordings that he bought a bag from İzmir, the bag-selling shopkeepers were constantly addressed and asked to offer their surveillant labour in the form of checking their security camera footages. Even the host herself admitted that this was a form of labour.

MA: I mean, everyone is working on this so candidly. (...) This is real labour, and people are working for it. They check their security cameras; they ask their family and friends about this. We especially need the help of our shopkeeper friends. Let us not dally and give ihbars to the police about this.³⁶

MATS is also aware of the gender composition of its audience. With predominantly women as viewers, the show is not shy of giving voice to the fact to mobilize women into action. How the show regards its female audience is interesting in that the implications often veer toward the women at home and not working. Therefore, their desired surveillant labour consists of looking out the window and notifying their shopkeeper husbands about the escapee. Two notable examples are; “Ladies, if your husband sells suitcases, call and ask them. I mean, I don’t know what to say, everybody call them.”³⁷ And “I am sure many of our woman viewers are looking out the window while listening to us, looking to see this guy.”³⁸

In this surveillance imaginaries, the gendered division of labour regards men differently. Whereas women are given a more passive role, men are seen as possible

³⁶ MA: (...) Yani herkes aslında bunu o kadar içten çalışıyor ki. (...) Gerçekten bu bir iş ve çalışıyor insanlar bunun için. Güvenlik kameralarına bakıyorlar, eşlerine dostlarına soruyorlar. Özellikle esnaf arkadaşlarımızın çok yardımına ihtiyacımız var. Üşenmeyelim, polise bu konuda ihbarda bulunalım. (Episode 1647)

³⁷ MA: Bir valizciden bahsediyoruz. Hanımlar, eğer eşiniz valizciyse arayın, sorun. Ya ne söyleyeyim hani, herkes arasın. (Episode 1647)

³⁸ MA: Eminim birçok hanım izleyicimiz camdan bir taraftan bakarken kulağı bizdedir, bu çocuğu görebilir miyim diye. (Episode 1647)

instigators of AF's capture. Presenting AF as an easy target works doubly as a confidence vote for other men.

MA: Don't get this wrong, but he is like a mouse in a trap. I mean, if two men see him in the street, they would hold him by the hand and turn him over to the police, they wouldn't let him go.³⁹

MA: He looks like a tiny thing. (...) And there are so many men there, they could have handled this between themselves.⁴⁰

A street interview conducted by the show in İzmir streets captured a man who relayed his efforts to find AF, which was met with appreciation and recognition from the host. The VTR was cut by the host so she could praise him.

Reporter in VTR: Have you seen this person in the photo around here?

Young man in VTR: This is the guy I'm after, but I haven't seen him. I hear there was an ihbar that he was seen getting on a Çeşme bus, the police came around. He was seen at ten-thirty.

MA (live): See my young man here, he says he is after him but hasn't seen him. This is our citizens! I mean, one should know our heart before criticizing our citizens. He says he is after him, my dear.⁴¹

The responsabilization for the men in these instances veers into territories where civilians may try to apprehend a known murderer on the run. Considering the lack of official training civilians have for such an occasion, and regardless of the fact that

³⁹ MA: Teşbihte hata olmaz, tam kapana kısılmış bir fare gibi aslında. Yani bunu sokakta gören, İzmir'de iki tane erkek görse tutar elinden polise teslim eder yani, bırakmazlar yani. (Episode 1647)

⁴⁰ MA: Ufacık tefecik de bir şey gibi duruyor. (...) Çok da erkeğin olduğu bir yer ya, yani bunu halledebilirlerdi aralarında. (Episode 1648)

⁴¹ Muhabir (VTR): Acaba bu fotoğraftaki kişiyi hiç buralarda gördünüz mü?

Genç adam (VTR): Yok işte ben de onun peşindeyim de hiç görmedim. Burdan Çeşme arabasına bindiler diye bir ihbar almışlar galiba, polisler geldi. Saat on buçukta görülmüş.

MA (canlı yayında): Delikanlıma bakar mısınız, diyor ki ben de peşindeyim ama görmedim. İşte bizim vatandaşımız böyle! Yani bizim vatandaşımıza da insanların laf söylemeden önce önce bizim bir yüreğimizi anlaması lazım yani. Ben de peşindeyim ama diyor, canım benim ya. (Episode 1648)

they are men, it is a heavily debatable practice to even insinuate that such actions might be commendable. This could be the reason for the later comment the host also makes: “I mean, here, we do not have the responsibility to go and catch someone who killed four people. We are obliged to give information.”⁴² However, it should be at least recognized that such a disclaimer does not negate the effects of the previous encouragements.

As previously mentioned, the act of responsabilization can bring up questions about the efficacy of law enforcement forces; this is an aspect the show endeavours to eliminate through constant reminders of how much and how hard the police is working. It is almost formulaic how this is executed; a long-winded appreciation of the hard work being carried off by the task forces is followed by some rendition of “But our citizens have a great duty,”⁴³ and “I am pretty sure that he will be found thanks to an ihbar from our viewers. That ihbar will come, I believe that.”⁴⁴ And last but not least: “But it will be the citizen who will find him, I mean the citizen should find him, the citizen should give ihbars.”⁴⁵

MATS’ role in responsabilization is vastly important in that it uses the specific culture of surveillance it creates and thrives in, to produce labour-power for the security forces. Honing the audience’s surveillance imaginaries (i.e. teaching them the kinds of surveillance practices that are possible, how they can be perceived and used, and why they are valuable) is done in accordance with a law and order

⁴² “Yani gidip de, böyle bir konuda, dört kişiyi öldüren birini yakalamak gibi bir sorumluluğumuz yok. Biz, bilgi vermek durumundayız.” (Episode 1650)

⁴³ MA: Ama vatandaşımıza çok büyük görev düşüyor. (Episode 1647)

⁴⁴ MA: Ben bir izleyicimizin ihbarıyla bulacağımıza çok eminim yani. O ihbar gelecek yani, buna inanıyorum. (Episode 1653)

⁴⁵ MA: (...) Ama vatandaş bulacak bunu, yani vatandaş bulmalı, vatandaş ihbar etmeli. Hep söylüyorum, kimlik bilgileriniz gizli kalıyor. Rica ediyorum, güvenlik kamerası görüntülerinizi takip edin efendim. Şimdi görüntüleri izlediğimizde zaten nerelerde görüldüğünü anlayacaktır İzmirli, özellikle esnafımız. Esnaf da demeyeyim, apartman yöneticilerimiz, kendi özel kişisel güvenlik kamerası olan izleyicilerimiz. (Episode 1647)

ideology. The show is merely mobilizing its audience into doing what is right and offering the show and the law enforcement authorities their surveillant labour. The audience members are “helping” rather than “accomplishing the task themselves” so as not to undermine any authorities. Adding to this the constant praise for the law enforcement forces, the unknown amount of backstage interaction with the authorities, and the show’s longevity since 2008, it can be said that MATS practically acts as a branch of the national security forces in meting out crime related surveillant responsibility to its audience- the citizens.

6.2.3. Ideology of Law and Order

MATS, as do most CBRTV shows, positions itself very strictly on the side of the law. In the case of AF, and in their other cases as well, the point is driven in through repeated reminders to obey the laws to protect oneself from experiencing what the CRP in their cases did, justifications of rules that the show admits might appear arbitrary or unnecessary but are in fact there to protect the citizens, and admonishments regarding the disobedient or deviant actions and/or people. The show admits to helping the law enforcement by informing the audience about the cases, motivating them into giving ihbars and being vigilant, and relaying all ihbars to the police; in short, by mobilizing the audience into surveillant labour.

The viewers are of utmost importance for the maintenance of this ideology of law and order the genre fervently favours. By viewing the show, they are made privy to information about criminal cases they otherwise would be unable to access. Their surveillance imaginaries are honed to bring the lawful, just result that the show sets as a worthy goal. They can participate in and contribute to a legitimate endeavour by keeping up with the show and practising surveillance in their everyday lives. This may be the show’s way of trying to capture “(...) empowerment and community in a society where the viewer all too often has little of either” (Cavender, 1998, p. 91).

However, since the law enforcement authorities do not come on the show and address the audience themselves, it is up to the show to make sure that the endeavours are just and legitimate, and this is most often conducted through repeated votes of confidence to the police, and reminders of how hardworking, competent, and trustworthy they are already. The effort not to undermine the efforts of the law enforcement authorities become clearer each time they are mentioned. “Needless to say,” the host says, “we are expecting ihbars. The police are expecting ihbars. And they are working very hard. I believe that we will actually come to a solution very fast.”⁴⁶ The words may change, but the message remains constant throughout: The show is firmly in the security forces’ corner.

The trust citizens have in the law enforcement institution is utilized often in order to ensure the flux of ihbars. Thus, the audience is regularly updated on the procedures followed by the police. Many steps taken by the police are relayed in a bid to make clear that they are effective and essential: They are not sitting idly by but doing some very hard work; they do not get tired, and they value every ihbar very much, following each new lead individually. The audience is notified of the new ihbar team formed by the police, which receives a lot of ihbars, and the host expresses her pride both in the surveillance labourers who make ihbars and the police who tirelessly pursue each ihbar individually.

MA: The police say that they do not get tired, that you should give them ihbars. If that is what they say, take pictures of people you liken to Atalay if you can. If there is a photo, we can mobilize the police faster. Even if you take it from afar, it would be wonderful to have a picture, an image of him.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ MA: Zaten aslında söylememize gerek yok, biz ihbar bekliyoruz. Emniyet ihbar bekliyor. Çok da yoğun çalışılıyor. Ben çok hızlı bir şekilde aslında çözüme ulaşılacağına inanıyorum (Episode 1646)

⁴⁷ MA: Emniyet diyor ki benim, ben yorulmuyorum, siz yeter ki bize ihbar verin. Onlar böyle söyledikten sonra benzettiğimiz kişileri, eğer çekebiliyorsak. Tabii ki, bir fotoğraf olursa, o zaman onları daha hızlı harekete geçiririz. Uzaktan da olsa, bir fotoğrafı bir görüntüsü olsa harika bir şey olacak. (Episode 1651)

The show receives many –if not most- of the ihbars, for being the more visible correspondent than the police during the investigation. It is thus necessary for the show to make clear that everything they receive, they pass on to the police. The discovery of AF’s rented depot was one such occasion where, upon receiving the ihbar, the show let the police know. It was a demonstration of the show’s value of collecting useful data, furthered by many reminders such as those from show expert Rahmi Özkan that “(...) the information we attain are shared [with the police] as soon as possible. (...) Our hotline awaits our viewers 24 hours.”⁴⁸

Although the host herself said similar things before, she still seized the opportunity to establish the police’s capabilities during a conversation with a very dedicated viewer, who indicated that AF could be grabbed by the civilians without any danger. “The police do not want the citizens to grab onto him anyway,” she said, “What the police wants from us is not to seize him. The police tell us to call them upon seeing him so that they can run to the scene.”⁴⁹

MATS appears confident in their knowledge of what the police want, which indicates some level of communication of intent. It detaches the show from a reality TV programme and establishes it firmly as a recognized branch of the investigation. The cooperation between the show and the police, while revealing many things such as some actions of the police, what the police want or demand, is at the same time concealing in nature as well: Some of what they communicated was held back from the audience but disclosed once the arrest happened, and the investigation would not be negatively affected. That the police saw fit to share with the show things they wanted to keep from becoming public knowledge indicates a deeper level of

⁴⁸ Rahmi Özkan: Bir an önce de elde edeceğimiz bilgiler paylaşılır. (...) Yirmi dört saat telefonlarımız izleyicilerimizi bekliyor. (Episode 1648)

⁴⁹ MA: Bakın aslında bizim böyle bir şey yapmaya ihtiyacı yok polis. Yani polis, vatandaş tutsun da alının ortasına yapıştırın istemiyor zaten. (...) Emniyetin bizden istediği hani turalım da bir tane alının ortasına yapıştırılmı değil. Emniyet sadece diyor ki gördüğünüz an beni arayın ki ben oraya koşabileyim. (Episode 1651)

cooperation than what little was already alluded to, and it works to increase audience faith in MATS in turn.

The show received information about AF having rented a house in İstanbul that the host and the Demirarslan family lawyer refrained from disclosing during the show upon police's specific request so that in case AF watched the show, he would be none-the-wiser and get caught if he went there. The police had also found that AF had not gone abroad as feared because he turned on his smartphone for a few hours, but this was not shared with the audience until after AF was caught.

The covert cooperation and communication of the show with the police, once revealed, serves to increase the audience's trust in both the show and the police. The show, because it is helping the police catch dangerous criminals. The police, because the show reveals the police efforts to establish such security. It is a win-win situation in which the audience can only make themselves useful by putting forth their surveillance labour. Be as it may, it should be kept in mind that without the audience's input, the investigation (both the show's and the police's) would have been much slower and might not have yielded the results that it did. The agency of the audience members, their attribution and contribution to this specific maintenance of surveillance culture both, should not be downplayed.

6.3. Surveillance Labour in Action

Lyon describes surveillance practices as long-lasting and reoccurring, and not necessarily conducted intentionally or wittingly (2018). He classifies such practices into responsive practices where individuals respond to being under surveillance, and initiatory practices, where individuals become involved with surveillance, negotiating and utilizing for their own benefits the dynamics of surveillance. His take on responsive practices is mainly focused on resisting surveillance. While the matter of individual strategies on battling surveillance of CBRTV shows would be an interesting topic of study, MATS and the case of AF allow for only the obedient

nature of the audience in terms of surveillance practices to become visible, seeing as broadcasting resistance to their own conduct would be counterproductive for the show. This is why only the initiatory surveillance practices approved and encouraged by the show are observable, and that offers valuable information on how the show operates and what the pillars of their specific culture of surveillance are, specifically.

“This is the first time in these nine years that I’ve come across someone that I showed this much but who managed to run for eleven days.”⁵⁰ Here, the host implied how, in the past, merely showing a picture or a video of the culprit was plenty to get the desired result. The length of the search was certainly not anticipated, for one specific fact: The audience was trained to perform surveillance practices in line with the surveillance imaginaries that were shaped by the show. Details to look out for (such as AF’s appearance, the possibility that he might use disguise, elaborations of how he might disguise himself, the amount of bags he carried) were reiterated to the audience, honing their perception in on what could possibly prove useful for his arrest.

This statement by the host also makes clear the importance of ihbars in the show’s continuing rating success and high closure rates. The show asks for ihbars and millions of television screens all over the country (and to some degree, the world) broadcast this call to the intended recipients: The audience; the reserve army of surveillant labour. Thus, the temporal and spatial restraints that hinder the police become obsolete. As Lyon says: “Time and space no longer restrict visibility in ways they once did” (2018, p. 44). The spectacle is not constrained to one time and place where the audience has to be there physically; instead, it is in the home of everyone who is willing to watch it. Through the show’s mobilization of the reserve army of surveillant labour, ihbars pour to the show and the police. No longer does the police

⁵⁰ “İlk defa dokuz yıldır birini bu kadar gösterip de onbir gün kaçan ilk defa birine rastladım.” (Episode 1649)

have to physically go from door to door to ask if anyone knows anything. Through TV, the individuals with the information necessary for the investigation are tasked with stepping forward and sharing what they know. This economy in time and space is the exact function the show provides to the police, and one of the causes of the show's longevity.

The ihbars received by the show came from both the country and abroad. Be it a Greek traveller who saw AF in her bus, or someone from Germany who came across someone with a strong resemblance to AF; all ihbars are –as mentioned previously– highly encouraged. In the examination of the ihbars, what must be kept in mind is the surveillance imaginaries and surveillance practices, and the way they function in the surveillant labour offered to the show. In the examples below, we shall see what the audience registers as surveillance, and how they carry them out in a way that benefits themselves, the show and, consequently, the police.

The show's audience has particularly honed surveillance imaginaries. Encouraged on a regular basis to be on the look-out for extraordinary circumstances and individuals in everyday settings, the viewers know to take notice of unexpected behaviour in public, such as a young man getting off the bus on a decidedly deserted location: The very first ihbar on AF came from a Mrs Bianca, who was on her way to Greece when he noticed details about AF such as where he got on, where he got off, what he looked like, what time it was, where he bought his ticket, which bus company he used, and whether he had baggage with him. A Mr Eyüp called, who claimed that AF approached and talked to him in a Kadıköy café on Saturday afternoon: the so-called AF had some stubble, asked how he could go to Europe after eavesdropping on Eyüp's conversation with his friend, told he was on his way to Azerbaijan, panicked when police came into the café, said he had no parents but some money, asked for his phone number. Eyüp, when he saw AF on MATS broadcast, called his friend to confirm that the guy who interrupted their conversation really was AF. An anonymous woman called with the exact location

and time she saw him, details on what exactly he was wearing, which dolmush he asked around to find, where that dolmush leads, and his bags.

These and indeed, many other ihbars were prompted by seeing AF's pictures and footage on MATS broadcasts. However, the attention to detail in search for information beneficial for the investigation is nothing new: It is the ideal chicken and egg situation. This attentiveness existed to some degree in the culture of surveillance already, and MATS made use of it by shaping surveillance imaginaries to fit its agenda. This, in turn, strengthened and gave purpose to the extant surveillant practices in the society, which then resulted in more yielding results of surveillant labour for the show. The audience is particularly driven to recognizing faces, taking in as many details as possible and relaying these with a care for accuracy. One ihbar maker described her state of attentiveness as follows: "I always look around attentively, so I am sure. I remember his face very well because I saw him directly on-screen that morning; that was the person I saw."⁵¹ When the host asked her why she didn't call it in immediately and waited so long to let them know, she said she saw him before she saw his face in the newspapers. A similar conversation happened with a restaurant owner who served AF food in Buca, who explained to the host upon her prompt that he waited to call it in until he was sure AF was in İzmir.

This example, as well as the next, works both to articulate the precise way the surveillant labour is conducted in accordance with the surveillance imaginaries ingrained by the show and how they translate into surveillance practices, and to showcase the host's frustration with the ihbar makers for not knowing about the search for AF or not being faster to give ihbars. By the simple implication of disapproval for the subpar actions of the callers, the entire population is held to the responsibility of keeping up with current news if not particularly with MATS, and

⁵¹ Anonim Kadın #1: (...) Sürekli dikkatli baktığım ben, için net kararım. Yüzünü çok iyi hatırlıyorum çünkü direkt sabah ekranda gördüm ben bunu, gördüğüm kişiyle aynı. (Episode 1647)

acting accordingly. The failure to do so is vital, at least within the bubble MATS creates for itself, where their case and their investigation holds importance above all else.

Many examples showcase MATS' success in establishing another lesson of surveillance imaginaries: Do not expose locations for it may set the investigation back, and do not dally before giving ihbars, for that too, will lengthen the investigative processes. One ihbar maker said, "I cannot give an exact location so as not to make it harder for our police friends; I can only say that it is in İzmir."⁵² This happened with other callers as well; either they refrained from giving an exact location or were warned by the host not to do so specifically.

However, the most important ihbar was a not recounting of a face-to-face encounter, but of hard visual evidence. The show was adamant about asking for surveillance camera recordings or even photos, for those would make it easier for the police to trace. Their demand was met when an internet café owner checked his cameras and offered indisputable evidence of AF's location, with time stamps and personal observations. It was this ihbar that ensured AF's presence in İzmir and narrowed down the perimeters of the investigation. The café owner, informed by his personnel that MATS was looking for a serial killer, compared his own footage with the show's, found him, and gave an ihbar to the show.

An audience ready to be mobilized at a moment's notice with knowledge on how to protect the investigation and how to aid it with specific sorts of information sounds a lot like an unofficial but equally policed mass ready for duty. It is not that they are aware of surveillance imaginaries and practices demanded by the show, it is that they utilize these and offer their surveillant labour to the show and the police that make this policed. Thus this entire exchange becomes one of social policing

⁵² İsmail: Polis arkadaşların işini zorlaştırmamak için çok net bir yer veremem, sadece İzmir diyorum size. (Episode 1646)

situated within the culture of surveillance and law and order ideology produced and maintained by the show.

There are many examples of people who saw AF after the show's broadcast and relayed all that they took notice of to the show. One caller, Servet Hanim, saw someone she claimed to be AF in the street during the show's ad break, looking to rent a flat in the apartment across hers. She took notice of his phone with white linings, his kindness, his clothes. She talked and walked with him until they reached a market, where she alerted everyone there to his status as a serial killer, after which he fled. She had her daughter call the police afterwards, and called the show as well. Another caller claimed the well-dressed man holding a lot of newspapers was AF, and that she noticed him because there were no people like that where she lived. As expected, she gave information about the purse he had, his lack of bags, his clothes, and the direction he fled towards when her sister yelled it was AF. She also notified the show of the possible hiding spots he could have in the area. While loudly claiming in the middle of the street that the man was AF might not be the kind of thing a fully-educated law enforcer would do, these people and many like them were trained to take in all the details they could to relay to the show and the police: How he looked, when and where they saw him, which direction he went, with as many details and additional information they could provide.

The kind of communication set off by MATS is not the simple, one-way flow of information from the show to its audience, or from the audience to the show. The prompt to be vigilant does come from the show, but the members of the audience also communicate with each other, ask around about the case at hand, and try to gain more information. It shows an organic conduct in the way the show manages to set the agenda and carve out a niche for itself inside the culture of surveillance that already exists in the society. An anonymous woman, for example, called to let the show know of her conversation with a taxi driver, who relayed to her what another passenger told him about seeing AF by the bus station two hours before she called

the show. The taxi driver also apparently heard about AF from his wife, who watches the show and warned him. The spread of news amongst the population brings about an exchange of information as well; if the information reaches a MATS viewer who would consider calling the show as was the case here, then MATS and the police, in turn, become notified.

One such example was from an anonymous woman from İzmir, calling to relay what she heard from her gardener when she wanted to warn her about AF. The gardener's daughter and her friends encountered a man who approached them and asked for water and information on how to go to the Sakız Island, and the available rental houses in the area. Details on his appearance (like the hair, clothes and bags) were relayed from daughter to mother, who told her employer, who called MATS. The caller took care to explain why this ihbar was late to come, and it was because the daughter saw AF on TV a couple of days after the encounter. And while her desire to excuse the lateness (seeing as how it was a sore spot for the show), her ihbar reveals how the media (and MATS as a part of it) decides the topic of conversation for the audiences and how the bits of information that surface in those conversations make their way back to MATS upon insistent demands for them.

There is also the element in the ihbars that most strongly resemble the practices in community-based policing where the police enlist the help of members of specific occupations to find and feed information to the police. In Greer's classification of the police informant, this most closely resembles the "outside multiple event informants," who are mostly local gossips, victims of a particular type of crime, petty criminals, or people in a position to appear inconspicuous while surveilling people due to their occupations. The act of informing the police may vary from civic responsibility to personal interests (Greer, 2006). In the traditional community-based policing practices, the police establish contact and enlist the surveillant labour of the taxi drivers or cafe waiters themselves, or the informants seek out the police to give reports of crime. In this instance, however, it is the show that calls for

information, and the members of certain occupations answering that call through ihbars.

Once the host shared with the audience the fact that AF was known to have taken the taxi instead of mass transportation, she made a call to the taxi drivers. “Let us call out to the taxi drivers in İzmir. Again, the bags might have caught their attention.”⁵³ And a call came in the same episode from a taxi driver. A Mr Ramazan offered his extensive familiarity with the city and its roads to give information on the routes and means of transportation used by the human trafficking organizations. Let us keep in mind that people not involved in these actions of people who lack a certain degree of grip on the city’s workings would not have known about this information with this level of detail easily, or at all, if this ihbar call and many more had not been broadcast on MATS.

The call taxi drivers must have been taken as a call for people involved in transportation, for a ship-owner who knew and spoke with AF personally was on the line soon after. This Mr Memiş told the show how AF had sometimes asked him about ways to go abroad by ship and about becoming a seaman. These bits of information were the precursor to his praise for MATS and the police.

All in all, these differing conducts of community-based policing, or in this case, “social policing,” was apparent in MATS’ representation. Whether the police personally sought out persons of certain occupations or not is unmentioned. However, the show does not shy from making a call of their own regardless and has the information come to it rather than actively and laboriously seek it out itself. The restraints of time and space are removed through the medium of TV, and access to information from specific groups is gained through the show’s popularity and legitimacy.

⁵³ MA: Özellikle İzmir’de görev yapan taksici arkadaşlara da burdan seslenelim. Valiz yine dikkatlerini çekmiş olabilir. (Episode 1647)

Overall, we can see certain elements of the place of MATS in producing, maintaining and reproducing cultures of surveillance as follows:

The show bases its conduct on the surveillant inclinations that already exists in society. Such tendencies are amplified through MATS and its kin, which utilizes the surveillant labour of their audience to solve crimes. The shows make visible the functions of the surveillant labour in producing results such as an arrest, or the reveal of the murderer. Through the proof that ihbars get results and that their surveillant labour counts for something, the audience is urged to expand what they consider to be surveillance and how it can be perceived (i.e., expand their surveillance imaginaries) and to realize their surveillant potential through action (i.e., perform surveillance practices.)

The surveillant imaginaries, which mean the understanding of how surveillance works and knowing what each step in the process mean with regards to real-life experiences, are trained by the show. MATS and other CBRTV shows are educative programs: The audience is trained about the procedures of an investigation. Through the insight information regarding the police's work the show shares, and through the reminders to look out for such and such or to conceal certain information, its audience becomes almost police-like in their perceptiveness and attentiveness. They are taught to be on the lookout for physical appearance (face, body language, detailed perusal of clothes,) the location of sighting (only to be broadcast at the show's discretion,) and additional information (what he said/asked, what he was told, what he was doing, how he was doing it, where he headed towards, how he acted and reacted, etc.) The audience is also made aware that knowledge of the area and current news can be utilized for precaution: They know to keep an eye out for abandoned buildings, student houses and lodgings as well as the areas where refugees are gathered and other transitional routes.

The desired surveillant labour is shaped through the pictures and CCTV footages MATS shows. The members of the audience are directly encouraged to keep an eye out for the object of the search. The demand is so reiterated and attributed such importance that the audience does more than settle for looking around or checking their surveillance camera recordings. They also talk about their experiences with each other. The prompt to start those conversations may come from a place of fear-of the danger, of the killer, of the unknown- but regardless, talking also equals an exchange of information. Whatever either party knows or has heard about the investigation, it is shared with the other party. And sometimes, the ihbars MATS receives contain information that was not gained directly by the callers themselves; they relay other people's experiences and hearsay. It is an addition to the surveillance imaginaries of the audience: Whatever one says can be relayed on TV by one's conversational partner to further an investigation carried out by a CBRTV show.

Responsibilization and community participation in policing in general and in practice require some training for the volunteers, which is mostly conducted in a formal or semi-formal manner with only the people who volunteered. That a TV show such as MATS can give this –albeit informal- training to a national audience, most of whom watch from the comfort of their homes, has to be recognized. MATS, by honing surveillance imaginaries and initiating surveillance practices in the form of surveillant labour, creates fertile grounds upon which responsabilization and social policing can grow.

It is a practice in community-based policing for the police to enlist the surveillant labour of members of certain occupations who know their way around a certain location and/or are the most likely to hear information in public. This also happens during the process of the show's investigation, albeit through a contractor. Rather than the police establishing such cooperation, it is the show that announces the need to receive more information that can benefit the police investigation. The members

of occupations who are most likely to have useful information (i.e. the taxi drivers and shopkeepers) are addressed and told, through such broadcasts, that their contribution would be of use. It is them who choose to contact the show to warn them and the police in this case.

6.3.1. Realization of Surveillance Labour

The majority of the ihbars the show received were people conveying instances they did or thought they saw AF. However, among these ihbars, one particularly stands out in its dedication to the cause, crystallizing the ideals of the show. A shopkeeper woman from İzmir called the show as the search narrowed down to İzmir. Her conversation with the host embodies the realization of the show's attempts at producing, maintaining, and reproducing cultures of surveillance.

Anon shopkeeper woman: Ma'am, we delved a lot into some details on this case. We created a group of eighty-ninety people, and we have friends present at all the central systems. It was said on Monday that he had been seen in Yeşilyurt, and there's this Mount Karafatma beyond Yeşilyurt. This Mount Karafatma has a lot of forested lands. We have many friends who saw him here, on this road. Our police are very powerful here, they work really hard but we, by our own means, we went there beforehand and checked it. We could find no trace.⁵⁴

Here, the show's endeavours for responsabilization bear their fruit. This very dedicated shopkeeper has rallied dozens of people to not only be vigilant as they go around their everyday businesses, but also to go on a recon mission to find AF in a place where they thought he was hiding. Notice that she took care not to insinuate that the police are incapable of doing this, but emphasized that they took initiative.

⁵⁴ Anonim esnaf kadın: Hanımefendi, biz bazı detaylara çok fazla girdik bu konuda. Seksen doksan kişilik bir grup yaptık ve bütün merkezi sistemlerde arkadaşlarımız şu anda mevcut. Yeşilyurt'ta görüldüğüne dair pazartesi günü, Yeşilyurt'un üstünde bir Karafatma Dağı var. Bu Karafatma Dağı'nın ormanlık alanları çok mevcut. Burada, bu yolun üstünde gören çok fazla arkadaşımız var. Biz kendi çabalarımızla, ki emniyetimiz burada çok güçlü, gerçekten çok güçlü çalışıyorlar ama biz önceden kendimiz gittik tetkik ettik. Bir ize rastlayamadık. (Episode 1651)

She continued, explaining their thought processes as to what transpired with AF and their predictions as to how he might behave, in order to foresee his moves and catch him. Based on the ihbars the show received before, she and her group of mobilized surveillance labourers rationalized that since AF spent hours in an internet café, and people spotted him with a cell phone, he would know he was searched for and would need to buy an internet pack. So they distributed AF's pictures, photoshopped into possible disguises, everywhere including phone shops. This group of surveillant labourers also figured he might be hiding in the crowds and using the metro, where nobody could call the police on him because their phones would have no signal. So they "(...) distributed these photos to the security systems in the metro as well."⁵⁵ The ihbars also said he dressed sharply, so figuring that he could not do so with clothes he carried in his many bags, they went and interviewed the Kemeraltı shopkeepers themselves, and found that he did, in fact, buy clothes from them. The shopkeepers told this group that they were afraid of him, so they did not come clean to MATS about seeing him.

Not only did they carry out initiatory surveillance practices in the form of recon missions, but they also revealed the surveillance imaginaries they have accumulated from watching the show. The bits and pieces of information spread throughout the case are brought together: If he has a phone, he's watching you, so he will need to buy an internet package and therefore he can be detected in phone shops. He dressed nicely according to the ihbars the show received, so they went to interrogate the clothes sellers and find out that they did, in fact, sell AF clothes.

There was also an underlying censure concerning other shopkeepers' fear. "Eighty per cent of the ihbars you receive, they know you, they watch you, but opt to let sleeping dog lie."⁵⁶ This came up a few more times during this phone call, with the

⁵⁵ Anonim esnaf kadın: (...) Ve biz, metrodaki güvenlik sistemlerine de bu fotoğrafları dağıttık. (Episode 1651)

⁵⁶ Anonim esnaf kadın: Size gelen ihbarların yüzde 80'i sizi biliyor, sizi seyrediyor, ama bize dokunmayan yılan bin yaşasın diyor. (Episode 1651)

host reminding everyone that it's scarier if he's not caught, and the anon voicing her exasperation at the others' silence. The investment in the show and its investigation is palpable: They have organized into a group even though the show only ever explicitly asks for individual surveillant labour; they have thought extensively on the information the show gave and taken care to spread AF's images to places he was likely to go; they have conducted their own interviews with people and confirmed that AF had been to Kemeraltı; and they did not like that some people are just not as brave as they are.

The anon finished her call with "I, we, would like to do the 'Game-over.'" She was referring to accounts of AF's statements to people in Tuzla that he viewed life as a game, and himself as the rule-maker for the game. Her grasp on the show's content was superb, as was her dedication to the show's oft-repeated cause of catching AF. This is what could reasonably be considered as an ideal member of the audience, and the epitome of the responsabilization and social policing the show nurtures with its conduct. The host surely thought so and said:

MA: I thank you so much, you have in fact form a civil initiative, and the lady says 70-80 people joined them on this. (Applause in studio.) I thank you all. I mean, we do of course need this, and see, the biggest reason that we need this is, as I said, what I fear the most, is for him to hurt someone. I mean that is why we all must do our part to prevent that, because he is going around like a ticking time bomb. I think, this lady has followed the broadcasts very correctly.⁵⁷

This conversation reveals many matters of importance. The audience is given many information on the culprit and is kept up-to-date about the ihbars coming to the show. This enables the audience to bring together information in a way that directs

⁵⁷ MA: Size çok teşekkür ediyorum, aslında tam böyle bir sivil inisiyatif kurmuşsunuz ve bununla ilgili 70-80 kişi de bize katıldı diyor hanımefendi. (Stüdyoda alkış.) Teşekkür ediyorum size. Yani buna tabi ihtiyacımız var, bakın buna ihtiyacımızın olmasının en büyük sebebi, dediğim gibi, en çok korktuğum şey, bir başkasına zarar vermesi. Yani o yüzden, bunu engellemek için hepimiz üzerimize düşen vazifeyi yapmalıyız, çünkü bu da pimi çekilmiş bomba gibi dolaşiyor. Hanımefendi çok doğru takip etmiş bence yayımları. (Episode 1651)

the audience's surveillant actions. In this example, the ihbars about AF in clean clothing prompted this woman and her group to interrogate the cloth sellers, and locate where he had been. Similarly, ihbars about seeing a smartphone in his hand led to the assumption that he could very well be monitoring the search for him. In other words, the surveillance imaginaries introduced and promoted by MATS were understood and put to action so well that they became surveillance practices. The audience carried out initiatory surveillance practices. These exemplify the term engagement as used by Lyon, where people are both subjects and objects of surveillance.

The amount of conviction in the need to organize, mobilize, and bring about the "game over" themselves through their own surveillant labour showcases how the show, and at least some part of its audience, play reciprocal parts in producing, maintaining and reproducing cultures of surveillance. The **fun** is had during the show's exposure of investigative information that would otherwise be unreachable. The **fear** is felt through the inconsistencies between how AF presents himself and how he behaves; an educated, smart and planned serial killer from a decent family. And the familiarity is in the constant satisfaction of the voyeuristic tendencies and in utilizing the already extant imaginaries and practices of surveillance, only in the direction pointed at by MATS and, indirectly, the police.

The audience finds encouragement to take matters into their own hands. Besides interrogating the shopkeepers, they closed in on a possible location where he might be hiding, and went there. This is a peak example of the realization of responsabilization: An organized, media-savvy group of people conducting what can be likened to a neighbourhood watch in suspicious locations and keeping communication constant in order to fight crime in their environs. This is "social policing" as operationalized in this thesis. Through MATS' production, maintenance, and reproduction of surveillance culture, and through the police's implicit motivation at responsabilization, the society is policed; goaded into

surveillant actions that should traditionally fall to the police. In the end, the police catch the bad guy, media is complimented for its help to mobilize its audience, and the audience does surveillant labour for many a motivation like identity building, contributing to the community, receiving praise, or belonging to “a team of millions” to list some.

6.4. Internalization of Surveillance Labour

Choi and Lee (2016) have listed seven factors that might contribute to the participation of civilians in community-based policing. Being previously victimized, being generally sensitized to crime, trusting the police, having personal interests in offering support to police, being devoted to one’s community, taking part in other crime-prevention endeavours as well as the level of crime in the region are possible factors that might motivate individuals into community-based policing.

Participation in MATS through surveillant labour can be likened to participation in community-based policing in that it is voluntary and aimed at the solution of a criminal case. Therefore, the motivations for community-based policing can apply to answering MATS’ demands for surveillant labour, which is most visible in the form of ihbars. A susceptibility towards matters of crime, having faith in the work of law enforcement authorities, and a dedication to keeping a safe community can very well encourage people to call in with the fruits of their surveillant labour. However, there are some additional factors employed by the show that may also contribute to the audience’s voluntary surveillant labour, around which a specific discourse that hints at a larger *raison d’etre* is spun intricately.

6.4.1. Indirect Peer Pressure

The show’s first way to ensure the flow of ihbars is to acknowledge the number of ihbars it already is receiving. This reminder is made very frequently. In fact, whenever a reference is made to ihbars, the host can generally be trusted to emphasize how many ihbars they are constantly receiving from how great a number

of people, and how thankful they are for them. In the instances where an ihbar is especially found to be useful, the caller is applauded by the in-studio audience upon the host's prompting.

MA: We are receiving so many ihbars. I thank İsmail Bey in particular, let us applaud him please. He gave a very important detail; said he was in İzmir. From that minute forwards, many of our viewers from İzmir called to give us ihbars. I wish for the continuation of your ihbars.⁵⁸

The show is also quite verbal in its appreciation of the ihbars that reach not them, but the police. There are many statements made in the show that are a rephrased version of "The hotline established by the police is likewise showered with ihbars, we thank you so much."⁵⁹ This implies that the show takes at least some responsibility it, because it is thanking its audience for calling the police. It strengthens the impression of cooperation between the show and the law enforcement authorities, giving justification to the broadcasts at the same time it solidifies the usefulness of the show's conduct for all parties involved.

It was also a concern of the show that the ihbar-makers might be disheartened when this massive amount of ihbars turned out to be null, and AF remained at loose. A decrease in ihbars might possibly mean less interest in the show and its chosen cases as well as a genuine lack of sightings. Within the bubble of the show's cultural conduct, such a thing is not desirable. The ihbar-makers were given God's blessings, and further reminders for vigilance were made.

MA: We are receiving many ihbars. Yesterday we received so many photographs, God bless you all. But no, they were not of Atalay. Still, it is vital to report whatever you have. One may not work, but the other might.

⁵⁸ MA: O kadar çok ihbar alıyoruz ki. Özellikle İsmail beye teşekkür ediyorum, onu bir alkışlayalım lütfen. Çok önemli bir detay verdi, İzmir'de dedi. O dakikadan itibaren de İzmir'den çok sayıda izleyicimiz bizi arayarak ihbarda bulundu. İhbarlarınızın devamını diliyorum. (Episode 1647)

⁵⁹ MA: Emniyetin kurduğu ihbar hattına da ihbar yağıyormuş, çok teşekkür ediyoruz. (Episode 1647)

This is how things go. One mustn't think whether it is of him or not. Please, let us look around with some attentiveness.⁶⁰

The peer pressure is not contained to the country either. A reminder that even international viewers give ihbars was made. Implied here is the show's international popularity and capability of mobilizing viewers across borders into surveillant labour. On one such occasion, after AF was caught, the international viewers were applauded as well.

The eventuality of AF's arrest was presented as a result of 'teamwork.' This had the effect of giving the MATS audience a collective identity, and a community to belong to, however distant and intangible that community may be. Lupton's conceptualization of "data communities" come to mind, where individuals who share the same interest in quantifying their bodily functions use and share their data on online platforms and feel "part of a community of people engaged in similar pursuits" as they compare with each other, offer each other assistance and inspiration to do better (2017, p. 347). While the medium is different, MATS can be said to offer a similar sense of belonging and identity through the act of sharing information. Viewers are motivated by the same goal, which is to catch the culprit. They share not their personal data but the results of their personal surveillant labour. They see other people giving ihbars and being thanked for it, which creates a sense of competition and aspiration to be the one to give the important ihbar. They talk to people they know about the case, and solidify each other's convictions on the case. This narrative, as well as that of a disassembled team of surveillant labourers, is encouraged by the show's host repeatedly, with reminders of outside validation in the form of awards and the credit belonging in essence to the audience.

⁶⁰ MA: Çok sayıda ihbar geliyor. Dün o kadar fotoğraf geldi ki, Allah hepinizden razı olsun. Ama hayır, Atalay'a ait değildi. Olsun, yine de elinizde ne varsa bunu bildirmek önemli. O tutmaz, öteki tutar. Bu işler böyledir. Acaba hani, gönderirim bu mu değil mi diye düşünmemek lazım. Lütfen etrafımıza biraz dikkatli bakalım. (Episode 1648)

MA: Thank you, we would do all these for nought if it weren't for your support and interest. This is a teamwork. That is why I say, I mean I am given awards but they belong to us all. For example, the institutions and organizations come and give awards, but I always say that this is teamwork. I say it again. They ask, 'How many people does your team have?' and I say, 'We have a team of millions.' Here, Kenan Bey and Mehmet Bey are one of the best examples of that today. Had Mehmet Bey not watched the programme that day, perhaps Kenan Bey would not have noticed him, that's what it is. That is why, I mean, all of us participated in the teamwork. You two are here today as the men of the day. I sincerely congratulate you once again. (Applause in studio)⁶¹

The show's reiteration of the high flow of ihbars, praise of surveillant labourers, and declaration of "a team of millions" create a space for the audience members to feel motivated to put in their surveillant labour in hopes of being recognized as valuable and accomplished, while at the same time they add to a discourse of a community, where belonging can be acquired through supporting the show with ihbars. As Cavender puts it so aptly, these shows "(...) foster a notion of community to which the audience can belong by watching the programs and by participating in the common effort to capture fugitives" (1998, p. 87).

6.4.2. Positive Association

The show's second step to ensure audience participation is through assigning specific characteristics to the individual surveillant labourers, and the audience as a whole. Their efforts, while appreciated in and of themselves, also reflect on their quality as people. They are referred to, in different instances, as "sensitive", "watchful", "conscientious", "helpful"⁶² persons. Such recognition, coupled with

⁶¹ MA: Teşekkür ediyorum, zaten sizlerin desteği ve ilgisi olmasa biz bunları boşu boşuna yapmış oluruz. Bu bir ekip çalışması. O yüzden diyorum, her aldığım ben hani, ödül bana veriliyor ama hepimizin ödülü. Mesela geliyorlar işte, kurum ve kuruluşlar ödül veriyorlar ama her zaman söylüyorum, bu bir ekip çalışması. Yine söylüyorum, 'Kaç kişilik ekibiniz var?' diyorlar, diyorum ki 'Milyonlarca kişilik bir ekibimiz var.' İşte aslında Kenan Bey ve bugün Mehmet Bey de bunun en güzel örneklerinden biri. Mehmet Bey o gün programı izlemese belki de Kenan abinin dikkatini çekmeyecekti o işte. O yüzden hani hepimiz bir ekip çalışması yaptık. Siz de böyle günün adamı olarak buradasınız. Gerçekten sizleri bir kez daha kutluyorum. (Stüdyoda alkış) (Episode 1654)

⁶² "duyarlı", "dikkatli", "vicdanlı", "yardımsever"

the assurance that their ihbars contribute to the community in a positive manner, is another obvious endeavour towards identity formation. The viewers are a part of a larger group, a community, but that is not the full extent of it. They are good people, too; they feel bad for the CRP and victims of the cases taken on by the show, and they are good for something if they offer their surveillant labour to help them. They are useful and important; they matter. And the only thing one has to do to be included is to simply look around and make an ihbar if they hit the jackpot.

MA: We take on many topics here, don't we? And yet, we have nothing to complain about our viewers. They embrace each murder with the same sadness, the same conscientiousness, and support us. (...) I used to ask myself how they could see the resemblances, how they could recognize them. Not one of them was mistaken. They really do recognize. We have such watchful people.⁶³

The skills of seeing resemblances between the pictures and footages MATS shows and the people the audience members see in their everyday lives is praised as such. Thus, the surveillant gaze is praised and approved, perpetuating its use in everyday lives as aid to the show's agenda. The show then justifies its efforts through the audience's surveillant labour, and uses it to seek recognition.

MA: (Applause in studio) Let this applause be for the police and the judiciary members, as well as our public who do not forsake their help, who studiously concentrate upon the case, who do not hesitate to give ihbars. He had been wanted for three years, and was found in as short a period as 15 days. Our sensitive citizens and of course, the broadcasts played a really big role in this. This showed us that if our people sees and knows something, and concentrates upon it meticulously, they very easily help the police for the resolution of the case. We have known this for nine years, but I think the institutions and organizations perhaps now have a better grasp on it now that

⁶³ MA: Burada çok konu işliyoruz, öyle değil mi? Yine sağolsun, izleyicilerimizden yana bir şeyimiz yok. Onlar her cinayete aynı üzüntüyle, aynı vicdanla sarılıp destek oluyorlar. (...) Kendi kendime, daha böyle ilk yaparken, ya nasıl benzetirler ki, hani nasıl tanırlar ki diyordum. Hiç boş çıkan olmadı yani. Gerçekten tanınıyor. Çok dikkatli insanlarımız var. (Episode 1649)

it is publicized. It is always actually the public that gives support. People feel sad for other people, for families, here.⁶⁴

Here and in many other instances, the show implies that it does not receive recognition for its conduct from unnamed “institutions and organizations.” This brings out a knee-jerk reaction from the dedicated audience: What’s there not to recognize, to approve? These vague implications work to make the audience even more defensive of the show, more vocal about the good that it does, and to further solidify the group identity they share for simply liking the show.

A common method of positive association for the show is the consideration of its audience as equal to the entire public. It creates the illusion for each viewer that everyone is like them, that everyone would do what they do, that everyone would lend their surveillant labour to a CBRTV show. It is a normalizing touch that is used to perpetuate the surveillance culture the show desires to cultivate. At the same time, it is used to justify the show’s existence in that they have the support of the public. No institutions and organizations worth their salt would disregard the public’s support, after all, at least within the rationale of the show.

The positive feedback surveillant labour receives, as well as the attribution of desirable traits the show offers to the surveillant labourers, create a desire in the audience to, perhaps one day, get in the show’s good graces. It seems to be working so far, seeing as the show is still up and running.

⁶⁴ MA: (Stüdyoda alkış) Bu alkışlar emniyet ve yargı mensuplarına, ayrıca değerli yardımlarını esirgemeyen, konu üzerinde titizlikle duran, ihbar etmekten çekinmeyen halkımıza gitsin. Üç yıldır aranıyordu, 15 gün gibi kısa bir süre içinde bulundu. Burada gerçekten duyarlı vatandaşlarımızın ve elbette yapılan yayınların çok büyük etkisi var. Bu da gösterdi ki bizim halkımız eğer bir şeyi görürse ve bilirse, üzerinde titizlikle durursa bunun çözümü için çok kolay şekilde emniyete yardımcı oluyor. Biz bunu 9 yıldır biliyoruz ama tabi bu kadar kamuoyuna mal olunca belki diğer kurum ve kuruluşlar da belki daha iyi anlamışlardır diye düşünüyorum. Aslında zaten hep halk destek veriyor. Burada insanlara üzüyor, ailelere üzüyor. (Episode 1655)

6.4.3. Duty of the Citizen

Besides these positive attributions to lending the show one's surveillant labour, the show also views the service the audience gives as an important 'duty,' often associating it with being a citizen. This is not an unusual endeavour seeing as the CBRTV shows or "reality crime programming," as Donovan calls it, endeavour to reconstruct "citizenship and the public sphere through the categories of law and order" (1998, p. 132). The approach to the entirety of the audience as citizens is deliberate on the part of the show: It entrusts everyone with responsibilities and duties through the simple fact of being a citizen instead of a mere member of the audience. This is such an important aspect of MATS, for example, that the sentiments are often repeated, each time reminding the "citizen" of their duties. Some examples are as follows: "I believe that our sensitive citizens are already looking at their footage."⁶⁵ "The police has received more than three thousand ihbars; our viewers, our citizens are extremely sensitive. Everybody is making great efforts for his capture."⁶⁶ "We need to relay to the police the information of, for example, what happened at five o'clock yesterday. A huge duty falls on our citizens. (...) Let us make this easy for the police."⁶⁷ "Each trail is followed for him to be caught but from now on, the information of the citizens is that much more needed."⁶⁸ And, of course:

⁶⁵ MA: Ben inanıyorum ki duyarlı vatandaşlarımız şimdi açıp bakıyorlardır bile görüntülere. (Episode 1647)

⁶⁶ MA: Emniyete üç binden fazla ihbar yağmış, izleyicilerimiz, vatandaşlarımız son derece duyarlı. Herkes yakalanması için büyük çaba harcıyor. (Episode 1649)

⁶⁷ MA: Emniyete, dün beşte mesela nerede olduğu bilgisini iletmemiz lazım. Vatandaşlarımıza çok büyük bir görev düşüyor. (...) Emniyetin işini kolaylaştıralım. (ep 1647)

⁶⁸ MA: Gerçekten yakalanılması için her türlü iz sürülüyor ama artık bu saatten sonra vatandaşların bilgisine çok daha fazla ihtiyaç var. (Episode 1649)

MA: [Ours] are viewers who look around vigilantly and try with all their might to fulfil their civic duty. (...) See, that has been what the police said for 15 days: The people will catch him, the ihbar will surely come.”⁶⁹

These and many more can be found throughout the episodes. The association between doing surveillant labour and being an active, contributing citizen feeds into the world paradigm the show wishes to produce, reproduce and maintain: All citizens operating as surveillant labourers, getting their prompts from the show and mobilizing accordingly. They are trained to know what to look out for, what to do upon spotting the culprit, and most importantly, they know who to call. The vision is of a policed, law-and-order society. The show does not even need to put effort into convincing the audience into surveillant labour because by redefining the audience as “citizens,” they put the aspect of civic duty before all, treating the viewers as surveillant labourers by default.

After a summary of the police work that was being done at the moment, the host adds that it should be the citizens who found AF. The call was made with reminders to the prospective ihbar makers that their identities would not be disclosed because people were afraid of AF coming after them and it could partly be due to the show’s excessive villainization of AF.

MA: Right now, the search happens almost street by street. However, it will be the citizen who’ll find him, I mean the citizen should find, the citizen should give ihbar. I always tell you, your identity will remain hidden. I ask of you; please check your security camera footage.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ MA: Yani hani etrafına dikkatli bakan ve vatandaşlık görevini yerine getirmek için tüm gücüyle uğraşan seyirciler. (...) Bakın 15 gündür hep emniyetin söylediği buydu: Bunu halk yakalayacak, mutlaka ihbar gelecek. (Episode 1654)

⁷⁰ MA: Şu an sokak sokak neredeyse araştırılıyor. Ama vatandaş bulacak bunu, yani vatandaş bulmalı, vatandaş ihbar etmeli. Hep söylüyorum, kimlik bilgileriniz gizli kalıyor. Rica ediyorum, güvenlik kamerası görüntülerinizi takip edin efendim. (Episode 1647)

Upon a reporter's encounter with a young man who said he'd been after AF but hadn't seen him yet, the host is ecstatic. "That is our citizens for you!" She says. "People should understand our heart before talking about our citizens."⁷¹ That it is a civilian person without official training out in the streets somewhat fades into the background as the ideal citizen represents himself.

The act of contributing surveillance labour to the show's investigations is praised almost as much as the ihbar-makers themselves, with mentions of duty and a speech from the host that solidifies and justifies the urge to help by appealing to the audience's idolization of her.

MA: We wouldn't be able to do these things anyway if you didn't watch with such interest and if our citizens weren't so interested, loving and helpful. That is why I always say: the awards we receive are all of ours, the appreciation is all of ours. The criticisms are mine, but the praise is all yours. (...) I always say this as Müge; if there were another programme like this on the screen (...) I would have aspired to find someone and call it in. And I know there are many who aspires to this, who share the same excitement. Because then you add value to life, and feel how important you are.

Rahmi Özkan: But that is a very important duty.⁷²

Mathiesen's take on the power of the host in synoptic settings where many watch the few has a basis in this case. According to him, media personalities are at the forefront of the audience's sight; they determine matters of importance and relay related information through a filter and frame. They are figures to whom the audience trusts (2006). In this, they yield the power to shape public opinion and give

⁷¹ MA: İşte bizim vatandaşımız böyle! Yani bizim vatandaşımıza da insanların laf söylemeden önce önce bizim bir yüreğimizi anlaması lazım yani. (Episode 1648)

⁷² AF araştırması sürecinde evden kaçan iki kardeşi bulduktan sonra MA: (...) Zaten sizler bu denli ilgiyle izlemesiniz ve bizim vatandaşımız bu kadar ilgili, sevgili, yardımsever olmasa bizim bu işleri yapmamız mümkün değil. Her zaman o yüzden söylüyorum: Aldığımız ödüller hepimizin, yapılan takdirler hepimizin. Eleştiriler benim ama övgülerin hepsi sizin. (...) Ben Müge olarak söylüyorum bunu, eğer ekranda böyle başka bir program olsaydı (...) ben birini bulup arayıp söylemeyi çok arzu ederdim. Ve bunu arzu eden çok kişi olduğunu da biliyorum hani aynı heyecanı paylaşan. Çünkü o zaman hayata bir değer katmış oluyorsun, ne kadar önemli olduğunu da hissediyorsun. Rahmi Özkan: Ama çok önemli bir görev. (Episode 1650)

direction to the public's actions. In the case of MATS, MA is the face of the brand, and it is her that yields the power to guide the audience. She has the audience's confidence and trust to the degree that the audience has given their surveillance labour to the show since 2008⁷³, leading to many unsolved cases being solved, many culprits caught and missing persons found. The legitimacy gained from the closure rates build up and feed into the show's credibility as well as the host's credence and trustworthiness. Through statements such as the ones above, the host uses this platform to appeal to the audience's desire to feel important and valuable by confirming that she, too, would want to offer her surveillant labour if she could. Her statements and expressions matter in that they offer a goal for the audience to aspire to in an endeavour to become model citizens.

That a CBRTV show, and not a direct, official police investigation branch, rebrands the surveillant labour as a duty of the citizen can be taken as the show's justification of its existence and legitimization of its conduct at once. The show exists because this 'duty' is open to neither interpretation nor question; it is the duty of the citizen to watch it, be in the know, and offer surveillant labour to help the police. MATS merely acts as a bridge between the citizens and the security forces but resents the lack of recognition it receives for it. It also legitimizes the way they reproduce a culture of surveillance by reminding that it is the police to whom the show's and its audience's help eventually reaches, even though the exact nature and amount of the police cooperation are left unsaid.

So far, we have seen how the show constructs its audience, and its views about the surveillant labour they galvanize. How this reflects upon the audience should also be examined. However, it should be kept in mind that the declarations of the audience members and other surveillant labourers were made to MATS reporters, host, or show's experts. This might have goaded people into speaking in favour of

⁷³ MATS is still running in 2021.

the show and its conduct. However, the simple fact that these words were uttered still carries significance.

The “duty of the citizen” angle was utilized by the two dolmuş drivers who recognized AF in their vehicles and led to his arrest. One said “(...) We were happy that we fulfilled our civic duty.”⁷⁴ while the other also said, “We have fulfilled our civic duty, so I am happy.”⁷⁵ They were brought to the studio after the fact, and received the host’s congratulations in person.

It is not only these two men who consider what was done as a duty. People who were on the lookout for AF also expressed their desire to do their duty. One dolmuş driver said, “The police are also on it; they gave us his description. We will tell if we see him. We will give ihbars.”⁷⁶ A bag seller said, “When I first saw him, I mean, had he come by, I’d have recognized him and given an ihbar anyways.”⁷⁷ And old man similarly said, “I mean if I notice him, if I knew, I would do what needs to be done.”⁷⁸ There are many more examples that can be given of instances where the act of giving ihbars was placed within the context of duty. That the mobilized surveillance labourers acknowledge giving ihbars as a responsibility and, in some cases, as a duty, might be interpreted as a win on the part of MATS to instil such a notion in its audience.

⁷⁴ Mustafa Berber: (...) Ondan sonra sevindik iyi yani bir işte, vatani yani vatandaşlık görevimizi yaptık diye. (Episode 1654)

⁷⁵ Kenan Aka: Vatandaşlık görevimizi yaptık, mutluyum yani. (Episode 1654)

⁷⁶ Dolmuş sürücüsü: (...) Polis de takip ediyor, bize bildirdiler eşkalini. Biz görürsek söyleyeceğiz. İhbar vereceğiz. (Episode 1648)

⁷⁷ Çanta Satıcısı: (...) Zaten ben de ilk gördüğümde, gelmiş olsa ben de tanırdım ve ihbar ederdim yani. (Episode 1653)

⁷⁸ Yaşlı adam: (...) Zaten dikkatimi çekse, bilsem, gerekli işlemi yaparım yani. (Episode 1655)

6.5. Legitimizing Surveillance Culture

CBRTV shows bring a case up as a problem that needs to be solved. In his study of two American shows of the genre, Cavender says that in these shows, “(...) crime disrupts the social order, but resolution comes with the criminal’s condemnation, capture, or punishment,” i.e. a “ritualistic catharsis” of the tension (1998, pp. 83-84). In MATS as well, the crime and the criminal are presented as the problem instead of the societal and structural factors that contribute to the crime. When the viewers or “citizens” are encouraged to put in their surveillant efforts, it does not bring about an effective end to crime or other factors generating fear in the audience. But the fact of the culprit’s arrest, simply because it was set as the goal in the first place by the show, offers the audience a sense of rightness and accomplishment for having contributed to the desired just end.

And again, as Cavender iterates, updates about the criminals even (or especially) after they are caught, “(...) offer resolution and symbolically herald the restoration of the social order” (1998, p. 84). While MATS spent nine episodes for the search for AF, it continued for four more episodes after he was caught, cementing the narrative of a mended order, prolonging the audience’s relief, and offering even more voyeuristic satisfaction by continuing to expose AF’s past, present, and possible future.

MATS also interposes what Mathiesen calls a “world paradigm” into this process of “ritualistic catharsis” even more than it usually does. The show goes over the case, and in doing so, offers retrospection about how others’ law-abiding behaviour could have prevented AF’s crimes, cements the law and order ideology by continuously thanking the law enforcement authorities, and ensures surveillant labour in the future by visualizing the success in this case. This world paradigm, according to Mathiesen, is accepted by the media audiences because it is given while their need to escape reality is being fulfilled. “It is by satisfying the need for escape that people are made to acquiesce, accept and fit into the requirements of our society” (2006, p.

56). This section is focused on MATS' endeavours to relay a world paradigm that produces, reproduces, and maintains a law and order culture of surveillance.

6.5.1. Statements

MATS has weaved this case, just as it has done in others, with detail upon detail. Many of the information presented to the audience can be said to serve little to no purpose for the audience in catching the perpetrator. The gifts he had given to his crush in Tuzla, or the movies that came out of his rental depot can be examples of that. A counter-argument could be made that such information worked to build up a profile of the killer for the audience. However, such an argument would imply that the audience needed to profile a killer, whereas such a job is supposed to be left to the professionals. After all, knowing his obsession with pornography in high school can hardly help a member of the audience in their surveillant labour to detect AF's location and give ihbars accordingly.

This information overload serves two main purposes. The first is what was implied above, that the aim for responsabilization necessitated that the audience draw a profile for this killer. The second reason is directly related to the first in that the audience's involvement is ensured through as many details as the show is permitted to give. They got to know the details of AF and the CRP's lives as though elements of a mystery plot. AF's arrest did not put an end to the demand and supply of information, however. The show wanted to expose more to strengthen their particular world paradigm and culture of surveillance, and the audience wanted to see and learn more to escape their everyday lives, bask in the relief and perceived success against crime, and to further satisfy the voyeuristic need to see and to know.

What better way to give closure than to read aloud AF's testimonies? Verbatim, parts of his statement was read to the audience by the host, which included AF's confession of his three murders and the motivations of self-preservation behind them. İzmir Provincial Police Chief Celal Uzunkaya's speech to the press was

similarly broadcast, including many details on AF's actions on the run. "He is very smart, and appears to be a young man. I did not detect much remorse. He appeared quite joyful,"⁷⁹ he added, and thus confirmed as a man in a position of authority the media representation of AF as a smart, unrepentant killer.

While the host kept relaying AF's statements as they were taken by the police, the audience was being made privy to a more visual side to the post-arrest processes as well. The show broadcast the moment AF, clad in a bulletproof vest, was escorted by the police from Gayrettepe to be taken to his trial in the Kartal courthouse. The show's reporter, who followed each lead as they were found in İzmir, was there to ask him questions about his crimes, to which he stayed silent. The place was swarming with other reporters as well, with a lot of cameras, as the police guarded him on the way to the armoured vehicle. The vehicle was approached by the show's camera, with the hopes to get a view of AF inside. The spectacle of justice is served both as a means to satisfy the voyeuristic needs of the producers and the consumers of such footage and as a way to emphasize the power of the show and its audience to actualize their goals. Such clips show the spectacular construction of the arrest, putting the culprit on the focal point and objectifying the law enforcement procedures in the interest of exposure for entertainment.

The heavily detailed closure sequences continued non-stop for four episodes, while the search had taken nine episodes. The two dolmush drivers who played the last civilian roles in his capture gave an intricate account of how they recognized him from MATS and how they respectively called and signalled the police upon noticing they had him in their vehicles. Further VTR recordings contained interviews with the drivers responsible for AF's arrest, footage of possible locations in the wild where he might have stayed, the times he was caught on camera while on the run, the contents of his infamous baggage with great detail, to list only some. It should

⁷⁹ İzmir İl Emniyet Müdürü Celal Uzunkaya: (...) Çok zeki, görünüşü itibariyle bir delikanlı. Öyle pişmanlık görüntüsü pek görmedim. Gayet neşeli bir görüntüsü var. (...) (Episode 1654)

be kept in mind that none of these mattered anymore and had to be shown to the audience for the simple fact that the culprit had already been caught. These four retrospective episodes served the purpose to satisfy the audience's curiosity about what might have happened, and that curiosity had been carefully built by the show itself all along. This is exemplary of how the show reproduces its own culture of surveillance.

The show took care to inform its audience of the procedural steps AF was to follow in the judicial system in the following episodes. When AF changed his statements to claim insanity, saying he has been taking orders from newspapers to kill for some time, it brought up the question of whether AF could avoid punishment and find his way back into the free society once again. Upon the host's giving voice to the concern of the general public about AF's possible release, the show's experts explained the legal and medical steps to determine AF's mental status and criminal responsibility. They were of the opinion that had AF been exempt from criminal liability, he would not have given the first testimony where he confessed to making decisions to kill people himself. All this was wrapped up with a reminder that expert knowledge of psychiatric evaluators could not be misled by imitations of psychosis. This could be interpreted both as an assurance to the audience that AF could not avoid punishment, and a warning that trying for insanity defence is a futile effort under mental health professionals' surveillance.

Having added to the surveillance imaginaries of its audience and given them voyeuristic closure in an attempt to reproduce its own culture of surveillance and the continuation of the surveillance labour it receives, the show also made sure to establish its position as an intermediary instrument.

6.5.2. Recognition

The arrest of AF brought along a storm of thanks and congratulations. Such is a familiar occurrence when the efforts of the police, the show, and the audience result

in a tangible way. It can be an arrest, a confession of crime, or it can simply be finding a missing person. Thanks make up a considerable part of the show, and carry in itself many implications.

First of all, the show praises the police for their hard work, dedication and vigilance. Elaborations on the case have an uncanny ability to end up with praise to the security forces. During the search, MATS took care to remind, at any feasible moment, that the police was working hard on the case. This was meant to calm the audience's fear of AF jumping out of the shadows to hurt them, and emphasize the police's effectiveness in establishing safety. After AF's arrest, the show kept praising the police. Seeing as many examples from the episodes contain gratitude towards the police one way or the other, the example below should prove to be enough to capture the sentiment here.

MA: We received ihbars for the last two days, I really thank our viewers so much. And I want to congratulate the police here once more because in the footage that come, it is impossible to be sure whether it is Atalay or not. (...) But the police never rejected any of them. They went after all of them.⁸⁰

Also thanked and applauded was the dolmush drivers who led to AF's arrest. However, the majority of the gratitude is shown towards the audience for their surveillant labour that carried the search to its fruition. The underlined point in all these thanks is that the audience, and indeed the society itself, is referred to as a unified front. This surely adds to the discourse of building a communal identity, one that entails contribution to society through surveillance.

Each thanks have common elements as well as specific additions, such as a reminder that without the audience labour, AF would not have been caught so soon, or that if

⁸⁰ MA: İki gündür ihbarlar vardı, ya çok teşekkür ediyorum izleyicilerimize gerçekten. Çok tabi böyle, burada emniyeti de bir kez daha kutlamak istiyorum çünkü öyle görüntüler geliyor ki, hani Atalay mı değil mi emin olmak mümkün değil, evet. (...) Ama emniyet hiçbirine hayır demedi. Hepsinin peşine düştü. (Episode 1654)

the previous victims' families had come to MATS, AF would not have been able to hide in Tuzla. This displays the show's confidence in its capability to mobilize surveillant masses and bring results. The two most profound instances of such are "the strength in unity" and "a team of millions," where the communal identity formation is encouraged, the labour praised, and the agendas to uphold a certain culture of surveillance justified.

MA: We must really congratulate our people. Our viewers already carry this potential. They are viewers who look around vigilantly and try with all their might to fulfil their civic duty. I mean, our general audience is already this way, so it is not surprising for us. But let me say this as well; The police do not take offence at this anyway. See, that has been what the police said for 15 days: The people will catch him, the ihbar will surely come. (...) People formed special teams. Our shopkeepers, our drivers, they contacted the show as you know. Our citizens continuously kept this on the forefront by forming special teams amongst each other, sharing these pictures with each other through means of social sharing, via phones etc. Here, we have seen "the strength in unity."⁸¹

MA: Thank you, we would do all these for nought if it weren't for your support and interest. This is a teamwork. That is why I say, I mean I am given awards but they belong to us all. For example, the institutions and organizations come and give awards, but I always say that this is a teamwork. I say it again. They ask, 'How many people does your team have?' and I say, 'We have a team of millions.' Here, Kenan Bey and Mehmet Bey are one of the best examples of that today. Had Mehmet Bey not watched the programme that day, perhaps Kenan Bey would not have noticed him, that's what it is. That is why, I mean, all of us participated in the teamwork. You two are here today as the men of the day. I sincerely congratulate you once again. (Applause in studio)⁸²

⁸¹ MA: Halkımızı gerçekten kutlamak lazım. Bizim seyircimiz zaten bu potansiyeli taşıyan bir seyirci. Yani hani etrafına dikkatli bakan ve vatandaşlık görevini yerine getirmek için tüm gücüyle uğraşan seyirciler. Yani bizim zaten genel seyircimiz bu yönde, bizim için şaşırtıcı değil. Ama şunu da söyleyeyim; emniyet zaten bundan gocunmuyor. Bakın 15 gündür hep emniyetin söylediği buydu: Bunu halk yakalayacak, mutlaka ihbar gelecek. (...) İnsanlar özel ekipler kurdular. Yayına da biliyorsunuz bağlandılar esnaflarımız, şoförlerimiz. Vatandaşlarımız kendi aralarında özel ekipler kurarak bu fotoğrafları birbirlerine sosyal paylaşım yolundani, telefonla vesaire aktararak sürekli gündemde tuttular. İşte 'birlikten güç doğar'ı görmüş olduk. (Episode 1654)

⁸² MA: Teşekkür ediyorum, zaten sizlerin desteği ve ilgisi olmasa biz bunları boşu boşuna yapmış oluruz. Bu bir ekip çalışması. O yüzden diyorum, her aldığım ben hani, ödül bana veriliyor ama hepimizin ödülü. Mesela geliyorlar işte, kurum ve kuruluşlar ödül veriyorlar ama her zaman

While the host reserves her thanks for the security forces and the members of the audience who offer the show surveillant labour, she also acknowledges the work of the show's employees as well. By interviewing the show's own reporter, the host showcases the staff's efforts to help catch AF. Their sleepless nights spent travelling and hunting for information in every ihbar was emphasized, with reminders that this was not the be-all-end-all situation the show itself had acted like it was for so long. "With that said, our work is never done. Atalay was caught, and now it is time for another, but we have worked day and night here."⁸³

Finally, the show underlines the importance of the show in the grand scheme of things. Such tirades, on the surface level, offer gratitude to the other agents such as the police and the audience. However, there is an underlying reproach about the unsatisfying level of recognition the show receives for its efforts. This interpretation is based on the emphasis on "the public now seeing the power of the public opinion better" and "perhaps the other institutions and organizations understanding it better now." By reiterating how the show's capacity to mobilize the reserve army of surveillance labourers, it re-embellishes its value and worthiness in the eyes of all who dare to criticize or disregard them. It is not unusual that the experts share their agreement on the topic of the show's deserved recognition and the importance of public opinion, too. One such example is as follows:

Şevki Sözen: Here, the major factor that made Atalay's arrest possible is the formation of the common sensitivity of the public.

MA: We have actually known this for nine years, but perhaps now, the entire public has understood it better.

söylüyorum, bu bir ekip çalışması. Yine söylüyorum, 'Kaç kişilik ekibiniz var?' diyorlar, diyorum ki 'Milyonlarca kişilik bir ekibimiz var.' İşte aslında Kenan Bey ve bugün Mehmet Bey de bunun en güzel örneklerinden biri. Mehmet Bey o gün programı izlemese belki de Kenan abinin dikkatini çekmeyecekti o işte. O yüzden hani hepimiz bir ekip çalışması yaptık. Siz de böyle günün adamı olarak buradasınız. Gerçekten sizleri bir kez daha kutluyorum. (Stüdyoda alkış) (Episode 1654)

⁸³ MA: (...) Gerçi bizde iş bitmez. Atalay yakalandı, şimdi sıra bir başkasına gelir ama burada çok geceli gündüzlü çalışıldı. (Episode 1654)

Şevki Sözen: It wasn't enough that we, the people in the know, knew about this. This sensitivity has a major role in the public understanding it, working together on it, and naturally, in Atalay's capture.⁸⁴

The aforementioned separation of the citizenry into the lawful and lawless repeats itself during monologues about the public opinion's invaluable nature. While it can be argued that the distinction is befitting from the perspective of the law, it can also be questioned that a TV show takes on such a position as to make that statement. This popular TV show's insistently structural and legal approach to matters of crime and criminals takes on an entirely different meaning when the show takes place on national TV and is broadcast to millions.

MA: In these nine years, our viewers have accepted, understood, internalized the importance of public opinion so much. Yes, public opinion matters. The public, the police, the gendarmerie shall cooperate so that things can proceed faster. It matters not to police or a gendarmerie, or to a judge or a prosecutor, from whom the information comes. (...) What matters is that the case is solved. But the public opinion matters; the public is valuable. When you know the public's value, when you already place them at that place of value, they too, we all are conscientious people. We always say that ninety, ninety-five per cent of society is made up of good people anyway. The rest is a fly in the ointment. And when that ninety, ninety-five per cent of people come together, the rest is resolved so well, so easily.⁸⁵

⁸⁴ Şevki Sözen: Burada Atalay'ın yakalanabilmesindeki en büyük etken aslında o toplumsal kamuoyu duyarlılığının oluşması.

MA: Aslında biz bunu biliyoruz 9 yıldır ama tabi hani bütün kamuoyu belki daha iyi anlamış oldu yani.

Şevki Sözen: Biz, konunun içinde olanların bunu bilmesi yetmiyordu. Toplumun bunu anlaması, burada işbirliği içerisine girmesi, doğal olarak da Atalay'ın yakalanmasında bu duyarlılığın çok büyük bir önemi var. (Episode 1654)

⁸⁵ MA: Artık izleyicilerimiz kamuoyunun önemini 9 yıl içinde o kadar içlerine sindirdiler, anladılar, özümstediler ki... Evet, kamuoyu önemlidir. Halk, polis, jandarma el ele verecek ki bu işler daha hızlı bir şekilde ilerlesin. Bilginin kimden geldiği önemli değildir bir polis için ya da jandarma için, ya da bir hakim ya da savcı için. (...) Mühim olan olayın çözülmesi. Ama kamuoyu önemlidir, halk değerlidir. Halkın değerini anladığımız zaman, zaten onları o değerli yere koyduğunuz zaman onlar da, hepimiz de vicdan sahibi insanlarız. Biz hep söylüyoruz, toplumun yüzde doksanı, doksan beşi zaten iyi insanlardan oluşuyor. Sinek küçük, mide bulandırıyor. İşte o yüzde doksan, doksan beş bir araya geldiği zaman da işler ne kadar güzel, kolaylıkla çözümleniyor. (Episode 1654)

This showcases how the show views the public: A high percentage of “good” people with a low percentage of “bad” people. It implies that the good should come together with the law enforcement authorities against the bad, and that it would solve problems about crime. Whether she means the solution of particular criminal investigations as in the case of AF or that of crime altogether is left unclear. Nonetheless, both fail to get to the root causes of crime and exaggerate the responsibility of the citizens in an endeavour that needs structural changes, not palliative solutions.

Also worth mentioning, perhaps, is the instance where the host thanked Yüksel Aytuğ, a journalist and the host’s friend according to her, for his reference to the show in his column as “the red notice of our country.”⁸⁶ His endorsement of MATS in its endeavours to produce, maintain, and reproduce a certain kind of utilitarian culture of surveillance was found important enough to mention during the live show. It serves as an outside support that the show then decides to read aloud to its audience; it is a bit of a “preaching to the choir” situation, but it does solidify the arguments that aim to criticize the show.

The police in this structure is mostly silent, possibly due to article 15 of law number 657 on Civil Servants that states in clear terms that civil servants cannot give information or make statements about their jobs to any media including the TV. Only those chosen and permitted by ministerial authority can. (Devlet Memurları Kanunu, 1965). The only information regarding the police comes from the host when she shares what the police is doing in regards to the search, and what they think about the case. As previously mentioned, the host has admitted to holding particular information from the audience when asked by the police. Whatever insight the audience receives into the inner workings of the police is highly censored and thus, very limited. The only law enforcement authority in the case was İzmir

⁸⁶ “Ülkenin kırmızı bülteni” (Episode 1657)

Provincial Police Chief Celal Uzunkaya, who only addressed and thanked “the public” for their efforts and sensitivity, and that they “presented a tableau of a very sensitive society”⁸⁷ by giving ihbars and information.

As seen in this section, MATS relies heavily on the legitimization brought around by cooperation with the police. However, it must be regarded that the show aids the police work with its broadcasts, and mobilization of the masses into supportive surveillant action. It can be said that theirs is a kind of antagonistic relationship in that any recognition put forward by the police might imply inadequacy on the part of the security forces in the completion of their tasks. Addressing the show as a focal point in the investigation, besides being against legislative measures, may also indicate a need for further help than what security forces can already provide. Such admittance would be harmful to the image of the security forces as competent and capable. This might be the reason the show takes care to address the police with votes of confidence and praise at any given opportunity. Through this delicate balance between the security forces and CBRTV shows, both agencies gain legitimization and justification for their actions. The show gets to keep airing for the worthy cause of shortening the investigative processes and removing the barriers of time and space for the security forces, whereas the security forces are mentioned positively and can accept ihbars as they come without any questions raised on their authority.

Another link in the chain of thanks is, of course, the CRP. They are the family, friends and acquaintances of the victims. The show’s post-arrest interviews with them are filled with thanks to the show, the police, as well as other people who aided in AF’s arrest. In his thanks in the name of the Demirarslan family, their lawyer takes care to thank any and every person involved in the search and the capture one by one. The CPR on the side of the Kayıkçı family, too, thank the police and the audience, but their appreciation is mainly towards the show for bringing attention to

⁸⁷ “Oldukça duyarlı bir toplum tablosu ortaya koyan tüm vatandaşlarımıza” (Episode 1654)

the case, for directing and narrowing the search effectively. One example to sum up the rest is as such:

Member of Fatma Kayıkçı's family: The security forces, bless them, investigated the ihbars that came to Müge Hanım. As a result of good work, Müge Hanım and the police cooperated and he got busted, the expected happened. (...) See here, I say it everywhere, he would not have gotten caught if it wasn't for Müge Anlı, this wouldn't have become so widespread.⁸⁸

A look at what the interviewees in the street interviews conducted by MATS have to say can also be valuable to show the "public opinion" that is given such great importance to by the show. Let us keep in mind that these statements were made to MATS staff, but also remember that the reiteration and broadcasting of such statements work to strengthen the idea of MATS as vital, effective, and entirely positive of an asset. One young woman said, "We watch all the time, and we really thank you very much. May God keep you with us always, is all I'm saying."⁸⁹ A middle-aged woman said, "I had said it, that he was going to be caught now that Müge Anlı was onto him; we are so relieved that she would not let this go."⁹⁰ And an old man attributed AF's arrest to MATS through this statement: "He was caught thanks to Müge Anlı. She exposed him, she exposed him on television, and the

⁸⁸ Fatma Kayıkçı'nın aile üyesi: Emniyet güçleri, sağolsun, Müge Hanım'a gelen ihbarları değerlendirdi. İyi bir çalışma sonucu, Müge Hanım ve emniyetle beraber yakayı ele verdi sonunda, beklenen oldu. (...) Ben bunu her yerde söylüyorum, Müge Anlı olmasaydı bu yakalanamazdı, bu kadar yayılmazdı. (Episode 1654)

⁸⁹ Genç kadın: Devamlı izliyoruz, gerçekten çok çok teşekkür ediyoruz. Allah başımızdan eksik etmesin, sadece onu diyorum. (Episode 1654)

⁹⁰ Orta yaşlı kadın: Müge Anlı'ya dedim zaten düştüyse kesinlikle yakalanacak dedim, bunun peşini bırakmayacak diye çok rahatladık. (Episode 1654)

citizens saw it, they recognized him, he couldn't get away. Bless Müge Anlı; she is one of the persons who pioneered this.”⁹¹

Overall, it is very clear due to the repetition and the allocated broadcast time that the vocalization of appreciation and gratitude play a vital part in the show's conduct. It secures the show's position in the eyes of the audience as useful and worthy of contribution, while it also validates the efficiency of structures such as law enforcement and the media. The community belonging fostered by the show and the post-arrest accomplishment attributed mostly to the audience work to ensure continued surveillance labour and justify this specific culture of surveillance further. Thanks go a long way to make this culture self-sustaining.

6.5.3. Wishes

MATS, as a CBRTV show, acts as a kind of contractor to the police. It broadcasts police-approved information to its audience and asks for information that would benefit the police. MATS' efficiency is in that it saves time and resources that the police would otherwise have to spend. As previously mentioned, MATS reaches millions instantly, and through strategies such as peer pressure, positive association, assignment of “citizen's duty,” and elements of engagement, ensures audience's mobilization and consecutive surveillant labour. The same approach eliminates spatial constraints, for people all over the country (or in some cases, the world) contact the show themselves through simple phone calls or Whatsapp messages. The physical hardships of finding witnesses by asking around and going from door to door is eliminated. This role of MATS' in the process of investigation is often appreciated by the CRP and the audience.

Put like this, it seems as though the request for ihbars come from above, and is simply returned with ihbars. The surveillant labourers' and the audience's input is

⁹¹ Yaşlı erkek: Müge Anlı sayesinde yakalandı. İfşa etmesi, televizyonda ifşa etmesi, vatandaş da bunları gördü, tanıdı etti, kaçamaz yani. Sağolsun Müge Anlı, bu işe önyak olan kişilerden bir tanesi. (Episode 1654)

more than information, though. There are desires and requests that are relayed by the show as well. Seeing as such wishes were given platform after AF's arrest in this case, the audience addressed the judicial authorities.

Examples range from the Demirarslan family lawyer, who said that the second phase should be AF's trial and punishment, to the street interviewees who asked that judges give him the punishment he deserves, to Fatma Kayıkçı's family wishing he was never released, and finally to Fatma Kayıkçı's neighbour asking for God's justice be done.

The interviewees above were open about their fear and apprehension during the search, as well as their anger towards AF. What is more significant here is that they saw MATS as the place to give voice to their wishes for AF's future, perhaps because nobody else asked them what they thought or wanted. The requests range from the judge giving him the punishment he deserves, to divine justice befalling him. These do not necessarily reflect a steadfast faith in the judicial system, about which even the host is sometimes frustrated when she hears perpetrators being released after custody. What these statements reflect is that the show is seen as a platform upon which the citizens can give voice to what they want. Such an unspoken understanding between the show and the audience can be read under the terms of Lyon's factor of exposure.

Exposure has direct links to visibility, especially in the literature on surveillance culture and social media. The act of sharing a picture and receiving likes or comments, for example, is an incentive for commitment to more sharing. This creates a feedback loop of sorts, where the sharer expects reactions and the reactors expects more exposure. In the case of MATS, the show expects its audience to give ihbars, which help further the investigation and result in a satisfactory end such as an arrest or solution of a murder mystery. The end, as it were, triggers further participation in future cases, because it acts as positive reinforcement. At this "end",

MATS also lets the audience have a say on what they wish to happen afterwards. This solidifies the feedback loop of exposure, for the audience is rewarded not only by the desired result (arrest) but also by visibility, both literally and vocally.

One more element of exposure that ties the audience into the show's particular culture of surveillance can be the show's updates on AF after arrest. Step by step, MATS showed where he was in the process of interrogation and judicial treatment. Revealing the fruits of the audience's surveillant labour would count as feedback that ensures further community participation.

6.5.4. Lessons

The particular discourse MATS weaves around its cases is quite structural and educational. The host and show experts go over didactic point after didactic point to drive home that the de jure rules, the laws, must be obeyed down to the t. The de facto rules also demand the same obedience from the audience, and are partly shaped by the show itself.

MATS, with its inside jokes and oft-repeated phrases, present a cohesive narrative where the show and its members are knowledgeable authorities that know how one should act and be. The show is righteous; the figures within act and speak as though they are above the actions of individuals they pick to pieces. The audience is educated on matters of how to give ihbars or how to obey the laws, with an insistence to embark upon the audience the importance of the means of surveillance. The show creates first itself, and then its audience in the desired image of law-abiding and upright agencies. Let us delve into the didactic elements for further elaboration.

AV: This case will teach so many things to us all.

MA: (...) I never could interpret the meaning of this saying: Malice arises from goodness. (...) If you hadn't allowed him to work without insurance in the belief that you were doing good for him. If you hadn't let him live in that house without a contract as a favour to him. (...) Which means malice does

arise from this kind of goodness. From lawlessness. It arises from lawlessness.⁹²

Lawlessness was a topic frequently visited by the host. She reiterated that had the Kayıkçı family asked to employ AF legally, make a contract for his accommodation in their house, or at least asked for his ID. These would have spooked him and he would have had to move to somewhere else. In doing so, the host rationalizes, he would have drawn attention to himself and eventually been caught. Upon such claims, she hastens to add that while the citizen may want to abide by each rule, it is the responsibility of the authorities to make sure that they do. The lack of control on the part of the authorities was criticized in the same vein.

MA: You have not the right but the freedom not to want to do something. That is why the government exists. That is why the government has institutions and organizations, in order to inspect people's such arbitrary actions. Those who must do such inspection shall do it. (...) Please, let us transform into a law-abiding society from now on.⁹³

The theme of favouring the state and its laws is consistent throughout the show's run. The host blames the lack of obedience to the laws as a reason for this crime in particular. However, in cases other than AF's, such highlights have been known to be made often as well. Although she said above that the authorities were at fault to never have checked AF's credentials, most of her admonishments are addressed to the general public or the CRP. In AF's case, the Kayıkçı family should have registered him as an insurance worker. But even that expands to include all rules put in place by the state, for according to the host, none of those is arbitrary.

⁹² Arif Verimli: Bu olay çok bir şey öğretecek hepimize.

MA: (...) Şu sözün anlamını hiç değerlendiremezdim: İyilikten maraz doğar. (...) Sizler bu çocuğa iyilik yapacağım diye sigortasız çalıştırmıyordunuz mesela. İyilik yapacağım diye keşke kontrat yapmadan işte o evde oturturmasaydınız. (...) Demek ki bu tarz bir iyilikten maraz doğuyor. Kuralsızlıktan. Kuralsızlıktan doğuyor. (Episode 1645)

⁹³ MA: Bir şeyleri yapmak istememe hakkına değil ama özgürlüğüne sahipsin. Devlet bu yüzden var. Devletin o yüzden kurum ve kuruluşları var, insanların bu kadar keyfi hareket etmesini denetlemek adına var. O denetlemeyi yapması gerekenler yapacak. (...) Rica ederim biraz da kurallara riayet eden bir toplum haline dönüşelim artık. (Episode 1646)

MA: As I always say, we will abide by the rules, my brothers. There is a reason for the establishment for each of those rules. We will abide by those rules. I mean, we do everything we can not to obey the rules established by the government. (...) Then when we don't follow those rules, we again turn to the government and tell them to help us. (...) As long as [lawlessness] continues, we will live to experience more of these.⁹⁴

After AF's arrest, AF said in his testimony that Fatma Kayıkçı confronted him about his false identity, and Göktuğ and Elena accused AF of having killed his missing girlfriend. The host summed up the retrospective lessons to be learned as follows: On Fatma Kayıkçı, it would have been better to take precautions before approaching someone who she's found to have given her a false ID. On the part of Göktuğ and Elena, it would have been better not to accuse AF of killing his girlfriend. In both instances, the victims should have gone to the police with their suspicions instead of confronting AF himself. This, without a doubt, adds to the surveillance imaginaries of the audience in that the deductions one makes from their face-to-face, file-based or interface surveillance activities should not be acted upon by oneself, for it could result in violent assault and even murder.

This pro-surveillance attitude continued in rants about more CCTV cameras and why they were neither invasive nor obsolete. The argument was that with more cameras, the police would have an easier time finding culprits that way, and it would be what everyone desired. The arguments against CCTV were swept away by the benefit they would offer to law enforcement and crime management.

MA: All security cameras are being checked, but sometimes, the security cameras we see around ourselves do not yield the kind of footage that we want, not the results we want. I wish there were more of them in number. We see in these broadcasts that there are apparently not enough of them. I said this before but, do you remember when city surveillance cameras were placed in İstanbul and people said it was an invasion of privacy, and there

⁹⁴ MA: (...) Ama hep diyorum ya, kurallara riayet edeceğiz kardeşim. O kuralların konulmasının hepsinin bir nedeni var. O kurallara riayet edeceğiz. Yani devletin koyduğu kurallara uymamak için elimizden gelen her şeyi yapıyoruz. (...) Sonra devletin kurallarına uymuyoruz, ama sonra dönüp hep devlete diyoruz ki gel bana yardımcı ol. (...) O kural tanımazlık devam ettiği müddetçe de biz bunları çok yaşarız. (Episode 1648)

was an uproar so as not to have them installed. It has nothing to do with private lives, nobody is recording this footage and exposing people's private lives.

Şevki Sözen: And they are placed in the street. Naturally, life in the streets has no way of being private life. There is a common, public kind of life in the streets.

MA: I wish they would be increased in number.⁹⁵

It cannot be denied that surveillance camera footage helped the show find culprits before. It no doubt did the same with the police much more frequently. However, when interpreted within the context and with the show's fetishization of all things surveillance, it can be said that the show wants more: More ihbars, more cameras, more surveillant labourers who look around like watchdogs.

Continuing with the watchdog analogy, we can also say that the audience is trained like hounds in terms of how and when they should call the show or the police upon detecting AF. The audience is told to be alert and vigilant, to stall him upon seeing him and to notify the security forces immediately. The keyword is immediately, because the show and the police arrived at the scene after he was gone for long as a result of the delayed ihbars. "It is a must to notify the police or the gendarmerie immediately," the host says, and adds, "But please, not after he is gone, but while he is still there (...) We must make it easier for the police."⁹⁶

⁹⁵ MA: Bütün güvenlik kameraları kontrol ediliyor, fakat bizim bazen bu etrafımızda gördüğümüz güvenlik kameraları istediğimiz gibi de görüntü vermiyor, sonuç vermiyor. Keşke bunun sayısı daha arttırılsa. Aslında bu yayınlarda hep görüyoruz ki demek ki az. Bunlar, hatırlar mısınız, İstanbul'a Mobese kameraları konulduğu zaman, bunu daha önce de söylemiştim, yani özel hayatın gizliliğine aykırı, konulmasın edilmesin diye ne kıyametler kopartılmıştı. Oysa az yani. Ki hani İstanbul'da belki en fazlası, oysa az. Özel hayatla alakası yok, kimse bu görüntüleri çekip insanların özel hayatını sergilemiyor.

Şevki Sözen: Zaten sokağa konuluyor bunlar. Doğal olarak sokaktaki yaşamın özel hayat olabilme şansı yok. Sokaktaki yaşam ortak toplumsal bir yaşam var.

MA: Keşke sayısı daha da artsa. (Episode 1654)

⁹⁶ MA: Anında emniyete jandarmaya bilgi vermek lazım. Ama lütfen gittikten sonra değil yani, oradayken. (...) Emniyetin işini kolaylaştırmak lazım. (Episode 1649)

Another lesson was about the importance of calling the police as well, but with a twist. A discussion broke out about Fatma Kayıkçı and how she should have gotten the police involved instead of confronting AF after becoming suspicious of him. The host declared her belief that citizens were sometimes reluctant to call the security forces, whereas Arif Verimli, the show's psychiatrist expert, defended that such a reluctance must be overcome. As a teacher, Fatma Kayıkçı was perceived as an educated woman who should have known not to make contact with AF after finding out he lied about his name. Rahmi Özkan, the show's lawyer expert, said she should have at least gotten a man involved before she talked to AF herself. Arif Verimli defended that the common sensitivity towards 'not bothering the police' was unfounded. The host explained that the ordinary public, as a result of culture and upbringing, regarded calling the police or the gendarmerie as a serious matter that should be thought out thoroughly in terms of the possible ramifications of the action. Arif Verimli, in return, used MATS as a disciplinary platform to educate the audience.

Arif Verimli: (...) We are speaking to the public here, and because we are speaking to the public, we should set apart the wrong from the right. I am saying what is right. (...) I am saying they must call. (...) I am now saying that yes, our public does it this way, that's true. But it should not be. I am trying to say that we should wake up now.⁹⁷

One reading of topic could be that MATS is filling a void it detected, the void being the gap between the security forces and the society. If the citizens are not inclined to call the security forces for reasons of their own, then a middleman like MATS could be less intimidating to contact. This could be yet another way this show and other CBRTV shows aid the police in their investigations. Considering how the show said that they received an ihbar about the existence of AF's rental depot and conveyed the ihbar to the police, and how the legal representative to the rental depot

⁹⁷ Arif Verimli: (...) Biz burada halka hitap ediyoruz, halka hitap ettiğimiz için yanlışı doğruyu koyalım. Doğrusu nedir diye söylüyorum. (...) Aranmalı diyorum. (...) Şimdi diyorum ki evet, halkımız bunu böyle yapıyor, doğrudur. Fakat olmamalı. Artık uyanalım demeye getiriyorum. (Episode 1654)

company chose MATS as a platform to clear their name, MATS may be said to indeed have a prior position in relation to the police for the ordinary citizen.

The show contains many other educational conversations between the host and the show experts. Main questions that spark off such discussions are as follows: What is AF's *modus operandi*? What constitutes as mental illness? What exactly constitutes criminal responsibility? What makes a "serial killer," and is AF one of them? How does the process of sanity tests go? What is risk-taking behaviour? How should parents treat children who show antisocial tendencies like harming animals, without a gender-based approach to both girls and boys? Again, some of the answers of the host and the show experts contain information that the general audience may not otherwise reach easily. The messages are structural and didactic, aiming to educate the audience on procedural steps as well as personal behaviour. It all adds to the discourse of law-abiding and responsible citizens while at the same time it expands the surveillance imaginaries and thus affects the surveillance practices of its audience in terms of crime and crime-related behaviours.

This concludes the case study of MATS and its search for AF. Overall, it was found that many dynamics and methods could be detected throughout the episodes to ensure a calibration of the viewers' surveillance imaginaries and practices that expand farther than the boundaries of episodes or the show's prompts. Compliance with surveillance was aimed through the perpetuation of bias concerning the crimes and criminals, emphasis on the legitimacy of fear, and excessive exposure of information related and unrelated alike. Surveillance imaginaries were shaped through demands for surveillance practices in the form of ihbars as well as statements in line with a strategy of responsabilization and law and order ideology. Surveillance practices, including ihbars and the more performative actions of the viewers, were given as examples to the conceptualization of surveillance labour and social policing, where surveillance culture is established and maintained through CBRTV programming to enlist citizen help in policing. The factors contributing to

surveillance culture being internalized on an individual basis were found to be indirect peer pressure concerning the rest of the audience, positive association with participation, and fulfilment of civic duties. Lastly, the legitimization of the show's overall conduct and surveillance culture was seen to be established through reading official statements of the perpetrator, recognizing the contributions of all parties included in ensuring the arrest, giving viewers a platform to voice their wishes, and retrospective lectures on avoiding victimization through surveillance and abiding by the law. The following chapter addresses these elements from a critical perspective, detects main policy areas, and endeavours to offer related policy recommendations.

CHAPTER 7

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

7.1. Exposure vs Privacy

MATS reframes its excessive exposure of personal details concerning the perpetrators and the CRP as a journalistic endeavour to help the police in their investigations of finding a missing person, solving an unsolved murder or, as was the case here, finding a runaway perpetrator. The host reiterates that they are taking a snapshot; they gather and evaluate the evidence, from which point on it is the police's job to act upon these. However, the amount of details exposed exceeds the amount necessary for the goal. The case of AF illustrated this point sufficiently; while the audience's surveillance labour needed only the details on his appearance and possible destination, for example, the show made it a point to expose AF's life down to the most minute details, like the gifts he gave his romantic interest and the entries in his high school yearbook. Even after he was caught and the goal of the show apparently achieved, exposure did not stop; the contents of his bags were shown and even the actual owner of one of his stolen, fake IDs was brought to the studio. His statements to the law enforcement authorities were read to the audience verbatim, and his post-arrest journey was relayed as well.

This sort of floating information, when brought together, paints a bigger and more specific picture and is the result of surveillance with a specific focus. About such aggregation of personal details for criminal investigations on suspects by the

surveillance conducted through the cooperation of the police and ‘the agents of partnership policing,’ O’Neill and Loftus say,

Compiled this way, even the most banal details can become problematic for the person concerned, in that multiple agents of the state have access to them and can easily fill in any gaps to create an ever growing picture of that person’s life (2013, pp. 449-450).

This may further contribute to the narrative around suspects that imply criminality. Adding to this the fact that such information is exposed on a national broadcast, this perception may become widespread and labelling. This can be observed in many cases of MATS. However, in the case study of AF, the perpetrator was identified through crime scene investigation and known throughout MATS’ search; the systematic surveillance into his life was redundant.

The show’s exposure is more than a means to an end; it is an end in itself. In an official investigation, such details would not be exposed to the extent and reach of MATS. With the show, the information becomes instruments first to entertain the audience with their spectacular aspects, and then to solve crime. Privacy, if it comes up at all, is discussed in a dismissive manner, focusing more on the private/public spheres rather than the individuals whose privacy are invaded; the latter is so normalized that it does not come up often. Regardless of whether or not such exposure is necessary to solve cases or find perpetrators, exposure is justified within the framework of a culture of surveillance that is in a mutually complementary relationship with law and order ideology. Privacy is counterproductive to goals and desires, such as the voyeuristic wish to see and know, and the validation that is given to exposure.

Exposure is validated on the status of criminality. In MATS’ contextualization, the *exposer* is justified by the objective to maintain social order and safety. Meanwhile, the *exposed* is a criminal, a murderer, a dangerous individual; his right to privacy is forfeited from the get-go because of this reason. This encourages another take on

privacy altogether, where one's status of criminality or relation to a criminal matter normalizes the invasion of their privacy not in an interrogation room with the police, but in a studio with a reality show host and show experts in national broadcast for millions to see if they wanted to see.

Surveillance imaginaries supported and nurtured by the show reiterate that exposure for the sake of justice is necessary. Seeking justice directly with the law enforcement authorities would render the show obsolete, and so the show does its best to remind its audience that its intermediation has led to the closure of many cases through the broadcast investigation it carries out. The audience members express trust in the finalization of cases because MATS is handling them; the show's confirmative spectacle of justice strengthens the understanding that more exposure leads to the desired goal of an arrested perpetrator. This feeds into the culture of surveillance and perpetuates a vicious circle of exposure and disregard for privacy, further strengthening surveillance imaginaries where privacy is not even a matter of concern.

Exposure acts as an underhanded threat and a disciplinary measure. The surveillant labourers that contribute to the show's conduct are everywhere and can be anyone. Awareness of the possibility that any detail of one's life, or any interaction one has with others can be made public on national television can be disciplining one to be lawful, or at least appear to be so. Under the gaze of possible citizen spies, the control of what is known about one becomes vital. The synoptic act of many (viewers) watching the few (MATS and CRP) produces an aspect where everyone watches everyone and behaviour is policed not only with the possibility of becoming suspicious, but doing so before the entire national audience.

Further research is necessary to find out the ways in which the audience perceives and experiences the disciplining power of this culture of surveillance and its commodification of personal information as well as its fetishization of constant

exposure. The prevalent discourses on privacy on mass media platforms as well as the justifications used to perpetuate invasive conduct should be critically approached and reframed. Privacy as a right should be respected regardless of the individual's status of criminality and lawfulness.

Specific attention should be paid to MATS', and indeed most of the CBRTV shows' dependence on surveillance culture, exposure, and their detrimental effects on the rights of privacy of all who become involved in the cases. Treating criminal investigations as products for spectacular consumption opens the entire lives and personal conduct of participants for discussion and criticism, and the shows justify this with a law and order narrative and social order discourse for entertainment. Therefore, the line between entertainment and policing must be drawn firmly. The dependence on surveillance should be lessened if not eliminated. The scale between making calls for ihbars and exposing minute details of individuals' lives should be narrowed with more respect to the right for privacy. The criticisms against exposing conduct should be regarded rather than dismissed immediately. Alternative formats may be formulated that would not stipulate the exploitation and expansion of constant surveillance and exposure.

7.2. Entertainment vs Information

The criteria according to which MATS chooses its cases are not disclosed to the audience. However, it should be safe to say that the entertainment value is important. Their preferred kind of crime is particularly interpersonal and petty instead of organized, white-collar, political or otherwise. This enables high levels of exposure focusing on particular individuals and creating a narrative of criminality. The intricacies of the crime and possible factors contributing to it are relayed specifically about the case at hand and not in a general sense. The consensus seems to be that as long as this one criminal is caught, justice prevails. Certain biases about crime and criminals are reproduced and the audience, the "citizens," are urged to be law-abiding as opposed to lawless, one or the other in a dichotomous relationship.

During the spectacular entertainment, the show tries to convince its audience to cooperate in the form of surveillant labour is ensured through the association of positive qualities to the act and by association to the audience members, indirect peer pressure and a narrative of civic duty. The reward offered to the surveillant workers and the rest of the audience is visual and vocal affirmation of the culprit's arrest, a lot of thanks and congratulations, and more entertainment through the investigation of new cases.

MATS offers a means of entertaining escapism with a side of cultural discourse. Mathiesen (2006, p. 56) calls this a "world paradigm" that is given to the audiences while at the same time satisfying their need for escapism and that shapes the individuals to fit into the requirements of the system. Every interaction contributes to the reproduction of a particular culture of surveillance. The audience's surveillance imaginaries are shaped and honed for the desired surveillance practices, i.e. surveillance labour. The culture of surveillance is produced, maintained and reproduced according to the needs of the case, and the concerns regarding the conduct are deemed null and void. MATS' longevity and closure rates are reminded frequently so as to prepare for further justification and expansion of this culture. As a result, the audience is enculturated and given no room for doubt concerning the invasive surveillance they receive from the show, and they give the show in return being utilized for mass entertainment as well as for the solution of cases.

MATS never lets it be forgotten that its first and foremost goal is to help the police, be it with finding a missing person, solving an unsolved murder or, as was the case here, finding a runaway perpetrator. The host reiterates that they are taking a snapshot; they gather and evaluate the evidence, from which point on it is the police's job to act upon these. This is presented as a journalistic endeavour, one built upon the law and order ideology and the utilization of surveillance cultures. In return, MATS also exacerbates and feeds surveillance cultures due to its formatting and declared intentions against crime. However, this does very little to actually

lower crime rates. What MATS does can be described as palliative and ad hoc; only the cases at hand are solved. Widespread and realistic awareness of crime and criminality, of the underlying factors behind them and the possible efforts to alleviate them are not the focus, unlike surveillance and the voyeuristic needs it satisfies.

Entertainment within exposed details is sought at the expense of addressing the broad social, cultural, economic and political contexts in which crimes take place. The experts are from professions that deal with the psychological, legal, and forensic aspects of crime, which are most relevant once a crime has already happened. Crime is sensationalized and accompanied by statements that increase crime and trigger a concern about safety, which aims to cultivate engagement and surveillant labour. Reaction as opposed to reflection is sought (Reisinger, 2007, p. 7) in the entire process, while the underlying causes and conditions of crime as a phenomenon remain understated.

The format of televised broadcasts about crime should be changed to be less towards the encouragement of security-oriented surveillance culture and surveillance labour, and more towards the production of informational content that raises awareness on the causes and conditions of crime. Expert knowledge should come from those who are knowledgeable on the antecedence and not the aftermath of crime. Sociologists, economists, political scientists as well as NGO and CSO representatives and researchers could be given the platform to inform the audience on matters such as unequal access to basic services, income inequality, unemployment, and discrimination based intersectionalities such as gender, race, and ethnicity to list some. Crime and criminality are matters that are best met with interdisciplinary approaches with a focus on the social instead of individual aspects, and this could allow MATS' platform and power of mobilization to be utilized to educate its audience and prompt effective and widespread action against the possible causes of crime. Otherwise, placing entertainment before information could only deal with the

results and fail to produce constructive, structural change. It would mean that the continuation of crime remains a source of benefit, and the surveillance labour demanded for the solution of particular cases would remain palliative and futile in the grand scheme of things. If the aim truly is combatting crime, then the format and content must be interdisciplinary and discussions should be about bettering the factors and conditions whose detriment contribute to crime and victimization. This way, a structural perspective to the conditions of crime can be brought about, shifting the attention from the perceivable and tangential to imperceptible but profound.

7.3. Intermediation vs Direct Communication

That CBRTV genre simply exists is indicative of an agenda, be it the cultivation for law and order ideology, representation of law enforcement in a competent and efficient light, or the perpetuation of bias concerning crime and criminality. However, the negation of such endeavours is implicit in these shows. As Dobash et al. mention: “The more the failures of law and order become evident, the greater the interest in a resolution of these problems on television” (1998, p. 39). Therefore, it can be argued that the public’s interest in these shows is indicative of some level of awareness that the narrative of the show is not a statement of the fact, but the voicing of the wish, that law and order is maintained. The audience receives resolution and affirmation in the form of an arrest or the solution of an unsolved case, law enforcement authorities have an easier time accessing evidence and statements through the show’s call for surveillant labour and ihbars, and the show thus justifies its existence as a middleman between the audience or the “citizen” and the law enforcement authorities.

That the CBRTV shows exist, survive and thrive, can be interpreted as an indication that there exists a gap between law enforcement authorities and the citizenry. TV programs partly ensure the desired connection, cooperation, and community-based policing through national broadcasts on the weekdays. Even MATS alludes to the

notion that citizens do not want to bother the police, or fear the ramifications of becoming involved in criminal or deviant cases by giving ihbars or participating in other ways. In that, MATS and its ilk offer a less intimidating and more approachable front. The show does relay the ihbars it receives to the police, and encourages the callers to contact the police themselves as well. However, in the meantime, it shapes the surveillance imaginaries and practices of its audience for the desired ends, and demands widespread compliance to the show's conduct in the form of surveillance labour. The audience does more than look around and relay incidental information; the viewers dive deeper into a discourse of surveillance for law and order, and they become policed and polarized in terms of lawfulness. Surveillance for the sake of surveillance on the off chance that it might aid in a criminal investigation one day becomes normalized. The logic behind surveillance practices "lasts over time and reappears routinely as it is repeated. And it goes beyond what each person does deliberately and with focused thinking" (Lyon, 2018, p. 47). That a show like MATS produces sensationalized surveillance imaginaries and habitual surveillance practices must, therefore, not be forgotten.

The intermediation of MATS and its ilk that perpetuates surveillance cultures can and should be eliminated. Police as an institution should need no alternative, buffer, or additional, if optional, contacts. On the part of law enforcement, approachability and accessibility should be aimed without the aid of CBRTV shows. On the part of the citizenry, informative meetings and workshops can be arranged in an official capacity. Schools and municipalities can be places in which to carry out such gatherings. School curricula can also be worked upon to include information on how interaction with the law enforcement authorities can and should be conducted. Direct communication between the police and the citizens, without hesitation or reluctance, must be the aim instead of surveillance labour called upon in a roundabout manner through reality TV programs on national broadcasts.

7.4. Social Policing vs Community-based Policing

In a way, MATS unofficially conducts responsabilization and community-based policing efforts that benefit the law enforcement authorities through constant reminders that the cooperation in terms of surveillance labour is included within one's civic duty, helping the show and consequently the police in the quest for justice and safety. Different organizations of surveillance are defended and proposed for more effective policing. Pre-modern (face-to-face) surveillance is demanded from the audience, modern (file-based) surveillance is defended as a mechanism to avoid incrimination in interpersonal experiences, and interface (post-modern) surveillance in the form of CCTV and security cameras are wished to be more in number to make police work easier. MATS makes use of fear, familiarity and fun of surveillance cultures to ensure audience compliance to its conduct, and expands surveillance imaginaries and encourages surveillance practices in its audience for the goal it puts; the solution of the cases it chooses. Surveillance is praised and conducted frequently for surveillance's sake most of the time; the professed goal of catching the criminal becomes less of a priority than the act of exposing information and promoting social policing in the form of the audience's surveillant labour.

MATS canalizes its audience's surveillant labour into the framework of community-based policing and responsabilization, whereas these two aims and endeavours should be within the jurisdiction of the law enforcement authorities or, at least, in direct and official association with them. However, the cooperation between the police as a state apparatus and MATS as a non-governmental media platform is not openly acknowledged; their differences in priorities when it comes to criminal investigative processes are thus unmentioned as well. Whereas the law enforcement authorities are expected to approach each of their cases with equal attention, impartiality and privacy, the same cannot be expected of a privately produced CBRTV show with concerns on ratings and profit.

The vagueness here, whether deliberate or not, blurs the boundaries between entertainment and concerns for criminal justice. The community-based policing promoted by the show is performative and based on consumption, just as crime is presented not as a phenomenon to be prevented but as an object to consume, and so it is reproduced. Thus the surveillance labour demanded by and offered to the show loses sight of what its primary objective is. Cases become commodities of entertainment and consumption, the end of which can only be viewed through viewers doing surveillance labour and relaying the results to the show. Such interactivity does little to touch upon crime as a social, economic, political matter and makes the cases appear almost fictional in their temporal and replaceable nature. Therefore, the audience or citizen participation in the show's conduct can be seen more as consumption of crime-related materials and social policing, and less as community-based policing.

Instead of enhancing cultures of surveillance for a never-ending cycle of problem and solution, the focus should be on providing communication channels between the public and the law enforcement authorities, and establishing the infrastructure for open communication therein. If community-based policing is vital, then the citizenry should be given ways to become involved in it that are more accessible than participating in a CBRTV show that makes debatable interpretations on surveillance imaginaries and practices.

In case citizen participation in policing does need a mass-mediated intermediary authority between the citizens and the law enforcement, then it should be one whose intermediation is not based upon the exploitation of voyeuristic tendencies and the propagation of constant exposure. Solidarity, as opposed to surveillance, can be the focal point of the culture or "world paradigm" (Mathiesen, 2006, p. 56) of such intermediary platforms. In an effort to produce responsible and not responsabilization content, such platforms can give information on citizen participation, how it operates and how one can participate in it, with a focus on

voluntariness and solidarity. The continuous surveillant behaviour expected from the entirety of the *audience* would thus be replaced by actions with which *citizens* can contribute to efforts of policing. The information that may benefit criminal investigations would cease to be televised because the intermediation of the show's own criminal investigation would be discarded, and direct cooperation would be established between voluntary community-based policing participants.

The state agencies on law enforcement, in the case of citizen participation becoming necessary for an investigation, must provide means for direct communication to volunteering citizens. Development of online community-based policing platforms and applications, text alerts, notices in public spaces, and public affairs centres may be offered in the place of profit-based TV shows.

7.5. Surveillance Cultures vs A Culture of Solidarity

MATS offers its audience a sense of belonging and purpose through its meticulously structured discourse of law and order, being a dutiful citizen and surveillance labourer. Perception of community is honed through statements that emphasize “the strength in unity” of citizens becoming mobilized to solve specific, individual cases of crime, and “a team of millions” that is encouraged to feel righteous and justified in surveillance practices. However, while such narratives appear to be solely for the sake of solidarity, it is also divisive in that it is blind to the intricacies and conditions of criminal behaviour, selective of which crimes are worthy of attention, perpetuates bias about crime and criminals, and approaches criticism of the show's conduct as attacks on what is presented as just behaviour.

Criminal cases are served as evidence that nationwide surveillance measures need to be expanded; surveillance is thus rationalized with urgency to maintain safety. However, such generalization of criminality and inflammation of fear from select cases may lead to a false sense of danger and incite paranoia as well as demands for invasive surveillance measures. The divisive nature of this was seen in the case of

9/11, where the narrative of attack from “the other” led to extreme measures of surveillant control and sorting of people, many of which remain to a considerable extent to this day. Once a surveillance measure is accepted to be necessary and useful, it does not go away even though the danger for which it was installed is gone. Shows like MATS, by instilling fear of a crime and criminality that is not as urgent as claimed, pave the way for more surveillance in all areas of life, contribute to sorting attitudes against groups, and encourage a viewpoint that renders people down to lawful and lawless.

Surveillance is so profound as a fact of life that it has its own fluid, ever-changing but also widespread and constant cultural imaginaries and practices. However, in MATS’ discourse of solidarity, it operates as a tool of dissolution on both an interpersonal level and an institutional level. On the interpersonal level, viewers are urged to practice surveillance on their immediate surroundings including other people, police each other’s behaviours, with the aim of detecting possible criminal or deviant behaviour. They are also encouraged with each case explicitly to carry out surveillance labour to detect the show’s current target, and implicitly to perhaps organize and carry out surveillance practices on which they have no official training. This is a practice that exceeds one-off instances, extends over time and becomes a habit. Hence, it may be divisiveness as opposed to solidarity that is produced. The world paradigm becomes one of crime opposing innocence, lenses black and white, with paranoia and suspicion underlying many interactions. On the institutional level, the simple fact that MATS asks its audience to make the law enforcement’s job easier by giving out surveillance labour implies an insufficiency or hindrance on the part of the law enforcement. This remains implicit even while the show puts effort to alleviate it through votes of confidence and constant reminders of the police’s hard work and competence. Actions and statements contradict for the sake of producing, maintaining and reproducing a particular culture of surveillance.

The show kindles a collective effervescence under the guise of community participation; each case is presented with the grisliest and most minute details that work to draw viewers and absorb them into the investigative processes. Emotions are high, the criminal act is shunned and the criminal is otherized, placed in contrast to the ideal, law-abiding citizens. And the participation of the citizens yields results that are palliative and not effective across instances, time and places. The communal identity and the sense of usefulness and belonging that are nurtured by the show are, likewise, temporary and tangential.

A culture of solidarity instead of surveillance could be effective in giving participants a founded sense of productivity and competence while producing lasting effects on how crime and criminality are conceived. A sociologically informed approach to broadcasting about such matters, for example, can help guide these collective efforts into action that breeds impact and steer the topics from the spectacular to the structural. Reframing citizen's duty as solidarity and cohesiveness can shift the commitment from the external to the internal, as the "duty" would not be one inflicted from above. The informed actions encouraged by a culture of solidarity would be empowering not only the individual ihbar makers as in the case of MATS, but the society as a whole. Rewards in the form of praise for surveillant behaviour accompanied by a demand for more would lose their allure, and satisfaction would be derived from working together for lasting changes for and with a well-informed community.

Such solidarity can be fostered by platforms where the matter of discussion is not specific criminal instances and the aim is not only their solution. Crimes of all kinds and not only the interpersonal ones can be opened up to discussion with the main focus of detecting the underlying causes and conditions, and the structural measures that can and should be taken accordingly. Ritualized discussions of matters should be replaced with a socially conscious approach, and citizen participation should be

encouraged to be constructive and offer insights- not ihbars, and certainly not information that invades privacy.

Participation of representatives from non-governmental organizations and civil society organizations can also help this endeavour to detach from invasive exposure of minute details of private lives, and consider the different data and perspectives on criminal matters. This could help procure an unbiased platform where discussions can display the multifaceted nature of the matters at hand, promote discussion and information, and introduce means of citizen participation that do not rely on surveillant labour. Solidarity, in this case, could be achieved through organized and systematic work in non-profit organizations, and have more of a likelihood of leading to more permanent measures, and not band-aid solutions.

Last but not least, solidarity can be aimed through recognition of and respect towards resisting and criticizing surveillance. The show does the complete opposite through reprimands for not being up to date with the show, for not giving ihbars when and how the show wants, for having avoided certain documentation about work and workers to list some examples. These work to normalize the glorification of invasive perceptions and actions of surveillance while at the same time they invalidate the well-founded criticisms against them and their divisive nature.

7.6. Concluding Remarks and Further Research

Overall, MATS and its ilk are both the outcome and the producers of surveillance cultures; the infusion of surveillance in everyday lives of the public sets the stage for these programs, and the programs build upon it. They shape and hone surveillance imaginaries and practices of their audiences and therefore of the public, through a utilization of the fun, familiar and fearful aspects of surveillance. In the meantime, the world paradigm of law and order, civic duties, and surveillance detached from its ethical and societal ramifications is justified, glorified, and normalized.

While surveillance –both panoptic and synoptic- is a fact of life, it should be empowering and not exploitative. Platforms where the mobilized surveillance labour is used to give a spectacle of one-off justice do not implement - or support the implementation of - addressing the conditions and underlying factors to criminal behaviour and victimization. Thus, the audience's responsabilization and labour across the country and indeed, the world, are used for individual cases while that effort and dedication could be used much more effectively and in a manner that brings together instead of sorts apart the public.

On the level of mass-mediated crime-based programming, a change of paradigm is recommended. Formats with a comprehensive, informative and ethical approach that pay attention to scientific researches and data, and an understanding of crime as a multidisciplinary subject that exceeds the expertise of specifically crime-related professions may be beneficial to prevent the proliferation of the certain kind of surveillance cultures this show and its ilk produce, to address the causes of issues instead of the symptoms, and to be proactive rather than responsive about the issues they handle.

On the level of law enforcement, institutional authorities should endeavour to close the perceived gap between themselves and the citizenry. Mediatory platforms claim such a gap as a means to justify their existence while making social policing agents out of audience members. Citizen participation should be accepted not in the form of untrained civilian surveillance labour in *sui generis* cases, but in the form of voluntary, informed and preventive efforts. It should be official authorities that inform and educate such citizens in a responsible manner to protect the civilians from unintended consequences of social policing through rash surveillance labour and divisive surveillance cultures.

And on the level of surveillance culture, more space should be made for the resistance against and criticism of surveillance in everyday life. Surveillance studies

focus prevalently on interface surveillance like online data collection, digital databases, and social media. Mass media like television is technologically far surpassed and receives less attention; however, it is still a prevalent platform upon which programs are noteworthy beneficiaries and producers of surveillance cultures and face-to-face surveillance. This thesis aimed not only to illustrate the ways in which television programming is relevant still for the surveillance studies, but also to clarify the ways in which their propaganda of surveillance cultures for entertainment and law and order restricts conversation on the impact and scope of surveillance. This may contribute to the overall perceptions on surveillance as inevitable and inescapable, whereas ways of empowerment, resistance and negotiation can be found through the deconstruction of the mass-mediated discourses, one CBRTV show at a time.

At last, it should be kept in mind that it is the duty of the welfare state to detect necessities and offer services concerning criminal justice, increased quality of life and social well-being. Strategies such as management of citizen expectations from the state agencies and responsabilization of citizenry with police-like duties may lead to further exploitation of the citizens. It is especially concerning that such endeavours are carried out by TV shows whose main concern is entertainment and ratings. In the long run, no matter how much assurance is given to the contrary and how the shows construct their praising discourses, this practice may erode belief in the state as a capable provider.

Writing on the interdependence of surveillance cultures, social policing, and CBRTV programming sparked interest in further research. First among them was the relation of surveillance cultures, and the reproductions of values concerning family, economy, social status, gender, age, and other factors through crime-based reality programming. Each of these factors is handled in ways specific to the context of the cases, and aid to a perpetuation of bias concerning crime, criminality, and victimization. The investigative processes draw interest while the beliefs and values

of the media personalities are offered to the audiences as ideals or facts. The lines between private and public, if they are respected, are only respected so far as it does not interfere with the processes of justice, while different sections of the society are approached with certain stereotypes in mind, reproducing stigmas and prejudices explicitly or implicitly.

Secondly, the gendered aspects of social policing could yield quite illuminating results, seeing as the CBRTV genre takes place during daytime broadcasts and the programs therein are produced with a female audience in mind. As exemplified above, MATS recognizes its audience's gender distribution and makes calls for surveillance labour specifically to the women, either to notify their husbands of the case and to mobilize their surveillant labour, or to look out their windows carefully to detect the perpetrator. Such calls are made in the show's other cases as well, creating a pattern. Adding to this the many occurrences of conversations (in relation to the cases at hand or not) concerning quite definitive gender roles that take place in the show, the kinds of gender roles that are reproduced and broadcast to a national audience draw critical attention to themselves from time to time. However, the fact remains that the surveillance labour of female citizens proves quite useful in concluding cases of criminal investigations through such shows. Women's participation in policing in general, as well as in social policing through consumption of TV programmes, may reveal a most interesting topic of research, especially in the context of Turkey and its national daytime broadcasts.

Lastly, the overall concept of social policing may be approached from the stance of citizenship. What surveillance cultures and social policing envision is a new kind of citizen with responsibilities that were previously solely of state agencies. Now, citizen surveillance of the self and others for state-sanctioned sets of goals is a palpable phenomenon. This may be researched in line with concepts such as active citizenship or surveillant citizenship, especially in matters concerning criminal investigative processes on mass-mediated platforms.

REFERENCES

- Aksop, G. (1998). *Reality shows in Turkey* (Publication No. 72295) [Master's thesis, Ankara University]. Council of Higher Education Thesis Center.
- Auerbach, C., & Silverstein, L. (2003). *Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis*. New York and London: New York University Press.
- Ball, K. (2009). Exposure: Exploring the subject of surveillance. *Information, Communication & Society*, 12(5), 639-657. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691180802270386>
- Brewster, J., Stoloff, M., & Sanders, N. (2005). Effectiveness of citizen police academies in changing the attitudes, beliefs, and behavior of citizen participants. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30(1), 21-34.
- Bulut, E. (2020). *Reconstruction of reality in reality shows: An example Müge Anlı ile Tatlı Sert program* (Publication No. 641240) [Master's Thesis, Marmara University]. Council of Higher Education Thesis Center.
- Cavender, G. (1998). In "The Shadow of Shadows": Television reality crime programming. In M. Fishman, & G. Cavender (Eds.), *Entertaining crime: Television reality programs* (pp. 79-94). Aldine de Gruyter.
- Cavender, G., & Fishman, M. (1998). Television reality crime programs: Context and history. In M. Fishman, & G. Cavender (Eds.), *Entertaining crime: Television reality programs* (pp. 1-18). Aldine de Gruyter.
- Choi, K., & Lee, J.-L. (2016). Citizen participation in community safety: A comparative study of community policing in South Korea and the UK. *Policing and Society: An international Journal of Research and Policy*, 26(2), 165-184.

- Choi, K., Lee, J.-L., & Chun, Y.-t. (2014). Why do citizens participate in community crime prevention activities? *Revija Za Kriminalistiko in Kriminologijo*, 4, 287-298.
- Corner, J. (1995). *Television form and public address*. Hodder Education Publishers.
- Crime Stoppers International. (n.d.). *Our Work*. Retrieved August 14, 2021, from: <https://csiworld.org/our-work>
- Çavdar, C. (2019). Gender inequality and women's representation in day time shows for women. *Journal of Selcuk Communication*, 12(1), 368-383.
- Çoban, E. M. (2019). *A sociological view of the media in the discussion of public sphere and civil society: 'Example of 'Tatli Sert with Müge Anli'* (Publication No. 623411) [Master's Thesis, Kütahya Dumlupınar University]. Council of Higher Education Thesis Center.
- Dean, J. (2001). Publicity's secret. *Political Theory*, 29(5), 624-650.
- Demirbaş, T. (2014). *Kriminoloji* (5th ed.). Seçkin Yayıncılık San. ve Tic. AŞ. .
- Devlet Memurları Kanunu. (1965, July 23). *Resmi Gazete* (Issue: 12056). Retrieved from: <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/arsiv/12056.pdf>
- Dobash, R., Schlesinger, P., Dobash, R., & Weaver, C. (1998). "Crimewatch UK": Women's interpretations of televised violence. In M. Fishman, & G. Cavender (Eds.), *Entertaining crime: Television reality programs* (pp. 37-58). Aldine de Gruyter.
- Donovan, P. (1998). Armed with the power of television: Reality crime programming and the reconstruction of law and order in the United States. In M. Fishman, & G. Cavender (Eds.), *Entertaining crime: Television reality programs* (pp. 117-137). Aldine de Gruyter.

- Douglas, J., Ressler, R., Burgess, A., & Hartman, C. (1986). Criminal profiling from crime scene analysis. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 4(4), 401-421. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2370040405>
- Doyle, A. (2003). *Arresting images: Crime and policing in front of the television camera*. University of Toronto Press Incorporated.
- Duru, H., & Çam, T. (2015). Türkiye'de polis-siyaset ilişkisi. In Kula, S., Şahin, İ. & Taşdöven, H. (Eds.), *Polis davranışı: Bekçileri kim bekleyecek?* (pp. 153–177). Orion Kitabevi.
- e-Devlet Kapısı Devletin Kısayolu. (n.d.). *Toplum Destekli Polislik*. Retrieved August 4, 2021, from: <http://www.turkiye.gov.tr/>
- Eco, U. (1990). A guide to the neo-television of the 1980s. In Z. Baransky, & R. Lumley (Eds.), *Culture and conflict in postwar Italy* (pp. 245-255). MacMillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-20841-8_13
- Elitaş, T., & Keskin, S. (2019). Türkiye'de realite programlar ve tele-kimlikler: Medyatik toplumsallık incelemesi. *Siirt University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 7(14), 411-434.
- Erol Işık, N., & Yaman, B. (2017). Crime and media: The world of 'reality show' as a moral frame of reference. *Milli Folklor International and Quarterly Journal of Cultural Studies*, 29(113), 69-78.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Princeton University Press.
- Finn, J. (2012). Seeing surveillantly: Surveillance as a social practice. In A. Doyle, R. Lippert, & D. Lyon (Eds.), *Eyes everywhere: The global growth of camera surveillance* (pp. 67-80). Routledge.
- Fishman, M. (1998). Ratings and reality: The persistence of the reality crime genre. In M. Fishman, & G. Cavender (Eds.), *Entertaining crime: television reality programs* (pp. 59-75). Aldine de Gruyter.

- Foucault, M. (2001). *Power: Essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984*. (J. D. Faubion, Ed.) The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (2007). Panopticism. In S. Hier, & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *The Surveillance Studies Reader* (pp. 67-75). Open University Press.
- Garland, D. (1996). The limits of the sovereign state: Strategies of crime control in contemporary society. *British Journal of Criminology*, 36(4), 445-471.
- Garland, D. (2001). *The culture of control: Crime and social order in contemporary society*. University of Chicago Press.
- Göker, G. (2015). Tele-lives: Reality programs in Turkey in the context of reality and fiction. *Global Media Journal TR Edition*, 6(11), 261-282.
- Grabosky, P. (1992). Law enforcement and the citizen: Non-governmental participants in crime prevention and control. *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy*, 2(4), 249-271.
- Greer, S. (2006). Towards a sociological model of the police informant. In C. Norris, & D. Wilson (Eds.), *Surveillance, crime and social control* (pp. 251-269). Ashgate.
- Haggerty, K., & Ericson, R. (2000). The surveillant assemblage. *British Journal Sociology*, 51(4), 605-622.
- Hakkari Emniyet Müdürlüğü. (n.d.). *Toplum Destekli Polislik Şube Müdürlüğü*. Retrieved May 4, 2020, from: <http://hakkari.pol.tr/tdp>
- Hayes, B. (2012). The surveillance-industrial complex. In K. Ball, K. Haggerty, & D. Lyon (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*. Routledge.
- Kaya, Ş. (2012). Fears for sale from the owner: The role of media in the construction of women as the frightened subject. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(1), 191-211.

- Kooistra, P., Mahoney, J., & Westervelt, S. (1998). The world of crime according to "Cops". In M. Fishman, & G. Cavender (Eds.), *Entertaining crime: Television reality programs* (pp. 141-158). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Koskela, H. (2004). Webcams, TV shows and mobile phones: Empowering exhibitionism. *Surveillance & Society*, 2(2/3), 199-215.
- Kula, S. (2015). Polislik, modern polislik yaklaşımları ve polis davranışı. In Kula, S., Şahin, İ. & Taşdöven, H. (Eds.), *Polis Davranışı: Bekçileri Kim Bekleyecek?* (pp. 19-43). Orion Kitabevi.
- Leishman, F., & Mason, P. (2003). *Policing and the media: Facts, fictions and factions*. Willan Publishing.
- Lupton, D. (2017). Personal data practices in the age of lively data. In J. Daniels, K. Gregory, & T. McMillan Cottom (Eds.), *Digital Sociologies* (pp. 339-354). Polity Press.
- Lyon, D. (1994). *The electronic eye: The rise of surveillance society*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Lyon, D. (2006). 9/11, synopticon, and scopophilia: Watching and being watched. In K. Haggerty, & R. Ericson (Eds.), *The New Politics of Surveillance & Visibility* (pp. 35-54). University of Toronto Press.
- Lyon, D. (2007). *Surveillance Studies: An Overview*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lyon, D. (2017). Surveillance culture: Engagement, exposure, and ethics in digital modernity. *International Journal of Communication*, 11, 824-842.
- Lyon, D. (2018). *The culture of surveillance: Watching as a way of life*. Polity.
- MacAleese, G. (2016). *Crime Stoppers: The inside story*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

- Marshall, T. (1983). Citizenship and social class. In D. Held (Ed.), *States and Societies* (pp. 248–260). Open University Press.
- Marx, G. (2006). I'll be watching you: Reflections on the new surveillance. In C. Norris, & D. Wilson (Eds.), *Surveillance, Crime and Social Control* (pp. 3-13). Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Mathiesen, T. (2006). The viewer society: Michel Foucault's 'panopticon' revisited. In C. Norris, & D. Wilson (Eds.), *Surveillance, crime, and social control* (pp. 41-59). Ashgate.
- McGrath, J. E. (2004). *Loving big brother: Performance, privacy and surveillance space*. London: Routledge.
- Metzl, J. (2004a). From scopophilia to survivor: A brief history of voyeurism. *Textual Practice*, 18(3), 415-434. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502360410001732935>
- Metzl, J. (2004b). Voyeur nation? Changing definitions of voyeurism, 1950–2004. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry*, 12(2), 127-131. doi:10.1080/10673220490447245
- Neuman, L. (2014). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7th ed.). Allyn and Bacon Press.
- O'Neill, M., & Loftus, B. (2013). Policing and the surveillance of the marginal: Everyday contexts of social control. *Theoretical Criminology*, 17(4), 437-454. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480613495084>
- Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. (n.d.). Reality TV . In *OxfordLearnersDictionaries.com*. Retrieved March 17, 2020, from <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/reality-tv?q=reality TV>

- Özgenç, M. (2017, April 30). Evlilik programları yeni Khk ile yasaklandı. *Hürriyet*.
<https://www.hurriyet.com.tr/gundem/evlilik-programi-khk-ile-yasak-40442535>
- Palmiotto, M. J., & Unninthan, N. P. (2002). The impact of citizen police academies on participants: An exploratory study. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 101–106.
- Reisinger, D. S. (2007). *Crime and media in contemporary france*. Purdue University.
- Rose, N., O'Malley, P., & Valverde, M. (2006). Governmentality. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 2, 83-104.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.2.081805.105900>
- RTÜK. (2010). *Kadınların Televizyon İzleme Eğilimleri Araştırması - 2*.
- RTÜK. (2018). *Televizyon İzleme Eğilimleri Araştırması (pp. 1–183)*.
- Schreurs, W., Kerstholt, J., de Vries, P., & Giebels, E. (2018). Citizen participation in the police domain: The role of citizens' attitude and morality. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 46(6), 775-789. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21972>
- Skogan, W., Hartnett, S., DuBois, J., Comey, J., Kaiser, M., & Lovig, J. (2019). *On the beat: Police and community problem solving*. Routledge.
- Terpstra, J. (2008). Police, local government, and citizens as participants in local security networks. *Police Practice and Research*, 9(3), 213-225.
- Tetik, T., & Özgüven, D. (2021). Reality crime programs in turkish television: The notorious case of Palu family on Müge Anlı. *Athens Journal of Mass Media and Communications*, 7(2), 137-150.
- Walsh, J. (2014). Watchful citizens: Immigration control, surveillance and societal participation. *Social & Legal Studies*, 23(2), 237-259.

Wood, D. (2012). Globalization and surveillance. In K. Ball, K. Haggerty, & D. Lyon (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies* (pp. 333-342). Routledge.

Yaman, B. (2013). *An analysis of crime-based reality tv shows: The case of Müge Anlı ile Tatlı Sert* (Publication No. 347994) [Master's Thesis, İzmir University of Economics]. Council of Higher Education Thesis Center.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

GİRİŞ

Bu tezin amacı, gözetim kültürünün Türkiye’deki suç temelli realite televizyon programları tarafından vatandaşın polisliğe katılımı amacıyla kullanıldığı yolları tespit etmek, bunun bireysel ve toplumsal düzlemde olası etkilerini tespit etmek ve bulguları sosyal politikaya yön verebilecek şekilde sunmaktır. Bu amaçla gözetim kültürü, vatandaşın polisliğe katılımı ve suç temelli realite televizyon programları olmak üzere üç ana alanda tarama yapılmıştır. Gözetim kültürü günümüzde ağırlıklı olarak sosyal medya üzerinden incelense dahi kitle iletişim araçlarının da gözetim kültürünün üretilmesinde özellikle Türkiye’de hala önemli bir yere sahip olduğu vurgulanmış ve vaka analizi, gözetim kültürü ve polisliğe vatandaş katılımı kavramları bir araya getirilerek yapılmıştır.

Ulusal yayın yapan birçok kanalda suç temelli realite programlarının örneklerine rastlanmaktadır. Bu programlarda ağırlıklı olarak faili meçhul cinayetler, kaybolan insanlar, dağılmış aileler ve dolandırıcılıklar konu edilmekte, bunların arasında en sık rastlanan ise cinayet soruşturmaları olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Ele alınan konu ile ilgili kimseler stüdyoda ağırlanmakta veya onlarla yapılan röportajlar programda yayınlanmakta ve programın sunucusu ve uzman ekibi tarafından yapılan bu soruşturma ulusal bir izleyici kitlesine canlı yayınlara aktarılmaktadır. Genellikle kuşak programı olarak adlandırılan bu türün örnekleri yayın sezonu boyunca hafta içi her gün yayınlanmakta ve çoğunlukla birden fazla suç nitelikli konu aynı anda işlenmektedir.

Bu türün bir diğer özelliği ise, yapılan yayınların dile getirilen amacının ortak olmasıdır. Programlar, incelenen konu ile ilgili kişilerin yayınları görüp konuya dair kendi bilgilerini programa ve/veya polise iletmeleri, bu sayede sorunun çözümüne katkı sağlamaları amacıyla yapılmaktadır. Bir diğer deyişle, geleneksel bir suç soruşturmasındaki zaman ve mekân kısıtları ortadan kalkmakta, yayın aracılığıyla kanıt ve bilgi toplama amacı güdülmektedir. Bu süreçte büyük oranda ortadan kalkan başka bir husus da gizlilik; konu ile alakalı kişiler ve şüphelilerden ulusal bir izleyici kitlesi önünde özel yaşamları da dahil olmak üzere birçok alanda dürüstlük ve açıklık beklenmektedir. Programa bilgi aktarımı amacıyla katılan izleyicilerin genel izleyici kitlesi içinde oldukça küçük bir grup oluşturduğu dikkate alındığında, bu programların suç soruşturmanın yanı sıra eğlendirme amacını da üstlendiğini göz önünde bulundurmak gerekmektedir. Bu eğlence, süreklilik arz eden bir ifşa etme, açığa çıkarma zinciri ile sağlanmakta, bu da toplumda hâlihazırda var olan gözetleme eğilimini ve görme, bilme ihtiyacını karşılamaktadır.

Türkiye’de popülarlığını korumakta olan bu tür, izleyicisinden suç nitelikli soruşturmalara bilgi ve kanıt sağlayarak polisliğe katılımında bulunmalarını talep etmektedir. Tezde çalışılan vakanın da açıkça ortaya koyacağı üzere izleyicilerden gözetim yapmaları ve bu gözetimin sonucunda elde ettikleri sözselsel ya da görsel verileri programa ve/veya polise iletmeleri beklenmektedir. Aranmakta olan bir şahsı görüp konuma ve kişinin/durumun tasvirine dayanan verileri iletmek, en alışlagelmiş taleplerden bir tanesidir. Bunun için de izleyiciden sürekli olarak dikkatli olması, etrafına dikkatli bakıp şahsı görür görmez polise haber vermesi istenmektedir. Bunun yanı sıra varsa izleyicilerin güvenlik kameralarının kayıtlarını kontrol etmeleri ve şahsı orada bulurlarsa bu görüntüleri de iletmeleri beklenmektedir. Bu ve benzeri talepler, programların yeri geldiğinde gözetim yapacak veya devamlı olarak gözetim yapan bir kitle öngördüğüne işaret etmektedir.

Bu tezde, programın gözetleme emeği ile sorumlulaştırdığı izleyici kitlesinde ve programın devamlı verdiği yasa ve nizam ideolojisi doğrultusunda, gözetim

yapmanın, gözetimin ve haliyle ifşanın uzun vadede normalleştiği savunulmaktadır ve bu olgu, “sosyal polislik” olarak kavramsallaştırılmıştır. Araştırma sorusu, gözetim kültürünün suç temelli realite programları tarafından sosyal polislik üretmek amacıyla nasıl kullanıldığıdır.

İlerleyen kısımlarda öncelikle gözetim kültürü, vatandaşın polisliğe katılımı ve suç temelli realite televizyon programları üzerine ayrı ayrı yapılan literatür taraması ve oluşturulan kavramsal çerçeve, ardından araştırmada kullanılan metodoloji ve metotlar açıklanacaktır. Takiben, yapılan vaka çalışmasında öne çıkan bulgular incelenecek ve ilgili çıkarımlar olası bir sosyal politika geliştirme sürecini bilgilendirme amacıyla sunulacaktır.

KAVRAMSAL ÇERÇEVE

Gözetim gündelik hayatın vazgeçilmez bir parçasıdır ve literatürde en yaygın olarak iki açıdan incelenmektedir; panoptikon ve sinoptikon. Panoptikon, her mahkûmun bir kuleden görülebildiği, ancak kuleden gelen ışık sebebiyle mahkûmların kulede onları gözetleyen birinin olup olmadığını göremediği bir hapisane tasarımıdır. Foucault’ya göre buradaki erk, kulenin görünürlüğü sebebiyle görünür, gözetleme görevini üstlenen kişinin görünmemesi sebebiyle de kanıtlanamaz bir özelliğe sahiptir (2007, p. 71). Her an gözetlenebileceklerinin bilincindeki mahkûmlardan, öz disiplin kullanarak davranışlarını istenen doğrultuda değiştirmeleri beklenmektedir. Kontrol, çok sayıda insanın az sayıda insan tarafından gözetlenmesi üzerinden sağlanmaktadır. Bu tür gözetim günümüzde birçok otorite tarafından gerçekleştirilmektedir ve vatandaşların arzu edilen toplumsal düzene uygun şekilde davranması amacını gütmektedir.

Öte yandan sinoptikon, çok sayıda insanın az sayıda olanı gözetlemesi olarak açıklanabilir. Mathiesen (2006) sinoptikon ve panoptikonun eş zamanlı var olduğunu ve tarih boyunca farklı şekillerde olageldiklerini savunmaktadır. Günümüzde birçok farklı televizyon kanalı birer sinoptikon görevi görmektedir;

haberler, filmler ve benzeri yayınlar sayesinde geniş kitlelerin tercih ettikleri kesimleri gözetlemesine olanak sağlamaktadır. Mathiesen, uzun vadede sinoptikon aracılığıyla yapılan yayınların da insanları belli bir dünya görüşüne dahil etme amacı taşıdığını, arzu edilen bilincin bu sayede şekillendiğini savunmaktadır (2006). Daha kapsamlı değişiklikler için de sinoptik gözetim araçsallaştırılmakta, politika değişiklikleri yapılabilmektedir. Buna örnek olarak 9/11 saldırısının canlı yayınlanmasını veren Lyon, olayın sinoptik olarak gözetlenmiş olmasının daha sıkı gözetim önlemlerinin alınmasında önemli bir rolü olduğunu, tehdide karşı bir savunma aracı olarak daha fazla gözetimin savunulmasını meşrulaştırdığını vurgulamaktadır. Bu gözetleme görevi vatandaşa da verilmiş, emniyet sorumlularına destek amaçlı gözetim yapmaları beklenmiştir (2006, p. 39).

Gözetim oldukça yaygın ve genel kabul görmüş bir olgu olarak, toplumda kendi akışkan ve devamlı değişim halindeki bir kültüre de sahiptir. Gözetim kültürünü teorik bir çerçeveye oturtan Lyon, gözetime riayet etmeyi korku, aşinalık ve eğlence faktörleriyle; gözetime katılımı da gözetim tahayyülleri ve pratikleri ile açıklamaktadır. Riayet açısından yaklaşacak olursak, gözetim ile korku unsuru oluşturan tehdidin etkisiz hale getirileceği düşüncesi yayılmakta, gözetim gerekli bir olgu olarak lanse edilmektedir. Gözetlemek ve gözetlenmenin hem eğlenceli bir aktivite haline gelmiş olması, hem de çeşitli formatlarda yapılageldiği için aşına olması hususları da bir o kadar önemlidir. Gözetime katılımı şekillendiren gözetim tahayyülü ikiye ayrılmakta, gözetim dinamikleri ile gözetimin işleyişi, gözetim görevleri ile de gözetimin beraberinde getirdiği sorumluluk ve rollerin tahayyülü kastedilmektedir. Katılımın ikinci ayağı olan gözetim pratikleri kişinin gözetimin içinde var olmasını açıklamakta ve hem gözetim altında olmaya verilen tepkilerle, hem de kişi tarafından başlatılan gözetim ile açıklanabilmektedir (2017).

Gözetimin görünürlük ile ilgili özellikleri de gözetim kültürünün önemli bir kısmını beslemektedir. Kişiler, örneğin çeşitli sosyal medya platformlarında kişisel verilerini paylaşabilmekte ve Lupton'un "veri toplulukları" olarak adlandırdığı

topluluklara dahil olabilmektedirler. Lupton, bedensel verilerin ölçülüp paylaşıldığı sağlıkla ilgili uygulamalar üzerinden bireylerin, başka bir çok özelliğin yanı sıra, birbirlerine duygusal destek sağladığını, aidiyet hissettiğini, benzer deneyimler üzerinden bağ kurduğunu, ve kendi çevrimiçi kimliklerinin inşasını yaptığını savunmaktadır (2017, p. 347). Kişilerin kendileri ile ilgili görünürlüğü Furedi tarafından da tartışılmış, özel alanda yaşananların ifşa edilmesi ve aile ile ilgili deneyimlerin düzeltilme amacıyla görünür kılınmasını “terapi kültürü” bünyesinde değerlendirilmiştir (2004, aktaran Ball, 2009, p. 650). Bu durum, özel alanda yaşananların kendiliğinden iyileşmeye ve düzelmeye ihtiyaç duyduğu algısı ile derinden ilişkilendirilmektedir. Son olarak Dean, görünürlüğün demokrasinin gerektirdiği bir özellik olduğunu; bilgi ekonomisi ve teknokültür dahilinde kişinin kendi bilgisini ifşa etmesinin şüpheleri defedeceğinin öngörüldüğünü aktarmaktadır (2001, pp. 645-646).

Gözetim ile derinden alakalı olan polislik uygulamaları tezin bir başka ayağını oluşturmaktadır. Yirminci yüzyılın başlarında Amerika’da yüz yüzelik esası ile yayan, anında, ve uzaktan iletişim araçları olmadan yapılan polislik, 1930’lara geldiğinde iletişim teknolojilerindeki gelişmelerden etkilenerek değişmiştir. Artan bürokratik denetim ve ulaşım araçları, polisin halktan uzaklaşması ve polisliğin ciddi bir meslek olarak algılanmasına yol açmıştır. Halktan uzak olmak beraberinde kendi sorunlarını getirmiş ve 1960’lardan itibaren polisin sorumlulukları tartışılmış, yeni polislik türleri üzerine düşünölmeye başlanmıştır (Duru & Çam, 2015, pp. 161-162). Yirmi birinci yüzyılın başlarında suçta bir artışın gözlemlenmesi toplumun polisten beklentilerini arttırmış, güvenliği öncelikli bir hedef haline getirmiştir (Garland, 2001, p. 163). Taleplerin karşılanmaması, yeni bir polislik yolu olarak toplum odaklı polisliğin gelişmesine katkı sağlamıştır. Grabosky, bu yaklaşımın toplumun polisle yakın ilişkiler kurmasını ve suç deneyimleri/çözüm yolları ile ilgili söz sahibi olmasını amaçladığını söylemektedir (1992, p. 254). Toplum ile dayanışma öngören polislik eğilimleri çok sayıda ülkeyi etkilemiştir ve Türkiye de, “Toplum Destekli Polislik” çalışmaları yürüten ölkelerden biridir.

Polisin vatandařla iřbirlięi iin motivasyonları arasında artan su oranları, bunlara cevap vermedeki yetersizlik ve iřbirlięinin maddi aıdan rahatlatıcı bir faktör olması sayılabilmekte; bu da sorumlulařtırma baęlamında vatandařın polisten beklentilerini azaltmaları talebini beraberinde getirmektedir. Vatandařın bu iřbirlięindeki motivasyonları ise daha önce su ile ilgili deneyimler, kamu gvenlięine verilen önem, emniyet glerine duyulan gven, polisle alıřmanın olası istihdam getirileri, toplumsal aidiyet hissi, toplumda mevcut olan su seviyesi, halihazırda suu önlemeye ynelik bařka abalara dahil olma (Choi & Lee, 2016, p. 172), ve maddi ödl beklentisi (Grabosky, 1992, p. 261) olarak sıralanabilmektedir. Vatandařın polislięe katılımı bir ok Őekilde sınıflandırılmıř olsa da, Schreurs, Kerstholt, Vries ve Giebels tarafından ortaya koyulan “iřbirliki katılım”, “sosyal control”, “tepkisel katılım”, ve “saptama” ayrıřtırması (2018, pp. 5-6) vaka analizindeki katılıma en yakın sınıflandırma olarak grlmřtr.

Trkiye’de vatandařın polislięe katılımı konusunda ayrıntılı veri, resmi bir veri tabanı mevcutsa dahi kamusal eriřime aık olmamakla birlikte, tezde bu olgunun en gzlemlenebilir olduęu alanın su temelli realite programları olduęu savunulmaktadır. Tezin iinde “sosyal polislik” terimi, bu programların izleyicilerinin sorumluluk sahibi vatandařlar olarak grldę, geleneksel olarak polislikle iliřkilendirilebilecek gzetim grevleri ile sorumlulařtırıldıęı, gzetim tahayyllerinin arzu edilen gzetim pratikleri ile sonulanması adına Őekillendirildięi, ve programlar aracılıęıyla gerek grldęnde harekete geirildięi sreci aktarmak adına kavramsallařtırılmıřtır.

Su temelli realite programları, kresel dzlemde özelleřmenin artması ve kar amacı gden özel kanalların oęalması ile realite televizyonculuęunun vazgeilmezi haline gelmiřtir. Su unsuru ieren konuların incelenmesi, arařtırılması ile ilgili olan bu programlar seyircilerinden o an ele aldıkları konuya dair bilgilerini paylařmalarını beklemekte, bu bilgiler de suun özmnde kanıt olarak kullanılabilir. Sre iinde gzetim ve gzetim ile ilgili kltrden faydalanılmakta, bunlara katkı

yapılmakta ve bu kavramlar yeniden üretilmektedir. Dünya genelinde bu türün örnekleri gazetecilik ile ilişkilene çabaları, emniyet güçlerini daima olumlu göstermeleri, suçu bağlam ve sebeplerinden kopuk temsil etmeleri, suçu bir eğlence malzemesi haline getirmeleri, ele alınan konu ile ilgili kişilerin kamuoyu önünde ve adli süreçlerde sıkıntı yaşayabilmeleri, adli süreçlerin yayınlardan etkilenebilmesi, ve kanun ve nizam ideolojisinin ağırlıklı olarak aktarılması gibi yönlerden eleştirilmiştir. MATS başta olmak üzere Türk televizyonlarındaki örnekler de benzeri şekilde eleştirilmiş, programların Foucault'cu açıdan disipline edicilikleri, neoliberal ve muhafazakar değerleri aktarmaları (Yaman, 2013), kendilerini kamusal alanda bir problem çözme platformu olarak sunmaları (Çoban, 2019) başta olmak üzere çeşitli şekillerde ele alınmıştır.

METODOLOJİ

Metodolojik olarak hem yorumlayıcı hem de eleştirel bir yaklaşım benimsenmiştir. Yorumlayıcı yaklaşım, gözetim kültürü ve sosyal polislik gibi kavramların yeniden üretildiği, ilgili değer ve anlamların yaratıldığı dolaylı yolları tespit etmek amacıyla üstlenilmiştir. Sayıca oldukça fazla aktörün etkileşimlerini geniş bir çerçevede anlamlı şekilde inceleyebilmek için bu yaklaşım gereklidir. Öte yandan, bu tezin politika önerileri üretme kaygısı, kaynak materyale eleştirel bir bakış açısını da gerekli kılmıştır. Özünde, vatandaşların izleyicisi oldukları bir televizyon programı tarafından polisliğe katılımının sağlanmasından çok, açıkça veya üstü kapalı bir şekilde polis-vari gözetim görevleri ile sorumlulaştırılması sorun teşkil eden bir olgu olarak görülmektedir. Bu süreçte yasa ve nizam söylemleri ile güven temelli bir hayat görüşü sunulmakta, bireyler arası suça karşı temkin sürekli bir gözetim temeliyle ele alınmakta, ve gözetim vatandaşın öncelikli sorumlulukları arasında sayılmaktadır. Gözetim kültürünün bu gibi amaçlar doğrultusunda yeniden üretilmesine ve vatandaşın sosyal polisliğe doğru sorumlulaştırılmasına karşı politika önerileri, eleştirel bir okuma ile geliştirilmiştir.

Suç temelli realite programları formatları gereği soruşturma ve sorgulama yapmaktadırlar. Ağırlıklı olarak sözlü anlatım üzerinden ilerledikleri için, bu içeriğin *niteliksel* bir analize tabi uygun görülmüştür. Bu sayede vakanın derinlemesine incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Yayın sürecinde bir soruşturma sürdürülmektedir; bu da yayının kendisinin doğrusal olmayan bir gidişatı olduğu anlamına gelmektedir. Bu medya içeriğinin analizi de benzer bir şekilde *doğrusal olmayan bir araştırma yolu* (Neuman, 2014, p. 170) izleyerek yapılmıştır. İlgili tüm inceliklerin ortaya koyulabilmesi amacı gözetilerek, *vaka çalışması* yöntemi tercih edilmiş ve bu sayede hem vakanın keşfi, hem nitelikli tasviri, hem de teoriyle bağlantılı açıklamalarını kurmak hedeflenmiştir.

Format ve içeriklerinin, gözetim kültürü aracılığıyla sorumlulaştırma ve sosyal polislik ürettiği savunulan suç temelli realite programları, araştırma için uygun bir alandır. Türün çok sayıda örneği bulunduğu için aralarından popülerliği, reyting başarısı ve uzun süren yayın hayatı sebebiyle *Müge Anlı ile Tatlı Sert* (MATS) programı seçilmiştir. Bu program da aynı anda pek çok konuyu araştırdığı için, aralarından tek bir konunun seçilmesi gerekmiştir, zira bölümlerin iki saati aşması ve bir konunun çok sayıda bölüm içinde işlenmesi, birden fazla vaka incelemesini zorlaştırmaktadır. MATS'ın program harici medya platformlarında da oldukça yer verilen Atalay Filiz'i (AF) aramaya ayırdığı bölümler, AF'nin kaçak statüsü sebebiyle arayış bir aciliyet ve ehemmiyet çerçevesinde yürütülmüş, bu da ülkenin dört bir yanından gelen gözetim emeğinin oldukça yoğun bir biçimde gözlemlenebilmesine olanak tanımıştır. Sorumlulaştırma ve sosyal polislik kavramsallaştırmalarının en açıklayıcı şekilde burada incelenebileceği düşünüldüğünden, vaka çalışması için MATS'ın AF ile ilgili bölümleri seçilmiştir.

AF vakası toplamda 13 bölüm sürmüştür. İlk 9 bölüm onun aranması ile, yakalanmasının ardından yayınlanan son 4 bölüm ise tutuklanma sonrası sürecin takibi ve geriye dönük bir şekilde vakayı yorumlama ile geçmiştir. MATS'ın AF soruşturması, başka soruşturmalarıyla eş zamanlı ve dönüşümlü yürütülmüştür. Bu

toplamda 27 saat 39 dakikalık bir içeriğe tekabül etmektedir, ancak analize yalnızca AF ile ilgili kısımlar dahil edilmiştir.

Analizde *niteliksel veri kodlama metodu* (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003) kullanılmıştır. Bu metoda göre işlenmemiş bölüm metinleri içinden araştırma sorunsalı ile alakalı metinler ayıklanmış, bunların içinde tekrarlayan olgular belirlenmiştir. Bu olgular, birbirleriyle ve teoriyle alakalı şekilde temalar halinde gruplandırılmış, temalar ise teoriyle desteklenerek anlamlı bir anlatı oluşturmak amaçlanmıştır.

Tez sürecindeki kısıtlamalardan bahsedilmesi gerekirse; tezin araştırma sorusuna karar verilmesinin ardından, sürecin MATS açısından nasıl ilerlediğine dair bilgi almak istenmiş, ancak iletişim kurulamamıştır. Buna göre araştırma yeniden tasarlanmıştır. Küresel Covid-19 salgını tezin bir başka kısıdını oluşturmuş; araştırma, danışma ve yazma sürecini zamansal, mekansal, ekonomik ve duygusal açılardan zorlu kılmıştır. Tezi güçlü kılan bir yön olarak da, programın bir izleyicisi olan yazarın, analiz esnasında hangi verilerin önemli ve anlamlı olduğuna dair önceden gelen bilgisinin bulunması sayılabilir. Yazarın aynı anda bir izleyici, bir araştırmacı ve bir yazar olarak sahaya yaklaşımı üç aşamalı bir anlamlandırma (Neuman, 2014, pp. 179-180) sağlamıştır.

VAKA ÇALIŞMASI

Gözetim kültürünün suç temelli realite programları aracılığıyla sosyal polislik üretimindeki yerini anlamak amacıyla MATS üzerine yapılan vaka çalışması beş başlık altında incelenmektedir ve bu başlıklar seyircilerin gözetime riayetinin sağlanması, gözetim tahayyüllerinin tahsis edilmesi, gözetim pratiklerinin hayata geçmesi, gözetim emeğinin benimsenmesi ve gözetim kültürünün meşrulaştırılması şeklinde bulunmuştur.

Program, seyircilerinin gözetime riayet etmesi için ilk olarak suça dair bazı önyargıları pekiştirmektedir. Suç ve suçluya dair kalıp yargılar, istisna denebilecek bir konu ele alındığında dahi o konunun ne denli istisnai olduğu vurgulanarak yeniden üretilmektedir. İkinci olarak suçu işleyen kişiye duyulan korku körüklenmekte, korkularını dile getiren şahısların röportajları yayınlanmakta, bu duygunun yerli olduğu da sunucu tarafından tekrarlanarak onaylanmaktadır. Suç genel bir olgu olarak değil vaka üzerinden ele alınmakta, suçluya odaklanılmakta, yaratılan korku üzerinden programın bilgilendirici özelliği vurgulanarak varlığı meşrulaştırılmaktadır. Üçüncü olarak ise suçlunun geçmişi ve özel hayatı ifşa edilmektedir. Seyircilerden şahsı gördükleri takdirde programa ve/veya polise ihbarda bulunmaları beklenirken, şahsın tanınması amacını aşan bilgiler aşırılıkla verilmekte, izleyicinin görme ve bilmeye yönelik istek ve ihtiyacı mahremiyet pahasına tatmin edilmektedir. Bu sayede gözetim kültürüne riayeti sağlayan eğlence, aşinalık ve korku faktörleri yerine getirilmektedir.

Seyircilerin gözetim tahayyülleri de program dahilinde istenilen doğrultuda şekillendirilmektedir. Öncelikle, program seyircilerinden ihbar talep etmektedir. Bu talep sıklıkla yinelenerek hem izleyicinin gözetimi adaletin tahsisinde bir araç olarak görmeleri, hem de kendilerini bu dinamik içinde sorumlu hissetmeleri sağlanmaktadır. Güvenlik temelli bir söylemsellik öne çıkmakta, bu güvenliğin gerçekleşmesi için de gözetim konusunda eğitim almamış sivillerden gözetim emeği istenmektedir. AF'nin Suriyeli mülteciler ile yurt dışına kaçmasının önüne geçme amacıyla insan kaçakçıları ile canlı yayında iletişime geçilmesi de programın kanun yanlısı tutumunun ve suça/suçluluğa yaklaşımlarının koşullar dahilinde yeniden şekillenebileceğini göstermiştir. Buna karşılık gelen eleştiriler yersiz bulunmuş, seyirciler ise programın tavrına verdikleri onay üzerinden ayrıştırılmıştır. İkinci olarak seyirciyi sorumlulaştırma çabaları öne çıkmaktadır; neoliberal kaygılar güden devletin sorumluluklarının bir kısmını devlet dışı platformlara aktarmasının bir örneği olarak, toplum ve birey bazlı güvenliğin sorumluluğun program aracılığıyla izleyiciye, yani vatandaşa verildiği gözlemlenmektedir. İzleyicilerden,

programca şekillenmiş gözetim tahayyülleri doğrultusunda gözetim pratikleri yapmaları, sonuç olarak edindikleri bilgileri de aktarmaları talep edilmektedir. Üçüncü olarak da tüm bu süreçlerin altındaki kanun ve nizam ideolojik söylemleri öne çıkmakta, polise yönelik övgü ve güven içerikli sözler tekrarlanmakta, polis ile program arasındaki iletişime göndermeler yapılmakta ve bu sayede program, polisin desteği ile kendini meşrulaştırmaktadır. İzleyicinin programa yaptıkları ihbarlar, dolaylı yoldan emniyet kuvvetlerine yapılmış olmaktadır.

Gözetim pratikleri genellikle zanlının eşkâlinin gündelik yaşam içinde tanınması, tespit edilmesi, ve zaman/mekan başta olmak üzere mümkün olan en çok ayrıntıyla programa ve/veya polise ivedilikle aktarılması şeklinde gerçekleşmektedir. Eş zamanlı olarak ülke içinde ve dışında birçok insan, programın talebiyle harekete geçmekte ve zanlıyı bulmak için gözetim emeği harcamaya başlamaktadır. Program, polisin işini kolaylaştırmak adına görsel kanıt (fotoğraf veya video) talep etmekte, güvenlik kamera kayıtlarının bireysel düzlemde taranmasını istemektedir. Programın takipçileri yapacakları ihbarın formatını da, ihbara yol açan gözetim emeğinin işleyişini de bilmektedir. Yayınları takip eden izleyiciler gündelik hayatlarında çevrelerini de uyarmakta, başkalarından duydukları bilgileri de programa aktarmaktadırlar. Programın talep ettiği gözetim emeğinin dışına da çıkılabilmektedir; var olan gözetim kültürüne uygun olarak ve programda ifşa edilen bilgiler doğrultusunda organize olup kendi araştırmalarını yapan bir grup, ulaştıkları verileri programla paylaşmıştır. Bu ve benzeri örnekler ile toplum destekli polislik aktiviteleri arasında benzerlik gözlemlenmiştir.

Gözetim emeğinin izleyicilerce içselleştirilmesi amacıyla program ilk olarak ellerine geçen ihbarın sayıca çokluğunu yineleyerek bir nevi dolaylı mahalle baskısı uygulamaktadır. İhbar veren izleyiciler isimle ya da genel olarak takdir edilmekte, bu çaba bir takım çalışması olarak adlandırılarak da ihbar vererek bir topluluğa aidiyet hissedilmesi olgusu güçlendirilmektedir. İkinci olarak izleyicilerin tasviri ekseriyetle övgü dolu olmakta, bu sayede programa ilgi ve desteğin olumlu olgularla

çağrışımı sağlanmaktadır. Bu olumlu çağrışım izleyiciler üzerinden tüm halka yapılmakta, bu da programa katılımı daha geniş bir kitle üzerinden meşrulaştırmaktadır. Son olarak gözetim emeği ile programa ve dolayısıyla polise destek vatandaşlık görevi olarak lanse edilerek gözetim vatandaşlık tanımlamasına eklenmekte, bu söylem ihbarlarıyla zanlının yakalanmasına katkı sağlayan kişilerce de tekrar edilmektedir.

Programın gözetim kültürünü meşrulaştırılması, özellikle incelenen vakanın bir tutuklama ile sonuçlanması ile girift şekilde gerçekleşmektedir. Adaletin vuku bulması vurgusu üzerinden program, kendi varlığı yanı sıra emniyet güçlerinin ve izleyicilerin gözetim emeğinin yerindeliğini ön plana çıkarmaktadır. Birçok başka verinin yanı sıra AF'nin verdiği ifadeler bire bir okunarak, gözetim emeği gereksinimi ortadan kalkmış olmasına rağmen gözetleyen izleyici kitlesine ifşa sürecine devam edilmektedir. Bu, program işlevinin adalet kadar eğlence üzerine kurulu olduğunun bir göstergesi olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Polis, ihbarcılar, izleyiciler, toplumun geneli ve programın kendisine teşekkür edilerek birlik algısı tekrarlanmış, her birinin kanun ve nizamı sağlamaya yönelik bu süreç içindeki yeri meşru kılınmıştır. Vaka ile ilgili kişilerin AF'nin adli süreçlerdeki akıbeti hakkında ceza yanlısı temennilerine bir platform sunan program, bu sayede hem etkileşim sağlamış, hem de kendisinin süreç dahilindeki yerini pekiştirmiştir. Son olarak vakaya geriye dönük bir yorumlama getiren sunucu ve uzman kadrosu, kanunlara uymayı ve birçok şekilde daha fazla gözetimi ile ileride yaşanabilecek suç ve mağduriyetlere karşı bir önlem olarak sunmaktadır.

BULGULAR VE SONUÇ

MATS vakası analizi teşhire karşı mahremiyet, eğlendiriciliğe karşı bilgilendiricilik, aracılığa karşı doğrudan iletişim, sosyal polisliğe karşı toplum destekli polislik, ve gözetim kültürüne karşı dayanışma kültürü olmak üzere beş başlık üzerinden incelenmiştir.

Teşhir edilen bilginin gözetim emeği ile orantısızlığı, yani tanıyıp ihbar edebilmeyi içeren gözetim emeği için yeterli olan bilgiden çok daha mahrem sayılabilecek bilgilerin izleyiciye sunulması, mahremiyet konusunu akla getirmiştir. Herhangi bir kişi hakkında toplanan veri, hele ki suç temelli realite programlarında suçluluğu destekleyici nitelikte algılanabilmekte, suç nitelikli vakayı çözüme adına eğlendirici içerik olarak kullanılabilir. Zanlı ve vaka dahilindeki insanlar, adli bir soruşturmada sahip oldukları mahremiyete erişememekte, dahil olmayanlar için dahi bilgilerinin ifşa edilme olasılığı davranışı ve bilinci disipline edici bir faktör olarak öne çıkmaktadır. Sonuç olarak suçluluk mahremiyetin bu raddede ötelenmesinin bir öncülü olmamalıdır ve ulusal yayında suç temelli içerik üretimi aynı anda eğlendiricilik kaygısı gütmemelidir. Burada gözetim kültürünün rolü anlaşılmalı, sürekli bir ifşa halinin gözetim kültürünü ve sosyal polisliği yeniden üretimi tanınmalıdır.

Program konu seçimleri esnasında cinayet gibi bireyler arası suçlara odaklanmakta, farklı organize suç gibi çok daha geniş kitleleri etkileyen suçları işlememektedir. Vakaların işlenişi de yalnızca o vakanın dinamikleri üzerinden olmakla beraber, suça bir olgu olarak sebebiyet veren sosyal, ekonomik, kültürel ve politik durum ve koşulların üstüne gidilmemektedir. Gözetim emeği ile ve gözetim kültürünü yeniden üreterek çözülen her vaka adaletin bir tecellisi olarak sunulurken suçu önlemek ya da kontrol etmek bir öncelik olarak görülmemektedir. Program uzmanları, suç gerçekleştikten sonra önem arz ettiği tartışılabilir hukuk, adli tıp ve psikiyatri alanlarından seçilmektedir. Güvenlik odaklı söylemsellik, bireysel düzlemde gözetim ile tedbirli olunmasını salık vermektedir. Oysa suç yapısal bir olgudur; suça yönelik yapılan yayınlar da suça sebebiyet veren eşitsizlikler üzerine kamuoyunu bilgilendirici ve değişimi tetikler nitelikte olmalıdır. Bu gibi platformlarda sosyoloji, ekonomi, politika bilimi gibi suçun öncesi konusunda bilgi sunabilecek alanlardan uzmanların yanı sıra sivil toplum kuruluşları ve hükümet dışı örgütlerden temsilciler gelir eşitsizliği, istihdam, ayrımcılık gibi meselelere disiplinler arası bir yaklaşım

sağlayabilirler. Bu sayede amaç gösteri, gözetim ve teşhirden yapısal değişikliğe çekilebilir.

Program, vatandaş ile emniyet güçleri arasında bir aracı görevi görmekte; izleyici kitlesini suç nitelikli vakadan haberdar edip ilgili ihbarları da emniyet güçlerine iletmektedir. Bu süreç kanun ve nizam ideolojisinin yeniden üretilmesini, daha fazla gözetimin savunulmasını, gözetimin normalleştirilmesini ve gözetim emeğinin bu doğrultuda içselleştirilmesini gerektirmektedir. Ancak bu programlar açıkça emniyet teşkilatının bir uzantısı olarak tanınmamaktadır. Her ne kadar zorunluluk olarak sunulmasalar da, emniyet ve vatandaş arasında aracı bu gibi alternatif platformlara ihtiyaç duyulmaması adına adımlar atılmalıdır. Vatandaş ve polis arasında doğrudan iletişim; polisin suç temelli realite programları olmadan ulaşılabilir ve yaklaşılabılır olması hedeflenmelidir. Bunun için de belediyeler ve okullar gibi kamuya açık alanlarda resmi ve suça dair bilgilendirici toplantılar düzenlenebilir, emniyet güçleriyle çekincesiz ve korkusuz iletişim konusunda müfredat değişiklikleri yapılabilir.

Program, izleyicilerini sorumluluk sahibi birer vatandaş olarak görmekte ve onları güvenlik adına gözetim ile sorumlulaştırmaktadır. Programın bir anda birden fazla vaka incelemesi, yayın sezonu boyunca hafta içi her gün yayınlanması ve 2008'den bu yana yayın yapması göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, takipçilerin güvenlik adına gözetimi içselleştirmeleri ve bir alışkanlık haline getirmeleri olağan hale gelmektedir. Tez dahilinde sosyal polislik olarak kavramsallaştırılan bu olguya suçun tek vakalık ve bir diğeri ile değiştirilebilir olarak yansıtılması, suçun bir tüketim metası haline gelmesi eşlik etmektedir. Eğer toplum destekli polislik uygulamalarında bu program benzeri araçlara ihtiyaç duyuluyorsa bu aracılık gözetim, röntgencilik ve teşhir üzerinden kurulmamalıdır. Sorumlulaştırılan değil, sorumlu içerik üretimi gözetilmeli; vatandaşın toplum destekli polisliğe izleyicilik değil gönüllülük esasına dayalı katılımı amaçlı bilgilendirici içerik üretilmelidir. Emniyet güçleri ve vatandaş arasında çevrimiçi platform ve uygulamalar, mesajla

bilgilendirme, umumi ilanlar ve aktif etkileşim gözetken kamu bilgilendirme merkezleri ile resmi ve doğrudan iletişim öncelik haline getirilmelidir.

Program izleyicilerine bir topluluğa aidiyet olma imkanı sunmaktadır ancak bu süreçte izleyici kitlesi de kendi içinde programa koşulsuz yardım ve desteklerini sunanlar ve sunmayanlar olarak ayrıştırılmaktadır. Gözetim kültürünün programın amaçları doğrultusunda şekillendirilmesi de güvenliği öncelikli kılan baskın söylemleri desteklemekte, tehlikelerden sakınmayı izleyiciler nezdinde öncelik haline getirmekte, paranoya ve toplumsal ayrışmaya yol açabilmektedir. Hem bireysel hem de ulusal açıdan daha fazla gözetim uygulamaları ve önlemlerinin alınması meşrulaştırılmaktadır. Gözetim işi ile ilgili eğitimi olmayan kitleler gözetim emeği ile sorumlulaştırılırken bir yandan da emniyetin işini kolaylaştırma söylemi bir yetersizliğe işaret etmektedir. Sorumluluk yerine dayanışma üzerinden üretkenlik, kabiliyet ve güçlendirme amaçlanmalı, gösteri ve gözetim değil sosyolojik açıdan farkındalıklı yaklaşımlardan faydalanılarak yapısal değişim amaçlanmalıdır. Bu noktada hükümet dışı örgüt ve sivil toplum kuruluşlarının da katılımıyla tarafsız, veriye dayanan ve düşünmeye iten içerik üretimi sağlanabilir. Gözetime direnç göstermek de normalleştirilmelidir ve vatandaşın polisliğe katılımı sosyal polislik üzerinden üretilmemelidir.

Sonuç olarak MATS ve benzeri programların hem dünya hem de ülke bağlamından kopuk ele alınamayacağı unutulmamalıdır. Kar odaklılık ve özelleştirme gibi küreselleşme ve neoliberalizm kaynaklı kaygıların yanı sıra bunlardan etkilenen ve bunları etkileyen yönetimsellikler, gözetim kültürünün medya aracılığıyla toplumsallığı dilenen doğrultuda şekillendirebilmesinde bir araç olarak görülmüştür. Devletin refah ve hizmet sağlayıcısı rolünden çekilmesi ile vatandaşlık birçok açıdan yeniden tanımlanmış, güvenlik merkezli söylemlerle gözetime riayet öncelenmiş ve bir meta olarak gözetim pratiklerinden faydalanılmıştır. Panoptik gözetimle beden, sinoptik gözetimle ise bilinç hedef alınmıştır ve ikincisine verilebilecek en iyi örneklerden biri suç temelli realite televizyon programlarıdır.

Bu tezde gözetim kültürünün gözetim emeđi ve sosyal polislik üretimindeki yerini Türkiye'deki en popüler suç temelli realite programı MATS üzerinden okumak amaçlanmıştır. Bu ve benzeri programların yeniden ürettiđi hegemonik söylemler ve dünya paradigmaları, izleyici kitlesinin çođunluđunu oluşturan kadınların gözetim emeđi konusunda deneyimleri, ve vatandaşlıđın sosyal polislik çerçevesinde yeniden tanımlanması gibi konularda gelecekte yapılacak arařtırmalar, özellikle Türkiye bağlamında literature oldukça katkı sağlayacaktır.

APPENDIX B: THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

- Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences**
- Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences**
- Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics**
- Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics**
- Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences**

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Mete
Adı / Name : Alım Irmak
Bölümü / Department : Sosyal Politika / Social Policy

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English): SURVEILLANCE CULTURE AND CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN POLICING THROUGH TELEVISION: A CASE STUDY ON MÜGE ANLI İLE TATLI SERT

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: **Yüksek Lisans / Master** **Doktora / PhD**

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /** Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. /** Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years.** *
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. /** Secure the entire work for period of **six months.** *

* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir. /
A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature **Tarih / Date**

(Kütüphaneye teslim ettiğiniz tarih. Elle doldurulacaktır.)
(Library submission date. Please fill out by hand.)

Tezin son sayfasıdır. / This is the last page of the thesis/dissertation.