

AN EXAMINATION OF THE DEBATE OVER THE REGULATION FOR SAFE INTERNET SERVICE IN TURKEY IN THE PRINT MEDIA AND SEARCH ENGINES

NURHAN KAVAKLI*

ABSTRACT

We live in an age that the sources citizens need for news and information are not limited to traditional media. Other than traditional media, internet and internet-based information and communication technologies offer citizens new alternatives in various forms. Internet search engines, which are one of these new technologies, play a significant role in the circulation of news and information regarding social debates, right along with any kind of news and information. However, this brings about the question how search engines' role plays out in the reflection and conformation of social debates. To investigate this question, this paper examines how the public debate on the "Procedures and Principles for Safe Internet Service" that was taken place in 2011 and 2012 in Turkey, was structured and framed in search engines and the print press by using content analysis.

Keywords: Search engine, Safe Internet, New Information and Communication Technologies, Internet Policy

INTRODUCTION

The Internet and internet-based information and communication technologies that could provide citizens with new forms and ways for sharing and reaching information, have already become a significant actor in the flow of information in both national and global levels which brings new challenges to existing standards, mechanisms or concepts (see e.g. Price, 2002; Sparks, 2001). While the internet has gained importance as a world-wide information and communication space, search engines, without which it is no longer possible to imagine the internet, deserve attention for their dominant role in the process of circulating of information and in the dispersal of views. When the size and complexity of the information on the internet is taken into consideration, it becomes clear that internet search engines perform an indispensable service for internet users who search online information. The importance of their role which could also make an impact on the public sphere has been pointed out by some researchers and scholars. For example, Lucas Introna and Helen Nissenbaum say that

* nkavakli@yahoo.com, Assistant Professor, İstanbul Aydın University, Communication Faculty

"Search engines are important because they provide essential access to the Web both to those with something to say and offer and to those wishing to hear and find (2000: 181)." Some also point out that search engines actually play the role of "gatekeepers" of traditional media, since they determine which information is accessible or not for the user (e.g. Schulz and others 2005; Machill and others 2008).

In comparison to the traditional media, internet has superior properties that creates the hope for an anti-centered communication system and new communicative spaces that could minimize inequalities in online communication (e.g. Dahlgren 2005; Papacharissi, 2002). This makes the internet content which is more likely to include a large variety of voices and views regarding a public issue, more valuable particularly for the formation of public opinion in a democratic way. This also makes internet search engines noteworthy for their dominant role in the circulation of discursive texts which could be potentially produced by more civil society (for example, non-government organizations, ordinary individuals or social movements that want to make an impact in the social or political decision making process). In addition, the alternately circulation of the discursive texts (Warner, 2002) and the reflexivity of discursive texts (Dahlberg 2001) on the net could increase the interactivity between many diverse discourses.

In this context, the impact of internet search engines' role gains a crucial importance for the formation of public sphere. It is particularly important for the question whether or not the pluralism and diversity, which is assumed potentially existing in internet content, is kept and reflected by search engines (in search result page). To investigate this question, this study attempts to examine what actors and frames in the debate for a 2011 Turkish internet regulation named "Procedures and Principles Regarding the Safe Use of the internet" (GİHU) were present in the search result pages. In order to find out whether or not search engines reflected all the sides present at the regulation debate, a comparison between the print media and search engines is held in the study.

THE INTERNET REGULATION: "PROCEDURES AN PRINCIPLES REGARDING THE SAFE USE OF THE INTERNET"

In 2011, the Turkish Information and Communications Technology Authority (BTK), carried out an internet regulation named "Procedures and Principles Regarding the Safe Use of the internet". The regulation was originally aimed to set a compulsory and centralized system for internet filtering in Turkey, by requiring internet users to choose one of the four filtering options: "children", "family", "domestic" and "standard". Soon after it was announced on the regulatory agency's website, on March 4th 2011 (about only six months before it was set to come into force) an intense public debate was aroused on its democratic, legal, social, political, ethical and economic implications. A large variety of actors ranging from academicians and members of civil society to government officials, took part in the discussion. While the government officials claimed that the only motivation behind the idea of filtering internet is to protect children as well as family values in Turkish society, many have posed harsh criticism and some of them have considered it censorship. Some civil society organizations have launched online campaigns against this new regulation, and thousands of people marched demanding its cancellation. After facing criticism, the authorities made

changes in its original plan and announced that only two voluntarily filtering options (“children” and “family”) would be offered to the internet users. Eventually, the new regulation was put into effect only after a four month testing period (August 22 – November 2011). According to the officials, the internet users not willing to use any filters will be provided with unfiltered access to the internet.

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Habermas’ discursive model of the public sphere is used in this study as the theoretical foundation. The model, which defines an ideal public sphere as a discursive interaction space and puts forward the communicative extent of the public sphere, sets forth that the “common good” for the solution of social issues can be achieved as a result of a deliberative communication based on equal and free participation, and rational reasoning. The public opinion in conceptualizing the public sphere has a principle value as it is a method of constituting a democratic collective power via using critical and rational thinking in dealing with social or political issues. Therefore, a democratic public sphere requires a social communication that citizens can have an equal chance of participation, so that ideas from many different perspectives can encounter, interact and turn into a new and informed form of collective rational thinking to realize the “common good “. While Habermas sets forth an ideal public sphere, his understanding of democratic social communication is based on the face to face communication situation taking place in cafes, meeting halls and parks in the 19th Century European cities such as London and Paris. However, as Habermas himself point out, the criteria set by him have become more difficult to meet as the result of the emergence of the mass media. Habermas by himself declared the collapse of the public sphere: The strictly organized, centralized and one way directed communication have failed in providing citizens with equal chance of participation (Habermas, 1989, 1992, 1996). More importantly, mass media is seen to be biased toward powerful and institutionalized actors whose discourses are more likely to be organized for gaining profit and/or power (Gerhards and Schafer, 2010).

The emergence of the internet and related technologies that have created new communication spaces and ways allegedly having some similarities to Habermasian public sphere, (although they are not based on face to face communication) paves the way for new approaches to the concept of public sphere. For example, Dahlberg (2001) points out that the internet has deliberative potential for fully facilitating the public sphere as “exchanges and critique of politic claims can be found to be taking place every day” on communication spaces and forums on the internet. Dahlberg notices that the internet does not carry out the normative conditions of Habermasian public sphere completely because of the limitations imposed by state or economic interests, minimal reflexivity in cyber-deliberations and difficulty verifying online identities and information etc. However, he claims that these limitations can be overcome via forums of discourse and activities which should be supported by regulations to increase democratic participation and discussion opportunities through internet.

Another scholar, Poster (1995), says that in today’s digital world it would be wrong and incomplete to understand and explain the public sphere through old assumptions

and acceptances. He argues about the necessity of developing a postmodern understanding in respect of public sphere and democracy. In a new context, Poster, who indicates that this understanding should take into consideration the qualities of electronic forms in which the discursive interaction is realized, evaluates Habermas's public sphere concept from a different point of view. According to Poster, it is almost impossible for internet to actualize rational critical discussion and consensus constitution, although it provides the condition of equal and free participation which is a must for Habermasian public sphere. The basic reason for this is the way of identifying/creating the identities in virtual world is radically different: The absence of face-to-face communication in cyber world which makes it harder to construct credible identities obstructs the constitution of a stable and steady political community. However, on the other hand, this property also brings the democratization of the subject, because the discourse, which is restrained due to sexual or ethnicity marks that are visible in face-to-face communication, is eventually clarified from these restrictions: As a result of the circulation of discourse by turns on reflexivity, the texts on the Net become more open to all participants' effect. Some others also emphasize the significant relation between the circulation of discursive texts and public sphere. For example, Michael Warner (2002) views the public as "a social field created by the alternately circulation of discourse" and says that everything that calls out to public has to get into circulation in public sphere. According to him, this necessity "helps us understand why the press and the market regulations about press historically have such a central position in the development of public sphere" (2002: 63).

As it is implied in the paragraphs above, the distribution process of discursive texts or symbols on the Net is dominantly conducted by internet search engines. Internet provides internet users with the searchable databases through search engines that allow users to reach and distribute information on the Net. This, at first sight, can be seen that the internet is giving the freedom of choice and the control over the selection of information largely to internet users. However, there are criticism and dissatisfaction on new information and communication technologies that are designed under the influence of market driven forces as that they can constitute new economic or political control mechanisms that weaken the participatory and pluralistic qualities of online communication. Search engines are one of the main targets that these criticisms are directed to. In a considerable part of the arguments that address the undemocratically impact of search engines, the technological mechanisms that search engines use while directing the information traffic on internet are mentioned. Some of them question the qualities of the algorithms the search engines use while organizing and disseminating information on the internet (e.g. Cho ve Roy: 2004; Gerhards and Schäfer, 2010), or the policies of search engine companies (e.g. Fallows, 2005; Lev-On, 2008; Hargittai, 2007). Some others discuss about the economical and political concerns which shape the technological properties of search engines and the algorithms. For instance, Introna and Nissenbaum (2000) put forward that, the algorithms are shaped by market economy which acts with the motivation of "profit" rather than motivations such as providing pluralism in public communication or achieving public benefit. Van Couvering (2007) indicates that in the logic of market economy search engines are perceived only as a commercial affair and their role in public communication is not taken into consideration. She also points out that search engines are not different from the "old" media in terms of their economical

construction, and puts forward that as search engines adopt an advertisement based work model, it is not possible for them to work fair and square. Moreover, some empirical studies conducted to assess the democratic potential of search engine, conclude that they did not find any strong evidence for supporting the superiority of search engines over traditional media in terms of promoting democratic communication (e.g. Gerhards and Schafer, 2010; Eklöf and Mager ,2013).

DATA AND METHODS

For analysis of the GİHU debate, Turkish print media, Google search engine and Google Blogger were chosen. Print media was particularly chosen for its similarity to search engines in terms of the way how information is presented to readers that is mostly through pre-structured written texts. Print media was also chosen for its suitability for empirical research (e.g. see Gerhards and Schafer, 2010: 147,157). For print media, the study focuses on *Hürriyet*, a mainstream Turkish national daily newspaper, because of its highest circulation that could make it an influential paper in terms of reaching out more people with a large variety of social backgrounds. Google search engine was chosen for a similar reason as it was the most widely used search engine in Turkey at the time the analysis were conducted. Google Blogger was added to analysis mainly for its content which was expected to give a better sight for the spectrum of opinions and actors in the GİHU debate on the Net. For the time period from March 4th 2011 when the regulation was made public to January 10th 2012, every section of the newspaper was searched for one of several key words, and 42 articles were selected for analysis. Taking into consideration that information processing and accessing information on the internet is different from the print media, for the Google search engine and Google Blogger, a different time period was chosen which is from December 10th 12 days earlier the regulation was put into practice, to January 10th. The same keywords were used for the Google search engine and Google Blogger. The analysis includes the top 20 results from each search engine and Google Blogger. After 78 links for Google search engine and 91 links for Google Blogger were selected by systematic random sampling. Content analysis method, both quantitative and qualitative (Geray, 2005) was used to code the variety of speakers and the plurality of evaluations and arguments expressed in the debate.

ACTORS IN THE PRINT MEDIA, GOOGLE SEARCH ENGINE AND GOOGLE BLOGGER

In order to see whether search engines have a wider diversity of actors than the print media, the degree of participation of actors present in the contents of the both is measured in this part. All actors are grouped into 19 categories. Some actor categories are grouped under higher headings according to their common features. As the Tablo 1 indicates, although, the diversity of actors in Google search, *Hürriyet* and Google Blogger represents a similarity, the diversity of the actors in the content that is achieved from Google search engine does not outclass the search engine over others. While same actor groups (such as center of politics and periphery of politics) are dominant in both Google search engine and *Hürriyet*, the percentages of these groups differ in a way indicating that the search engine content does not have a larger variety of actors. It also can be read as the search engine has a bias for the economically and politically powerful actors. For example, in Google search engine, the ratio of the actor

group BTK who planned and put into practice the regulation is 19.6 % which is the highest ratio among the three. So is the economic actor group with a 10.9 ratio. Addition to that, the actors such as artists, international figures, internet/technology associations who are observed to take place in opposition to the regulation are not present or show a lower presence in the search engine.

On the other hand, it catches attention that, some actor groups such as the academicians, who are seen rarely (1.6 %) in print media, has a higher ratio (10.9 %) in the search engine. Moreover, while some other actor groups such as web site moderators, bloggers/content contributors, and commenter readers who are not in *Hürriyet* newspaper, are present in Google search engine. However, the presence of this kind of actors in the search engine seems to be insufficient to provide an evidence to conclude that search engines constitutes a more open communication for equal participation, since their ratios are considerably low.

A similar situation is also seen for the visibility of civil society actor group in the search engine. The visibility of this actor group in Google search engine is lower than the visibility of it in *Hürriyet* newspaper. On the other hand, its sub category, NGO/ social movements' actor group has a slightly higher presence in the search engine. However, when the fact that almost the all the campaigns and movements against the regulation were organized through the internet, is considered, a stronger visibility of NGO/social movement's actors should be expected in the communication of the search engine. The weakness of the representation of NGO/ social movements' group in the search engine content becomes more noticeable when it is compared to Google Blogger.

Tablo 1. Actors in Google search engine, Google Blogger and *Hürriyet* (in %)

	Google Search Engine	<i>Hürriyet</i>	Google Blogger
Center of politics	19.6	29.0	34.4
Executive (Government, ministries)	7.2	11.5	1.3
Legislative	2.2	4.9	1.3
BTK	19.6	18.0	17.0
Other political actors	-	-	-
Periphery of politics: civil society	14.5	27.9	28.8
Social movements/NGOs	11.7	9.9	26.1
Artists	-	11.5	-
Internet/technology associations	1.4	4.9	2.0
Employee associations	1.4	-	-
Other civil society	-	1.6	0.7
Economic actors	10.9	3.3	3.9
Internet service providers	10.2	3.3	2.0
E-commerce sites	0.7	-	1.9
Other economic actors	-	-	-
International actors	1.4	4.9	-
Akademic actors	10.9	1.6	2.4
Journalists	15.2	27.9	12.4
Website moderators	5.1	-	4.6
Bloggers/content contributors	5.1	-	14.4
Readers	6.5	-	2.6
Other	1.4	-	1.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

THE FRAMES USED BY THE ACTORS

In this part, qualitative frame analysis is used to analyze the frames used by the actors to react, interpret, criticize or state an opinion on the GİHU. Considering the assumptions that the frames of interpretations used by actors will have a widening or narrowing effect on how an issue is perceived, defined and discussed in public opinion (e.g. Benford and Snow, 2000; Entman, 1993; Gerhards and Schafer, 2010), the study tries to estimate to what extent search engines are open to various opinions and interpretations in comparison to print media. The coding scheme used for actor frames analysis consists of five main frame categories. The main frame categories are divided into sub framing groups in order to deepen the analysis.

Social-technological frame: This third category brings together social and technological patterns of the views about the GİHU. The possible positive and negative to be effects of internet on society are evaluated in the context of the regulation. The subframes are as follows.

Social development of society: This includes various approaches regarding to the role of the internet in social progress. One of the main approaches to internet in this subframe is that the internet is a very important means in accessing, using and sharing information in a national and global level. Thus, internet, as an important technological actor in the development of society, is valued as playing a significant role in converting Turkey to an information society. Therefore, the GİHU in this frame is generally opposed as blocking potential of internet in liberating and improving Turkish society.

Technical infrastructure appropriateness: This refers to questions related to whether or when the technical infrastructure is appropriate in order to put the GİHU into practice. This subframe gets attention as being one which is used by mostly service providers.

Alternative (technical) service: This subframe, which is predominantly used by BTK representatives, refers to the definition of the regulation as an alternative service for society. It is emphasized that the regulation is designed as a service for a social requirement (for the complaints that come from the users), and although the filtering implementations in the market are paid, the GİHU is free and its usage is totally optional.

Digital literacy: This subframe addresses some questions in diagnosing problems related to the internet. In this, it is debated whether many problems that are caused by internet can be prevented not by prohibitive regulations, but by educational initiatives such as digital literacy.

Political frame: This frame includes political interpretations and approaches about the GİHU and it consists of two subframes.

State control of the internet (censorship): It attracts attention as being the most prominent subframe in this group. The concern is raised mostly on the existence of a problem which is pointed out as “censoring internet”. It is indicated that what lies

behind the crux of the problem is Turkish government's wish to bring internet under control. It is argued that making a regulation of internet filtering and also forcing this regulation by government centrally is in contradiction with the country's political regime and the democratic structure of society. It is indicated that such service should to be prepared and presented by non-government institutions such as internet service providers who do not have a political agenda.

Lack of participation in the regulation: This subframe includes questions whether the participation of non-governmental organizations, representatives of various segments of society, and experts is made possible by the government, in the decision making process on the regulation. While the importance of participation is highlighted, various opinions from both the members of the government and civil society are presented as to whether there is participation or not.

Legal frame: In this frame, all questions and discussions relating to legal legitimacy of the regulation from the perspectives of national, international and universal laws are put together. It consists of two subframes.

Not having a legal basis: This refers to the arguments that address why and how the regulation is unlawful. In this subframe, issues such as the right to freedom of speech and access to information are stressed as constitutional rights which can only be restricted by laws of parliament. It is also expressed that BTK exceeds its authority and breaks the law by interfering internet access. This frame is generally used by the civil society and the information/internet/technology organizations who are in an opposition position.

Consumer right: This subframe refers to the definition of the regulation as a consumer right (whose legal reference is the 10th article entitled "Safe Internet Using" in Consumer Rights Regulations, which is in accordance with Electronic Communication Law). In this subframe, which is generally used by the representatives of BTK, the attention is drawn on the complaints and requests of consumers about safe internet.

Social-cultural frame: This frame includes all questions regarding the regulation in terms of its social and cultural effects, probable benefits, and problems. It is one of the most commonly used main frames. Five subframes can be distinguished.

Protection of children: This subframe refers to the interpretations of the regulation presented by mostly the representatives of BTK and the members of the government, as one of the main reasons for making the regulation. Interpretations include the necessities for protecting children from harmful internet content such as pornography, violence and sexual abuse.

Protection of family (values): This aspect refers to the protection of family unity and continuity from the online content that may encourage adultery or sexual immorality.

Protection of national and religious values of society: This refers to the possible positive role that the regulation would play in protecting the national and religious

values of society. Within this frame, for example, while the favoring opinions for the regulation approaches to internet as a potential danger, the opposite opinions describe internet as a door to the world that enables citizens to be connected to the rest of the world.

Imposing a monotype society: In this category, arguments on the regulation are framed in a way that the ruling party (Justice and Development Party (AKP) imposes a monotype society accordingly to its own worldview and religious preferences. In this respect, the regulation is interpreted as a democratic disrespect since it ignores the multi-identified and multi-cultured structure of the Turkish society.

Common social and cultural problems: This subframe includes various social and cultural problems related to the regulation.

Other.

Table 2. Actors frames in Google search engine, Google Blogger and *Hürriyet* (in %)

	<i>Google search engine</i>	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Google Blogger</i>
Political frame	25.5	40.8	31.1
State control of the Internet (censorship)			
<i>Positive</i>	0.6	3.9	1.4
<i>Negative</i>	17.6	30.4	21.4
<i>Neutral</i>	3.1	3.9	2.9
Lack of public participation in the regulation			
<i>Positive</i>	1.8	1.3	0.5
<i>Negative</i>	1.2	-	3.9
<i>Neutral</i>	1.2	1.3	1.0
Social-cultural frame	25.5	28.9	22.9
Protection of children			
<i>Positive</i>	12.2	3.9	-
<i>Negative</i>	3.6	6.6	5.6
<i>Neutral</i>	2.4	1.3	2.4
Protection of family (values)			
<i>Positive</i>	1.2	1.3	0.5
<i>Negative</i>	-	-	-
<i>Neutral</i>	-	-	-
Protection of national and religious values of society			
<i>Positive</i>	-	-	-
<i>Negative</i>	-	1.3	-
<i>Neutral</i>	-	-	-
Imposing a monotype society			
<i>Positive</i>	-	1.3	-
<i>Negative</i>	1.8	9.2	4.8
<i>Neutral</i>	-	-	-
Comon social and cultural problems			
<i>Positive</i>	2.4	1.3	1.0

144 An Examination Of The Debate Over The Regulation For Safe Internet Service In Turkey In The Print Media And Search Engines

<i>Negative</i>	0.6	2.7	-
<i>Neutral</i>	1.2	-	0.5
Social-technological frame	31.5	15.8	26.4
Social development of society			
<i>Positive</i>	-	-	-
<i>Negative</i>	2.4	2.7	1.0
<i>Neutral</i>	-	1.3	-
Increasing the use of internet in the society			
<i>Positive</i>	0.6	-	0.5
<i>Negative</i>	-	-	-
<i>Neutral</i>	1.8	-	-
Technical infrastructure appropriateness			
<i>Positive</i>	-	-	-
<i>Negative</i>	1.2	1.3	-
<i>Neutral</i>	3.6	1.3	0.5
Alternative (technical) service			
<i>Positive</i>	7.9	7.9	10.5
<i>Negative</i>	2.4	1.3	3.3
<i>Neutral</i>	10.4	-	8.6
Digital literacy			
<i>Positive</i>	-	-	-
<i>Negative</i>	1.2	-	2.0
<i>Neutral</i>	-	-	-
Legal frame	15.7	11.9	18.7
Not having a legal basis			
<i>Positive</i>	-	-	-
<i>Negative</i>	8.5	6.6	13.9
<i>Neutral</i>	-	-	-
Consumer rights			
<i>Positive</i>	5.4	5.3	4.3
<i>Negative</i>	1.2	-	0.5
<i>Neutral</i>	0.6	-	-
Other	1.8	2.6	1.0
<i>Positive</i>	-	-	-
<i>Negative</i>	1.2	1.3	0.5
<i>Neutral</i>	0.6	1.3	0.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

As it is seen in the Table 2, the content arranged by Google search engine does not embody such different and various framing that provide an evidence of a more heterogeneity and pluralism existing in the content. The spectrum of frames in Google search engine and the other two are almost the same. The only (exception) frame that is seen, not in the print media, but in Google search engine is the digital literacy frame. However, its ratio (1.2 %) is considerably low.

On the other hand, although there is no significant difference among the Google search engine, Hurriyet and Google Blogger in terms of the heterogeneity of the frames, the distribution ratios of the frames for the each one is noticeably dissimilar. At the first sight, the dispersion of frames in the search engine appears to be balanced more equally than the print media for representing different sides of the regulation debate. While, in the print media, a heavily concentration on the political frame strikes

attention, the social-technological frame which is the dominant one in the search engine does not show such a dramatic variation. The margin between the social-technological frame and the ones (the social –cultural frame and the political frame) come just after it is not so wide.

However, this finding can also indicate that the regulation is predominantly approached or debated as a political issue, especially a censorship practice in the print media (and Google Blogger as well). In addition, in the analysis, the political frame is observed to be produced mostly by NGO/social movements, journalists, artists, academicians and blog/forum writers, who generally stand against it. The social-technological frame, in which the regulation is mostly interpreted or debated as an alternative technical service necessary to meet the public demand for the safe internet use, is noticed to be used by particularly BTK representatives and government members who are put forward the regulation and also by service providers.

Also, the higher ratio value of the protection of children subframe with a higher positive value in the search engine, is another finding that shows the difference between the search engine and the print media. The other noticeable finding is the greater variation of the imposing a monotype society subframe in the print media. This subframe, is noticed to be used by the opponents of the regulation. As a result, these findings can indicate that Google search engine fails in promoting more diversity and pluralism in the GİHU debate.

EVALUATIONS IN THE SEARCH ENGINES AND PRINT MEDIA

Table 3. Evaluations in Google search engine, Google Blogger and *Hürriyet* (in %)

	Google search engine	<i>Hürriyet</i>	Google Blogger
Positive	32.2	26.2	26.8
Negative	42.9	63.4	56.9
Neutral	24.9	10.4	16.3
Toplam	100.0	100.0	100.0

As Table 3 shows, the negative approaches (42.9 %) toward the regulation in the content of the search engine are much less when they are compared to *Hürriyet* newspaper (63.4 % negative). When Google Blogger (56.9 % negative) are included in the comparison, the difference in the search engine comes up strikingly. This situation indicates that the communicative space constructed or supported by the search engine is less open to the critical discourses about the regulation. When it is considered that the anti-regulation movements were organized and spread mainly on internet, it could be claimed that the Google search engine failed to function fully in making accessible opponent views and arguments already existing in the GİHU debate.

CONCLUSION

In this study that aims to analyze the debate on the regulation of “Procedures and Principles for Safe Internet Service” (GİHU) in search engine (Google) and the print press (*Hürriyet*), it is found that the search engine does not include a larger variety of

actors. In the search engine content, political/bureaucratic and economic actors have a dominantly higher presence. Among them, BTK members and internet service providers who are the regulators or the implementers of the regulation, gained the most visibility. In contrast to this, civil society actors that include NGOs and social movements who are most likely to produce reservations, objections or alternatives to the regulation have lower visibility in the search engine content.

When it is looked at the discursive field composed in the relation to the GİHU debate through the actor frames, it is seen that search engine content does not include a more heterogeneous framing that could promote an open and participatory communication. However, findings indicate that there are some discourses which are struggle. These discourses are particularly on GİHU's social, political and legal legitimacy and compete with each other in sense of molding public opinion and shaping the debate on the GİHU. In the Google search engine content, discourses about legalizing the GİHU take place dominantly: the GİHU is mainly framed as a technological issue, and it is defined and discussed in this context. Within the scope of this frame, the GİHU is generally presented as an alternative technical service, which is on free will and constituted to meet demands of internet users. The subframe about protecting children also has the claim that the GİHU is created to meet a certain need and demand. In a similar way, in the consumer rights subframe, the GİHU is generally defined as a regulation to satisfy the demands of consumers for safe internet. In *Hürriyet* newspaper, however, opposite discourses that problematize the GİHU's legal and social validity are more dominant. While in political frame the GİHU is generally approached and debated as a practice of censorship, in social-cultural frame, it is generally interpreted and questioned as an instrument of imposing a monotype society. In addition, it is seen that the positive approaches regarding the GİHU is more on Google search engine's content when it is compared to both *Hürriyet* newspaper and Google Blogger.

In summary, no evidence is found that Google search engine could promote a better or a more democratic public debate on the GİHU. When it is taken into consideration that BTK representatives and economic actors have a higher presence in Google search engine content than in *Hürriyet* newspaper (and Google Blogger), it could be claimed that the search engine favors one side rather than providing equivalent visibility to other sides of the GİHU debate. Considering, the visibility gap that favors for some certain actor groups or discourses in Google search engine, especially in comparison to Google Blogger, the conclusion can be drawn that, the search engine fails to reinforce and reflect the pluralism and diversity on the internet regarding the GİHU debate.

REFERENCES

- ALEXA, Top Sites in Turkey", <http://www.alexa.com/topsites/countries/TR>. 10.10.2011.
- Basın İlan Kurumu (2011) "Tiraj Raporu" <http://www.bik.gov.tr/web/index.php>. 10.11.2011.
- Cho, Junghoo and Sourashis Roy (2004). "Impact of Search Engines on Page Popularity." *Word Wide Web Conference*. <http://oak.cs.ucla.edu/~cho/papers/cho-bias.pdf>. 20.09.2010.
- Dahlberg, Lincoln (2001). "Extending the Public Sphere Through Cyberspace: The Case of Minnesota E-Democracy." *First Monday* 6 (3). <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/838/747>. 20.06.2014.
- Dahlgren, Peter. (2001) 'The Public Sphere and the Net: Structure, Space, and Communication', in W. L. Bennett and R. M. Entman (eds), *Mediated Politics*, pp. 33-55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahlgren, Peter. (2005) 'The Internet, Public Spheres, and Political Communication: Dispersion and Deliberation' *Political Communication*, 22: 147-62.
- Eklöf Jenny and Mager Astrid (2013). "Technoscientific Promotion and Biofuel Policy: How the Press and Search Engines Stage the Biofuel Controversy." *Media Culture and Society*, 35 (4), ss. 454-471.
- Fallows, Deborah (2005). "Search Engine Users: Internet Searchers Are Confident, Satisfied and Trusting – But They Are Also Unaware and Naïve." *Pew Internet and American Life Project*. <http://www.pewinternet.org/pdfs/PIPSearchengineusers.pdf>. 20.6.2010.
- Geray, Haluk (2006). *Toplumsal Yöntemlerde Nitel ve Nicel Yöntemlere Giriş*, Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Gerhards, Jürgen and K. Mike Schafer (2010). "Is the Internet a Better Public Sphere? Comparing Old and New Media in the USA and Germany." *New Media & Society* 12 (1): 143-160.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1992). 'Further Reflections on the Public Sphere' in C. Calhoun (ed.) *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, pp. 421-60. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1996). *Between Facts and Norms*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hargittai, Eszter (2007). "The Social, Political, Economic, and Cultural Dimensions of Search Engines: An Introduction." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 12 (3): 769-77.
- Introna, Lucas D. and Helen Nissenbaum F. (2000). "Shaping the Web: Why the Politics of Search Engines Matters." *The Information Society*. 16(1): 169-185.

Lev-On Azi (2008). "The Democratizing Effects of Search Engine Use: On Chance Exposures and Organizational Hubs." *Web Search: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. içinde, (der.) Amanda Spink; Michale Zimmer, Berlin: Springer. 135-149.

Machill Marcel, Beiler Markus and Martin Zenker (2008). "Search-engine Research: A European-American Overview and Systematization of an Interdisciplinary and International Research Field." *Media, Culture & Society* 30(5): 591-608.

Poster, Mark (1995). "CyberDemocracy: Internet and the Public Sphere." University of California, Irvine. <http://www.hnet.uci.edu/mposter/writings/democ.html>. 14.06.2014.

Price, Monroe (2002). *Media and Sovereignty*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Schulz, Wolfgang, Thorstan Held and Laudian Arne (2005). 'Search Engines as Gatekeepers of Public Communication: Analysis of German Framework Applicable to Internet Search Engines Including Media Law and Anti-trust Law', *German Law Journal* 5(10): 142-47.

Sparks, Colin (2001). "The Internet and the Global Public Sphere", in W. L. Bennett and R. M. Entman (eds) *Mediated Politics*, pp. 75-95. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van Couvering, Elizabeth (2007). "Is Relevance Relevant? Market, Science, and War; Discourses of Search Engine Quality." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 12(3): 866-77.

Warner, Michael (2002). "Publics and Counterpublics." *Public Culture* 14(1): 49-90.