ERDEM AKIN TEMEL

SOCIAL TV RATINGS: A MULTI-CASE ANALYSIS FROM TURKISH TELEVISION INDUSTRY

Bilkent University 2016

SOCIAL TV RATINGS: A MULTI-CASE ANALYSIS FROM TURKISH TELEVISION INDUSTRY

A Master's Thesis

by
ERDEM AKIN TEMEL

Department of
Communication and Design
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University
Ankara
May 2016

To my family…

SOCIAL TV RATINGS: A MULTI-CASE ANALYSIS FROM TURKISH TELEVISION INDUSTRY

Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences
of
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

ERDEM AKIN TEMEL

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
in
Media and Visual Studies

THE DEPARTMENT OF
COMMUNICATION AND DESIGN
İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BİLKENT UNIVERSİTY
ANKARA

May 2016

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Media and Visual Studies.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Gürata

Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Media and Visual Studies.

Prof. Dr. Bülent Çaplı

Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Media and Visual Studies.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şirin Atakan Duman

Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Halime Demirkan

Director

ABSTRACT

SOCIAL TV RATINGS: A MULTI-CASE ANALYSIS FROM TURKISH TELEVISION INDUSTRY

Temel, Erdem Akın
M.A., Department of Communication and Design
Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Gürata

May 2016

In recent years, viewing habits of TV viewers and television itself have changed significantly thanks to the integration of exponentially developing web technologies to continuously evolving mobile devices. Televised content became digitized and freed from time and space, while public expression became available in a time and space unbound form via social media. This integration and its ever growing outcomes started to be called Social TV, which includes dialogues among viewers and/or producers, social media based ratings, screen interactions, analyses over user created content both in numbers and in relation to contexts etc. Academic definitions seem to be insufficient in defining the general scheme of Social TV. Thus, an important part of this thesis aims to offer a comprehensive definition to this newly developed interaction cluster. Moreover, this thesis argues that Social TV ratings are complementary to the traditional set-top-box rating systems with even a potential to replace them in the future. To support this argument, historical background of

Turkish Social TV is provided including its current state, as well as a detailed discussion of the pros and cons of Social TV ratings against traditional rating systems.

Keywords: Big Data, Social TV, Television Ratings, Twitter Ratings

ÖZET

SOSYAL TV REYTİNGLERİ: TÜRK TELEVİZYON ENDÜSTRİSİNDEN BİR ÇOKLU VAKA ANALİZİ

Temel, Erdem Akın
Yüksek Lisans, İletişim ve Tasarım Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Y. Doç. Dr. Ahmet Gürata

May 2016

Katlanarak gelişen web teknolojilerinin sürekli bir evrim içerisinde olan mobil cihazlar ile entegrasyonu son yıllarda televizyon yayıncılığı ve izleyicilerin televizyona dair alışkanlıkları üzerinde önemli değişimlere yol açtı. Yayınlanan içeriğin dijital hale gelip zaman ve mekanın getirdiği kısıtlamalardan kurtulmasına paralel olarak, toplumun kendini ifade biçimleri de sosyal medya sayesinde benzer bağımsız bir forma kavuştu. Bu entegrasyon ve bu entegrasyonun izleyiciler ve yapımcılar arasında gerçekleşen diyaloglar, sosyal medya tabanlı reyting ölçümleri, ekranla etkileşimler, kullanıcılar tarafından yaratılan içeriklerin istatistiksel ve bağlamsal anlamda incelenmesi gibi günden güne artan sonuçları sadece Türkiye'de değil, dünyada Sosyal TV olarak adlandırılmıştır. Öte yandan, akademik tanımların Sosyal TV'nin işleyişini anlatmada yetersiz kaldığı görülmektedir. Bu sebeple, bu tezin önemli bir kısmı bu yeni ortaya çıkan etkileşim yumağına kapsamlı bir tanım önerisinde bulunmak için ayrılmıştır. Ayrıca bu tez, her ne kadar erken bir safhada olsa da, Sosyal TV reytinglerinin geleneksel reytingleri tamamlayıcı bir pozisyonda

olduğu ve hatta gelecekte geleneksel reytinglerin yerini alabilecek potansiyeli taşıdığı savını ortaya atmaktadır. Bu savı desteklemek için, Türkiye'de Sosyal TV'nin güncel durumu, geleneksel ve Sosyal TV reytinglerinin avantaj ve dezavantajlarının detaylı bir karşılaştırması ile birlikte sunulmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Büyük Veri, Sosyal TV, Televizyon Reytingleri, Twitter Reytingleri

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor Ahmet Gürata for his guidance and support. Then, I would like to thank other members of the jury, Bülent Çaplı and Şirin Atakan Duman, whose remarks have helped me to complete my work.

I would also like to thank Bestem Büyüm, a friend of mine who also introduced me to Kimola and inspired me to come up with this thesis, and Mustafa Savaş who welcomed me to work at Kimola and was really helpful all along this journey. Thanks to them, I could be able to work at the friendliest workspace that I could not even imagine before and came up with this thesis.

I owe special thanks to Bircan Çoban for being there with me with utmost support, listening to me every time I blabber about this thesis and helping me until the very end.

I would like express my gratitude to Emel Özdora Akşak, who kindly accepted to guide me and supported me until the very end of this journey. I cannot thank her enough because without her guidance and discipline this process would be a lot harder for me.

Last but not least, I'm deeply grateful to my mother and father, who have always been very supporting, unconditionally.

As a side note, I would like to thank everyone who have been working to create great content, people whose names are written in this thesis and their unnamed cast and crew members. Also, I would like to thank Cartoon Network Türkiye for introducing me to Regular Show, which have helped me to enjoy this process a little more.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Social TV is among the most popular terms of recent years. Even though there are several reasons behind its popularity such as television's state as an easily accessible medium, increasing number of mobile networked devices, widespread use of social media platforms, and millions of viewers contribute to this phenomenon every day; a comprehensive study has not been conducted to understand where it began and how it has evolved. Besides addressing and aiming to fulfill the absence of such a study, this thesis combines the personal interest and professional experience of the researcher.

In March 2014, I started to work at a big data company called Kimola, which provides cloud based search, semantics and analytics services. The company was founded upon the idea of harnessing social sciences with engineering. Moreover, unlike industry's general tendency to focus only on engineering solutions, Kimola's decision processes are carried out by a team of professionals who does not only consist of engineers and coders, but also include a sociologist and communication professionals. At that time, my duty was to come up with strategies and to manage operations regarding Kimola's communication efforts within the ever-changing media landscape of Turkey. Even though Social TV related components, especially

social media based ratings results, were new within the Turkish television industry Kimola was the first company to introduce Twitter-based daily television ratings results and analyses to both the industry and viewers. As a professional who had to be involved within the procedure and as a graduate student, I became very intrigued with the topic. Even though I had to leave for personal reasons, I have stayed in contact with the company and continued my research on both academic and industry related sources. As a result, I have found that there were several different understandings of Social TV and it was believed to have appeared almost overnight. Before I started to work on this thesis, I was already interested in the history of television, documenting cases from Turkish television industry and collecting sources on this topic. Therefore, after consulting my supervisor, we decided that my research could be the basis of my master's thesis.

Social TV refers to public interaction clusters around television related issues that occur on social media and a variety of outcomes these interactions present. It emerged within the first decade of 21st century thanks to uncontrollable and exponential development of social media. As a result of the interactive nature of social media platforms, hard boundaries among people who are within the different layers of product life cycle of televised content were broken. Therefore, interactions and dialogues among content producers, performers, advertisers and viewers became possible. To be more precise, a new platform was born in which shows are marketed by industry professionals while viewers express their thoughts either to each other or to certain professionals who relate to the show in question via social media platforms.

Moreover, the digitalization of content allowed television manufacturers, content producers and entrepreneurs to come up with on demand television and costless screen interactions. Today, televised content is accessible for everyone no matter where they are or when they want to watch. Also, new live television formats started to appear thanks to free social media platforms and dedicated applications, which spread the idea of interactive television and freed it from being device-dependent and costly.

Perhaps one of the most important aspects of Social TV is its ability to serve as a real time focus group. Any dialogue, interaction or sum of both actions are analyzable through specific tools, which also allow their users to compare the evolution of different metrics and shows within changeable durations. This specific aspect of Social TV is highly beneficial for advertisers and producers since it provides valuable insights in relation to different audience groups.

Social TV provides a common ground for each person without being selective about their intentions. Since it is both free in terms of costs and free from limitations embodied by traditional feedback and analysis mechanisms, it has become a necessity for the television market. However, it can be said that the notion of Social TV is not fully grasped by academia by simply looking at relatively low number of studies, which refer only partially to the phenomena. Two reasons can be listed regarding the rarity of Social TV related studies, which are the diversity of academic fields that require specificity in terms of research subjects and the recentness of Social TV related literature. Even though partial references are understandable within

the context of academic studies, the term lacks a comprehensive definition. Additionally, the absence of a comprehensive definition may not affect businesses and commercial relations, however it may misguide researchers by understating the depth of the phenomena and by making them struggle within minor details of a complicated process. Therefore, one of the main aims of this study is to define the boundaries of Social TV for further reference.

On the other hand, since nearly all Social TV related actions produce organically accumulating data, a counterpart of traditional rating systems, Social TV ratings were born. Then, the popularity of Social TV ratings increased exponentially, since it is started to be used as a gateway to valuable insights thanks to Social TV analytics tools that also capture content of messages besides statistical data. Moreover, thanks to learning infiltration algorithms Social TV ratings started to be compared with traditional rating systems. Plus, some claimed that traditional ratings will be replaced by Social TV ratings since traditional ratings are small-scale, device dependent and costly applications while Social TV ratings can embrace every viewer and can be free from both charges and external devices. However, there is an important dilemma before this claim: While the identities of people whose actions are tracked by set-top-box rating devices are genuine, Social TV users' claimed identities might be falsified.

This thesis is an attempt to define Social TV comprehensively in comparison with previous uses, show that the idea of social and interactive television is not new and argue that even though Social TV ratings did not replace traditional ratings at least

yet; pros and cons of both rating systems complement each other, with Social TV ratings having the potential to replace traditional ratings in the future.

The next chapter of the thesis, titled "Review of the Literature" will try to present a variety of academic attempts at defining Social TV and how they relate to the big picture of the phenomenon, provide historical background on earlier implementations of interactive television, summarize the proceedings of web technologies together with social media, present Social TV related cases which correspond to different aspects of Social TV from different countries and conclude by an overview of Turkish Social TV and its historical development.

The third chapter, "Traditional vs. Social TV Ratings", focuses on the discussion that compares Social TV ratings with traditional television ratings. Firstly, the history and current state of rating applications in Turkey are described. Then, statistical data on Turkish market and Turkish Social TV is presented in detail. After that, a set of boundaries are presented within which traditional and Social TV ratings are compared such as: the reasons behind the utilization of case study method, primary and secondary data sources which were used to provide insights regarding the occurrence of chosen cases and to place them within broader contexts, and cases used as a basis for the aforementioned comparison with a variety of reasons that make them eligible for such comparison. Finally, advantages and disadvantages of the two ratings systems are compared through exemplary cases, which are a web episode of *Irfan Değirmenci ile Günaydın*, a riveting episode of *Halk Arenası* and

Çalıkuşu, a TV series which cancelled due to its low results on traditional television ratings.

These three cases were selected specially to reveal the different aspects of both ratings systems and explain how they have been and can be used. The first case study leans on dependency of traditional television ratings to the conventional television environment while today's television knows no boundaries thanks to its integration with the internet. The second case study examines relations among organizations that are involved within the process of traditional television ratings measurements and Social TV ratings position on that matter. Finally, the third case study tries to look at both ratings systems from the perspective of viewers and define what has changed thanks to Social TV in terms of viewer-producer relationships.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Although foremost aim of this thesis is to provide case studies from Turkish television industry to demonstrate the Turkish Social TV and compare its ratings with traditional ratings, while both explaining and criticizing overall schemes and their elements, it also aims to close a gap. Considering that Social TV quickly became a part of the television industry but could not draw the attention of academia, academic studies on this topic have to aim at creating an understanding of Social TV, starting from coming up with comprehensive definitions. Moreover, the lack of such an understanding causes a fallacy that Social TV appeared almost overnight, even though the idea of interactive television was around for decades. Both to create an understanding of Social TV that closes the mentioned gap and to support explanations and claims regarding Turkish Social TV, this chapter involves a comprehensive definition, technological and industrial developments that led to the birth of Social TV, some important examples of today's Social TV applications and finally, brief history of Turkish Social TV.

2.1. Defining Social TV

In recent years, people who are interested in either web technologies, mobile devices or media production have witnessed the rise of a new phenomenon. The popularity of this phenomenon took off so fast; it easily broke the invisible wall between industry professionals and regular people. The word got out of academia and meeting rooms of media and tech companies, and reached out to millions of social media users. This exponentially spreading phenomenon is called Social TV. In its simplest definition, Social TV can be described as the use of social media platforms in relation to TV content. However, as an interaction cloud, Social TV serves different purposes of the product life cycle hierarchy as being a marketing and decision making tool for industry professionals and a pathway for expression to viewers; while it is capable of creating its own trailing cycles through user generated content. Moreover, even smaller fragments of resulting content have potentials to create smaller cycles around them, which means, in theory a dialogue can continue forever through newly generated cycles. Plus, every piece of content and its fragments are analyzable to benefited from. The term also refers to television related technological advancements which have significantly affected the viewing habits of millions. Therefore, the description mentioned above is only enough for daily use while it is not comprehensive enough for both professional and academic purposes. Also, it further stresses the reason behind this study's attempt to define Social TV and identify mechanisms that are involved. To be precise, a comprehensive definition of Social TV is provided through this thesis with the help of academic studies that try to tackle

the subject only partially, to create a reference point for both mechanisms that are mentioned within this thesis and further academic and industrial research.

Although some attempts were made to define Social TV, especially by academia for research purposes, none of the attempts seem to grasp the notion of today's Social TV environment. For instance, while Chorianopulos and Lekakos (2008), Bellman, Robinson, Wooley and Varan (2014) and Hu, Wen, Luan, Chua and Li (2014) present Social TV as a general term for the use of communication technologies, especially social media platforms to connect with friends and family during active TV watching process, more or less; Marinelli and Andò (2014) also mention channel apps which keep viewers more engaged by providing information about shows and allowing viewers to interact with the screen. On the other hand, Shin (2013) refers to Social TV as the use of television sets that are designed to perform certain interactive tasks due to their capability of internet connection and rich application stores containing big-screen versions of highly appreciated computer, tablet and smartphone applications. As for Montpetit and Me´dard (2012), Social TV is more than a second screen experience through which people communicate with others because Social TV also functions as a platform on which people who are at a distance can have a dialogue due to today's TV broadcasts' state as being unbound by neither space, nor time. As it seems, all of these definitions seem to provide necessary information within the context that they were used, it is obvious that the definition of Social TV needs to be much broader and more elaborate. As even a superficial comparison of aforementioned definitions would reveal, they look at the subject from four different angles. While Chorianopulos and Lekakos (2008),

Bellman et al. (2014) and Hu et al. (2014) put the emphasis on the initial function of Social TV, Andò and Marinelli (2014) expand the subject by talking about viewer-broadcast interaction. While leaving viewer-broadcast interaction, Montpetit and Me´dard (2012), point to Internet's function as being the carriage for all other media by steering towards web TVs and on-demand video services. Interestingly, none but one, Shin (2013) talks about the evolution of devices thanks to Social TV. Even though all of these researches intersect with each other at some point, there are some points left to be added, such as resulting data, which in turn affects the quality of researches. However, a proper definition of Social TV should also mention other qualities of the phenomenon that were not issued by aforementioned definitions. Therefore, when defining Social TV, key factors involved in, such as main user profiles, purposes, platforms, mechanisms, and possible outcomes should be also stated clearly, instead of focusing only on a certain part of the functioning mechanism.

Additionally, Social TV usage can be linked to Blumler, Katz and Gurevitch's uses and gratifications theory (1973), which is constructed around the belief of active, aware and goal oriented media consumption. According to the theory, users' goals can vary from fulfilling personal needs whether they are emotional or physical, to accomplishing certain tasks. Surely, this utilitarian approach requires a certain level of selectiveness among texts and meanings. Besides selectiveness, the theory suggests that audience members are capable of interpreting media texts. Even though Blumler, Katz and Gurevitch's uses and gratifications theory seemed to analyze unidirectional processes of media texts from production to consumption, many

researchers applied this theory to internet related platforms and products. Since public use of the internet together with the democratization of media broke the traditional understanding of media production and consumption, applications of the theory in question to internet related services and products was necessary to both understand consumer tendencies and update the theory itself. Today, three factors raise the level of selectiveness and intentionality while providing an environment for deeper interpretations, which are: Digitalization of the environment, easiness of content creation and the ability to create omnidirectional connections which lead to changing production processes and continuous content creation. Social TV as a phenomenon which combines internet's abilities with the medium of television, has the potential to be an important field of study due to its aspects that are mentioned below.

Thanks to Social TV, content creators and sponsors can easily promote their productions and get feedback from audiences before, during or after broadcasts. Audience members can comment on future programs or televised events and shows, communicate with content creators, check-in to particular moments of shows, join a live discussion whether it is televised or not, and form audience groups to exchange ideas and thoughts. Moreover, by providing analyses on audience tendencies over marketed products and different TV shows over time, Social TV helps advertisers to make better decisions. Since anyone can engage in dialogue through widespread technologies with basic internet connection, there is no need for costly set-top-box devices unlike traditional measurement systems. Instead, viewers are able to decide on the platform which will be used as a gateway to Social TV. This gateway may be

a free and popular social media platform such as Facebook, Twitter or Reddit; or it can be a specifically designed tool, which may demand a certain fee for specific features, to keep in touch with television environment as in the cases of tvyo, dediki, Beamly and GetGlue. Additionally, on-demand viewing experiences can be added to Social TV analyses and ratings, which is an important change considering how today's television is unbound by time, space and device. Also, resulting content whether it is a visual or a written message, is available for reuse and analyzable in two ways: As qualitative and quantitative.

While qualitative analysis deals with content's place within the broader context, the aim of quantitative analysis is to find out frequencies and statistical cues regarding its relation to broader context and arguments presented within. For instance, while qualitative analyses can reveal the degree of objectivity, authenticity, credibility, craftsmanship, level of positivity of the content; quantitative analyses can reveal the popularity of such creation thanks to numbers that represent the amount of users who re-shared, favorited or responded to the content, and weighed arguments within the content through statistical examination of keywords' frequencies. Moreover, in relation to analytics tools developed by data companies such as Bluefin Labs, Nielsen and Kimola, detailed audience reports can be generated over these qualitative and quantitative analyses. These audience reports may include sentiment analyses, audience fragmentations, affinity scores, location data, etc. Therefore, even though it is still at an early stage, Social TV acts as a real time focus group, a marketing tool and a complementary data source to traditional rating systems with a great potential to replace it due to its exponential development in the recent years.

2.2. The Evolution of the Web

To truly understand the roots of Social TV, recent developments in web technologies and their integration to mobile platforms and devices must be examined. Considering that World Wide Web was first introduced to the general public in 1989 as a concept and spread slowly for several years until it became truly available for masses and easily contributable, it can be said that its history in terms of public consumption is nearly equal to two decades. Today, this two decades of history is roughly divided into two phases in terms of web's evolutionary state, which are named as Web 1.0 and Web 2.0, respectively. The characteristics of these two concepts must be compared to explain the mechanism behind the birth and development of Social TV, since Web 2.0 functioned as a trigger while Web 1.0 remained insufficient.

The term that defines the current era of the web, "Web 2.0" was used for the first time in a short magazine article that talked about the future of the web in 1999. Titled "Fragmented Future" (DiNucci, 1999), the article provided a brief look at the future of the web from a UX (user experience) designer's standpoint. In the article, DiNucci, who is often credited as the person who coined the term "Web 2.0", predicted dynamicity and interactivity of the future web by looking at developments in different devices, web and communication technologies. According to her, Web 1.0 was almost an iconic cultural reference that nearly everyone can identify with websites that present static screens inside certain browsers with identical fonts and underlined blue hyperlinks. Her predictions for the future of the web included the evolution of the web into a transferring mechanism through its TCP/IP (Transmission

Control Protocol/Internet Protocol), HTTP (Hypertext Transfer Protocol) and URL (Uniform Resource Locator) protocols rather than start-to-finish static, identical screens while the resulting form multiplies in relation with screen sizes and capabilities of different devices, their input and output methods, internet speeds and advanced interaction capabilities. She summarized her predictions by saying "Web will fragment into countless permutations with different looks, behaviors, uses and hardware hosts" (1999: 32).

Even though DiNucci's term was seen as a promotional marketing buzzword by some, including Sir Tim Berners-Lee, the inventor of the World Wide Web who told that he saw the term as a piece of *jargon* during an interview made for *IBM developerWorks Podcast* (Laningham, 2006); the term's popularity took off half a decade after its coining and two years before Berners-Lee's interpretation, thanks to Tim O'Reilly and Dale Dougherty, the founder and the vice president of O'Reilly Media, respectively. In 2004, O'Reilly Media organized an event under the name of "Web 2.0 Conference", during which Tim O'Reilly himself and John Battelle served as moderators of the event while some of the key speakers were Jeff Bezos, Lawrence Lessig, Cory Doctorow, Mark Cuban, Craig Newmark and Jerry Yang, who, in a respective order, are the founder and CEO of Amazon, worldwide known academic and political activist, science fiction writer, the owner of Landmark Theatres and Magnolia Pictures, the founder of Craigslist and the co-founder of Yahoo! Inc.

However, although the popularity of the term took off, as Tim O'Reilly confessed later, there had been misunderstandings about the meaning of Web 2.0 and some companies misused it while trying to market themselves by using the power of this term. Tim O'Reilly published an article roughly one and a half years later with the title "What is Web 2.0?" (2005) regarding the misunderstandings and deliberate or indeliberate misuses of the term. While explaining the inner workings of such a new concept he utilized a different approach than DiNucci's. In her article, DiNucci had talked about increasing internet speeds, changing web protocols and newly introduced or rumored devices, such as internet-ready PDAs and cellphones, smart TV-set concepts and rumored-to-be online microwaves that can find cooking times for different meals. However, since she is a UX (user experience) designer, her approach focused mainly on which aspects of the new web should be considered in the future during the design phase. On the contrary, O'Reilly (2005: 1), while admitting that the concept "does not have a hard boundary, but rather, a gravitational core", revises the situation while trying to explain the process behind the evolution of the web through exemplary companies and lists several key principles that Web 2.0 companies have. According to his article, companies of the Web 2.0 era introduced constantly evolving and upgrading online services rather than packaged software with periodical release cycles. These services are designed to rely on user-generated content as businesses get more profitable when they are in control of unique databases and their services are used by a high number of users. Moreover, users are treated and trusted as co-developers who provide valuable information on user experience, which in turn leads continuous evolution. Also, rather than trying to present all of the related content, these services are designed to create organic bonds

with other ends of the web and support self-service methods for users who benefit from reaching best possible sources. In addition, rather than being limited to a single device, availability for a variety of platforms is encouraged and if possible, application programming interfaces (APIs) are provided. Lightweight user interfaces, development and business models are supported with hackability, easiness, and reachability in mind.

Surely, even though all of the principles listed above cannot be implemented by every tech company to every service, what has changed the internet was the overall approach. User integrated, easily accessible interactive systems led the way. Hence, personal websites were replaced by free blogging platforms, Wikipedia displaced Britannica with its user generated content, Google's organic bonds and AdSense system surpassed DoubleClick's traditional advertising method, P2P (peer-to-peer) systems transformed personal computers into servers that bond user archives together, and social media platforms such as Facebook and Twitter are accepted as the prime examples of Web 2.0. Even though these different platforms, which are somehow connected to each other, created a new environment, the popularity of social media platforms skyrocketed and led to the birth of Social TV.

During his TED Talks presentation "How Social Media Can Make History", which he made in 2009, Clay Shirky talks about the web as the fifth revolutionary breakthrough of the last 500 years; following printing, telegraph/telephone, recorded media and broadcasting technologies, all of which either contribute to one-to-one or one-to-many communication paradigms. According to Shirky (2009), although they revolutionized the way people communicate, these older technologies represent the

media landscape of the 20th century together with an asymmetry that is integral to all their functioning mechanisms. An asymmetry in which, “the media that is good at creating conversations is no good at creating groups and the media that’s good at creating groups is no good at creating conversations”. Meaning that, sharing a message either happens between two individuals as in the case of telephone and telegraph or professionals share the expensively produced, bundled messages with groups over TV and/or radio broadcasts or print media without any kind of feedback. Also, before the web, it was hard for message recipients to share those messages with others. They either had to reach others physically or spread the word through telephone calls or fax one by one. However, the introduction of the many-to-many communication paradigm thanks to fifth breakthrough, the web, changed things dramatically.

According to Shirky, the web came into play with three major changes that were never-seen-before. One of which, as aforementioned, is the many-to-many communication paradigm which broke existing walls between people and allowed them to talk back or talk with each other. Considering that every single internet user can directly communicate with any other internet user; at least in theory, the number of possible communications and the complexity of the network reached the square of the number of internet users. Second major change is the place of the web against all other media. Just as Shirky stated (2009), “as all media gets digitized, the Internet also becomes the mode of carriage for all other media; meaning that phone calls migrate to the Internet, magazines migrate to the Internet, movies migrate to the Internet” which leads to a shift in understanding of media. Therefore, traditionally

created media becomes the common field for internet users, because people who experience media products can now gather around to talk about them. Finally, the third change is the ability to produce content with ease. Considering that media has been democratized by today's internet ready devices that are already capable of many things, the past's media consumers evolved into content producers. Consequently, as Shirky highlights (2009), today's media turned into being "global, social, ubiquitous and cheap".

In recent years, another phrase has started to be used in order to define an evolutionary step of the web, which is referred to as *Internet of Things* (IoT). Even though the use of this phrase does not correspond to a possible third era of the Web, it refers to one of the key aspects of today's internet, which appeared thanks to developments regarding Web 2.0, and will significantly influence internet's future. The key aspect in question is network-connected devices' ability to create bigger automated systems through data exchange. Even though the phrase was coined in 1999, by Kevin Ashton, and it is as old as the term Web 2.0, it was considered as a projection until a few years back. Unlike conventional understanding of the Web, which mainly consists of human-device interaction, information exchange and human-to-human communication via the internet; *Internet of Things* introduced the concept of M2M (machine-to-machine) communications (McLellan, 2013). Moreover, both projections and applications of IoT shows that communicating machines do not have to be in forms of personal computers, smartphones, tablets etc. Which means, devices that vary from light bulbs to cars, smart appliances to city grids can communicate with each other via network connection technologies such as

Bluetooth and Wi-Fi, and exchange data that are collected and analyzed by various software and sensors. Considering that such communications can be created to build systems or even systems of systems, i.e. smart homes and city management platforms that include traffic, infrastructure etc. monitoring systems, respectively; feedback of such systems could bring efficient automations to lives of its users. For instance, in a world where cars could talk to each other about traffic and inform drivers regarding alternative routes through navigation systems, daily commutes would be a lot less stressful and efficient in terms of fuel and time economy. Furthermore, considering that hundreds of sensors monitor modern cars, when something goes wrong within a vehicle, the car could inform the driver about the situation and depending on driver's input, find the nearest maintenance store, make an appointment regarding estimated time of departure, give directions regarding the location of the service and finally inform the car manufacturer regarding a possible fault that may have occurred on the assembly line depending on the number of cars which face the same problems. Another example could be the grid systems that control infrastructures. With the use of IoT compatible devices, smart environments can be built. Streetlamps can adjust to time changes and lower their carbon footprint depending on the density of traffic, CCTV cameras can inform officials regarding abnormal activities and drivers about alternative routes, pipeline (water, electricity, natural gas etc.) faults can be identified with a pinpoint precision and notify relevant officers, roads can charge self-driving electric cars while they are on-the-go etc. While majority of mentioned mechanisms are still considered as concepts due to lack of a protocol, which could be seen as an agreement among manufacturers to provide seamless connections among devices, IoT is already considered as one of the key aspects of internet's future, together with

artificial intelligence (AI). Considering that *artificial intelligence* is an interdisciplinary field which brings philosophy, neuroscience, robotics, computer science and linguistics together to develop human-like cognitive abilities for software and robotics, it can be said that the combination of IoT, AI, and Web 2.0's networking abilities could change personal and societal lives dramatically.

Another important concept that has been developing over the several years is *Big Data*. The concept appeared based on the idea that massive data sets are being created or building up continuously, whether they are processed or unprocessed and no matter what their sources are. Every statistically and/or semantically analyzable action of living and/or inanimate objects is considered as a part of big data. For instance, heartbeats or steps of a person is considered as the source of a unique data set. If they are collected, the data set is considered unprocessed. When they are filtered through certain criteria and/or analyzed statistically and/or semantically, the data set becomes processed. The concept presents the idea that these massive data sets are key to valuable insights. For example, considering that usage of social media became one of the important aspects of human life and resulting data can be acquired freely through platforms' APIs (Application Programming Interfaces), they can be filtered and analyzed in numerous ways. These analyses may focus on people's television viewing habits, political preferences, brand choices, shopping habits, where they exercise, their health conditions, social statuses etc. As a result, the clash of at least two analyses made on the data set that is acquired from social media would lead to better decisions. Political campaign managers can clearly define who belongs to their target demographics and where would be good spot to place

advertisements, advertiser can learn latest trends, sports equipment manufacturers can place advertisements to locations where people exercise etc. Even though *Big Data* analytics is utilized within numerous fields, from healthcare to advertising, politics to social engineering, and becomes an important part of life day by day, its integration is still highly controversial. Considering that a crushing majority of social media users are not aware of the fact that their data is being used by both governments and companies or they are aware of such fact without realizing possible benefits and harms, the subject of *Big Data* usage seems to be ethically challenging (Boyd, 2012).

2.3. Brief Overview of Social Media's Development

When speaking of social media platforms, which are the key commodities of Social TV, their short history has to be revisited to understand the popularity boost. Friendster, the first website that allowed its users to create profile pages, add other users as friends and connect within personal cycles was founded in 2002. In 2003, Myspace followed Friendster with a slight difference, which is the ability to open pages for local and global musicians and bands. A year later, in 2004, The Facebook was introduced to Harvard students as a local networking website. As it grew, it became global and went to a name change by getting rid of "The". Facebook's popularity and growth rate easily surpassed Myspace and Friendster's and Facebook's user count firstly hit 500 million on July 21, 2010 (Arthur & Kiss, 2010), than a billion on October 4, 2012 (Kiss, 2012). According to Facebook, in March 2015, the number of monthly active users was 1.44 billion while 1.25 billion of them

reached the site from their mobile devices and the average number of daily active users was 936 million (Facebook, 2015).

Facebook's establishment was followed by the founding of two other important social media platforms, which are Youtube and Twitter. In February 2005, Youtube was founded as a video-sharing platform by three former PayPal employees and in November 2006 it was acquired by Google as a subsidiary platform for $1.65 billion (*Google buys YouTube for $1.65bn*, 2006). Within the same year, Twitter was founded by Jack Dorsey, Evan Williams, Biz Stone and Noah Glass. According to Twitter's announcement, as of March 2015, it has 302 million monthly active users, 80% of whom reached the website from mobile devices, while roughly 500 million tweets were produced every day (Twitter, 2015).

Interestingly, when Jack Dorsey came up with the idea of an instant micro-blogging platform, he was still an employee at Odeo, a company which helps its users create their own podcast streams, owned by Evan Williams and Noah Glass. As a side note, Evan Williams was the co-founder of Pyra Labs and its blogging platform, Blogger. Blogger was one of the most influential companies during the transformation of the web from Web 1.0 to Web 2.0. Before Blogger, bloggers had to start personal websites, which cost a reasonable annual fees and their followers had to bookmark homepages of these websites to check regularly to see if new content has been added to the site. Also, since it required different kinds of communication, such as e-mail, mail or phone, reaching out to a blogger for a comment or a correction was another problem. However, Blogger came out as a free blogging platform that allowed

anybody to blog who registers to the platform. Also, the system allowed registered users to comment directly below posts and notified every time new content was up online through the integration of RSS (Rich Site Summary) system.

In 2008, first Social TV analytics company was founded by Deb Roy, head of MIT Media Lab's Cognitive Machines Group and his PhD student Michael Fleischman, under the name of Bluefin Labs. Before the foundation, Deb Roy and his group were working on 240,000 hours of recorded media to understand where, when and how Roy's son learned to talk and how his verbal skills were developed, through deep machine learning algorithms. Then as a part of his PhD work, Fleischman applied similar algorithms to broadcast video. Moreover, when his PhD thesis attracted the attention of National Science Foundation, Roy and Fleischman were awarded with a Small Business Innovation Research grant, which led to the foundation of Bluefin Labs. The company was working on free social media data stream to understand user behaviors and match incoming content with people, events, brands, products and shows through its machine learning algorithms' language processing ability. Also, a service called Signals is provided to industry professionals under two different versions, Network Edition and Brand Edition. While one was aimed to be used by TV professionals, other's target was brands. Due to its success and uniqueness, Bluefin Labs was bought by Twitter in February 2013 (Davidi, 2012), which is rumored to be the biggest acquisition of Twitter until that day. Later, Bluefin Labs's trails were followed by many companies, two of which were also bought by Twitter in March 2014, Mesagraph, a French Social TV company founded in 2010 and SecondSync, an English Social TV company founded in 2011 (Lunden, 2014). Also,

due to increasing significance, an important global research company, Nielsen, which provides traditional television ratings among a variety of services for some countries, launched its own Twitter TV Ratings department in July 2013 (The Nielsen Company, 2013).

2.4. The Idea of Interactive Television Before Social TV

Social TV, a platform that functions mainly as a real time focus group while creating bridges between content creators, audience members and other industry professionals, can be considered a new phenomenon. The reason behind this thought is that such a fully-functional system has been made available only for the first time in the history of television via today's technological environment and developments in interactivity. However, even though the experience is new and it requires today's technology for its existence, the idea of interactive TV goes back a few decades.

In the 90s, academic research on social aspects of television defined social television as a technical construct that allows users to perform certain interactive activities according to a blog post written by D. Yvette Wohn, who is the writer of one of the first academic articles written about Social TV, "Tweeting While Watching TV" based on 2009's data and published in early 2011. In her blog post, "History of Social Television" (2013), Wohn states that 90's academic research were conducted upon hypothetical lab settings around publicly unavailable concept devices, since none of the early interactive television sets were successful. These concept devices included Microsoft Labs's Media Center Buddies, Motorola's STV, Alcatel's Amigo TV and

etc. On the other hand, as it is hinted before, she also mentions that there were commercial attempts made by device manufacturers and content creators even before these academic studies and these attempts continued up to date.

Since profound effects caused by fan movements and dialogue that circle TV shows are known by content producers and device manufacturers, some of them tried to integrate interactivity that can spark dialogue and engage viewers to TV shows. To achieve their goal, some device manufacturers added interactive capabilities to their TV sets or introduced additional devices that turned already purchased TV sets into interactive facilities, while some content producers integrated those functionalities to their TV formats or found other mediums that can also work. In the case of interaction through TV sets and devices, the mechanism was device dependent. A device, whether it is an interactive TV set or the additional device had to be purchased beforehand by viewers to participate in the dialogue, which meant an additional cost for a slightly different viewing experience. Since a small number of TV programs supported such interactive functions, paying a fee that varies between the cost of a brand new TV set and a relatively low-powered computer was not favored by viewers. On the other hand, some content producers tried to integrate different media to their shows, such as dedicated phone lines, SMS and fax messages, etc.

The first interactive TV set, QUBE, was introduced to the public in Columbus, Ohio in 1977 by Warner-Amex Satellite Entertainment, a joint venture operated by Warner Communications and American Express. It consisted of a bi-directional cable

television system with a compatible remote controller connected to local stations (Carey, 2009: 5). The debut of the system was made with only 30 pre-programmed channels: 10 broadcasting channels including ones that are sourced by PBS, NBC, ABC and CBS under different channel names, 10 pay-per-view channels for the first time in cable television and 10 community channels. While these community channels were different from each other in terms of content, some of which allowed viewers to use interactive functions of the system, every now and then. To use the interactive functions of the set, commands were given through the remote controller, while television set's built-in computer system was checking every six seconds if there is any new command given by the viewer. The remote controller of QUBE had 18 buttons, 10 buttons on the left side of the controller, 3 at the bottom and 5 on the right side, surrounding a three-column table that has ten rows. The table consisted of 30 television channels listed according to their content, which could be selected through buttons that are placed on the left and bottom side of the table grid. On the other hand, remaining 5 buttons were placed only for interactivity. Through these buttons, viewers could vote for their favorite contestants on talent shows, participate in public opinion polls on local talk shows such as *Columbus Alive*, compete with others during game shows or shop at home. However, no matter how revolutionary it was, QUBE failed due to its high costs.

According to John Carey (2009: 6), the price of QUBE's initial home setup was more than four times the cost of an ordinary cable box. Even so, Columbus station was considered a success. After Columbus, Warner decided to expand QUBE operations to other regions, and won several bids to build new stations. Depending upon these

bids, Warner attempted to build thirty-channel systems in Houston, Milwaukee, St. Louis and suburbs of Chicago. Also, sixty-channel stations were planned to be built in Cincinnati, Dallas and Pittsburgh. However, the cost of producing local shows, construction of local stations and these stations' interconnectivity, which is a key point for shows to be nationally interactive, increased Warner's loss from $99 million in 1982 to $875 million in 1983. According to Amanda D. Lotz (2009:107), "the technology was adequate, but the additional technology costs plus the expense of producing the local programming were considerable". After Amex's withdrawal in 1984, QUBE stations were closed one by one until the last station in Pittsburgh was closed in 1994. Later to QUBE's disappearance, its children's channel *Pinwheel* evolved into Nickelodeon, and its music channel *Sight and Sound* led to the birth of MTV while its talent shows laid the ground for future talent shows such as *American Idol* and *X Factor* in which performances of contestants are voted by viewers (Lotz, 2009: 107).

In 1979, Viewdata, a concept that was being researched since the late 60s, was introduced to public under the name of Prestel in the United Kingdom (Carey, 2009: 7). Prestel was known as the first videotex system usable through TV screens and the precursor of modern generation online services. As a videotex system, Prestel came with a terminal that connects the telephone line to a television screen. Through its ability to setup two-way communication, viewers could get information about a variety of subjects and/or perform simple tasks such as sending messages, making calculations, booking theatre seats or purchasing flight tickets with their credit cards. Also interestingly, similar to today's platforms and app store logic, a store was

available among the pages of Prestel, in which there were free and paid applications waiting to be downloaded.

Before Prestel and videotex, there were teletext systems as the first step of an evolution which continues through the web today. The difference between videotext and teletext was a major one: Videotex required telephone lines to set up a two-way communication system similar to the earlier versions of the Internet, whereas teletext was a one-way system that transferred information through regular TV connections and the only interactivity allowed was the ability to change pages, a process similar to changing TV channels (Wright, 2001). Perhaps the most used and cherished teletext system was created by the BBC under the name of Ceefax. Since its introduction in 1974, Ceefax was a free information system that can be viewed via almost every TV set without any additional requirement until its cancellation in 2012 (Hand, 2012). A similar service was also initiated in 1990 in Turkey by the state-owned television channel TRT under the name of Telegün to provide free information to the public and continue to be exist today. The aforementioned major difference between two-way and one-way communication schemes of videotex and teletext, respectively, also designated their fate. While videotex was much more interactive than teletext, the cost of setup and the cost of retrieving information, pay-per-page as in the case of Prestel, together with the arrival of the World Wide Web led to the death of videotex. None of the other equivalent systems, namely, Cox Cable's Qube competitor Indax, Viewtron and Times Mirror's Gateway reached a profitable state for its manufacturers but eventually disappeared from the market.

According to Carey (2009), during the 80's, another important development took place in the field of education. Several US state universities as well as the non-commercial American broadcaster Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) and National Technological University (NTU) started to offer a service that creates two-way video connections between instructors and students. However, even though the technology was capable of transferring two-way video, in most instances, one-way video option was used, with the additional voice transfer in oppositional direction. The videos of instructors were transferred in real-time to a room where students were gathered to watch, while students could communicate with their instructors via voice transfers or phone calls. Later, voice transfer feedback option was multiplied with the introduction of fax, e-mails and dedicated data terminals. The system was especially beneficial for students who lived in the rural areas of the United States, because they were able to take courses that would not be available otherwise.

During the 80s, the popularity of QUBE increased and Warner-Amex executives tried to introduce QUBE to different cities. Also, although it was a paid service, videotex was a powerful tool that allowed two-way communication via the television environment. However, they were available for only a small number of people and some companies were trying to integrate phones into television sets just to allow viewers to make phone calls via their televisions during TV shows, such as Zenith as in the case of its short-lived product, Spacephone (Wohn, 2013). These examples indicate that the idea of interactive television was developing through a variety of products and services. However, even though these products and services varied in terms of processing mechanisms and the approaches they utilized, one thing was

common for all of these examples: To use a particular interactive function even just for once, a certain device had to be purchased and/or a subscription agreement had to be signed. For instance, Spacephone was introduced for people who would like to call others while watching TV. But Zenith's approach as the manufacturer was faulty since both TVs and telephones were already prevalent. Consequently, Spacephone was withdrawn from the market, since many did not want to buy a device that binds these two functions at a price of a new TV set, while they already had them separately. Therefore, it can be said that even if these products and services were available; their sales were far less than their potentials due to their setup and operational costs.

On the other hand, some simpler approaches freed the idea of interactive television from being device dependent and presented limited opportunities through other widespread technologies. Among them, most limited one was the use of fax machines. Viewers could send fax messages to specifically dedicated telephone numbers, and then appropriate ones were selected by either TV shows' presenters or editors to be read or showed on the screen during broadcasts. The purpose of fax and the process of sending fax messages was the main obstacle in front of its interactive and popular use. Since fax was invented to send what is already on paper as it is, it was mainly preferred by commercial entities and institutions. In other words, fax was invented for people who deal with paperwork in offices rather than household use. As a result, the use of fax machines to interact with television shows remained shorter than expected.

Another important approach was dedication of premium-rate telephone numbers to television shows that started with a certain prefix. By dialing the numbers presented on the screen, viewers could participate in opinion polls, purchase items or express their thoughts on TV either by leaving a note or connecting to live shows. When compared to regular calls, premium-rate number calls' billing was different. Prices were higher and call charges were shared by telephone companies and television channels. Also, these numbers were unbound to area codes. Therefore, they were easily distinguishable and nationally available although the prefix was different for each country.

While these dedicated premium-rate telephone numbers provided a certain level of interactivity to viewers during regular shows, perhaps their most important use was during telethons. As a combination of two words, television and marathon, telethon refers to long-running television shows that are broadcasted to raise money for certain causes. Turkey's latest telethon was organized in October 26th, 2011 for the victims of 7.1 magnitude Van earthquake, under the name of *Van için Tek Yürek* (*Türkiye 'Van için tek yürek' oldu*, 2011). Similar to the international format, celebrities answered calls of benefactors who reached through premium-rate numbers and a four-digit number was allocated by mobile operators for SMS donations. While the amounts of call-through donations were changing, each SMS counted as 5 Turkish liras. The show lasted about 4 hours and total amount of donations reached nearly 62 million Turkish liras.

Another popular approach was the integration of SMS as a real time chat tool. Similar to dedication of premium-rate telephone numbers to broadcasts, four-digit or five-digit numbers were also dedicated to TV channels to be used during their particular shows. When viewers send SMS messages to dedicated numbers, their messages would appear on the bottom of the screen during the broadcast of the show. According to Wohn (2013), this service was launched around the year 2000 in many European countries and it was akin to a primitive online chat room since every SMS sent by viewers were reflected on the screen.

During the early years of the new millennium, the notion of interactive television has evolved once more. Thanks to the growing popularity of the Internet, online access started to be featured on many devices rather than being available only on PCs. In 2002, American On-Line (AOL) came up with a set-top box device with a keyboard that adds Internet-related functions to TV sets, such as browsing, instant messaging, live chat and e-mail interchange (Kawamoto, 2002). Even though AOL pulled the plug on sales of AOLTV after a year, technology companies, especially the ones that produce television sets, continued to integrate popular Internet features and specifically developed apps of hugely popular Internet platforms to their TV sets. According to Pachal (2013), Samsung started to produce Smart TVs in 2013 and these new generation TVs were also capable of streaming on-demand content from other platforms such as Netflix or Hulu Plus, connect to a home network to reach local content, connect to popular social media platforms such as Facebook and Twitter, and allowed users to download and run new apps.

2.5. Social TV Around the World and Viewer Interaction

As the combination of social media platforms' integration to the screen and specifically developed television related applications, Social TV turned out to be an important part of the industry. Considering that it is impossible to list each and every change brought by Social TV related applications, some important ones can be exemplified to give a sense of the big picture. In this part, free interactions through the integrations of social media platforms and especially hashtags, newly appeared television formats, the use of Social TV during events and also, application of data analytics that provide valuable insights are explained through certain examples.

2.5.1. Basic and Free Interactions through Hashtags

Dedication of unique but content related hashtags to each episode of a series or certain parts of a show is a highly utilized method to encourage viewer interaction. Although creators' interest on resulting interactions may change depending on the format of the content, it is known that such hashtags initiate conversations among viewers. While these hashtags work as labels for episodes of TV series, they also allow content creators to work on new materials, create follow-up events, promote their shows or respond directly to their viewers as in the case of TV shows.

For instance, Jimmy Fallon, the host of *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*, announces a new hashtag via his personal account every Wednesday for his viewers to respond. Thanks to responding viewers, hashtags appear on the worldwide

Trending Topic list of Twitter mostly within an hour and serve as a free advertisement for the show. Moreover, each week Jimmy Fallon reads a certain number of tweets containing that week's hashtag sent by viewers within the *#hashtags* segment of the show. Even though these hashtags change from week to week, some of the popular ones were: *#MisheardLyrics*, *#WhyImSingle*, *#MakesMeMad*, *#IfIWasInCharge* and *#WorstSummerJob*. Moreover, every segment including hashtag related ones is uploaded to Youtube after the show every day and watched by thousands of Youtube users. As a result, while Jimmy Fallon and his writing team generate content out of viewers' responses, viewers are enjoying the sense of interaction and if they are lucky, they get to see their names and jokes on *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* on NBC, the recent form of the *Tonight Show*, world's longest running talk show which created its own comedic legends since 1954.

Another important example is HBO's *Last Week Tonight with John Oliver*, a popular late night news-satire show hosted by John Oliver, a British comedian who acts as an anchorman with satiric tendencies. Each episode of the show lasts 30 minutes, however only the main segment was uploaded to Youtube after the broadcast. While John Oliver often uses hashtags as a part of his humor, unlike Jimmy Fallon, he does not include viewer comments but mentions follow-up events around his hashtags and continues to produce similar content. For example, when he mentioned Jamie Dornan, the lead actor of *Fifty Shades of Grey* (Oliver, 2014a), during one of his segments as "Jamie Dornan is not my Christian, hashtag not my Christian (*#NotMyChristian)*", viewers of the show started to tweet about the subject together

with the hashtag. While many seemed to understand the humor behind Oliver's comment, which was a reference to over heated debates among fans of the franchise regarding the casting of Mr. Grey, some seemed to be puzzled. Thanks to frequently used hashtag, a few weeks later, John Oliver sent a tweet announcing the presence of a new web exclusive video on show's Youtube channel. The announced video was named "*Fifty Shades #NotMyChristian Apology*". Within the video, John Oliver explained the reason behind his "movement" with following words: "My real complaint is Hollywood's unimaginative casting. When it came time to cast Christian Grey, a character described by Fifty Shades's author E. L. James as the "the epitome of male beauty", they found an actor who specializes in handsome and I guess what I'm driving at is it hurts not to have been asked" (Oliver, 2015). After his pseudo-jealousy, he recorded a humorous audition tape for the role of Christian Grey, which was shared even more together with the hashtag, *#NotMyChristian*.

On the other hand, hashtags, despite being the most popular tool of interaction today, is not the only hook for viewers. For instance, after his Net Neutrality rant, John Oliver addressed Youtube commentators, who often use nicknames and swear or make jokes on matters, to comment on Net Neutrality within FCC's (Federal Communications Committee) online comment board (Oliver, 2014b). According to Oliver's explanation, FCC's deal with cable companies, such as Comcast and Time Warner Cable, would destroy net neutrality, which would require small companies and users to pay more for a higher speed access. The explanation, which took two thirds of the segment, was a usual one, however, after the Youtube commentators address, FCC's website went down due to more than 47,000 comments posted in

only three days (Holpuch, 2014). Plus, 301,000 comments were sent to the committee via e-mails (Francheschi-Bicchierai, 2014). Then, as a part of the Freedom of Information act, *The Verge* requested internal e-mails form FCC. According to published e-mails, even though Oliver's rant and resulting responses were bad for the FCC, the regulatory institution whose actions are in question, it became apparent that FCC's employees shared Youtube links of the rant with each other while some of them were laughing at jokes targeting their superiors and defining Oliver's humor as "Priceless!!!!!!" (Lecher, 2014). Later, Net Neutrality was voted by the FCC and FCC decided to keep the equality among internet users by sweeping the deal. In other words, it can be said that Oliver's broadcasted criticism and his wit towards the issue aroused a great deal of interest among his viewers. While he was pointing out that regulations may break the ongoing equality among internet users and same users may take action on the subject, social media users shared his words, which in turn met with bigger interest. More people tuned in to hear Oliver's words and international news agencies reported on the subject. When comments made by internet users surpassed the expected amount, Oliver himself and media outlets mentioned the subject again together with public responses and FCC's comments. As a result, the chain of events started by John Oliver created future contents for both *Last Week Tonight* and international media outlets, while forcing FCC to rethink the regulation proposal. In other words, viewers could transfer their thoughts upon a controversial issue at the slightest hint that John Oliver is on their side and the entire process took place on Social TV. Viewers used a variety of video platforms when spreading the word, ranging from on-demand television to video sharing sites, and commented on the issue on social media platforms especially the

official website of the institution and most importantly, the depth of the issue became evident only through analytic analyses made on multiple platforms.

On the other hand, considering that Youtube tends to treat video uploaders as content providers, it is possible to earn money out of Youtube views and interfering advertisements. But to monetize videos, channel owners have to sign agreements with Youtube. Today, even though both NBC and HBO do not monetize aforementioned shows on Youtube, segments of both shows are worth millions of dollars. For instance, according to an article of *The Wall Street Journal*, a calculation made by *OpenSlate* shows that NBC could have earned somewhere between $7.2 million and $9 million a year from Youtube clips of *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*, depending on Youtube's revenue cut, presence of brand deals and the percentage of U.S. viewers (Shields, 2015). In summary, content creators of television shows, especially talk shows', generate content out of viewer comments during production, create brand awareness through their viewers and in turn make money out of online streams.

2.5.2. Social TV Related Television Formats

"It was so nice to see all the thousands of Facebook and Twitter users discussing the same view, talking to each other as they were on the same train together" says Thomas Hellum (2014), an executive member of the team who introduced a new television format. Al Jazeera's coverage defined this new format as "a new kind of reality TV show was born and it's goes against all the rules of TV engagement.

There is no storyline, no script, no drama, no climax and it's called Slow TV" (Pizzaro, 2013). Unlike regular formats, Slow TV shows are broadcasted a few times a year on NRK, Norway's public TV channel, without a relation among each other. In 2009, NRK broadcasted *Bergensbanen – minutt for minutt* (2009), a train ride that takes more than 7 hours between Bergen and Oslo. While the ride was broadcasted with four cameras, archival footages were used to replace the darkness of long tunnels as only additional pieces.

Bergensbanen was followed by *Hurtigruten – minutt for minutt* (2011) a 134-hour long coastal voyage from Bergen to Kirkenes. Equipped with a control room and 11 cameras, the ship has covered nearly 3000 kilometers. However, unlike *Bergensbanen*, hundreds of people rushed into coastal towns and hills just to wave at the ship and make an appearance on this historic event. This was made possible by the team behind the broadcast who informed NRK viewers about the route and even take suggestions about the content of the broadcast and following events. Even the Queen of Norway showed up on the last day to wave at the ship and partly because of her appearance on the television, Twitter could not handle incoming messages and went down for some time. Another highly popular Slow TV event was *National Knitting Night* (2013), which was the live broadcast of a record attempt to knit a sweater in less than 4 hours 51 minutes and it lasted more than 12 hours due to additional parts such as the herding of a sheep whose wool provided the necessary yarn for the sweater. It was mocked by Jimmy Kimmel, the host of highly popular American late night talk show *Jimmy Kimmel Live*, with following words: "Even the people on the show are falling asleep!" (Hellum, 2014). At the end, a new format

was born thanks to viewers who are responding on NRK's website, Facebook and Twitter; especially the ones who commented on *Bergensbanen* such as an old man who tweeted: "I am 76 years old and have just watched the best television program ever. I watched all the way until the train stopped. Just before the end station, I rose from my seat to get my luggage. I hit the curtain rod and realized I was in my own living room" (Hellum, 2014). Social media responses like these and *Bergensbanen*'s success on traditional ratings, which pointed at 1.2 million viewers, made a path for Social TV and *Hurtigruten*, possibly the most successful broadcast under this category which reached 3.2 million of 5 million Norwegians.

In September 2013, an Israeli broadcasting company, Keshet Broadcasting has introduced a new singing contest format that differs from its equivalents. The name of the contest was *HaKokhav Haba*, which meant "The Next Star". Similar to other popular singing contests on the television, *HaKokhav Haba* was also treating its audience members as members of the jury. However, while other singing contests were allowing their users to join contests through SMS messages, *HaKokhav Haba*'s most important feature was the utilization of a specifically coded application, which is available for different platforms for free. This application allowed audience members to join the conversation without paying a fee, unlike SMS participation which charges higher-than-usual amounts. As the format requires, the program introduces contestants who sing well-known songs according to their choices in front of a big screen which is often referred as "the wall". This screen works as a barrier between contestants and members of the jury. Before performances, viewers at home are asked to check-in to the next performance via the app. Only the people who

checked-in are allowed to vote. During the performance, head shot of the performing contestant is shown on the app. While a left swipe means yes, a right swipe means no. After voting, a button on which a social media platform's logo appears on the screen. The logo belongs to either Facebook or Twitter depending on which platform was used during the registration of the viewer. By pressing that button, voted viewers are prompted to their social media accounts to comment on their votes. Also, "the wall" shows profile pictures of randomly chosen voters, taken from their social media accounts, to contestants who are performing and to the audience of the show. Moreover, the application presents real-time status of the votes which is crucial for contestants to take part on the next round. Every performer whose votes pass 70% are entitled to be on the next round, while each yes comes from the jury which consist of celebrities and famous singers is equal to 7%. For those who will participate in the next round, the wall rises and allows them to talk to members of the jury, while the wall stays down for others. Another claim about the show is the accurateness of votes and instantness of fame.

According to *Rising Star Promo* (2014), a promotional video for *Rising Star* (2014), ABC's adaptation of *HaKokhav HaBa,* app based votes differ from SMS based votes because instantly counted votes provide both accuracy and objectivity. Plus, viewers can see the rise of percentages as votes are counted, which means viewers do not have to wait for the announcement of results unlike traditional SMS voting systems. Thanks to app through voting, the wall on which voters' pictures are shown and instant results, *HaKokhav HaBa* gained the attention of both Israeli viewers and foreign producers, which led to the international adaptations of the format. First, the

show was sold to *M6*, a French television channel, only after its second week and then, Israeli version's first finale drew 58% household shares in December 2013 (Marechal, 2014). Other international sales followed, including deals with ITV (UK), RTL (Germany), ABC (USA), TV8 (Turkey) and NHK (Japan). The name was changed to *Rising Star* and aired on mentioned channels except ITV. ITV decided to cancel before its premiere due to the possibility of low ratings against other popular contests, *The Voice*, *X Factor* and *Britain's Got Talent* (Plunkett, 2014). Also, ABC integrated Instagram to the auditioning process (*ABC's Groundbreaking Summer Singing Competition Series "Rising Star" Launches Instagram Campaign to Power the Search for America's Best Singers*, 2014) while trying to arrange a nationwide airing time for viewers of different time zones (Littleton, 2014). The managing director of Keshet International, Alon Schurtzman, explained the hype of *HaKokhav HaBa* as following: "Talent shows are no longer a place for judges, it's now the audience" (Marechal, 2014). Also, due to popularity and success of the first season, *HaKokhav HaBa* was also used as Israel's national selections for Eurovision Song Contest by Israel Broadcasting Authority (Storvik-Green, 2015). Nadav Guedj, the winner of second season represented his country in 2015 and placed 9th.

2.5.3. Social TV During the Olympics

The 2012 London Olympics was claimed to be the first truly *social* Olympics by many, and according to Miah (2012) this claim is supported by high number of interconnecting event and social media related top stories. According to Crook (2012), a senior editor of Tech Crunch, number of tweets sent within some days even

surpassed the total number of tweets sent during 2008 Beijing Olympics. While the Opening Ceremony of 2008 Beijing Olympics made history by being the first Olympic event that is ever broadcasted in High Definition and 1.500 hours of live coverage was broadcasted from both television and dedicated websites during the 17 day-long events; BBC broadcasted every event and competition through 24 simultaneous live High Definition streams, which resulted in 2.500 hours of coverage in total. Plus, as a technological advancement, Opening and Closing Ceremonies of London 2012, men's 100m final and daily highlights were broadcasted in 3D on BBC HD for viewers who have 3DTVs (*London 2012: How to watch the Olympics on BBC TV*, 2012). While explaining BBC's approach, Carl Hibbert, a tech analyst at Futuresource Consulting, said "There were no tablets at the last Olympics (Beijing 2008) – it's a completely new market," and continues "tablets have proved a lot more engaging for video than the laptop, and during the Olympics tablet owners will be able to fire-up the BBC iPlayer at work to catch-up on the judo or weightlifting in their lunch-hour. It provides a new resource and touch-point for broadcasters" (Carter, 2012).

On the other hand, while content gets digitized, it becomes more comprehensive and universal, causing late responding companies to be protested by their viewers. Since NBC was the sole broadcast rights holder of London 2012 in the United States, American viewers had to follow Olympic Games through NBC's channels. But, even though NBC introduced two apps for London 2012, NBC Olympics Live Extra as an online streaming app and NBC Olympics as a primetime companion (Edelsburg, 2012), their policy on cable television, which involves delays of competitions to be

broadcasted as primetime events based on United States time zones and relatively superficial commentary was seriously criticized by viewers. Also, while NBC broadcasted the event with nearly 4 hours of delay, a live stream was available on NBC's website. However, viewers who want to watch the live stream via NBC's website were asked to prove that they were cable subscribers, while NBC itself is noncable (Edelsburg, 2012). Inevitably, viewers mocked NBC's broadcasting policies and uninformed commentators. For instance, when Meredith Vieira commented on Tim Berners-Lee's appearance during the Opening Ceremony as "If you haven't heard of him, we haven't either", many Twitter users tried to inform her that Berners-Lee is the inventor of the World Wide Web (for opinions, see Kaczynski, 2002; Boese, 2012; Hernandez, 2012). On the other hand, Wright (2012) took a step further and combined uninformed commentary with NBC's online broadcasting policies: "Berners-Lee: Internet is "for everyone." Meanwhile, I can't stream any of the Olympics without first proving that I'm a cable TV subscriber." Also, thanks to Twitter users who added *#NBCfail* hashtag to their tweets the issue became a Trending Topic on Twitter, while making it visible all over the world. While millions of people were responding to the hashtag, NBC took action to suspend *The Independent*'s Los Angeles bureau chief Guy Adams's Twitter account, which became a bigger crisis for NBC (Masters, 2012).

According to Bluefin Labs (*Social TV Infographics from the 2012 London Olympics*, 2012), a total number of 5 million social media comments, 4.86 million on Twitter and 140.000 on Facebook, were sent during the Opening Ceremony of London 2012. While the numbers peaked at the very beginning, other important moments were the

appearance of James Bond and The Queen of the United Kingdom together, first appearance of USA's Olympic team and Sir Paul McCartney's performance. During the Olympics, Bluefin Labs tracked comments about 38 popular athletes in non-team sports and American swimmer Michael Phelps became the most talked about athlete with 2.1 million comments and followed by British diver Tom Daley with 2 million comments, while Jamaican sprinter Usain Bolt ranked 7th by receiving 147.000 comments. Also, Tom Daley, Gabby Douglas and Jordyn Wieber were listed as athletes mostly commented on by women, with 74%, 72% and 68% women commentators, respectively, Yohan Blake, Lolo Jones and Tyson Gay listed as athletes mostly commented on by men, with 58%, 58% and 57% men commentators. Out of 600 analyzed brands, DirecTV appeared to be the brand that Gabby Douglas's commentators are likely to tweet about with 1.92 times ratio. It is followed by Victoria's Secret and Macy's with 1.39 and 1.33 times, respectively. Also, 82.6 million comments were sent by social media users during London 2012, while 36 million of them were related to NBC's broadcasts, which included 34.9 million Twitter and 1.1 million Facebook comments. As a result, Bluefin Labs found that NBC's Olympic broadcasts were more social with a sum of 36 million comments compared to the 32.7 million comments posted during Super Bowl, Grammys, Oscars, Golden Globes and the World Series combined.

2.5.4. Social TV During the 2012 U.S. Presidential Elections

According to Rutenberg (2013), Obama's successful 2012 Presidential Election Campaign is an important example of how data mining and proper use of big data

analyses can change political campaigns and television ad buying processes. He believes that even though the internet has changed the fundaments of politics, he claims that nothing can persuade voters like well-produced televisions ads. On the other hand, TV advertising is considered to be the least effective method while being the most expensive way of promoting politicians; since the sale of commercial air slots has never changed and purchasing such air slots were done according to the use of household people meters that monitor people's viewing habits. Although audience rating analyses based on people meter activities are likely to be successful when creating advertising strategies for products, using same analyses when creating political campaigns are believed to be irrelevant. People meter analyses provide necessary demographics to advertisers, which are in turn used to define target consumers and their leanings. On the other hand, since a person's political leanings may depend on different factors, which may or may not become obvious through people meter analyses, these analyses may in fact be irrelevant. As a result, even though campaign managers examine such analyses, they tend to decide on hunches. Also, since these analyses do not provide a consistent dataset that is enough for buying certain air slots, most of the political campaign ads are broadcasted within commercial breaks of prime-time shows, series or news. Considering that these air slots are expensive to purchase and political ads have to address individuals rather than demographics, efficiency of such ads are frequently questioned.

In addition, according to the same article, strategists of the Bush era were proud to talk about their success on predicting voter behaviors based on phone surveys, during which neighborhoods, car and sport choices were discussed. Obviously, both of these

methods were problematic. While audience ratings consisted of limited samples, 22.000 homes as in the case of Nielsen, dialogues over phone calls approach is criticized: “Why engage in such divination when you have the time and money to just call voters and ask them about their leanings directly?” On the other hand, during the Obama campaign, managers utilized a different approach. Through Obama’s Facebook fan page, names of 15 million persuadable voters in swing states, voters who are undecided but on the edge, were listed. Even though they thought of reaching some of these voters through their Facebook friends and some others through e-mails and individual visits to their homes, the campaign had to be targeted, tech-savvy, effective and cost efficient, because Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney’s campaign was likely to outspent Obama’s, thanks to Super PACs (Political Action Commitee) supporting Romney. To form the television side of the campaign, campaign managers contacted Rentrak, a relatively new company that was able collect data from 20 million set-top-box devices spread across 8 million homes at the time. While Rentrak’s data revealed what was being watched by roughly 15 million persuadable voters, an algorithm called “optimizer” was created to find out the cheapest possible ad slot alternatives that are watched by greater concentrations. As it was revealed by the algorithm, 1 a.m. reruns of *The Insider* and afternoon episodes of *Judge Joe Brown* were the two top shows to advertise during, which were far cheaper than what was being on networks in prime time and evening shows. Moreover, the algorithm also revealed unexpected shows and times that could be beneficial for the campaign, such as Syfy’s *Area 51* at 2.30 a.m. According to the article, during the campaign, Obama’s ads ran 588,006 times on 100 channels, which

nearly doubled Romney's ads in both figures, while Obama and his supporting super PAC placed 40.000 more spots on air by spending roughly $90 million less.

Mobilization of the youth in a scale that has not been seen before was claimed by many as the main factor behind Barack Obama's first presidential victory. His strategy in his second presidential race during which social media was highly utilized was not surprising. Considering that the number of smartphone users together with social media profiles is rapidly increasing especially among youth and these technologies are integrated into the lives of billions as a new media for expression and conversation, analyzing content created by voters and targeting them directly by identifying the appropriate medium to place ads was a correct move in terms of strategy.

2.6. Arrival of Turkish Social TV

Even though primary examples of Social TV ascended from particular major markets, it also started to appear within relatively small territories like any expanding technology that is embraced by its users. Before Social TV, social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter were functioning as communication tools for distant users. Considering that television has been one of the major subject providers for conversations for decades, it can be said that television related conversations were already circulating on such social media platforms. While ongoing conversations formed a basis, the appearance of today's Social TV, in which television related apps, ad campaigns, and analyses are interconnected, was inevitable. This argument

is also valid for Turkey. While Turkish viewers were communicating about televised content via Facebook and Twitter, companies and business relations were formed around these conversations. In other words, since such phenomena evolve into being rather than appearing overnight, it is impossible to point at a certain event to mark as the birth of Social TV in Turkey. Therefore, when searching for the birth of Turkish Social TV, the intensity and the growth of the market in terms of companies involved must be considered.

One of the most important aspects of Social TV is the availability of television programs anywhere and anytime. To achieve such a high level of reachability, companies provided mobile television services that took television out of its traditional concept and transformed into a constantly available platform. In his article, Kuzuloğlu (2012) examines three major platforms that carried televised content to mobile platforms, which are TTNet Tivibu, Turkcell TV+ and Digiturk Play. TTNet Tivibu as a service provided by one of the biggest ISPs (Internet Service Provider) of Turkey, Turk Telekom, consists of two products. These products are a TV set complementary set-top box device that serves as a receiver over Turk Telekom's internet and an online platform that is reachable from both mobile and desktop devices through apps and browsers. Both of these services provide live streams of Turkish TV channels together with a limited list of international ones, streamable movies and a large database of past television programs in exchange for a fee. Similar to TTNET Tivibu, Turkcell TV+ and Digiturk Play also provide live streams of Turkish televisions, streamable movies and databases of past television programs. While Turkcell TV+ requires Turkcell's own internet setup, Digiturk

comes with a satellite dish. Also, since Turkcell's main operation field is mobile communication, Turkcell TV+ is mainly targeted at viewers who would like to reach televised content from their mobile phones, tablets and laptops.

Another important difference is Lig TV, Digiturk's dedicated sports channel that broadcasts only the Turkish Football League. Lig TV is an exclusive service for Digiturk subscribers who pay an extra for Lig TV. While Kuzuloğlu examines pros and cons of aforementioned systems in his article, he does not mention another platform which was available in a set-top-box form, but later introduced as a mobile app, which is D-Smart. D-Smart is another satellite TV solution provided by one of the biggest media networks of Turkey, Doğan Yayın Holding, which contains Kanal D, CNN Türk, TV2 and several newspapers including Hürriyet, Milliyet and Posta. When introduced, D-Smart's initial promise was to broadcast UEFA Champions League and UEFA Cup matches of Turkish teams together with live streams of Turkish TV channels over a set-top-box system. Thanks to increased demand, D-Smart's domain was later expanded to mobile devices and internet with D-Smart BLU. Even though all of these platforms seem to provide similar services under different commercial names, they are differentiated by nuances. Furthermore, they had a huge impact on the mobilization of the television. For example, while Tivibu's main target was TTNet internet subscribers, Turkcell's TV+ started out as a non-interactive mobile app under the title of Turkcell MobilTV and mainly targeted Turkcell's customers who use smartphones. After its name was changed, TV+'s set-top-box form was introduced, which requires Turkcell's terrestrial internet service Superonline's connection. On the other hand, even though Digiturk and D-Smart

were offering a variety of TV channels, football matches of different leagues and tournaments were their main promise. TTNET Tivibu's website and mobile app were introduced to public in February 2010 (Kutsal, 2010). More than two years later, in April 2012, Turkcell and Digiturk introduced their online television platforms (Demirel, 2012; Canpolat, 2012). Moreover, D-Smart announced BLU in April 2013, a year after Digiturk and Turkcell's introduction (Küstür, 2013).

Another important development for Turkish Social TV was the appearance of companion apps created to enrich viewing experience. For example, Tivilog (Demirel, 2011) was created as a website that allows viewers to check-in and share what they watch in real time. Also, it supported conversations over TV shows and provided information about live and past television shows, such as summaries of episodes, names of actors and actresses and suggested similar productions. Besides providing information and allowing viewers to check-in to television shows, the app tried to gamify televised contents. Viewers could earn various amounts of points, depending on their check-ins and earn badges. However, this adaptation of GetGlue, a highly popular TV check-in app released in the United States before Tivilog, failed to survive. Another check-in app released by Doğuş Media Group, dediki (Ferah, 2014) released in April 2014 nearly two years after Tivilog's launch in January 2012, has also failed. Check-in through sound identification was the major function of the app. Users would open the app during active watching process, which would trigger sound identification function and users could share what they watch and record their progress through certain shows.

In 2013, the first Turkish Social TV analytics service was introduced. Kimola, a big data company that provides database search engines to commercial or governmental institutions, announced a new service called Kimola Analytics. This new service was created to mark users and tweets according to their relation to TV shows. The resulting data was used to provide insights and social media ratings to advertising agencies, TV channels and production companies (*TV ratingleri Twitter'da ölçülecek*, 2013). Kimola's move was followed by Cem Aydın, former CEO of Doğuş Media Group. After resigning from his job at Doğuş Media Group, Cem Aydın established Somera, a social media monitoring company that specifically deals with social media ratings (Ferah, 2013). Five months later, in May 2014, YNK Labs also announced their social TV analytics system (Eyidilli, 2014).

As aforementioned, even though it is impossible to tell the exact birth time of Turkish Social TV, market related actions must be examined to find an intensive era. When examined, the evolution of television can be seen even within a short amount of time. However, since two out of three biggest Social TV analytics companies were founded in 2013 and both streaming services and apps were released in the same year to a relatively new market, it can be said that Turkish market grabbed the notion of Social TV around 2013 and stepped in. Since then, especially Social TV ratings were accepted as complementary materials to traditional ratings as they provide further detail into viewers' thoughts, which is not available through traditional TV rating systems. The exponential development of Social TV ratings in such a short time span indicates that the system is continually evolving and carrying a great potential to replace traditional TV ratings in the future.

The next chapter will feature three specifically chosen case studies, all taken from the Turkish television industry both to exemplify Turkish viewers' embracement of Social TV and to compare traditional and Social TV ratings in terms of their processes, limitations and people's reactions to their results. While the first case study, a webisode of *İrfan Değirmenci ile Günaydın*, leans on traditional television ratings' dependency on conventional television environment whereas today's television is almost without boundaries, the second case study, a riveting episode of *Halk Arenası*, examines the processes and organizations involved within traditional television ratings to find out possible sources of biases. Finally, the third case study, the process behind *Çalıkuşu* series' cancellation is analyzed in terms of viewer-producer interactions, changing airing schedules and shows rankings on both ratings results.

CHAPTER III

TRADITIONAL VS. SOCIAL TV RATINGS

Considering that the main aim of this thesis is to compare traditional and Social TV ratings by providing case studies from Turkish television industry; a definition of Social TV, its history and examples had to be given. However, the lack of a comprehensive definition and fallacies regarding its birth that ignores decades long developments forced us to reassess certain historical processes and compare two different understandings of Social TV, which are from the academia and the industry. Within the previous chapter, these two understandings are compared to come up with a comprehensive definition of Social TV, historical process is laid out to support the concept, recent examples are given both to mention different aspects of the concept and to create a reference point both for global and local applications of Social TV. Therefore, it can be said that the previous chapter forms a basis for the comparison and explains the birth of Turkish Social TV. Even though this chapter involves case studies and comparisons, the history of traditional television ratings in Turkey, quantitative data regarding Turkish Social TV, this thesis' data provider Kimola's data collection system and methodology of the study is presented beforehand, respectively. Within the methodology part, reasons behind the selection of cases, data sources, limitations of the study and areas for further research are explained.

The chapter ends after presenting three case studies that are taken from the Turkish television industry.

3.1. The History of Traditional Television Ratings in Turkey

The history of Turkish television begins with test transmissions of Turkey's public broadcaster TRT (Turkish Radio and Television Corporation). In 1968, TRT broadcasted its and Turkey's first test program from Ankara. In 1971, TRT's broadcasts reached a national state after linking Izmir and Istanbul stations as second and third broadcasting sources.

Due to legal restrictions, TRT remained as the only institution allowed broadcasting in Turkey until 1990. During these years, few thematic channels were opened by TRT to broadcast dedicated content, such as sports, news etc. Starting from 1972, advertisements were welcomed by TRT executives, however dedicated air time of advertisements and their monetary contributions were kept low intentionally to protect the unbiased position of the institution (Erdemir, 2011: 209).In 1989, another TV channel, Magic Box Star1 was founded in Germany and broadcasted for Turkish audiences through satellite (Erdemir, 2011: 214). Thanks to former president Turgut Özal's promotions, whose son was among the shareholders of Magic Box Star1, it became the first private television channel that broadcasts in Turkish language. Later, Magic Box Star1 was followed by other initiatives. Even though the president was supporting such initiatives, the lack of laws that govern broadcasts of private television channels led to inequalities among TRT and others. While TRT was under

constant investigation of governmental departments, especially for economic and content related reasons, private television channels were not.

An important example of this situation would be advertising choices among channels. While TRT stayed away from liquor and cigarette ads due to its position as a serious, informative and directive channel, private television channels could easily broadcast those commercials (Erdemir, 2011: 215-216). Also, Magic Box Star1 provided lower fare advertising services than TRT due to its condition as a Germany-based television channel, which led to a significant decrease of TRT's advertising income. Moreover, as new television channels were introduced, TRT's advertising shares decreased due to much more entertaining program choices of private televisions.

In 1992, TİAK (Televizyon İzleme Araştırmaları Anonim Şirketi - TV Audience Measurement Committee) was founded to organize and examine viewing habit researches. The initial foundation of the committee was based on voluntary rudiments. However, in December 2010, TİAK became an incorporated company. Today, shares of TİAK are shared by RVD (Reklamverenler Derneği - Advertisers Association), RD (Reklamcılık Derneği - Advertising Association) and television channels. Also, in March 2011, a legislative regulation held RTÜK (Radyo ve Televizyon Üst Kurulu - Radio and Television Supreme Council) accountable for supervision of future rating measurements.

However, even before the foundation of TİAK, a partnership of AGB and Nielsen brought television ratings to Turkish television industry in 1989. For 22 years, AGB Nielsen collected data regarding the viewing habits of Turkish people through set-top-box devices called *peoplemeter*s. These devices were installed by AGB Nielsen to television sets of selected houses which belong to the sample group that is believed to be reflecting the choices of overall population.

Peoplemeters allow television viewers to identify themselves through certain buttons, track viewing data while the television is on and send collected data to certain servers through telephone lines. Basically, this process allows servers to generate statistical results through the compilation of viewers' personal information, channels and shows being watched, durations of active watching segments and finally rank television shows within different categorizes.

In 2011, TİAK terminated AGB Nielsen's long running contract on rating measurements and initiated a tender. TNS Kantarmedya surpassed its rivals and gained the right to measure television ratings starting from September 2012. The reason behind this shift was an investigation that revealed an identity crisis. While normally research companies that provide television ratings related services keep identities and addresses of viewers secret to get objective results, it was found out that addresses of 1100 houses among the sample group were revealed. It was also unveiled that some viewers among the revealed ones were manipulated to watch certain shows and channels in exchange of gifts and money by executives of some television channels and production companies.

Same year, TRT also terminated the agreement by defending that even though TRT's efforts to broadcast high quality content were appreciated by viewers across the country, same enthusiasm could not be seen on AGB Nielsen's television ratings results (Madanoğlu, 2015). Also, since the status of television ratings was on a hiatus between two contracts, one of which was ended and there was time for the other, TRT declared that being measured by a company with a terminated contract would be wrong. Sometime after this declaration, TRT executives announced that TRT will be working with SBT, another independent research company, for its own measurements (*TRT'nin açtığı rating ölçüm ihalesi sonuçlandı*, 2009).

Due to sampling issues TNS could not start to measure television ratings until September 2012. During the gap between the tender and the beginning of measurements, TNS came up with a new panel design and formed a sample group that is compatible with TÜİK's (Turkish Statistical Institute) guidelines.

Additionally, an important decision was made to change definitions and distributions of demographic groups called SES (socioeconomic statuses) before TNS's measurements to create a more recent sample (Eyüboğlu, 2012). Changes made within the definitions and percentage distributions of SES classes significantly affect the quality of overall data collection, since these changes require obligatory replacements of houses that form the sample group and shifts within the elimination process of candidate houses. The latest consensus over SES consisted of six different classes, which are: A, B, C1, C2, D and E. These classes represent different layers of the society in a consecutive order according to their members' education, workplace,

income, location etc. For instance, class A represents the most educated group and class E represents the least educated in terms of diploma degrees. Also, while half of class A consists of paid workers who are also qualified experts such as lawyers, doctors and engineers, class E consists of unemployed (30%) and retired (still working 30% - not working 40%) citizens.

Similar to the selection of sample group members, distribution of SES groups also plays a crucial role. To form a sample group that can reflect the tendencies of overall population, TNS works with TÜİK. TÜİK defines the number of sample houses, their locations and their distributions. Then TNS selects members of the sample group according to TÜİK‘s guidelines by examining their status one-by-one. Also, requirements defined by TÜİK changes from time-to-time. For instance, in 2011, AGB Nielsen’s sample group consisted of 2500 houses from 34 cities which represented a universe of 51.657.783 people who were older than 5 years old. In 2014, TÜİK requested a sample group from TNS that consists of 4000 houses. Today, TNS’s sample group consists of 4000 houses within 40 cities, which reflect the viewing habits of 55.723.000 people who are older than 5 years old.

On the other hand, while TNS’s group consists of 11 percent AB, 21 percent C1, 32 percent C2 and 36 percent DE SES groups (Madanoğlu, 2015), AGB Nielsen’s sample group consisted of 21 percent AB, 67 percent C1- C2 and 12 percent D and E SES groups.

Changing definitions of SES groups and their percentages within the sample group aroused serious concerns. To explain them, some deductions have to be made. First of all, before the change, education was more important than income when defining A and B groups. The change brought income as the most important metric for their definition. Also, the percentage of AB group within the sample was lowered to 11 percent from 21 percent. Secondly, total percentages of C1 and C2, which represent upper and lower middle classes and considered to have the highest purchasing power, have been lowered to 53 from 67 percent. On the other hand, percentage of members that represent D and E SES groups, which are considered to have the lowest incomes, was increased to 36 from 12. To be more precise, the education level of A and B groups have decreased and representation of D and E groups have increased instead of C1 and C2 groups, which belong to middle class: The most important economic force within the society. Journalist Levent Gültekin (2012) bounds these changes to an ideological force and questions the objectivity of the new television ratings system. Briefly, he emphasizes the political power of the mass media and especially television, then defines television ratings as a platform which brings advertisers and clients together. After explaining the aforementioned changes, he concludes by stating that AK Parti tries to manipulate media to use its political powers by increasing the representation of D and E groups, whose members are commonly associated with voting for AK Parti. Besides his political concerns, he also claims that the overall quality of Turkish television may decrease significantly since the representation of AB group is lowered. His latter claim depends on the idea that significant presence of AB group serves as a balancer within the sample, since

members of AB group is more educated than members of other groups and they tend to seek higher quality in TV programming.

3.2. Quantitative Data Regarding Turkish Social TV

Social TV has been a popular subject for Turkish media outlets for the last two television seasons. The term was introduced to the market by few companies that were aware of global movements and sensed the existence of valuable insights among actions of social media users. Considering that Turkish citizens are highly interested in mobile and web technologies, it can be said that the interest will continue to grow in the future.

According to a statement made by the Minister of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communications in 2015, there are over 72.1 million mobile phone subscriptions in Turkey (*Mobil telefon abone sayısı 72 milyonu aştı*, 2015) while Turkey's population approaches 80 million, as the latest census made in 2014 reveals the number as 77.7 million (Turkish Statistical Institute, 2015b). Among these, over 61 million subscribers are registered as 3G subscriptions, while 35.3 million of them use mobile access points (*Mobil telefon abone sayısı 72 milyonu aştı*, 2015). On the other hand, while the percentage of houses that have internet connection went up to 70 percent, actions specific to social media platforms are found as the foremost reason behind internet subscriptions with 80.9 percent, which was followed by news related actions with 70.3 percent and health related searches with 66.3 percent, respectively (Turkish Statistical Institute, 2015a).

Facebook, as being the world's biggest social media platform in terms of monthly and daily active user count, also triumphs in Turkey. While Facebook's worldwide monthly active user count is over 1.49 billion, the number falls down to 968 million for daily active users. According to Kara (2015), the data regarding the second quarter of 2015 reveals that there are over 39 million monthly and over 26 million daily active users who visit the platform from Turkey.

When the popularity of social media platforms is in question, Facebook is followed by Twitter with 12 million Turkish users (Akkoc, 2015), which makes Twitter the second biggest social media platform used in Turkey and fourth biggest app in terms of user count following Facebook, Whatsapp and Facebook Messenger, respectively (Kemp, 2015). However, both Whatsapp and Facebook Messenger are instant messaging apps for mobile devices. While Facebook Messenger is a byproduct of Facebook, Whatsapp was founded as an independent company in 2009 and acquired by Facebook in 2014. Also, considering that these two instant messaging services are created for private conversations, resulting data is not publicly available. Therefore, Facebook and Twitter function as the main sources of Social TV. On the other hand, this may change according to dynamics of different markets and preferences of companies that analyze the resulting data.

For Turkish Social TV, Twitter seems to be the main data source, since Kimola and Somera, two companies that provide daily Social TV ratings prefer to use it as the source for their ratings measurements. On the other hand, the third company that is self-claimed to be a daily Social TV ratings provider, YNK Labs's position is vague

on this issue since the company prefers not to publish any results publicly or declare a source for its actions regarding Social TV.

Besides Kimola and Somera, three other companies work on Twitter based television ratings, which are: EtkiTakip.com, Starmetre and Social Feels. EtkiTakip.com was a startup company that provides analytics services to its customers. According to company's official website, the company used a self-built application which can detect words and sentences that are written in Turkish. Even though it was one of the first companies to come up with an explanation of Social TV (EtkiTakip, 2013) after Kimola and Somera, latest social media and blog records show that EtkiTakip.com operated until mid-2014 and later one of the partners became the CEO of Somera. The second company, Starmetre is a company that provides social media monitoring solutions. The main difference between mentioned companies and Starmetre are the different approaches they utilize. While companies that were mentioned before Starmetre use analytics solutions, which include filtration, analysis and categorization of all tweets in real time, Starmetre's monitoring approach is only capable of tracking certain phrases and hashtags with less or no filtration. In this respect, Starmetre and Social Feels belong to a second category, unlike other mentioned companies Kimola, Somera, YNK Labs and EtkiTakip.com.

Additionally, there are several key differences between analytics and monitoring services. While both services use Twitter's Public API (Application Programming Interface) to reach, read and categorize tweets based on keywords, analytics services are able to identify patterns, analyze tweets semantically, categorize them according

to sentiments, proper nouns (names, brands, locations etc.) and reanalyze based on several types of categorizations. On the other hand, monitoring services only provide keyword based identification. As a result, while monitoring services can only provide statistical outcomes such as the number of tweets sent in relation to a certain hashtag or topic and direct links to most retweeted tweets, analytics services can guess users' genders, identify influencers based on the number of retweets, mentions and re-shared tweets (not to be confused with retweets, these include copy-pasted content), and calculate tweets' possible number of spread (maximum number of users who might see a certain tweets) etc.

While Twitter only allows these companies to retrieve last 3200 tweets of each user whose profiles are publicly available, it also provides an advantageous partnership option for companies. Most important advantage of Twitter's partnership programs for analytics companies is the access to the database of Twitter without certain limitations such as the number of accessible tweets, interval between reaching each tweets, the number of simultaneous profile accesses and in some cases, access to private user data. However, as of June 2016, Twitter's official partners subpage shows that Twitter does not have a partner in Turkey, which can be interpreted as either Twitter did not see any of the applicants qualified enough to be a partner or companies did not apply at all. Therefore, it can be said that Turkish analytics companies can only see tweets that belong to public profiles and try to make meaning out of what is available freely.

On the other hand, except Somera, all of the mentioned companies were founded with a startup mentality without the necessary industrial connections at the beginning. But, Somera had a distinct advantage since it was founded by the former CEO of Doğuş Medya Group Cem Aydın, who worked at two of the biggest television networks of Turkey, Doğan and Doğuş media groups. Additionally, while results provided by both monitoring and analytics companies are being shared by fans; television channels, advertising agencies, political parties and research companies tend to work with analytics companies due to their services' versatility. Therefore, Kimola and Somera are dominating the sector against monitoring companies and YNK Labs's absence, even though they announced their interest in Social TV related applications.

Whether these companies provide monitoring or analytics solutions, it can be said that all of them are processing *big data*. However, their approaches to content, algorithms that process incoming data and storage solutions lead to important differences among them. Even though retrieving raw data freely from Twitter seems profitable at first; storing data becomes a major problem. While the problem is relatively small for monitoring companies that archive statistics and a little amount of content, analytics companies face a bigger challenge since they have to store the entire content retrieved from the platform together with their analyses and statistics.

Additionally, big data companies can be criticized about their actions, such as analyzing and storing data. Moreover, to avoid superficial deductions, different user types should be included to this debate. Considering that all the data that is analyzed

and stored belongs to users of social media platforms without their consent and used to make profit, big data companies' situation becomes controversial. On the other hand, keeping a public account means visibility of shared content, and thus the industry tends to assume that users are consenting.

However, retrieving and processing data from social media platforms to generate Social TV ratings creates a problem, unlike traditional television ratings. Since traditional television ratings are measured via *peoplemeter*s within certain houses that are specifically selected for a sample group and details (age, education, income etc.), traditional television ratings system allows a certain segmentation, which is helpful for television channels and advertisers when identifying and addressing their target demographics. On the other hand, social media platforms such as Twitter, which is the main platform for Turkish Social TV ratings, does not provide enough information to create similar target segmentation. Also, even though other platforms such as Facebook provide these details, validation is impossible since the platform relies on its users for this information. Companies that provide Social TV ratings try to overcome such an important problem by utilizing different approaches. Even though these approaches are kept secret, there are some rumors about creating additional systems, which looks for pre-defined consumption habits of different socio-economical groups within user profiles to categorize them accordingly.

Additionally, it must be known that even though ratings systems are important factors within the industry in terms of investments' directions, they are not the only factor during decision making processes. Profitability, political ideology of

advertisers and media executives, politics, business relations, viewers' habits etc. all contribute to the process. But still, to make sure that the content is of high quality, the capital is distributed right and viewer's attitude towards the content is reflected truthfully, ratings systems have to avoid biases, provide unmodified results and extend their sample groups.

According to Kimola, the data provider used in analyses conducted for this thesis, during 2013-2014 television season, 10.1 million tweets regarding Turkish Social TV were sent by over 2 million Twitter users and both of these numbers increased during 2014-2015 television season. Final results of 2014-2015 Turkish Social TV season indicated that while the number of tweets surpassed 21 million, user count went up to over 2.1 million. On the other hand, it must be noted that since there cannot be strict beginning and end dates for a TV season due to independent schedules of TV channels, the beginning and end dates of both seasons were determined as September 1st and June 30th respectively within database queries to be on the safe side. Also, since the number of users regarding both television seasons were calculated independently from each other, difference cannot be interpreted as 0.1 million newly joined users, which means the number of new users is likely to be more than 0.1 million people since a certain number of users might chose to stay away from tweeting about television related issues.

3.3. Kimola's Data Collection System

By using Twitter's Developer API, Kimola collects live tweets for its Social TV analytics service Kimola Analytics. Even though every tweet sent by every Twitter user is searched thoroughly, Kimola's algorithm examines each one with up to 21 different metrics to eliminate unrelated ones and determine which pool that they belong to. Although some of the aforementioned metrics are mentioned in this thesis, others will not be discussed for commercial purposes and to protect the copyrights of the company.

Since Kimola's analytics service keeps track of tweets which are sent in relation to Turkish television, deciding whether a tweet is related or not automatically becomes the most important job of the algorithm. To ensure that all tweets are sent by Turkish viewers, first of all, the algorithm searches for tweets that are written in Turkish. The reason why language becomes the most important element of the process instead of embedded location data is that when compared, tweets with location data consist less than 5 percent of total tweets. To decide whether a tweet is written in Turkish or not, the company uses its own language library. Additionally, if a tweet does not contain any kind of location data or readable words, the same language detection process restarts for the screen name and short section of biographical information (provided by the user in question) of the person who sent the tweet in question.

For example, if a tweet only consists of "<3 #GoT" letter string, it becomes impossible to understand whether it is written by a Turkish viewer or not, just by

analyzing its content. Considering that, the system needs clues such as keywords, phrases and hashtags to bond a tweet with a television show, every verified tweet goes through a second investigation phase. In this case, "#GoT" hashtag refers to *Game of Thrones*, a TV series based on George R. R. Martin's bestselling fantastic fiction novel series. However, since this hashtag is a generic one and it is globally associated with Game of Thrones and the first "<3" part of the tweet refers to a popular chat slang, which means love, this tweet fails to pass the test of language detection.

On the other hand, when actions of a Twitter user are approved, the system marks that user as verified. To understand whether a user is eligible enough to be marked as verified, the system goes through a certain number of tweets sent by that particular Twitter user to detect whether they were written in Turkish or not. When a verified user tweets, the algorithm automatically looks for related keywords, phrases and hashtags, even though tweet in question cannot pass the test of language detection. Therefore, in the case of "<3 #GoT" tweet, the user will through a background check regarding his/her relation with Turkish Social TV. If his/her Twitter handler is listed as verified thanks to former tweets that are written in Turkish, relates to a TV show airing in Turkey and eligible to be in the pool of Turkish Social TV; the tweet will be counted within *Game of Thrones* related tweets. If not and the screen name or biographical information is not in Turkish, the system will disregard the tweet automatically.

In many cases, television related keywords, phrases and hashtags are used in unrelated tweets to attract the attention of Twitter users; which raises the necessity of a second elimination process. Similar to the tweet categorization process, in which every tweet is sent to the pool of the show it refers to; the system examines tweets to determine which others are unrelated with Social TV. Considering that there may be different reasons behind every tweet that is unrelated to the television environment but contains television related elements, an evolving filtering system that can learn user behaviors is needed. To be precise, some of the aforementioned reasons have to be listed beforehand. For instance, either one or more of production company executives, channel executives, director(s), actors or simply fans may wish to see a certain show on the Trending Topic list of Twitter or spread the word to make it more popular. People who gain money out of selling fake accounts as followers may be advertising by causing a tweet flood under different hashtags. Or there may be other reasons, such as political propaganda, call for help, raising awareness etc. No matter what the reason is, these attempts are clues of the power of Social TV, however, at the same time they are the reasons of inaccurate data and they have to be eliminated.

To eliminate inaccurate tweets, Kimola Analytics's algorithm examines content of tweets to separate unrelated ones and to find possible patterns among tweets that share similar intentions. While unrelated tweets are kept away from the database, detection of patterns as the embodiment of machine learning ease the process of elimination. For instance, people who create fake accounts in an attempt to sell them as followers tend to choose usernames with words and consecutive numbers

combined together, send the same tweet under different accounts, retweet certain tweets, add certain links or add three or more digit numbers. In any case, those tweets and accounts are eliminated from the data pool thanks to the learning algorithm.

3.4. Methodology

The main argument of this thesis is that even at an early stage, Social TV ratings emerged as complementary metrics to traditional ratings and they embody a great potential to replace them. To support this argument, a multi-case analysis has been conducted using examples from the Turkish television industry that reflect the main and comparable aspects of both rating systems. This section defines the methodological approach used in this thesis by explaining the research method selection rationale including a detailed overview of data types and sources used.

Yin (2009: 10-11) states that various research methods are not mutually exclusive, however case studies have an advantage when "how" or "why" questions are being asked about a contemporary phenomenon. According to Yin (2009: 8), even though "how" and "why" questions also lead to the use of experiments and histories, these research methods may be appropriate different uses. While experiments require the control of behaviors, historical analyses do not focus on contemporary events. Therefore, it can be said that even though these three research methods may be instruments in answering similar questions they have different applications. While experiments require a certain amount of control, histories deal with unobservable

pasts, while case studies include the direct observation and detailed analysis of a specific phenomenon (Yin, 2009), which is closely in-line with the purpose of this research.

Television is one of the most cherished mediums, if not the most. Its popularity and effectiveness automatically turns it into one of the biggest industries among all. Moreover, since measurability of people's viewing habits increases the accuracy of advertisements due to the ability of reaching the target audience effectively, it makes television even more profitable as an advertising media. To measure people's viewing habits, set-top-box devices that track and convert the data into statistical outcomes have been used for decades and they continue to be used today. To track people's viewing habits, a sample group that is relatively small but believed to be reflecting the tendencies of the entire population is formed by research and ratings companies, such as Nielsen Media Research, BARB (Broadcasters' Audience Research Board) and TNS (Taylor Nelson Sofles). These companies install set-top-box devices into the houses of thousands who belong to the sample group to record viewers' actions and viewing habits.

Companies that provide ratings results collect the necessary data from set-top-box devices that are installed in a certain number of houses which consists the sample group and send those results to relevant entities. These entities may be certain departments within tabloid press, production companies, television channel executives or government officials. But, the level of expertise may be unrelated when it comes to deciphering these stats, as the question *why* cannot be answered by

analyzing the statistical data. The media decision makers often utilize different methods to understand viewers' tendencies to complement the data that is provided with traditional ratings. Therefore, it can be said that even though traditional rating results are publicized on a daily basis, they are aimed at industry professionals rather than viewers. Also, since viewer tendencies and direct reactions are not captured within traditional ratings results, nearly all decisions made by industry professionals become unobjectionable for viewers due to the lack of reasonable context-driven evidence.

Collecting data regarding traditional television ratings is a complex process, which requires a collaboration of governmental institutions and the private sector. To identify the members of a sample group, official statistics institution of the government publishes guidelines, which involves indicators and classifications of demographics, number and cross country distribution of sample group houses that can represent the way of life of the entire country, percentage distribution of demographics within the number of houses that belong to the sample group etc. Then, the research company is selected to measure and publicize television rating results form a sample group compatible with official guidelines. An official board that includes governmental officials, channel executives and guilds checks the compatibility of the sample group proposed by the research company. If proposed sample group meets the guidelines, the research company installs set-top-box devices to the houses of sample group members.

During the installation, personal information of each possible viewer within a house is associated to a particular button on the remote controller of the device. Users activate their profiles when they turn on the television to enter information to the system. Also, viewers use the remote controller to respond when the system requires an input, such as validation of the presence of at least one viewer. During the active watching process, ratings device records the information regarding the person who is watching the television, which channel he/she is on, program information and the durations between viewer actions. At the end of each day, the device sends the sum of collected data to a central server via telephone lines. After collecting the data from the houses of sample groups' members, the system combines all the data to perform a rating analysis.

On the other hand, Social TV analytics companies provide ratings based on the viewer activities on social media. A major difference between the two rating systems is Social TV analytics' ability to provide further and more detailed and qualitative information, such as the focus of viewers' conversations, the intention of viewers, comparisons of viewer groups in relation to their TV viewing choices, viewing habits, political views, sports preferences, and etc. Such expandability and depth of Social TV data quickly became a critical tool for industry professionals in comparison to the quantitative and heavily numerical stats provided by traditional ratings.

3.4.1. Case Selection

Social TV ratings' ability to provide extensive detail on television viewers' preferences, habits and thoughts plays a key role during the case selection. To be more precise, while traditional ratings provide daily numerical stats which allow contextual examination to a certain level due to the lack of viewers' expression, social media based viewer expressions are recorded on various databases depending on their relation to Social TV. If a certain expression is considered and saved as an act within the Social TV environment, it becomes open to examination both by itself and within a broader social and media context. However, its openness to examination depends on the transparency of the Social TV analytics service in question.

Unlike traditional ratings, the level of detail collected and combined together via Social TV ratings strengthen the hands of viewers. Since tendencies and reactions of viewers are visible for members of the interaction cluster without discrimination regarding their position within the scheme, every single action automatically turns into evidence, which also automatically makes Social TV a source of evidence. Therefore, whether an argument is presented within a business meeting, in viewer conversations or viewer-creator discussions, Social TV helps members of the network to provide solid arguments by providing tangible evidences to support their arguments. The ability to provide solid evidences guides discussions that are related to advertising, air time and content from being prediction based.

Since one of the purposes of this thesis is to introduce Social TV ratings and how Social TV ratings allow in-depth data regarding viewer interests, primary examples were chosen from the Social TV environment. Moreover, examples which relate to traditional ratings system will be presented through primary examples. However, since traditional rating system can be considered as a closed circuit that only target and involve industry professionals, most of the examples regarding traditional ratings will be taken from newspapers and articles of television critics.

The history of traditional ratings in Turkey provides controversial cases that can support Social TV ratings' growth. Traditional ratings have always been questioned by the Turkish television industry. In 2011, the biggest scandal regarding rating measurements erupted. An investigation revealed that AGB Nielsen, (a partnership of Audits of Great Britain and Nielsen Media Research), the company in charge of providing rating results, was also providing the identities of sample groups' members to production companies and channels, which in turn was used by executives of these institutions to bribe those members to get higher rating results.

When misuses of the system were revealed by the public prosecution office, regulatory laws were introduced by the parliament. As a precaution, a governmental organization, Radio and Television Supreme Council was given the responsibility for the regulation of measurement, supervision and distribution of television ratings, which led to the eruption of a new question: Can the new ratings system increase the votes of the ruling party, since the board was crushingly under the control of its representatives? In 2015, Onur Tan, the director of a television series named

Reaksiyon, claimed that pre-prepared lists were served as daily ratings results. He backed up his claim by sharing a list that shows daily ratings results which included a postponed football game (Eyüboğlu, 2015).

Three primary cases selected from Social TV environment have been used in this analysis. First one belongs to the TV show *Çalıkuşu*, an adaptation of a classical novel as a TV series, which was highly appreciated by especially young viewers but withdrawn from screen due to low traditional ratings. Second one is a morning news show, *İrfan Değirmenci ile Günaydın*, in which the host of the show revolted against government's ban and encouraged his viewers to use alternative ways to reach Twitter, such as VPN (Virtual Private Network) plug-ins and DNS (Domain Name System) values. Both of these methods alter connection routes and add foreign networks to the connection scheme as if they are the genuine sources of connection requests. As a result, İrfan Değirmenci, the host of the show was also banned from the screen for two days within which he streamed an episode from his kitchen via online platforms and ranked first on Social TV ratings. Finally, the third case happened after the Soma mining disaster, a coal mine fire which resulted in 311 deaths and which was recorded as the worst industrial accident in the history of Turkey. On the second day of the disaster, veteran news anchor Uğur Dündar moved his show to Soma, the town in which the disaster took place to broadcast a public forum which reached thousands of people. However, his show *Halk Arenası* was aired on Halk TV, a television channel associated with the major oppositional party CHP, and even though the particular episode of the show was watched by thousands,

it was not on the daily list of traditional ratings due to a few reasons and ignored by pro-government media outlets whereas it triumphed on Social TV ratings.

3.4.2. Data Collection

As one of the main purposes of this thesis is to compare traditional and social TV ratings to find out when and how they support or outdo each other, looking only at statistical outcomes of both rating systems would be meaningless. Instead, this thesis will lean on multiple case analyses, which are categorized within comparable aspects of both rating systems and provide details about the ratings of these cases while referring to how both rating systems influenced the future of the examined TV shows.

Essentially, both traditional and Social TV ratings and rankings were provided in relation to selected cases. While Social TV ratings were taken from the database of Kimola Analytics, traditional ratings will be taken from websites that are specifically created to publicize rating results and websites of the tabloid press. Even though secondary sources may create an authenticity issue in the case of traditional ratings, results were cross checked for accuracy. In order to ensure data accuracy, several sources will be used such as: Official websites and social media accounts of TV channels and production companies, op-eds of television critics, prestigious industry magazines, and finally national media outlets. Similar to the rating results, these sources were cross checked as much as possible to construct both internal and external validities of the cases. Finally, to provide viewer comments on selected

cases, the database of Kimola Analytics, articles written by the analytics team of Kimola for other sources, blog posts and forums were examined in detail. When using Kimola Analytics's database, if possible, direct sources of tweets or embedded links within tweets were mentioned for a detailed analysis.

3.4.3. Limitations of the Study

An important limitation before the execution of this study is the rarity of prior research studies on the topic of Social TV. Such rarity can be linked to two factors, which are: the vastness of this term's meaning and recentness of the understanding that combines nearly all parts of televised content's product life-cycle under the roof of Social TV. Additionally, current commercial state of Social TV companies can also be counted as a major limitation. Within a newborn and yet competitive sector in which methodologies are created uniquely by rival companies and affect workflows significantly, learning what these methodologies are and using their outcomes both crucial and nearly impossible.

There are limited number of studies on Social TV because of two aforementioned factors, which are also interdependent on each other. These factors are the term Social TV's vast meaning and the long-lasted separatist approach which suggests clear cut distinctions between every stage of televised content's life-cycle. Today, the term Social TV covers a vast area consisting of many different mechanisms that significantly affect each other and due to the ramification of academia these mechanisms are studied one-by-one by researchers of different fields. Therefore,

even though studies overlap and/or create continuity similar to the functioning mechanisms of television industry, researchers are unable to see different ends of the overall structure. Moreover, thanks to ever-evolving technology, television industry started to expand exponentially while production and consumption started to integrate and multiple. As this expansion adds new mechanisms to the scheme, focuses of academic researches on television industry started to shrink in relation to the ever-expanding size of the industry. On the other hand, television sector's desire to put forward profit-driven products or maximize profits started to conquer new areas that were unimagined before. As a result, developments above created the first research question of this thesis, which is the necessity of defining the boundaries of Social TV's recent structure. Since academia started to fall back against the rapidness of commercial applications, business related information sources and personal observation started to be use where limited number of academic research seem to be lacking.

On the other hand, second limitation directly affects the last part of the research, which is the comparison of and traditional ratings. Even though key aspects of traditional ratings system are easily reachable, Social TV ratings depend on digital technologies that analyze data according to certain methodologies, which differ from company to company. Since television sector does not force Social TV companies to explain their methodologies and companies try to avoid from uncloaking their innerworkings, explaining the process within a research becomes nearly impossible. Luckily, necessary amount of information regarding a methodology and data that is

used within case studies are provided by researcher's previous employer who runs several analytics products with a scientific mindset.

3.4.4. Areas for Further Research

Even though aforementioned factors hinder academia to fully grasp the boundaries and the essence of Social TV, mechanism-based academic explanations will replace business related information sources. As the number of Social TV related mechanisms will multiply, the understanding will be more grounded within academia. Therefore, researchers should closely follow television industry to add new and already-out-there processes of production and consumption of televised media.

Considering that each methodology is developed by a different company and produces unique results when analyzing data collected from Social TV applications, methodologies can be compared. While this kind of comparisons will lead to finding strong and weak points of their processes, they will also increase their accurateness by providing possible fixes for problems and possible advancements.

3.5. Case Studies

As mentioned, case study method was chosen to compare Social TV and traditional television ratings systems. In this part of the thesis, three case studies are presented to demonstrate differences between two types of measurements. An exclusive web

episode of *Irfan Değirmenci ile Günaydın* is chosen as the first case to explain an important incapability of traditional television ratings system, which is its dependency on mass media while internet based streaming was on its heyday. Secondly, a riveting episode of *Halk Arenası* is analyzed to explain possible defects of traditional television ratings measurement's structure, including commercialization, which creates inequalities between television channels according to their budgets. Finally, outcomes of both ratings systems are compared upon *Çalıkuşu*, a TV series cancelled after its 30th episode due to low results on traditional television ratings even though it was successful show on Social TV rating with an active fan base, which tried different tactics for the continuation of the show.

3.5.1. Irfan Değirmenci ile Günaydın

Irfan Değirmenci ile Günaydın, a morning news program, airs on weekdays between 6.45 a.m. and 9 a.m since May 2010 on Kanal D. Its host, İrfan Değirmenci is an experienced journalist who worked as a correspondent at news programs of four national channels since 1999 until he became the host of FOX TV's morning news on July 2007. Over the years, an audience has grown around Değirmenci due to his sincerity and comments on social and political events. Moreover, as he goes live every morning, members of his audience tend to interact with Değirmenci either to express their loyalty or to comment on the news presented during the program.

Although Değirmenci is a familiar face and his program is popular on Social TV ratings lists, viewer loyalty in a very specific situation created an interesting case

for Turkish Social TV. On March 20, 2014, Twitter became unreachable from Turkey. According to government officials, the reason was Twitter's indifferent attitude towards Turkish government's request to be provided information on certain users who share pornographic content (İşleyen, 2014a). However, the ban was quickly associated with Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's words which he used during a rally on the same day: “We now have a court order. We’ll eradicate Twitter. I don’t care what the international community says. Everyone will witness the power of the Turkish Republic” (Kayalar, 2014). Since he did not mention any reason for a court order to take place, many claimed Erdoğan wanted Twitter to be down since the country was heading towards local elections which took place on March 30, 2014. Later, another reason was claimed by government officials, which was pressuring Twitter to open an office in Turkey to collect taxes in exchange of its popularity among Turkish citizens (İşleyen, 2014b).

As mentioned, the ban on Twitter was interpreted as a political move by Erdoğan. Considering that Turkey had a complicated agenda on the way to local elections, Twitter's use as an alternative news source which instantly provided uncensored examples of citizen journalism was seen as a threat that could harm Erdoğan's AK Parti's image, even though it has been the ruling party in charge of the government for the last 12 years. Major political events popular in social media’s critical agenda were Gezi Park protests, December 17-25 corruption probes, Soma mining disaster and the then upcoming local elections.

Briefly, Gezi Park protests can be described as the biggest civil disobedience act in Turkish history. It began on May 28, 2013, as a reaction towards the harsh attitude and treatment of police forces against activists who tried to hinder municipal workers from dismantling trees from Gezi Park, located right next to Istanbul's Taksim Square, as the first step to build a shopping center. Clashes spread nearly all cities in the country and continued for weeks.

A few months later, on December 17 and 25, two police raids took place regarding the biggest corruption probe in the history of Turkey, which brought Erdoğan's son, four ministers, three of those four ministers' sons, an Iranian businessman and many government officials under suspicion. Many documents and voice recordings were shared through social media platforms, especially Twitter and Youtube, by anonymous accounts.

Another major event was a mining disaster. On May 13th of 2014, an explosion took place in a coal mine in Soma, which led to the death of 301 miners and nearly 90 injuries. The incident is recorded as the worst work and mining related accident in terms of death count. After the incident, Minister of Energy and Natural Resources Taner Yıldız declared that victims of the incidents will be counted as martyr and their families will be receiving financial support. However, he also mentioned the holiness of martyrdom to suppress protests. Additionally, in two separate incidents both Erdoğan and one of his counsellors, Yusuf Yerkel, were photographed while attacking protesters.

Under the influence of such a complicated social and political agenda, Twitter was seen as a legitimate and non-government controlled news source by the people. Therefore, the presence of comments on the issue, especially the ones that claim the Twitter ban was Erdoğan's political move to decrease both news related to these events mentioned above and protests, were inevitable. After the ban on Twitter, many protested Erdoğan and the AK Parti government, however Değirmenci continued his protests on live television.

Even though Twitter was banned in Turkey, Değirmenci reached his Twitter account by changing his DNS settings before the live broadcast of his program on the first day of the ban and explained what Twitter is, how it can provide transparency over governmental actions, how one can reach and use Twitter despite the ban, and finally criticized Turkish government's ban which limits the freedom of expression including both expression without suppression and access to information. As a governmental reaction, RTÜK issued a screen ban for İrfan Değirmenci that blocked him from the TV screens on 25th and 26th of March 2014.

On the first day of his screen ban, he utilized a different approach to reach his viewers: He and his crew live broadcasted morning news from Değirmenci's kitchen via Google Hangouts and UStream (Kocasu, 2014a). He spread the word via his Twitter and Facebook accounts. His viewers were able to reach Değirmenci's accounts and read his announcement thanks to his previous tutorial on breaking the ban. Also, viewers were experienced in breaking such internet bans due to previous governmental practices. As mentioned before, he broadcasted an episode of his

program from his home on the first day of his ban. His live broadcast ranked first on Social TV ratings with 3,276 tweets sent by 2,805 users. Interestingly, 48 percent of these users tweeted about Değirmenci and his TV show for the first time ever. Also, Değirmenci's viewers created a supportive hashtag: #direnirfan (resist Irfan) for the particular episode, which also made a reference to Gezi Park protests. While the first version of this hashtag was #direngezi (resist Gezi), a slogan for protesters who resisted governmental forces and oppression, it became a part of Turkish slang and started to be used in many occasions.

During the broadcast, Irfan Değirmenci compared the ban on Twitter and his situation with the early years of private television and radio. He explained that even though there were regulations which support media outlets of the state, people were trying to reach international or local television channels via satellite dishes and trying to communicate with each other via either illegally brought or do-it-yourself walkie-talkies. He claimed that the road to information, especially in 21st century, cannot be blocked and there will always be a workaround. As an example, he mentioned the effort spent by Twitter users to reach the platform by utilizing different approaches, such as DNS changes, untraceable browsers, VPNs, and etc.

Majority of comments sent during his broadcast were indicating that Değirmenci and his team's efforts were greeted support and respect. For instance, while FeNoLMaYaNMeN (2014) nicknamed user was describing the broadcast as the most amusing morning news he had watched in his 25 years of life ("25 yillik hayatim boyunca en zevkli izlediğim sabah haberleriydiniz tşkkrlr dostlar... @degirmencirfan

@ertgrlalbyrk"), Aygün (2014) tweeted that he had watched the broadcast via UStream and described it as worthy of a standing ovation ("@degirmencirfan Bu sabah unstream üzerinden yayınınızı izledim. Ayakta alkışlıyorum. Allah, her aileye sizin gibi temiz evlat nasip etsin.") . Moreover, while both Nesil the Çapulcu (Çapulcu, 2014) and sn_g (2014) were congratulating Değirmenci, their words were quite different. Their tweets can be translated into English, roughly and respectively as following: "Well done @degirmencirfan, that's the journalist mentality we have been waiting for… Broadcast is banned, but not the right to be informed!" ("Tek kelimeyle helal olsun @degirmencirfan beklediğimiz haberci mantalitesi bu işte.. Yayın yasak, haber hakkı değil!") and "I'm proud of you, I'm proud of everyone who makes me feel free:) congrats and thanks:)" ("@degirmencirfan seninle gurur duyuyorum, beni ozgur hissettiren herkesle gurur duyuyorum :) tebrik ve tesekkurler :)"). Moreover, FOX TV's anchorman Fatih Portakal (2014) tweeted a message in relation to Değirmenci's broadcast to announce his support: "Bravos to @degirmencirfan. He lets his voice heard. To days where there are no bans, no stoppings. Viva la freedom." ("Bravo @degirmencirfan ye.. Sesini aslan gibi duyuruyor... Yasakların durdurmaların olmadıgı günlere.. Yasasın özgürlük.."). On the other hand, a small number of tweets consisted of contradictory statements in terms of ideology. For example, while Değirmenci was accused of shedding hatred every morning and being a groveler of Aydın Doğan, the media mogul who owns Kanal D, by a Twitter user, another user accused him as being a supporter of terrorists who brainwash children to clash with police forces (Özcan, 2014), after Değirmenci's criticizing remarks on unproportional force enforced police forces during Gezi Park protests, which led to the death of Berkin Elvan.

As a result, he created a perfect example of his claim. Even though he was punished by RTÜK due to his critical attitude and encouraging behavior, he found an alternative way to communicate with his viewers and convey his message in an even stronger manner. He also managed to persuade people other than his regular viewers to tweet about him and his program while the ban on Twitter continued. Therefore, Değirmenci's act can be considered as an act of rebellion which includes a degree of mockery since he utilized digital tools to broadcast while RTÜK and traditional television ratings system are not able to inspect, measure and evaluate content created outside the traditional television environment.

3.5.2. Halk Arenası

Arena is one of the longest running news programs in the history of Turkish television. It started on September 1992 and continued until October 2011. The show was created and presented by veteran news anchor Uğur Dündar. With varying subjects changing from week to week, *Arena* presented well documented examples of field journalism. While majority of episodes were related to social issues including religious cults, drug trade and food inspections, it also covered national matters such as politics, corruptions, historical artifacts etc. After a two-year long hiatus, Dündar restarted the program on Halk TV as *Halk Arenası*. Moreover, he also changed the format and became the moderator of weekly live panel discussions and started to take guests who can comment on the complicated agenda of the country. Even though he was a trusted anchor and *Arena* was

a popular program before its hiatus, the new version could not reach its former success, which was closely related to Halk TV's viewership status.

Established in 2005, Halk TV was the in-party information channel of Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (CHP - Republican People's Party) and mostly viewed by executives, officials and strict electorates of the party. During Gezi Park protests, which started in May 2013, it became an alternative voice for an important part of the society due to its nearly all day long live broadcasts from different protest sites spread across the country. However, it faced government sourced difficulties due to being among few opposing television channels that informed Turkish people about the ongoing protests. Although it was able to continue despite difficulties thanks to its relation to the main opposition party, its political root was and is a double-edged sword. To be precise, while Halk TV is able to be more questioning and critical due to the political protection provided by CHP, it is unable to close advertisement deals due to business owners' attitude towards being mentioned together with the main opposition political party or its extensions.

As a television channel bound by the main opposition party, Halk TV promotes an ideology. Therefore, it addresses a certain part of the society and gets affected in two ways in return, which are the scarcity of advertisement deals and the single-sidedness of opinions presented on the channel. Similar to other programs on Halk TV, Dündar only hosts representatives of CHP, former politicians, and leftist journalists and artists. However, as a rare occasion, Dündar organized an open

forum in Kınık, a county near Soma, two days after the Soma mining disaster which occurred on May 13, 2014.

Soma mining disaster is recorded as the worst work accident in the history of Turkey in terms of death count (İşleyen, 2015). It resulted in 301 deaths and nearly 90 injuries, while 51 of the dead were from Kınık. The initial explosion took place during a shift change, while there were 787 miners in the field. Since it was a coal mine, walls of the establishment started to burn and release carbon monoxide, which led to poisoning of many workers. Closed exit, lack of proper ventilation, heat, shortage of necessary safety equipment and safe zones led to the death of 301 miners. After the incident, a three day long national mourning was declared by the government. Although it was known by the government officials that nearly all mines of Turkey are active on outdated technologies and a few parliamentary questions were addressed by the MPs of three opposition parties within twenty days before the incident regarding work safety issues in mines, these attempts were refused by MPs of AK Parti, the ruling party with the majority of the parliament's seats (Ayhan, 2014).

After the incident, television channels changed their weekly schedules, broadcasted reruns of last episodes of their series, cancelled action, comedy and music related shows and films and aired drama films. Moreover, news channels responded to the incident by starting continuous live broadcasts from ground zero and gradually switched to studio debates as time passed. On the third night of the incident, while Uğur Dündar was moderating the forum, news channels were broadcasting

debates from their headquarters in Istanbul and connecting to the incident site from time to time. However, guests of these debates mostly consisted of journalists and MPs, most of whom did not even visit the incident site and whose knowledge on the issue was limited.

The particular episode of *Halk Arenası* lasted nearly three hours. Main guests were two MPs of CHP, Aykut Erdoğdu and Özgür Özel, and Atilla Sertel, the former chairman of Türkiye Gazeteciler Federasyonu (The Federation of Journalists of Turkey). Moreover, residents of Soma and Kınık, survivors of the disaster, former employees of the mining company in question, friends, family members and relatives of victims showed high interest to the forum due to the establishment of the set, which was on a public area. Within the first forty minutes, Dündar and his guests expressed their grief and addressed the issue rather politically by comparing statistical data regarding mining incidents taken from Turkey and other countries, explaining the history of mining incidents in Turkey, reminding former parliamentary addresses on the issue and questioning the careless and biased attitudes of pro-government media outlets. While normally *Halk Arenası* would take place as a debate among three or four people including the host, this specific episode was specifically organized for speeches of other attendants who could give firsthand information on the disaster.

The episode created waves of interaction among viewers. For instance, as of December 9, 2015, there were 117 comments under the Halk Arenası topic of Ekşi Sözlük, a platform which can be described as the most visited online forum of

Turkey that functions in a similar fashion with Wikipedia and relies only on user generated content, but stands out as being humorous and/or informative depending on the subject at hand. However, 31 of these comments were directly linked to the particular episode of the program. Furthermore, a dedicated topic was opened by Ekşi Sözlük users under the name "15 mayıs 2014 halk arenası" and 195 comments were posted under this topic while 191 of them were created within the first two days starting from the beginning of the initial broadcast. Which means, even though the general topic of Halk Arenası has been an active topic ever since December 18, 2013, it could not reach the popularity of the dedicated topic in terms of the number of comments posted. Also, some viewers captured the broadcast either partially or as a whole and uploaded clips to Youtube and Dailymotion to make it reachable after the broadcast.

As viewers continued to inform each other regarding the program and speeches of miners, the number of tweets increased exponentially. Besides informing tweets, people shared supporting messages, quotes from miners' speeches and their comments on the issue. Unlike any other political program on Halk TV, Dündar's forum did not receive pro-government tweets, which can be easily linked to the mourning state of the nation. Additionally, to label their tweets as program related, viewers stuck to *#HalkArenası* hashtag, since several hashtags were already in use regarding Soma mining incident such as *#Soma*, *#DualarımızSomaİçin* (prayers for Soma), *#PrayForSoma*, *#AklımızKalbimizSomada* (our hearts and minds at Soma), *#KazaDeğilCinayet* (not an accident but a massacre). Also, Uğur Dündar's Twitter account was mentioned in some of the tweets. For instance, Şener (2014) tweeted

“Listen to miners who speak at Halk Arenası. Workers are dissatisfied with unions and supervisions. They are not workers, but slaves. @ugurdundarsozcu” (“Halk Arenası'nda konuşan maden çalışanlarını dinleyin.Işçiler sendikalardan dertli, denetimlerden dertli. Işçi değil köle.@ugurdundarsozcu”). Moreover, two quotes of miners were shared frequently, which are, “That coal did not only contain our elbow grease, but also our blood drops.” and “They were all dead. Survivors left on foot. They put gas masks to dead ones and said they’re wounded. They lied”. Additionally, LTFMTN (2014) tweeted that he believes in miners since they seem sincere. Furthermore, İpek (2014) tweeted “Uğur Dündar is at the forum with miners on Halk TV and he instigates forgotten journalism” (“Uğur Dündar, halk tv de madencilerle forum yapiyor, unutturulan gazeteciligi ayaga kaldiriyor #halkarenası”), while Pastafaryan (2014) likened the episode with “labor day” and thanked Dündar.

Even though Halk TV addresses a limited number of people due to CHP’s ideology, Halk Arenası ranked first on Social TV ratings with 25,397 tweets sent by 16,170 Twitter users (Kocasu, 2014b). The second place is taken by *İrfan Değirmenci ile Günaydın*, which received 9,805 tweets sent by 7,275 users. *Fatih Portakal ile Türkiye’nin Trendleri* came third with 8,215 tweets shared by 4,867 Twitter users, while 5N1K received 8,185 tweets of 6,066 Twitter users, which brought fourth place to the program. Unlike *İrfan Değirmenci ile Günaydın*, *Fatih Portakal ile Türkiye’nin Trendleri* is a weekly political interview program that hosts one major political figure per program, and *5N1K* is a weekly news program that presents details on recent issues by combining interviews, debates and documentaries.

Moreover, both of the latter two started live broadcasts from the site on the second day and continued on the third day of the incident.

Also, at its peak moment at 11.40 p.m., 481 tweets were sent about *Halk Arenası*. This moment corresponded to the end of a miner's speech on the show, during which he talked about the profit-driven policies of the mining company, such as locking miners to the tunnel until a quota is reached and not allowing them to leave the tunnel for even personal needs. This moment also corresponded to the beginning of an announcement made by Uğur Dündar regarding Digiturk's unfair broadcasting choices. To be precise, unlike other satellite television providers, Digiturk is blamed for cutting the broadcast many times intentionally due to the criticisms of the government during the show. For example, a user with the nickname Dolu Metrobüs (Metrobüs, 2014) tweeted "While miners speak the truth on #Halk Arenası on #Halk TV, is it a coincidence that #Digiturk created technical problems?" ("#HalkTv de #HalkArenası nda madenciler gerçekleri tüm çıplaklığıyla anlatırken #Digiturk ün yayınında teknik arıza çıkması tesadüf müdür???"). Moreover, other viewers protested Digiturk in several ways. For instance, Kara (2014) addressed Digiturk to tell that she plans to cancel her subscription because of technical difficulties she faced while watching Halk Arenası. Seferoğlu (2014) behaved in a similar manner and mentioned two different Twitter accounts to say "Call Digiturk at 4737373! If they don't fix the broadcast, cancel your subscription!" ("4737373 digitürk'ü ara...! Ya yayını düzeltsin ya da aboneliğini iptal et...! @halktvcom @ugurdundarsozcu@ErknCan @zerqddt"). On the other hand, a Twitter user nicknamed Aylin_ (2014) utilized a satirical approach and asked a

question to Digiturk's support team: "Dear @DigiturkDestek when do you think you can fix the problem on Halk TV's broadcast! When #halkarenasi ends?" ("Sevgili @DigiturkDestek Halktv'deki yayın problemini ne zaman gidemeyi düşünüyorsunuz! #halkarenasıbitince mi??").

However, even though the show ranked first on Social TV ratings, it did not appear on the traditional television ratings list of the day. There may be two reasons behind this outcome, one of which is the scale of traditional ratings in terms of the number of television channels that are measured via peoplemeters and the other is the distribution of houses that form the sample group.

For the first reason, the structure of TİAK A.Ş. has to be examined due to its commercial and regulatory position for the measurements of traditional television ratings and the involvement of television channels as shareholders within the structure. According to TİAK A.Ş.'s website, television channels have to be shareholders to be included in measurements. While two types of shares define channels' status within the structure as fully or partially measured, there are 12 fully measured and 9 partially measured television channels in recent traditional measurement system (Table 1). Considering that Halk TV is not a shareholder and peoplemeters are capable of collecting data containing signals of many channels, Halk TV's absence can be explained in two ways: Either it is not measured by TNS Kantarmedya since it is not a shareholder or it is measured but its results are intentionally kept secret within the board.

Table 1. Shareholders of TİAK A.Ş.

Fully Measured TV Channels	**Partially Measured TV Channels**	**Associations**
ATV	NTV	Reklam Verenler Derneği (Advertisers' Association)
Kanal D	Habertürk	Reklamcılar Derneği (The Association of Advertising Agencies)
Star TV	Bloomberg	
Show	CNN Türk	
FOX TV	Yumurcak TV	
Kanal 7	TV4	
Samanyolu TV	Ülke TV	
Flash TV	Kanal A	
TV8	Kanaltürk	
TRT		
TRT HABER		
TV2		

For the second reason, the randomness regarded during the distribution of the sample group houses should be considered. As mentioned before, four organizations take part before and during measurements, which are: TÜİK, RTÜK, TİAK A.Ş. and a research company, TNS Kantarmedya in this case. TÜİK and RTÜK are governmental organizations, while TİAK A.Ş. and TNS Kantarmedya are commercial companies. TÜİK as the statistical institute of the state, defines criteria for sample group houses and their distribution, while RTÜK is responsible for nearly all relations within television environment as the supreme board, including viewer-channel interaction through a mechanism that watches over the content being distributed. However, TÜİK is entirely bound by government especially in terms of its recruitment process as a state institution. As Gültekin expressed in the year 2012, which corresponds to the 10th year of AK Parti's rule as the only

party, TÜİK's non-independent position may produce results that are in favor of AK Parti. To support his claim, Gültekin points at changing definitions of socio-economical statuses and their distribution within the sample group together with the increasing importance of income instead of education which was the significant factor in former definitions of socio-economical statuses. He defined the sum of mentioned actions as an attempt to reflect AK Parti's masses to the rating system, which would affect the society in two ways which are forcing society to change ideologically in terms of being accustomed to AK Parti's ideology and maximizing the profit of pro-government media outlets by allocating advertisements to them.

Moreover, supreme board members of RTÜK are elected by TBMM (Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi - Grand National Assembly of Turkey) according to percentage distribution of parties within the parliament, which may lead to biases during decision processes. For instance, as of July 15, 2015, one being the chairman of the board, there are 4 AK Parti, 2 CHP, 2 MHP and 1 HDP members on the board. Considering that RTÜK is a regulatory board for television and its supreme board consists of political party representatives, it may take biased decision for political aims if the majority is formed. For instance, selection of board members resulted in a collaboration between AK Parti and MHP. MHP's members supported AK Parti’s candidate for RTÜK's chair in exchange of vice-chairman and a secondary member's chair within the board. Other opposition parties and leftist media outlets were concerned regarding the mentioned collaboration that it can damage the objectivity of the board, since both of these parties are right-wing

parties that support conservationist acts in a variety of subjects and they have collaborated many times in the past.

Additionally, TİAK A.Ş. is placed on a regulatory position for TNS Kantarmedya's actions. As mentioned before, it is an incorporated company shared by certain associations and television channels. Being a shareholder of TİAK A.Ş. requires a high-scale budget which mainly relies on the amount that comes from advertisements. Since Halk TV is associated with the main opposition party and it is not able to attract the attention of popular brands that can create monetary sources for the channel, it can be said that Halk TV cannot afford to be to the structure. Also, political attachment of the channel makes it invisible for the majority of other media outlets in Turkey. As Ergen (2014) documented, out of four major Turkish newspapers, only *Sözcü* notified its readers about Dündar's upcoming forum on the day of the broadcast. Considering that the ideology presented by *Halk Arenası* and *Sözcü* is parallel, it can be said that *Sözcü* addresses a certain part of the society which already overlaps with the typical audience of Halk TV. Moreover, Halk TV is not able to present itself as one of the popular TV channels of Turkey, which in turn affects the visibility of the channel. As of 12th of December, 2015, Halk TV can be reached via three satellite television systems, two of which are platforms with unalterable channels list. It appears as the 53rd channel on Digiturk and 272nd channel on D-Smart. Third and last option is basic satellite, which is free but inconvenient to set up.

In summary, half of four organizations (RTÜK and TÜİK) that are responsible from the traditional television ratings measurements in Turkey are closely related with the government and politics of the country. On the other hand, remaining two organizations, one of which is a commercial entity that belongs to advertising associations, partially and fully measured television channels (TİAK A.Ş.) and the other is an independent research company (TNS Kantarmedya for now), are under the influence of market relations. Also, considering that only television channels that are shareholders of TİAK A.Ş. are measured, the necessity of having financial strength becomes obvious to be a part of the measured television channels list, either fully or partially. Although hundreds of nationally available television channels face similar financial and audience related problems regarding ratings measurements, Halk TV's position is more challenging due to its ideology. To be precise, Halk TV has disadvantages as a television channel due to its close ideological ties with the major opposition party, financial problems and limited audience. Moreover, attachments of organizations that take part within the traditional ratings system forces viewers to question the reliability of traditional ratings whereas in the eyes of the audience, Social TV ratings stand relatively unattached, accountable and comparable in terms of the number of companies that measure television ratings.

3.5.3. Çalıkuşu

Reşat Nuri Güntekin's *Çalıkuşu* (The Wren) is considered among the classics of Turkish literature. The novel follows the story of an orphaned girl named Feride who is obliged to live and continue her education alongside of her aunt. She grows up to

be an idealist teacher but also lives a stormy life thanks to the love-hate relationship which develops between her and her cousin Kamran. Since its initial publication in 1922, *Çalıkuşu* has been adapted to a movie in 1966 and to two television series by TRT and Star TV in 1986 and 2005, respectively. In 2013, Kanal D announced a new adaptation of the novel. The project included Çağan Irmak, Fahriye Evcen and Burak Özçivit, as the director of the series and members of the main cast who play Feride and Kamran, respectively.

Kanal D applied a strict scheduling policy for the first 14 episodes of *Çalıkuşu*. While episodes were announced to be broadcasted on Tuesdays at 8 p.m., the 8th and 14th episodes aired two hours later than the usual airing time due to extended main news bulletins. Interestingly, starting from the 15th episode, Kanal D put *Çalıkuşu* into 5 different time schedules on 3 different days. Moreover, a trend was observed related to the changing schedules. For instance, while the 15th, 16th and 17th episodes were broadcasted at 9.45 p.m., the 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st and 22nd episodes were broadcasted at 10 p.m. on Tuesdays. The 23rd episode was rescheduled to start at 10.30 p.m. Then, the 24th episode was announced to be broadcasted at 8 p.m. on a Thursday evening, which continued for three episodes. Finally, last four episodes were broadcasted on Saturday nights at 11.30 p.m.

Each change created rumors around the show and many questioned the future of the production. As each rescheduling postponed broadcasts to a later hour or changed the day of the broadcast, these rumors started to be taken seriously by the series'

fans. Also, they have protested several times by tweeting certain hashtags, such as "We support our show with *#ÇalıkuşuErkenSaateAlınsın* (Çalıkuşu should start earlier) hashtag.. Please RT.. #çalıkuşu" ("#çalıkuşuerkensaatealınsın etiketi ile dizimize destek veriyoruz.. Haydi RT' ye.. #çalıkuşu") (Tanrıverdi, 2014) and "#calikusu #calikusukafeste I expect those who want Çalıkuşu to return its former schedule #ÇalıkuşuEskiSaatine (Çalıkuşu to its former schedule) hashtag" ("#calikusu #calikusukafeste Çalıkuşunun eski saatine dönmesini isteyenleri #calikusueskisaatine hashtagıne bekliyorum") (Yazar, 2014). Moreover, *Çalıkuşu*'s fluctuating position on the traditional television ratings was thought as the main reason behind mentioned changes which finally came to an end with the cancellation of the series.

A brief examination of *Çalıkuşu*'s rankings reveals that the series lost its competitiveness over time. This examination can be divided into two parts regarding two combinations of different socio-economical groups, which are AB and TOTAL groups. While AB group only constitutes the data collected from A and B socio-economical groups, which refer to the two with highest income and education, TOTAL group constitutes the data collected from all six groups, which are A, B, C1, C2, D and E. Even though 18 episodes of the show managed to be in the top 5 places of AB group results, 11 episodes fell into the latter five places between 6th and 10th and in one occasion, an episode ranked 18th. While the first 9 episodes, 15th-19th episodes and two latest episodes ranked among the top five, the show could not come in first. Similarly, while the series could not rank first on TOTAL group, its ranks decreased dramatically. Only the first 3 episodes were successful enough to be

in the top 5, third episode became the most successful among all episodes by ranking 4th. Also, while 10 episodes ranked between 6th and 10th places, another 10 episodes ranked between 11th and 15th places, 4 episodes were placed among 16th and 20th places and respectively 2 and 1 episodes were placed between 21st-25th and 26th-30th episodes. Between 5th and 16th episode, *Çalıkuşu* could not find a place among the top 10, yet it fell down to 19th place twice and 21st place once. Then, for three episodes it ranked 8th,6th and 8th respectively. After these relatively promising results, *Çalıkuşu*'s rankings declined again until its final episode, which ranked 8th.

In contrast with traditional TV ratings, based on the number of tweets it received, *Çalıkuşu* performed well on Social TV ratings. While the first 20 episodes of the series, except the 4th episode, ranked 1st on Social TV ratings, remaining episodes went back and forth between 2nd and 3rd place. Additionally, 23rd episode took the worst result by ranking 4th. Also as mentioned, *Çalıkuşu* could not reach the first place starting from its 21st episode, which was broadcasted on March 4, 2014. When examined, the two major reasons behind this decline in rankings reveal that it was the premiere of another long-waited TV series *Kurt Seyit and Şura* on the same day and the beginning of *Survivor* two days before (Kocasu, 2015).

In order to prevent a possible cancellation, series' fans tried to organize social media acts to inform TV and production company executives about their fan base. For instance, fans used certain hashtags to appear on the Trending Topic lists of Twitter. While they utilized episode labels, which are pre-defined hashtags that were announced by Kanal D, on broadcast days, they also created their own hashtags for

other days. However, there is a certain distinction between these two types of hashtags. While pre-defined hashtags relate to the plot of the episode, such as *#FerideninGidişi* (the departure of Feride), *#AşkınİmtihanI* (the test of love) and #SabırVeUmut (patience and hope), hashtags created by the fans of *Çalıkuşu* were directly related to the overall situation of the series and wishes of fans, for instance *#ÇalıkuşuDizisiErkenFinalYapmasın* (*Çalıkuşu* should not have a premature final), *#ÇalıkuşumaDokunma* (do not touch my *Çalıkuşu*) and *#ÇalıkuşuAnadoluyaStardaGitsin* (*Çalıkuşu* should go to Anatolia on Star TV). In many cases, viewers organized to use certain hashtags on a same day to collectively increase the popularity of hashtags until they appear on the Trending Topics list of Twitter. For instance, tweets such as these sparked the enthusiasm of series' fans and those organizations ended up on the Trending Topics list many times: "Guys we should make a TT operation since we have to protest and its #calikusu day! Please RT to announce" ("Arkadaşlar bugün TT çalışması yapalım need olsa #calikusu günü ve tepkimizi yeniden göstermeliyiz ! RT yapıp duyuralım lütfen") (FerKam, 2014), "Today's Çalıkuşu continue hashtag is #calikusumadokunma." ("BUYRUN BU AKSAMIN TAGI CALIKUSU BITMESIN RT #calikusumadokunma") (Çalıkuşu!, 2014).

Even though many of these hashtags appeared on the Trending Topic list of Twitter, fans could not receive any feedback from either the channel or the production company. Since the future of the show depended on the number of viewers according to fans, they tried to attract the attention of people to motivate them to watch *Çalıkuşu*. To reach their goal, they distributed flyers on public areas and even

discussed co-funding a newspaper ad. Also, their overwhelming attention was written on newspapers by several critics. Additionally, one of the viewers started an online petition to transfer *Çalıkuşu* to Star TV and to unify all fans under the same cause. The aim was to collect 10.000 signatures and the petition was signed by 3500 on its first day. On its third day, when the petition reached 9.350 signatures, the goal was raised to 15.000 signatures. 9 days after its opening, the number of signatures only reached 14.764. Even though this was an important number for a petition that is organized for a television series, both producers and channel executives decided not to continue the series.

In addition, some fans started to collect traditional television ratings results to analyze the overall situation. Such analyses did not only include traditional ratings results but also Youtube and Kanal D's view counts, number of *Çalıkuşu* related Google searches, comparisons between metrics of *Çalıkuşu* and other popular shows. Moreover, same fans sent these results to the chairman of the production company, Timur Savcı, together with the petition and another comparison which exposed the series' Social TV ratings (see Çalıkuşu, 2014; Angelhappy, 2014). A letter was attached to packages which stated the wish of *Çalıkuşu* fans.

The plot of the novel involves a wedding planned by Kamran and Feride. However, the betrayal of Kamran forces Feride to leave everything behind to be assigned as a teacher in Anatolia. According to rumors, the series would end with Feride's departure. Hence, fans insisted on forcing the production company and the channel to continue the story or transfer the series to Star TV.

Unfortunately, Timur Savcı, who is the chairman of the production company, announced to have a personal break from the industry and a pass for Kanal D to continue *Çalıkuşu*. However, Kanal D finished the series after its 30th episode with Feride's departure for Anatolia.

In summary, even though fans' attempted to resuscitate *Çalıkuşu* and the channel questioned the success of the series and made arrangements upon scheduling of episodes to reach a higher number of audiences, the show was cancelled due to low TV ratings. This represents the necessity for a proper communication between industry and viewers. While the channel wanted better ratings, which in turn is the result of a fan base, miscommunication or the lack of communication led to the cancellation of the series even though there was an active fan base on Social TV. Which means, producers must learn how to listen to and communicate with their audiences in order to stay away from guess-based decision-making as this would be considered as a more profitable option as it will also make fans happy.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

This thesis was written in an attempt to answer two research questions. While first research question aimed to reveal the boundaries of Social TV, a newly emerged phenomenon that could not find a place among academic research of relative fields; and the second research question resulted in an attempt to find out the future of Social TV ratings system against long-lasting traditional ratings system. In order to answer the first research question, a compilation of already existing academic research and business related definitions have been synthesized. To answer the second research question, three case studies were presented to compare traditional and Social TV ratings systems. These three cases were selected to demonstrate how Turkish people react to televised events via Twitter, where does Social TV ratings system stand against the traditional ratings system, and how Turkish people embraced Social TV related actions and outcomes. But before the presentation of mentioned cases, related background information was provided in a comprehensive way.

In order to mark out the boundaries of Social TV, a variety of academic studies were analyzed and their definitions of Social TV were compared. The comparison

revealed that, studies that belong to different fields of academia contained different definitions of Social TV. Also, even though these definitions answered study research questions, a comprehensive definition could not be found. An analysis of current research, revealed academic approach to the issue as well as weaknesses and gaps in the academic definitions of Social TV, which revealed the necessity to clearly describe what Social TV is.

Thus the current study described Social TV as a vast interaction cloud that functions thanks to both multi-purpose and television related social media platforms, on which both televised and television related content is unbound by time, space and device while two-way communication among viewers and producers is both possible and available for analysis. To be precise, Social TV contains newly emerged online television platforms that provide both broadcasts and broadcast related content, screen interactions that became possible thanks to developing online technologies, dialogue among viewers and producers that took place on social media platforms that are multi-purpose and/or focused on television environment and analyses of these dialogues both statistically and semantically. Thanks to its mentioned qualifications, Social TV has changed the process of production and consumption for the television industry and it provides a more democratic environment, within which actions of viewers are not limited. In addition, a brief explanation of uses and gratifications theory and its relation to the nature of Social TV was provided. To be precise, uses and gratifications theory assumes that the audience is actively and intentionally selecting and/or interpreting media texts to fulfill needs and accomplish certain tasks. Since Social TV is an interactive platform that allows audience members to react to

televised content as a part of their active watching processes, it can be said that theory and the platform in question are closely related.

Furthermore, an overview of the historical development of web technologies and the idea of interactive television, which is replaced by today's Social TV, were provided together with the brief history of social media and current Social TV applications. Regarding the development of web technologies, the transition from Web 1.0 to Web 2.0 was considered as the main event that led to the birth of Social TV. While Web 1.0 consisted of static, identical and unaltering websites that work on stationary devices with one-to-many communication paradigm, Web 2.0 altered the look and functions of websites due to increased internet speed, developing input-output models and interaction capabilities of devices while introducing a many-to-many communication paradigm, which virtually allows any internet user to communicate with any other(s). Also, the web became a carriage for all other media such as television, telephone, printed media, recorded visuals and sound thanks to Web 2.0. To be precise, online technologies allowed people to reach texts and recorded media, follow live television and radio events and make phone calls. Moreover, with the arrival of a new concept, which is social media, free and unlimited peer-to-peer and group conversations became available online. This section, within which the history of web technologies was recounted, is followed by an overview of the evolution of social media and statistical information regarding the use of highly popular social media platforms, such as Twitter and Facebook.

Social TV appeared as a result of interactions that take place between viewers, producers, stars and the televised content. While many thought that these interactions were introduced recently, a review of the literature reveals that the idea of interactive television has been already out there for decades. Therefore, to provide background information regarding the evolution of television, prime examples of earlier interactive television applications, such as QUBE, Videotex, Teletext, Spacehone, WebTVs and the integration of fax, SMS and telephone calls to the screen, were explained in detail. Considering that mentioned examples have been developed in a long timeline with the introduction of QUBE in 1977, it can be said that the aim of this section was to reveal the roots of Social TV.

After providing an overview of the history of interactive television, which later led to the birth of Social TV, current examples of Social TV applications were explained. Starting from the use of hashtags used on social media platforms and provide basic interactions, Social TV related television formats, the integration of different Social TV applications during the 2012 London Olympics and the utilization of resulting data during 2012 United States Presidential Election were described respectively. This was followed by an historical overview of the birth and development of Turkish Social TV together with the functioning mechanism of Social TV ratings in Turkey starting from 2013-2014 TV season, which is considered the beginning of Turkish Social TV.

As mentioned before, one of the main aims of this thesis is to predict the future of Social TV ratings, which can either continue as a separate measurement system or

replace the traditional ratings system by evolving up to an industry standard, a comparison has to be made between traditional and Social TV ratings. Since these ratings measurement systems function in entirely different ways and produce incomparable ranking results, the comparison has to address additional factors that can distinguish between the advantages and disadvantages of both ratings systems. Therefore, the case study method has been chosen as the methodology of this comparison to address the broader context and identify the differences between both ratings systems. Moreover, three cases were selected to cover different aspects of today's television and to identify the differences between two ratings systems, which are an exclusive episode of *Irfan Değirmenci ile Günaydın* which was broadcasted via Google Hangouts and UStream from the kitchen of show's host as a reaction to a screen ban issued by RTÜK. The second case was the exclusive episode of *Halk Arenası* which was broadcasted on television as an open forum in which Soma mining disaster was discussed by its victims that ranked first on Social TV but did not appear on traditional ratings results due to a variety of factors. Finally, the last case focused on the cancellation of *Çalıkuşu* TV series due to low ratings results on traditional measurements despite its leadership in Social TV ratings and a strong and active fan base.

Viewers might be interested in different types of content which are produced outside the traditional television environment as Değirmenci's case proves by ranking 1st on Social TV ratings even though the program did not even appear on television but competed with traditionally produced prime time shows. Considering that costly peoplemeters can only measure traditionally televised content in specific

locations on specific time periods and today's television reaches more people through a variety of devices that can deliver televised content without being limited to time and space; it can be said that the limits of television ratings must be clearly elaborated. On the other hand, today, Social TV and Social TV ratings provide a common ground for the measurement of both traditional and contemporary television environments since social media stands as an international, limitless meeting platform for all people where they gather to talk about any content and create both quantitatively and qualitatively comparable data.

The second case study, in which a special episode of *Halk Arenası* is discussed, puts the emphasis on the objectivity of the traditional television ratings system. In this case, entities that are involved in the measurements of traditional television ratings and external factors such as governments, political parties and companies were listed, internal relationships between the shareholders of the regulatory organization are examined. Finally, the limits of current traditional television ratings system in terms of the number of channels that are currently being tracked and requirements for a television channel to be included in the group were specified. Today, traditional television ratings measurements in Turkey include four organizations, two of which are bound by the government while the other two is purely commercial. Considering that even though the job of measuring society's viewing habits is given to a commercial research company to provide objectivity while the other three entities were included in the system as regulators which are either partially or entirely dependent on external forces, the study revealed possible sources of biases and the

extent of traditional television ratings which only measure a small number of television channels.

The third and final case study examines the cancellation of the *Çalıkuşu* TV series due to low ratings. Since traditional television ratings system which involves measurements made via peoplemeters is considered the industry standard, fate and future of television programs and series depend on its results. However, in the case of *Çalıkuşu*, which was cancelled after its 30th episode due to low ratings, there was a fan base which consisted of people who worked heartily to keep the series on air. Even though a few tactics were utilized by fans including creating hashtags, distributing flyers and starting a petition to convince the executives of the television channel and the production company, they failed. Moreover, analyses upon both traditional and Social TV ratings and additional material, such as popularity of the show among others on social media platforms, episodes' view count on both Kanal D's website and Youtube etc. proved that the overall situation was not hopeless even though it could not stop the cancellation of the series. Even though fans tried to use one of the primary functions of Social TV, which is the ability to communicate with others including people who work on the production side of content creation, and even though they provided additional materials to support their request, their messages were not taken seriously by both the production company and the television channel.

In summary, even though the idea of interactive television was around for some time, Social TV brought never-before-seen advancements to the industry. Also, it is

obvious that the utilization of these advancements led to more engaging viewing experiences for viewers and increased profits of both production companies and television channels. Moreover, social media based ratings started to challenge traditional ratings system, which has been considered as the only metric for the success and failure of TV productions. Considering that procedures of traditional ratings system did not change over the course of decades and were regarded as insufficient by many, Social TV ratings system, which involves the collection and both statistical and semantical analyses of the data generated by millions on free social media platforms, can change the dynamics of the industry.

While traditional ratings provide results that are generated by costly devices that track viewing habits of limited number of sample group members, it is impossible to question the objectivity of results due to their incomparability since they are provided by only one research company. However, Social TV ratings can be provided by a number of companies that are able to get user generated content from free social media platforms and analyze it either quantitatively and/or qualitatively. Therefore, Social TV provides a certain extent of comparability due to the openness of data sources even though their algorithms can change. Also, unlike traditional television ratings, the number of sample group members is not limited to thousands since Social TV can capture millions of social media posts sent by millions of viewers without being limited to time and device, which also suits the current state of television which is unbound by time, space and device. On the other hand, traditional television ratings accept television shows to be broadcasted within certain time slots, although they are always available on other platforms. Another

important aspect of Social TV ratings is the ability to provide thoughts and feelings of viewers while traditional television ratings only provide statistics regarding active watching processes.

Even though the future looks bright for Social TV, several highly criticized aspects of the platform should be addressed. As mentioned before, many of the analytics companies acquire data freely from highly popular social media platforms and earn profits by selling their analyses. Unfortunately, hundreds of millions of social media users are not aware of the fact that their data is being used or being profited from. Moreover, considering that social media platforms such as Twitter and Facebook do not provide data generated by users who use their profiles privately and only allow access to data shared on publicly open profiles, people who keep their profiles open to public are considered as consenting. And again, even though these platforms present a terms of use agreement to each future user with an article that clearly states an allowance for third-party use, many users accept the agreement without even reading such articles. Another important aspect of treating social media platforms as data sources is their inability to provide necessary data and if they are providing such data, its validity. Since Twitter does not ask for or provide important demographic information such as age, gender, location etc. data, Turkish Social TV companies that provide ratings results are not able to create a segmentation of their samples according to viewers' socio-economical groups, which is an important feature of traditional television ratings. Moreover, similar to the case of Facebook, even though Twitter would ask for these details, there would not be a way for validating users' inputs. Considering that television ratings are mostly utilized by advertisers, brands,

television channels, political parties to market products and ideologies to distinguish their target demographics, such a lack creates an important disadvantage for Social TV ratings. Therefore, traditional television ratings system is still dominant within the market relations and Social TV ratings are being used as complementary metrics to the traditional ratings system.

As mentioned before, television ratings are mostly used by people who market products and ideologies, such as advertisers, brands, TV channels and political parties. Although ratings are the not only factor within the functioning mechanism of the industry to choose between options to invest, it is clearly one of the most important. Since Social TV ratings are measured by independent companies that have to gain profit from their services, their results might be biased. Because algorithms that are used by these companies are self-built, therefore customizable. Even though this does not necessarily mean a corrupt industry, it certainly creates doubts and calls for a verification system. As *Halk Arenası*'s case shows clearly, both traditional and Social TV ratings systems have weaknesses that can clearly affect the functioning mechanism of the media industry. While traditional ratings system include organizations that might be under the influence of governmental and/or market forces, Social TV side seems independent, but needs further inspection and verification. Therefore, to construct a trustworthy system, it is clear that traditional ratings system has to be less dependent on organizations and competitive forces, such as other companies that can measure television ratings, have to introduced to compare their results. For Social TV ratings, this verification mechanism can change depending on the event. The verification mechanism can be

the results of an other Social TV analytics company, traditional ratings results and/or surveys. In the case of Turkey, both ratings systems are being used in a complementary manner. Rankings of both systems are considered important, viewers' thoughts are analyzed thanks to Social TV ratings and finally, Social TV ratings results provided by different companies are compared to criticize and verify them.

As a result, as a relatively new phenomenon that has covered lots of ground in a relatively small time and still open to evolution, Social TV ratings seem to provide certain advantages with its openness, questionability, comparability, informativeness, scale that cover millions, and compatibility with the current state of television. However, its position against traditional television ratings is still critical. Considering that traditional television ratings system has been around for decades, quite insufficient to provide valuable insights and manipulated according to the benefits of industrial forces, Social TV ratings seem to be a competitor that might replace traditional system. On the other hand, Social TV ratings is still new and carries important defects such as the lack of segmentation, customizable nature depending on the company that builds analytics algorithms. Considering that these systems are being used complementarily and Social TV still needs improvements, it can be said that Social TV ratings will gain importance but will not be able to replace traditional ratings system in the near future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABC's Groundbreaking Summer Singing Competition Series "Rising Star" Launches Instagram Campaign to Power the Search for America's Best Singers. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.disneyabcpress.com/abc/pressrelease/abcs-groundbreaking-summer-singing-competition-series-rising-star-launches-instagram-campaign-to-power-the-search-for-americas-best-singers/

Akkoc, R. (2015). Turkey's crackdown on freedom of speech intensifies. Retrieved from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/turkey/11400939/Turkeys-crackdown-on-freedom-of-speech-intensifies.html

Angelhappy. [angelhapy]. (2014, April 28). Dizimize bizle birlikte sahip çıktığınız için çok teşekkür ederiz size @benguergin #calıkusubitmesin [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/angelhapy/status/460524955700953088

Arthur, C., & Kiss, J. (2015). Facebook reaches 500 million users. Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2010/jul/21/facebook-500-million-users

Aygün, G. [Destekfx_gokhan]. (2014, March 25). @degirmencirfan Bu sabah unstream üzerinden yayınınızı izledim. Ayakta alkışlıyorum. Allah, her aileye sizin gibi temiz evlat nasip etsin. [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/Destekfx_gokhan/status/448370307909570560

Ayhan, V. (2014). Soma önergesi 20 gün önce böyle reddedilmiş Retrieved from http://www.zaman.com.tr/gundem_soma-onergesi-20-gun-once-boyle-reddedilmis_2217215.html

Aylin_. [sirinest]. (2014, May 15). Sevgili @DigiturkDestek Halktv'deki yayın problemini ne zaman gidemeyi düşünüyorsunuz! #halkarenasıbitince mi?? [Tweet]. Retrieved from https:// twitter.com/sirinest/status/ 467040752510726144

Bellman, S., Robinson, J. A., Wooley, B., & Varan, D. (2014). The effects of social TV on television advertising effectiveness, *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 1-19, doi: 10.1080/13527266.2014.921637

Bergensbanen – minutt for minutt [Television broadcast]. (2009, November 27). Oslo: NRK.

Blumler, J. G., Katz, E., & Gurevitch, M. (1973). Uses and Gratifications Research, *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37(4), 509-523. doi: 10.1086/268109

Boese, C. [ChrisBoese]. (2012, July 28). Yo Meredith and Matt. That's SIR Tim to you. #werenotnotworthy #olympics [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/ChrisBoese/status/229021635796156416

Boyd, D., & Crawford, K. (2012). Critical Questions For Big Data, *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 671-673. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2012.678878

Canpolat, Y. (2015). Digiturk Play ile Netten Maç ve TV Keyfi. Retrieved from http://shiftdelete.net/digiturk-play-ile-netten-mac-ve-tv-keyfi-36743

Carey, J. (2009). Winky Dink To Stargazer: Five Decades Of Interactive Television. Retrieved from http://www.bhecker.com/history_of_interactive_tv.pdf

Carter, J. (2012). Why London 2012 will be remembered as the social Olympics. Retrieved from http://www.techradar.com/news/internet/why-london-2012-will-be-remembered-as-the-social-olympics-1089052

Chorianopoulos, K., & Lekakos, G. (2008). Introduction to Social TV: Enhancing the Shared Experience with Interactive TV. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 24(2), 113-120. doi: 10.1080/10447310701821574

Crook, J. (2012). The First Truly Social Olympics: Tell Me How You Really Feel. Retrieved from http://techcrunch.com/2012/08/08/the-first-truly-social-olympics-tell-me-how-you-really-feel/

Çalıkuşu. [Calikusu2013]. (2014, April 25). Sayin @ikodogan Calikusu 12 bin imza ve reyting gercegi ile yola cikti size dogru geliyor. [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/calikusu2013/status/459596525979832320

Çalıkuşu!. [Calikusu2013]. (2014, April 19). BUYRUN BU AKSAMIN TAGI CALIKUSU BITMESIN RT #calikusumadokunma. [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/calikusu2013/status/457579392256851969

Çapulcu, N. [nesilvar]. (2014, March 25). Tek kelimeyle helal olsun @degirmencirfan beklediğimiz haberci mantalitesi bu işte.. Yayın yasak, haber hakkı değil! http://t.co/pGyovCeUHN [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/nesilvar/status/448355793084366848

Davidi, A. (2013). Twitter acquires the social TV analytics company Bluefin Labs. Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/media-network/media-network-blog/2013/feb/06/twitter-bluefin-labs-social-tv

Demirel, F. (2012). Turkcell yeni kişisel TV platformu TVPlus'ı duyurdu. Retrieved from http://webrazzi.com/2012/04/18/turkcell-tv-plus/

Demirel, F. (2011). Televizyon Odaklı Sosyal Ağ Tivilog.com'un İlk Ekran Görüntüleri. Retrieved from http://webrazzi.com/2011/12/21/tivilog-ilk-erkan-goruntuleri/

DiNucci, D. (1999, April). Fragmented Future. *Print Magazine* 32, 221-222.

Metrobüs, D. [dolumetrobus]. (2014, May 15). #HalkTv de #HalkArenası nda madenciler gerçekleri tüm çıplaklığıyla anlatırken #Digiturk ün yayınında teknik arıza çıkması tesadüf müdür??? [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/dolumetrobus/status/467041373217386496

Edelsburg, N. (2012). NBC debuts 2 social apps for the London Olympics. Retrieved from http://www.adweek.com/lostremote/nbc-launches-two-apps-to-complement-olympic-broadcast/32830

Erdemir, F. (2011). Başlangıçtan Günümüze TRT'nin Reklam Serüveni. *İletişim Kuram ve Araştırma Dergisi*, (32), 205-226. Retrieved from http://www.iletisimdergisi.gazi.edu.tr/

Ergen, Y. (2014). Gündem Belirleme Kuramı Bağlamında Yeni Medya: Twitter Gündemi Hakkında Karşılaştırmalı Bir Analiz. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/8578057/G%C3%BCndem_Belirleme_Kuram%C4%B1_Ba%C4%9Flam%C4%B1nda_Yeni_Medya_Twitter_G%C3%BCndemi_Hakk%C4%B1nda_Kar%C5%9F%C4%B1la%C5%9Ft%C4%B1rmal%C4%B1_Bir_Analiz

EtkiTakip. (2013). *Sosyal TV Nedir?* Retrieved from http://blog.etkitakip.com/sosyal-tv-nedir/

Eyidilli, S. (2014). Sosyal TV analizi yapan yerli girişim: YNK Labs. Retrieved from http://webrazzi.com/2014/05/11/sosyal-tv-analizi-yapan-yerli-girisim-ynk-labs/

Eyüboğlu, A. (2012). Türkiye'nin "SES"i Değişti. Retrieved from http://cadde.milliyet.com.tr/2012/05/03/YazarDetay/1535492/turkiye-nin-ses-i-degisti

Eyüboğlu, A. (2015). 'Benzemez'de bu isimler yarışacak. Retrieved from http://www.milliyet.com.tr/-benzemez-de-bu-isimler-yarisacak/magazin/ydetay/1994062/default.htm

Facebook. (2015). *Company Info.* Retrieved from https://newsroom.fb.com/company-info/

FeNoLMaYaNMeN. [AhmetYunusOnur]. (2014, March 25). 25 yillik hayatim boyunca en zevkli izlediğim sabah haberleriydiniz tşkkrlr dostlar...

@degirmencirfan @ertgrlalbyrk **[**Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/AhmetYunusOnur/status/448362400765722624

Ferah, A. B. (2013). Doğuş Yayın Grubu'nun eski CEO'su Cem Aydın'dan sosyal medya ölçümleme girişimi: Somera. Retrieved from http://webrazzi.com/2013/12/16/somera-cem-aydin-dogus-yayin-grubu/

Ferah, A. B. (2014). Doğuş Yayın Grubu'ndan televizyon merkezli mobil sosyal ağ: dediki.com. Retrieved from http://webrazzi.com/2014/04/04/dediki-com/

FerKam. [ferkamcalikusu]. (2014, May 3). Arkadaşlar bugün TT çalışması yapalım nede olsa #calikusu günü ve tepkimizi yeniden göstermeliyiz ! RT yapıp duyuralım lütfen [Tweet]. Retrieved from http://twitter.com/ferkamcalikusu/status/462505737219219456

Francheschi-Bicchierai, L. (2014). After John Oliver's Net Neutrality Rant: 22,000 Comments and Site Overload. Retrieved from http://mashable.com/2014/06/03/fcc-site-down-john-oliver-net-nuetrality-rant/

Freed, K. (2000). When Cable Went Qubist. Retrieved from http://media-visions.com/itv-qube.html

Google buys YouTube for $1.65bn. (2006). Retrieved from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/6034577.stm

Gültekin, L. (2012). *Yeni reyting sistemi AK Parti'nin oylarını artırır mı?*. Retrieved from http://www.gazeteciler.com/levent-gultekin/yeni-reyting-sistemi-ak-partinin-oylarini-artirir-mi-807y.html

Hand, J. (2012). *Ceefax service closes down after 38 years on BBC*. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-20032882

Hellum, T. (2014, August). *Thomas Hellum: Slow TV* [Video file]. Retrieved from http://www.ted.com/talks/thomas_hellum_the_world_s_most_boring_television_and_why_it_s_hilariously_addictive

Hernandez, R. [webjournalist]. (2012, July 28). .@NBC co-host of #Olympics opening ceremony says she has never heard of Tim Berners-Lee ... oh the irony. Oh the painful irony. [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/webjournalist/status/229032811049414656

Holpuch, A. (2014). John Oliver's cheeky net neutrality plea crashes FCC website Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/jun/03/john-oliver-fcc-website-net-neutrality

Hu, H., Wen, Y., Luan, H., Chua, T., & Li, X. (2007). Towards Multi-Screen Social TV with Geo-Aware Social Sense. *Journal of Latex Class Files* 6(1), 10-19.

Hurtigruten – minutt for minutt [Television broadcast]. (2011, June 16). Oslo: NRK.

İpek, B. [bulentipek]. (2014, May 15). Uğur Dündar, halk tv de madencilerle forum yapiyor, unutturulan gazeteciligi ayaga kaldiriyor #halkarenası [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/bulentipek/status/467038872099368960

İşleyen, E. (2014a). O kadının avukatı konuştu. Retrieved from http://www.milliyet.com.tr/o-kadinin-avukati-konustu-/gundem/detay/1854997/default.htm

İşleyen, E. (2014b). Vergi ödemiyor, ofis açmıyor. Retrieved from http://www.milliyet.com.tr/-vergi-odemiyor-ofis-acmiyor-/siyaset/detay/1856833/default.htm

İşleyen, E. (2015). Soma'da takvimler hala 13 Mayıs 2014. Retrieved from http://www.milliyet.com.tr/soma-da-takvimler-hala-13-mayis-gundem-2058109/

Kaczynski, A. [BuzzFeedAndrew]. (2012, July 28). Once NBC learns who Tim Berners-Lee is it will make setting up a live steam for the next Olympics much easier. [Tweet.] Retrieved from http://twitter.com/BuzzFeedAndrew/status/229020130858909698

Kara, F. [fundakara]. (2014, May 15). #halkarenası programini izlememizi engellemeye calistiginiz için yarin aboneligimi iptal ediyorum! @Digiturk [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/FundaKara/status/467043571829571585

Kara, M. (2015). Facebook'un Türkiye'deki aylık kullanıcı sayısı 40 milyona dayandı. Retrieved from http://webrazzi.com/2015/09/03/facebook-turkiye-aylik-kullanici-sayisi/

Kayalar, A. (2014). Turkey blocks Twitter, after Erdogan vowed 'eradication'. Retrieved from http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/turkey-blocks-twitter-after-erdogan-vowed-eradication.aspx?pageID=238&nID=63884&NewsCatID=338

Kawamoto, D. (2002). AOLTV service to hit market Monday. Retrieved from http://www.cnet.com/news/aoltv-service-to-hit-market-monday

Kemp, S. (2015). Digital, Social & Mobile Worldwide in 2015. Retrieved from http://wearesocial.net/blog/2015/01/digital-social-mobile-worldwide-2015/

Kiss, J. (2012). Facebook hits 1 billion users a month. Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2012/oct/04/facebook-hits-billion-users-a-month

Kocasu, A. N. (2015a). Evinden gerçekleştirdiği canlı yayınla birinci oldu. Retrieved from http://www.mediacatonline.com/evinden-gerceklestirdigi-canli-yayinla-birinci-oldu/

Kocasu, A. N. (2015b). İkinci ekran gündemini Halk Arenası belirledi. Retrieved from http://www.mediacatonline.com/ikinci-ekran-gundemini-halk-arenasi-belirledi/

Kocasu, A. N. (2015c). Kurt Seyit ve Şura ilk yayın gününe birincilikle başladı. Retrieved from http://www.mediacatonline.com/kurt-seyit-ve-sura-ilk-yayin-gunune-birincilikle-basladi/

Kutsal, A. (2010). TTNET'ten Online Televizyon: Tivibu. Retrieved from http://webrazzi.com/2010/02/24/ttnetten-online-televizyon-tivibu/

Küstür, S. (2013). D-Smart hem TV'de hem internette iddialı. Retrieved from http://www.teknoblog.com/d-smart-hem-tvde-hem-internette-iddiali-57278/

Laningham, S (editor). (2006, August 22). *Interview with Sir Tim-Berners-Lee* [Audio podcast]. Retrieved from https://www.ibm.com/developerworks/community/groups/service/html/communityview?communityUuid=70786d1c-a2d4-4de8-a807-fccfa600bc77

Lecher, C. (2014). Read the FCC's internal emails about John Oliver's net neutrality segment. Retrieved from http://www.theverge.com/2014/11/13/7205817/fcc-john-oliver-net-neutrality-emails

Littleton, C. (2014). ABC's 'Rising Star' Juggles Time Zones to Allow For Live Voting. Retrieved from http://variety.com/2014/tv/news/abcs-rising-star-juggles-time-zones-to-allow-for-live-voting-1201195783/

London 2012: How to watch the Olympics on BBC TV. (2012). Retrieved from http://www.bbc.com/sport/0/olympics/18922069

Lotz, A. D. (2009). Interactive TV Too Early: The False Start of QUBE, *Project Muse* 64, 106-07. doi: 10.1353/vlt.0.0067

LTFMTN. [LutfiMetin]. (2014, May 15). #halkarenası işçileri izlerken edindiğimiz izlenim,hepsinin yüzünde samimi bir ifade,her söyledikleri doğru.yalan söyleyen işçiler değil. [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/LutfiMetin/status/467029792018411520

Lunden, I. (2014). Twitter Buys France's Mesagraph And UK's SecondSync To Ramp Up Social TV Efforts In Europe. Retrieved from http://techcrunch.com/2014/03/31/twitter-buys-frances-mesagraph-to-ramp-up-social-tv-work-in-euroupe/

Madanoğlu, S. M. (2015). Reyting: Toplumun aynası mı sektörün terazisi mi?, *MediaCat* (243), 40-42.

Marechal, A. (2014). ABC's 'Rising Star': Network TV's Next Big Thing?. Retrieved from http://variety.com/2014/tv/news/abcs-rising-star-singing-competition-manifests-the-opposite-of-entire-market-1201074296/

Marinelli, A. & Andò, R. (2014). Multiscreening and Social TV: The Changing Landscape of TV Consumption in Italy. *Journal of European Television History & Culture*, 3(6), 24-36. Retrieved from http://viewjournal.eu/index.php/view/index

Masters, S. (2012). #NBCFail: Backlash as Twitter locks out reporter Guy Adams. Retrieved from http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/nbcfail-backlash-as-twitter-locks-out-reporter-guy-adams-7987906.html

McLellan, C. (2013). M2M and the Internet of Things: A Guide. Retrieved from http://www.zdnet.com/article/m2m-and-the-internet-of-things-a-guide/

Miah, A. (2012). Viewpoint: London 2012, a social media Olympics to remember. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.com/news/technology-19191785

Mobil telefon abone sayısı 72 milyonu aştı. (2015). Retrieved from http://www.trthaber.com/haber/ekonomi/mobil-telefon-abone-sayisi-72-milyonu-asti-202108.html

Montpetit, M. & Me´dard, M. (2012). Social Television: Enabling Technologies and Architectures, *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 100, 1395-1399. doi: 10.1109/JPROC.2012.2189804

National Knitting Night [Television broadcast]. (2013, November 1). Oslo: NRK.

Nielsen Launches 'Nielsen Twitter TV Ratings'. (2013). Retrieved from http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/press-room/2013/nielsen-launches-nielsen-twitter-tv-ratings.html

Oliver, J. [LastWeekTonight]. (2014a, May 19). *Last Week Tonight – Drones* [Video File]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K4NRJoCNHIs

Oliver, J. [LastWeekTonight]. (2014b). *Last Week Tonight - Net Neutrality* [Video File]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fpbOEoRrHyU

Oliver, J. [LastWeekTonight]. (2015, January 25). *Last Week Tonight - Fifty Shades #NotMyChristian Apology* [Video File]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fPloDzu_wcI

O'Reilly, T. (2005). What Is Web 2.0? Retrieved from http://www.oreilly.com/pub/a/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html

Özcan. [hasimozcan]. (2014, March 25). @degirmencirfan @SabriyeGLER çoluk çocuğu fişeklerin önüne atıp sonra da timsah gözyaşlarıyla ucuz siyaset yapmak yetmedi mi ağalar?Yapmayın [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/hasimozcan/status/448577797531783168

Pachal, P. (2013). Samsung Re-Invents the TV Interface to Include Social and Apps. Retrieved from http://mashable.com/2013/01/07/samsung-smart-hub/

Pastafaryan. [MarsKorsani]. (2014, May 15). Uğur Dündar resmen bugün İşçi Devrimi yapıyor. Helal olsun #halkarenası [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/CHPKorsan/status/467043019569778688

Pizzaro, M. [Al Jazeera English]. (2013, September 15). *Feature: Norway's Slow TV* [Video]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4Ibe17-JMCU

Plunkett, J. (2014). ITV drops Rising Star talent show format. Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/media/2014/sep/17/itv-drops-rising-star-talent-show-format

Portakal, F. [fatihportakal]. (2014, March 25). Bravo @degirmencirfan ye.. Sesini aslan gibi duyuruyor... Yasakların durdurmaların olmadığı günlere.. Yasasın özgürlük.. [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/fatihportakal/status/448338385154084865

Rising Star Promo [Video]. (2014, June 2). Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UYegexUgd9g

Rising Star [Television]. (2014). New York, NY: ABC.

Ruggiero, T. E. (2000). Uses and Gratifications Theory in the 21st Century, *Mass Communication & Society,* (1), 3-37. doi: 10.1207/S15327825MCS0301_02

Seferoğlu, M. [MeralSfroglu]. (2014, May 15). 4737373 digitürk'ü ara...! Ya yayını düzeltsin ya da aboneliğini iptal et…! @halktvcom @ugurdundarsozcu@ErknCan @zerqddt [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/MeralSfroglu/status/467042713284907009

Shields, M. (2015). How Much Could NBC Make By Selling Ads on YouTube For Jimmy Fallon?. Retrieved from http://blogs.wsj.com/cmo/2015/03/11/how-much-could-nbc-make-by-selling-ads-on-youtube-for-jimmy-fallon/

Shirky, C. (2009, June). *Clay Shirky: How social media can make history* [Video file]. Retrieved from http://www.ted.com/talks/clay_shirky_how_cellphones_twitter_facebook_can_make_history

Shin, D. (2013). Defining sociability and social presence in Social TV, *Computers in Human Behavior,* 29(3), 939-947. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2012.07.006

Sivaslıoğlu, 4. [AlpFB58]. (2014, March 25). Her sabah ekranlarda kin ve nefret pompalayan, Doğan'ın köpeği şerefsiz @degirmencirfan, Keşke RTE gerçekten diktatör olsaydı da görseydik. [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/AlpFB58/status/448363867383795712

sn_g. [S_N_GS]. (2014, Mar 25). @degirmencirfan seninle gurur duyuyorum, beni ozgur hissettiren herkesle gurur duyuyorum :) tebrik ve tesekkurler :) [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/S_N_GS/status/448396475706650624

Social TV Infographics from the 2012 London Olympics. (2012). Retrieved from http://www.slideshare.net/bluefinlabs/social-tv-infograhpics-from-the-2012-london-olympics

Storvik-Green, S. (2015). Nadav Guedj wins Israeli ticket to Vienna, song revealed. Eurovision Song Contest. Retrieved from http://www.eurovision.tv/page/news?id=nadav_guedj_wins_israeli_ticket_to_vienna

Şener, V. [vecide11] (2014, May 15). Halk Arenası'nda konuşan maden çalışanlarını dinleyin.Işçiler sendikalardan dertli, denetimlerden dertli. Işçi değil köle.@ugurdundarsozcu [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/vecide11/status/467038233113935872

Tanrıverdi, H. [HilalTanrverdi2]. (2014, February 18). #çalıkuşuerkensaatealınsın etiketi ile dizimize destek veriyoruz.. Haydi RT'ye.. çalıkuşu [Tweet].Retrieved from https://twitter.com/HilalTanrverdi2/status/435882629297344512

TRT'nin açtığı rating ölçüm ihalesi sonuçlandı. (2009). Retrieved from http://www.mediacatonline.com/trtnin-actigi-rating-olcum-ihalesi-sonuclandi/

Turkish Statistical Institute. (2015a). *Hanehalkı Bilişim Teknolojileri Kullanım Araştırması, 2015.* Ankara, Turkey.

Turkish Statistical Institute. (2015b). *Nüfus, Yıllık Nüfus Artış Hızı, İl, İlçe, Belde Belediyesi, Köy Sayısı ve Nüfus Yoğunluğu, 2007-2014*. Ankara, Turkey.

Türkiye 'Van için tek yürek' oldu. (2011). Retrieved from http://www.ntv.com.tr/turkiye/turkiye-van-icin-tek-yurek-oldu,hwe0Uw8ZmkOpzTdh_phzlw

TV ratingleri Twitter'da ölçülecek. (2013). Retrieved from http://www.ntv.com.tr/turkiye/tv-ratingleri-twitterda-olculecek,9XxyjvLQMkaR2GQeb6vuWA

Twitter, Inc. (2015). *Company, About*. Retrieved from https://about.twitter.com/company

Wright, J. L. (2001). Videotext/Teletext--The Web that wasn't. Retrieved from http://www.jour.unr.edu/j705/DE.WRIGHT.VIDEOTEXT.HTML

Wright, N. [nathantwright]. (2012, July 28). Berners-Lee: Internet is "for everyone." Meanwhile, I can't stream any of the Olympics without first proving that I'm a cable TV subscriber. [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/nathantwright/status/229022427726876672

Wohn, Y. (2013). History of Social Television. Retrieved from http://yvettewohn.com/2013/01/11/history-of-social-television/

Yazar, H. K. [hikmetkaanyazar]. (2014, February 18). #calikusu #calikusukafeste Çalıkuşunun eski saatine dönmesini isteyenleri #calikusueskisaatine hashtagıne bekliyorum http://t.co/DYhtXxI2qT [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/hikmetkaanyazar/status/431064084155351040

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (4th ed.). California: Sage Publications, Inc.