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ABSTRACT
Parliament’s Website as a Public Sphere: A Study of e-DPRD Province in Indonesia

The study started from parliament to e-parliament evolution. This exploratory study aimed at answering following questions of (1) publicness capacity of parliament’s website and (2) rational consensus vs. algorithm in Internet-mediated public sphere. It also aimed at (1) identifying the genealogy, the map, and the capacity of the parliament’s website as public sphere. It was useful in (1) the identification of the development of the e-parliament as social sphere, especially e-DPRD province and in the perspective of cyber-sociology and (2) the application of the e-parliament in social sphere in cyber-sociology perspective. Data was collected using online searching and in-depth interview. The data was analyzed by coding, matrix formulation, occurrence index filling, causal-conceptual net formulation, and conclusion test.

Based on initial study, the parliament to e-parliament evolution represented intercorrelation of (1) e-parliaments, (2) international organizations, (3) supporting institutions, and (4) global donor institutions. E-parliament ecosystem was built through biennial conference organized by three international organizations and involving national parliaments, 190 parliament supporting organizations that operated in more than 80 countries, and global donor institutions. The e-parliament was also undergoing evolution into mobile-parliament. The results of the mapping of the parliament’s websites showed that there were 22 (66.6%) e-DPRD province’s websites of totally 33 DPRD provinces, 94 (23.6%) e-DPRD district’s websites of totally 399 DPRD districts, and 33 (33.7%) e-DPRD City’s websites of totally 98 DPRD cities in May 2014.

It was concluded that first, (1) in its providing capacity the publicness of the parliament’s website has operated in terms of hardwares and applications, leadership and commitment, and human resources, (2) in its capacity to use, the publicness of the parliament’s website must be improved in terms of the capability of persons, community and system, network and cooperation, and management pattern, and (3) in its output, the publicness of the parliament’s website required improvement schema to increase relevance, effect/impact, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability. Second, the debate of rational consensus vs. algorithm in public sphere that was mediated by Internet put the importance of the management and the abuse of the algorithm as real life strategic interest.

It made following recommendations: (a) It was necessary to perform social valuation of the parliament’s website in Indonesia; (b) It was necessary to conduct programmatic researches in the perspective of cyber-sociology to identify and to fight against algorithm in the form of code of protocol in cyber area that might be abused by data collectors.

Keywords: citizens, Member of Parliament, e-parliament, and public sphere.
A. INTRODUCTION

1 Background

It was interested to appreciate the presence of Internet-based parliament’s media of parliament’s website and parliament’s hompage as a new social transformation power. It was considered as a new public sphere in term of people’s representation and participation in the parliament. It was expected that the growth and the development of e-parliament would give a new meaning of “people’s sovereignty” in achieving a consensus of legislation, budgetting, and supervisory functions. The e-parliament was considered as a political warranty for increasing transparency, accountability, and participation in addition to an improvement of inter-parliament cooperation at both global and local levels.

According to Samroni (2007) if people and parliament were in an equal position at the beginning, they would converge at the end. The usefulness of the e-parliament was to manage daily parliament politics and not merely to manage the politics in recess period or when plenary meeting news would be uploaded so that plain truth for goodness norm became the basis of collective action. People’s aspiration submitted through the e-parliament would be discussed by parties in the parliament. A representation of the majority of people (solus populi) would change into public interest supremacy that subsequently got legal justification of moral basis as suprema lex through representative democracy.

Also, the e-parliament became the answer of the question of parliamentary process modernization in information society. According to Global Centre for ICTs in Parliament, it was a strategic answer for democracy, good governance, and an achievement of millenium development goal (2010: iii). It was one of follow-ups of WSIS’s mandate, Tunisia, November 2005, to improve inter-parliament cooperation at both global and regional levels in filling digital gap. The change and the acceleration of the change in information and communication technologies (ICTs) have changed and broadened parliamentary democracy practice. The ICTs became a social power to multiply and to broaden parliament’s
functions through e-parliament. In the relationship between the parliament and the ICTs, this study used following three trends as its background:

1. **Evolution from parliament into e-parliament**
   Evolution from parliament into e-parliament represented an interrelation and mutual influence between parliament and Internet with various terminologies such as “cyber-parliaments” (Judge, 1998), “virtual parliament” (Campbel, 1999), “digital parliament” (PSA, Zittel, 2004), “parliament 2.0” (Ferguson, 2008; O’Connor, 2011), “21st century parliament” (Bercow, 2013), “parliament’s online” (mySociety), and “mobile parliament” (MagilaTech). The study used the term “e-parliament” refering to biennial *World e-Parliament Report*. Based on the recapitulation of *World e-Parliament Report 2012* (2012: 4), there were 190 countries with various parliament and e-parliament models at national level.

2. **“Online Parliament” versus “Traditional Parliament”**
   “Online parliament” was the use of Internet-based social media for political movement. Refering to Alexa’s ranking, the online parliament made more uses of Facebook. People’s movement in the online parliament shifted those with citizenship identity to those with online netizenship identity.

3. **Evolution from e-parliament into m-parliament service**
   Evolution from e-parliament into m-parliament (mobile-parliament) service – mobile phone-based parliament application with Android, Windows Phone, and iOS platforms or others—brought people closer to parliament members through parliament application.

2 **Initial Study**
   The initial study explored parliament’s website evolution, especially provincial parliament’s websites (i.e., provincial e-parliaments and provincial e-DPRD) in Indonesia as Internet-mediated public sphere.
3 **Formulation of Problems, Objectives, and Uses of Study**

The study intended to explore parliament’s websites, especially provincial parliament’s websites as public sphere. *First*, parliament’s website publicness was approached as capacity of *providing, using, and giving output*. *Second*, parliament’s website as public sphere and co-opted by power assumed a “rational consensus” claim according to Jürgen Habermas *vis-à-vis* a claim of algorithm power as regulator of Internet-mediated public sphere.

It aimed at (1) identifying the genealogy, the map and the capacity of the e-parliament as public sphere and (2) analyzing the power that operated in the e-parliament as public sphere. It was useful to identify the development of (1) the e-parliament as public sphere, especially provincial e-DPRD and (2) that of the e-parliament application in social sphere in cyber sociology perspective.

4 **Literatur Review**

(1) **Public Sphere and Cyber Space**

“Public sphere” (*Öffentlichkeit*) referred to Habermas’ concept. He proposed two analyses of public sphere: *first*, the analysis of the origin of bourgeois public space and *second*, the structural change in modern era as indicated by the revival of capitalism, cultural industry, and increasingly powerful economic organizational position and big business groups in public sphere. Further development was observed in big economic organization and governments took over public sphere management, while people became consumers of goods, services, political administration, and public entertainment.

The subject shifted when “people organized discussion in public sphere for public interests” using Internet-mediated communication media (singular: medium). Easy access to Internet gave rise to optimism of new public sphere and even of new society and new world, through political movement that was mediated by Internet in cyber space. Hope of Internet power emerged from grass roots and not from elites, decentralized world and not centralized one, the disappearance of
time and spatial barriers, and huge potential of human participation with communicative action. The new public sphere was endowed with more inclusive and deliberating condition, while the condition was constantly commercialized. The presence of Internet was the sufficient requirement for radically egalitarian political process that enabled anyone to get involved and to involve him-/herself in information abundance to achieve concensus.

In Habermasian’s position the radical criticism of the optimism of the presence of the new Internet-mediated public sphere was aimed at commodification, digital gap, and government supervision.

(2) The Evolution of Parliament’s Website

Etymologically, the term “parliament” came from Late Latin word “parlamentum” that subsequently adopted by French into parlez-vous and English parliament (Timpson, 2015; Ilbert, 2013: 7). The meaning of the words parlez-vous and parliament in Middle Age was “conversation”.

The evolution from the parliament into the e-parliament might be traced from policy global implementatin through “World e-Parliament Conference” from 2008, 2009, 2010, 2012, and 2014. The world conference of the e-parliament represented joint partnership initiative among Global Centre for ICTs in Parliament, UNDESA, IPU, and national and regional parliament groups gugus that was launched as WSIS’s mandate in Tunisia in 2006.

As part of the empowerment of good governance, it was also expected that the evolution from the parliament into the e-parliament would be a media for people to get access to public information and to interact with parliament with Internet.

5 Study Method

The discussion of the method of the study consisted of data identification, data collecting technique, and data analysis technique.
B. PARLIAMENT’S WEBSITE AS PUBLIC SPHERE

1 e-Parliament’s Institutional Network

It was necessary to identify institutions along with their network that implemented the program of parliament empowerment all over the world to further analyze the development of the e-parliament evolution at global level. Based on the initial study, the parliament empowerment program was implemented to empower the e-parliament. The results of the identification showed that there was interrelation among parliaments to function the e-parliament capacity in its respective country. Based on World e-Parliament Report, the supporting institutions of the e-parliaments at global level was a network consisting of (1) e-parliaments, (2) international organizations, (3) supporting institutions, (4) and global donor institutions.

(1) e-Parliament
Based on the data from Web Sites of National Parliaments, coming from 190 countries identified by IPU, there were 181 countries with accessed parliament’s websites.

(2) International Organizations
The results of the identification showed that there were three international institutions committed to the development of the e-parliament, which were Global Center for ICT in Parliament, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), and Inter-parliamentary Organizations (IPU).

(3) Supporting Institutions
The results of the inventory making by Agora and Mandelbaum (2011) showed that there were more than 190 parliament supporting organizations that operated in more than 80 countries. The results of the processing the data from Global Center for ICT in Parliament and investigation in Internet, showed that there were 27 regional parliament institutions, 5 parliament associations, and 29 e-parliament supporting organizations. So, there were totally 61 parliament supporting institutions. Additionally, there were also other e-parliament supporting
institutions such as *agora*, *e-Parliament*, *Climate Parliament*, *Opening Parliament*, and other institutions that optimized the functions of the parliament in cyberspace.

(4) **Donor Institutions**

The results of the identification using search engine showed that there were five donor institutions committed to the development of the e-parliament.

The results of the performance of the aforementioned four networks were evaluated in the biennial World e-Parliament Conference. The results of the survey by *Global for ICT in Parliament* showed that there were 46% parliaments that followed-up the recommendation of IPU by designing and maintaining parliament’s website. However, there was a gap in the use of documents, meaning that there has not been any significant increase in the use of Extensible Markup Language (EML) for the parliament’s documents. Meanwhile, there was also in one hand an obstacle in using information and communication technologies because there were people who did not get any access to Internet or even they were unfamiliar with the information and communication technologies. In other hand, there were parliaments that did not have any supporting system to manage the benefits of the information and communication technologies. The biggest obstacle was found in the fact that people did not understand legislation process and parliament’s members did not have any good experience in the information and communication technologies.

2 **The Evolutions of Parliament’s Website**

In Indonesian history, the origins of parliament were what so-called *Volksraad* (1918), *Tjou Sngi-in* (1943), and KNIP (1945). The evolution from the parliament into the e-parliament, especially from the *DPRD* into the *e-DPRD* in Indonesia, represented the further development in the implementation of e-government. The interrelation among regulation, transparency requirement, and public service became the social background of the implementation of the e-
government and the e-parliament. Based on Author’s final recapitulation following facts emerged: there were 22 (66.6%) provincial e-DPRD’s websites of 33 provincial DPRD, 94 (23.6%) district e-DPRD’s websites of 399 district DPRD, and 33 (33.7%) city e-DPRD’s websites of 98 city DPRD in May 2014.

3 Parliament’s Website Audit

Website audit represented a process of collecting and evaluating evidences to establish that website management—in this case parliament’s website—has met institutional objectives. The audit was conducted in general and in particular to 22 provincial e-DPRD’s websites using StatsCrop on March 24 th, 2014; April 8 th, 17 th, 24 th, 2014; dan May 5 th, 2014. Five facilities of 19 facilities provided by the StatsCrop were selected for general audit units. They were (1) Alexa Rank, (2) Pagerank, (3) SEO Score, (4) Primary Traffic; and (5) Server Location.

• Alexa Rank
Based on Alexa’s ranking, the 5 biggest provincial e-DPRD’s websites were DPRD Banten (#17.810.877), DPRD Sulawesi Tengah (#14.502.230), DPRD Lampung (#13.026.170), DPRD DIY (#12.631.514), and DPRD Kalimantan Barat (#11.507.362) of the total number of world websites. One of the application to find out the number of websites was InternetLiveStats.

• Google PageRank (PageRank)
Based on Google PageRank’s ranking (PageRank), the 5 biggest -DPRD’s websites were DPRD Kalimantan Tengah (4), DPRD Kalimantan Timur (4), DPRD DIY (3), DPRD Kalimantan Barat (3), and DPRD Jawa Tengah (3). The Google PageRank was one of the “obligator” ranking applications and became reference because Google was the biggest search engine.

• SEO Score
Based on SEO Score’s ranking, the 5 biggest -DPRD’s websites were DPRD Kalimantan Barat (64.3%), DPRD Kalimantan Tengah (61.8 %), DPRD DIY
(58.8%), DPRD Maluku (58.8%), and DPRD Banten (57.6%). The high traffic of world websites required website developers to optimize websites that they were red and identified by search engine in cyber space that the websites they managed could be used and useful for website visitors.

- **Primary Traffic**

Based on Primary Traffic’s ranking that was supported by Alexa for the regional area of Indonesia, there were only three red DPRD’s websites. They were DPRD Maluku (108.231#), Sumatera Utara (#70.281), and Sulawesi Selatan (#47.720). The Primary Traffic referred to the number of Internet users traffic in certain area, which was in this case Indonesia. Thus, the Primary Traffic’s ranking was managed in a Indonesian unit.

- **Server**

Based on the checking of server saving location, there were only two websites saved outside Indonesia. They were e-DPRD Provinsi Lampung (Dallas, USA) and e-DPRD Provinsi Kepulauan Riau (San Francisco, USA). Server was a computer system that offered certain service in a computer network. Usually, the server managed applications, data, and proxy (Internet network traffic regulator).

Meanwhile, the results of particular audit using Socials Analysis, were summarized in the table below.

**Table 1. Analysis of social media in provincial parliament’s websites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Websites</th>
<th>Socials Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sumatera Utara</td>
<td>Twitter: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sumatera Barat</td>
<td>Twitter: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook Likes: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook Shares: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lampung</td>
<td>Twitter: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook Likes: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook Shares: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook Likes: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook Shares: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kepulauan Riau</td>
<td>Facebook Likes: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook Shares: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Jawa Tengah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>DIY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Banten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Kalimantan Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Kalimantan Tengah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Kalimantan Timur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Sulawesi Selatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Maluku</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 The Publicness Capacity of Parliament’s Website

The publicness capacity of parliament’s website, which was in this case the capability of parliament’s website of provincial *DPRD* to be the space for people and people representatives to discuss aspired issues that were under the authority of provincial parliament. The capability of the parliament’s websites considered as the capacity of the websites facilitated discussion space on the basis of menu availability in the parliament’s website. Concerning with the results of the general and particular audits of the provincial parliament’s website, author organized an indepth interview with resource persons to elaborate the capacity of the provincial parliament’s website as public sphere, which was in this study *DPRD DIY’s* website.

An analysis with the approach that was developed by Usman (2015: 5) showed that parliament’s website represented public utility that was managed as public service obligation of government by the government as government accountability, while at the same time as outcome of the development of information society and the interrelationship between people and people
representatives through parliament’s website. The choice of the technology of the parliament’s website was high technology. The technological context of the parliament’s website was enabler, which connected people with people representatives through public debate in the parliament’s website. The provision and utilization process consisted of the availability of materials (including hardwares, softwares, and application), costs, resources, design, technologies, and people’s preparedness. Therefore, the publicness capacity of the parliament’s website of the Special District of Yogyakarta was analyzed using the approach developed by Usman (2011) as follow:
Analysis was made by referring to resource person’s response (i.e., spoken interaction) to the result of the causal net formulation (i.e., written text) of the e-parliament’s website as public sphere. Based on the results of the audit of the tool StatsCrop of the parliament’s website and the appreciation of the aforementioned resource person, the publicness capacity approach of the provincial parliament’s network proposed following proceedings:

(1) In term of the providing capacity, the publicness of the parliament’s website has operated from the point of view of hardwares and applications, leadership and commitment, and human resources.

(2) In term of the using capacity, the publicness of the parliament’s website should be improved from the point of view of the capability of personnels, communities and systems, network and cooperation, and also managerial pattern.
(3) In term of the output, the publicness of the parliament’s website required the improvement of scheme to increase relevance, effect/impact, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability.

It was necessary to encourage and to constantly test the presence of the parliament’s website that it could serve its representation function and broaden the institutional services of the parliament. As interaction media between people and people representatives in cyber space, the usefulness of the e-parliament was to manage truth, probity, and norms. And, it was all in daily political unit that the truth was upheld for goodness norms and became the basis of collective action. It meant that there was an appreciation of the parliament’s as public sphere for people who were tax payers.

5 Rational Consensus vis-à-vis Algorithm in Internet-mediated Public Sphere

The growth of the number of the parliament’s website in Indonesia with its potential as public sphere that was supported by the development of infrastructures, the sale of mobile phones, the applications of mobile parliament, the number of uploaded pages, the responses through social media, and other supporting factors, assumed the interrelation between “people sovvereignty” and “people representatives” in e-parliament. In post-1995 era, Internet, world wide web (www), and and technologies were connected into public awareness (Bidgoli, 2004: 121). Since the beginning, Internet represented common interest of government, campus laboratory, and industries. Internet innovation to optimize all products of communication media made the innovation increasingly popular with social and economic impacts like the innovation in motorized vehicles at the beginning of 1900 (Kline, 1997: 39). The growth, the change, and the acceleration of the change resulting from Internet enabled people to do mutual communication in cyber space. According to Rainie (2007) the connected people has functioned as *homo connectus* in their daily life or according to Economist
2015) was *phono sapiens*, because mobile phone with the development in dimension and the capability to be connected have threatened its users. The interrelatedness between people and various parties has also shifted from something “*ius privatus*” to something “*ius publicus*” in public sphere controlled by algorithm.

According to Alvaro (2014), the term “algorithm” came from Muhammad bin Musa al-Khawarizmi (780-850), which was at the beginning a set of rules used in arithmetics operation of Arabic numbers. In its development the algorithm was defined as a set of procedures to solve problems. It became significant when there was interrelation among IP (Internet Protocol, 1969), URL (Uniform Resource Locator, 1994), and WWW (World Wide Web, 1995). The IP and the WWW became the place where data was saved, accessed, processed, and indexed by computers from any place all over the world, while the URL enabled the algorithm to interact and to establish interconnection. The interrelation of the algorithm in the URL became increasingly complicated proportional with the growth and the spread of the number of the computers connected to Internet.

The power of the algorithm in the “converging” space among users, communities, institutions, corporates, and government laid essentially in its capability to give meanings to the traffic of the huge Internet-mediated data as computational politics. According to Tufekci (2014), computational politics referred to the implementation of a computational method for a huge number of data coming from both online and offline data sources to reach, to persuad, and to mobilize voters in election to support or to oppose candidates in the election. In this case information was asymetrical in nature in which those who got access to data knew many things about user information, while on the contrary the users did not know what the data holders managed and controlled. It was the condition of the asymetrical information traffic controlled by the algorithm designed by the data holders that became the point in the Internet-mediated public sphere. What was referred to as “netizenship sovereignty” in which the citizens in the Internet-
mediated public sphere were free of control became contradictory. Even, netizenship identity was also questioned because in this case the platform in Twitter enabled a netizen to make limitless number of accounts. In a huge number of data, the power of the algorithm was potential to breach the freedom of speech in a discussion as an integrated public sphere as idealized by Habermas.

Pepi (2011) suggested that algorithm represented “a colonizing instrument”, while Google was “a kind dictator” for Masnick (2008) and they have answered the questions in our effort to trace any thing in Internet and directed the answers with PageRank. The algorithm of Google PageRank answered our questions based on authority (in accordance with the number of quotes), visitors (in accordance with the number of visits), closeness (in accordance with recommendations), and rapidity (in accordance with real-time aggregation and the importance of a subject in trending topics). What so-called volonté générale (common will) was established in a parliament through discussion and decision making that served the interest of all people and according to Habermas it started from rational debate in a public sphere and shifted to the question: How were the data that became volonté générale prepared and served by collectors of huge number of data using the power of the algorithm?

For author the rivalry between the Habermas’ rational consensus vis-à-vis algorithm in the Internet-mediated public sphere resulted in Habermasian recommendation contributing power to the power of the algorithm in saving cyber public sphere. The reading of how the algorithm became a strategic entry instrument into life spaces raised at the same time the question of how to manage and to oppose the life spaces. Therefore, it was time for cyber-sociology to trace and involve itself in the power of the algorithm as the regulator of the traffic and the content of news network and to analyze the trends in cyber space.
C. CLOSING

1 Conclusions

(1) The Capacity of Parliament’s Website as Public Sphere

The evolution of the parliament into the e-parliament represented an interrelation among (1) e-parliaments, (2) international organizations, (3) supporting institutions, and (4) global donor institutions. The ecosystem of the e-parliament was built through biennial conference of 181 national parliaments organized by three international organizations supported by 190 parliament supporting organizations that operated in more than 80 countries and global donor institutions. The e-parliament was also undergoing an evolution into mobile parliament with Internet penetration, the sale of mobile phones capable of Internet access, and the spread of information and communication technologies.

The results of the mapping of the parliament’s websites in Indonesia showed that there were 22 (66.6%) provincial e-DPRD’s websites of the totally 33 provincial DPRDs, 94 (23.6%) district e-DPRD’s websites of the totally 399 district DPRDs, and 33 (33.7%) city e-DPRD’s websites for the totally 98 city DPRDs in May 2014.

The publicness capacity of the parliament’s website showed that (1) concerning with the providing capacity the parliament’s website has operated in terms of hardwares and applications, leadership and commitment, and human resources; (2) concerning with the using capacity it was necessary to improve the parliament’s website in terms of the capability of personnals, communities and systems, networks and cooperations, and also managing pattern; and (3) concerning with output the publicness of the parliament’s website required the improvement of scheme to increase relevance, effect/impact, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability.
(2) Rational Argument *versus* algorithm in Internet-mediated public sphere

The difference between Habermas’ rational consensus *vis-à-vis* algorithm in Internet-mediated public sphere considered the algorithm as a strategical factor. Therefore, identifying the algorithm that was misused for the interest of strategic instrument in real life was at the same time managing and opposing the misuse. Therefore, it was necessary for cyber-sociology to trace and to involve itself in the power of the algorithm as regulator of the traffic and the content of news network and also as controller of trends in cyber space.

2 Recommendations

Based on the aforementioned conclusions, the study gave following recommendations:

1. It was necessary to organize a social valuation of the parliament’s websites in Indonesia from the the websites of Indonesian legislative assembly, provincial assembly, and district/city assembly. The valuation of the parliament’s websites was to respond: (1) the interoperability requirement of the websites that they were able to answer and to follow up people aspirations; (2) the empowerment of e-parliament’s staffs in managing interaction methods by managing knowledge because the parliament’s website represented enabler and not merely the problem of the choice of information and communication technology; and (3) the optimization of the usefulness of the parliament’s website as people’s media that interacted with people representatives in the areas of legislation, budgeting, and supervision in which people’s rights and obligations were warranted by constitution and also the users of the cyber services could serve as responsible consumers.

2. It was necessary to conduct programmatic research with the perspective of cyber-sociology to identify and to fight against the algorithm in the forms of codes and protocols in cyber space that were misused by data collectors. The
trends in the Internet-mediated social interaction showed that there were more complicated globally connected pattern and types. The strengthening of the rational argumentation represented a validity test for the interest of the algorithm that appeared as strategic action that was more oriented to business rationality in cyber space.
REFERENSI


Fisipol UGM, 2010, Panduan Penulisan Akademik, Yogyakarta


