CHAPTER 2

DIGITAL VALUE: ON THE ACHIEVEMENTS / LOSSES OF DIGITAL CULTURE

Bahar EROĞLU YALIN[1], Sibel AK[2]

[1]Prof. Dr., Trabzon University, Communication Faculty, Public Relations and Advertising, Trabzon, Turkey
e-mail: baharerogluyalin@trabzon.edu.tr

[2]Lect., Trabzon University, Communication Faculty, Radio, TV and Cinema, Trabzon, Turkey
e-mail: smert@trabzon.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

It is possible to explore the concept of value that is different from the previous and transformed in the digital age that we are experiencing - individual or social - by revealing the interaction of value with culture. Because human beings are faced with the situation of revising values, searching for new values or producing new values in every age, and every period, every culture, every society has value systems that they own or carry. The present time and conditions emerge as factors that prepare the formation of sovereign values and also influence other systems within the social system.

Therefore, information and communication technology, which allows the exchange of cultural images, determines the values in this way (Yetim, 2002) and even the activities of this technology, especially advertising, public relations and marketing, in Duverger's words "the effect of the images they have forcibly embraced the place of an increasingly intelligent judgment." (1998: 82). In this study, it will be conceptually evaluated how values and digital itself constitute value in the value world of the digital age defined by these two intertwined concepts, infinity, spacelessness, and timelessness. In this study, how has technology transformed society, institutions and individuals and the relationship of all three with each other? How can new cultural forms of communication age be defined? What is the meaning of the cultural images of the digital age? Questions will be searched for answers.

Keywords: Value, culture, communication, digitalizationy

1. Seeking for a new Conceptualization of Value

For Weber, history, and society can only be understood through causality between values and human actions (Özlem, 2002). They are the values that guide all meanings and preferences related to the life of the individual and values emerge as observable behaviors under the influence of culture. In fact, culture, which is a value system and defined on its own values, is the sum of the customs, traditions, and traditions of the community how it behaves heard and thought, separating itself from other societies and giving it an identity. Similarly for Gerbner, culture is a system of messages and images, a symbolic organization that cultivates, organizes and reproduces social relations, values, priorities, and conceptualization of being (Özer, 2004). From this point it can be said that technology, which is an element of culture, objectively covers the technical, material and physical values such as tools of nature and intervention, architectural works put forward in all relations between tools and human beings. Technology has made the intercultural communication compulsory by limiting the world, especially through mass media. Mobility is essential for cultures to survive.

According to Toffler, it is information that initiates and accelerates social change (1981). With the push of knowledge, science and technology to the limits of industrial society, the production of knowledge, not the production of objects, but the production of new concepts and realities that encompass and transform the societal, political and cultural, such as ''information society'', ''information sector'' or even ''information age''. has become an important and necessary state (Doğan, 1995). Cultural dependence, which is a result of the culture industry in which the societies where information and technology are produced, is organized within the economic, social, but especially the dominant ideology, refers to the shaping of values according to the conditions of this industry as all commodities produced (Oskay, 1993).The buyers of all products produced under the ideological conditions of this industry are also the buyers of the values offered by these products.

Value is defined as preferring one situation over another. The way of understanding and meaningfulness of behaviors leads to the emergence of values. Values also define what individuals care about and indicate desirable or undesirable situations (Erdem, 2003). Besides, the perspective that an individual has gained in recognizing his / her environment has an effective role in guiding his / her behaviors. In addition to having human values, reproducing it and having the ability to give up its own values, each individual is the only entity that has its own value judgments.

Value is not directly affected by changes in the social sphere, but directly. Rokeach says "If values had not changed, individual and social change would not have been possible (1973). If values had a completely changing nature, the continuity of society and the individual would have become impossible. Indeed, the interaction between values and society becomes more pronounced when it comes to "change".

Communication technology, which is an important part of the economic / cultural globalization process of the mass consumption and standardization society with the birth of printing technology, enables the worldwide hegemony of commercial ideology, word and action in interaction with the spread of scientific and technical knowledge, computerization and transnational corporation (Schiller, 1989; byLull, 2001, p. 164). The development of technology and the transformation of information in this direction, especially the limitation of the world with mass media, the loss of intercultural boundaries and as a result of this has led to the emergence of different lifestyles (Huyssen, 1994).In the 21st century, where war and environmental problems and poverty have increased, as well as the advances brought by science and technology as Havel says (1994), science and technology "destroyed life rather than using it and using it, instead of using it. In addition to these, no solution was found for economic, scientific and political values. The return of global values has been distanced from their realities. Developments in science and technology, revealing modern societies that are fond of material development, imposes that the key to happiness is a power gained with material competence and knowledge (Lama, 2001). Walters explains this with the following words (1995):

> "It is a known fact that modern man lived in the age of crises. Signs of this in almost every area; In the global wars of opposing ideologies and the natural and social turmoil created by technology, it is also possible to see the rapid lifestyle that threatens human existence. Peace is mentioned, but doubts, fear or anger prevail in social relations. We talk about economic prosperity but swim in debt. Freedom is mentioned, but freedom is equated with humanization. Equality is mentioned, but equality is perceived as the punishment of merit. It is also clear that these irregularities will eventually become chaos. "

The Dalai Lama agrees with Walters. It is now argued that there is a complete return towards extremism in which reality itself is questioned and that this is, in fact, chaos (Lama, 2001).This situation emerges as a crisis caused by devotion to values (Bauman, 2001).The reason for all this is again gain and competition.

This chaos actually consists of shared or non-shared values. Social chaos is produced by imposing, modifying or destroying the fundamental values of the individual, such as religion

or political power, on the minorities, especially by imposing their own value judgments on others. Values, which are the source of social life, have caused more and more individuals to think only of themselves in the process of transition from traditional to modern. Therefore, this state of the lonely and alienated individual is the chaos itself. Because the individual becomes alienated, the individual begins to construct his / her own values and moves away from society. In this case, the solution necessitates the discovery of universal and common values that will make it easier to live together, given the fact that the impossibility of returning to traditional values, with the redefinition of the unifying property of value. In line with the measure of rational logical coherence, when the issue of value is considered from the perspective of life and human, at least the conditions of existence of any value practice that does not tend to eliminate the differences can be established in the public sphere. The only thing to do in this case is to turn to the principles of rational-natural law. Non-instrumental, egalitarian rationality within the framework and to turn to self-actualization values, alienation and alienation is the solution to minimize the effect (Toku, 2002). Since the present values are superior to date and time, they do not change, and people's awareness or opinion about value changes (Özlem, 2002). Nietzsche points out that the person who creates value has to create new values, and to create new values, he must first criticize, destroy and re-evaluate existing values. According to this view, the individual who creates value and lives according to these values is accepted as a free individual (Özlem, 2002).

2. Cultural Images of the Digital Age

In every age, man is confronted with re-evaluating values, searching for or producing new values, and there are different and similar value systems that each period, every culture, every society possesses or carries within itself. These value systems are specific to the society to which they belong and show what is important in that society (Kluchohn & Strodtbeck, 1961). Therefore, the present time and conditions emerge as the factors that prepare the formation of sovereign values. And it also affects other systems within the social system.

Every society has tried to create its own culture that makes it different from other societies. Culture, as a continuum of being, plays a role in changing societies, transforming, informing and integrating societies. If we examine the concept of culture under the main headings; addition to the meaning of production and reproduction, it can be evaluated in terms of the activities of literacy, idea, and art, mastery of general information and strengthening social relations in the social context. (Cunbur, 1981).In the context of these elements, we can say that by taking the formation of culture from human beings, it forms against the living spaces

and nature, and especially it is accepted as a type of communication depending on knowledge (Güvenç, 2015). There are unity and activity within the culture itself. This also ensures that culture has the ability to regulate and influence society.

All realities that have been experienced in a given time and that will be experienced in the future are shaped by people and depending on human knowledge. Therefore, all the gains related to the existence of culture produce the process and quality of human evolution, and as a result, culture and knowledge are mutually transforming each other (Yalçınkaya, 2016). Based on the meaning of the concept of culture, it is seen that culture is a fact that transforms and transforms based on knowledge. Therefore, as long as human beings and society exist and produce knowledge, the culture will continue. Also, the concept of culture has developed and changed with the transition from the classical period to the modern period and the post-modern period and has been moved beyond the boundaries that define it (Güzel, 2016). Digitization, in its simplest terms, is education, culture, in short, the transfer of all materials to the electronic environment and the access of these data to users via the Internet.In other words, it is the transformed form of knowledge. This process is time-consuming and costly. Besides, it has irrevocably transformed the nature of knowledge. It is as follows (Acun, 2008):

- With digitalization, digital copies of information sources that can be used for a long time can be produced.

- Digital resources can be stored, searched and indexed.

- Digital resources can be shared with the whole world.

- These resources, which can be shared locally, nationally and globally, can be accessed anywhere in the world without time and space limitations.

- It facilitates the transfer of information to future generations.

Digitalization, which extends the dominant field of knowledge, has influenced the world to a great extent with its philosophical, demographic and biocultural dimensions, not only in representation but also in almost every field. The social reflections of successive innovations, especially in the 2000s, have had a significant impact on culture and culture. In this context, digital culture expresses a new cultural structure that is articulated in the current intensive climate of technology. The cultural structure that emerges through digital tools or that emerges as a result of the digitization of existing structures is reflected in all habits of individuals and societies (Erdem, 2017). The fixed identities brought by social and economic status in society are now being replaced by replaceable and purchasable identities dominated by the digital

revolution. In online networks that provide the greatest support to this formation, individuals have the chance to easily shape their identities in the way they want. The most important element of digitalization in terms of identity is social media. Social media is a new place where individuals display their identities as they wish (Güzel, 2016).Technology has begun to change all known facts of knowledge-based culture. Cultural images are now transforming into traditional environments instead of rapidly changing digital culture images.

The basic problems related to how to explain this concept with the concept of digital culture are tried to be explained by two interconnected concepts. First, digital culture represents a relative break with its predecessors, and secondly, the existence of digital technology has revealed the existence of digital culture. First of all, the digital culture, which emerges in the light of the latest technological developments and is determined to depend on the digital structure, is distinctly different from the previous culture (Gere, 2008).

Digitization digitizes the existing culture that can be defined as the knowledge of the world or creates a new digital culture in the digital environment. Both the digitalization of the existing culture and the new digital culture accelerate the transformation of the masses and societies. Since the 1970s, especially with the advances in image technology, the feeling of being followed and recorded by someone every second of every moment has left individuals vulnerable to technology (Kaplan & Ertürk, 2012, p. 9).With the digitalization brought about by internet technology, individuals are becoming digital entities as well as culture. Moreover, individuals are transforming into a new kind of produced image that spontaneously dissolves and alienates. The entity field is defined as being visible. This process unintentionally transfers individuals' identities to digital culture's own rules (Güzel, 2016). Individuals or actors, as the author puts it, present themselves to the audience who have received the approval of the society and, as expected, watched the showcase in certain patterns. Individuals who tend to present their idealized identity perform these showcase presentations through social media. In this way, their identities they want to show at the same time and in mass form, their photos, world views, private lives, etc. that they think will get the most appreciation or viewers or followers (Güzel, 2016).The sanctions of the visual-oriented digital culture are again made up of digital values focused on the visual. In this case, the socio-cultural changes among the individuals of this age to adapt to digital culture cause differences. The classification of these changes is categorized under three main headings; digital natives, digital immigrants, and digital hybrids.

3. States of the Digital Individual: Indigenous, Immigrant and Hybrid

With the development of technology and the age of the Internet easily adapting to societies, the doors of a digital world have been opened for the human age; this has led to the emergence of new concepts. It was Marc Prensky who first introduced the concepts of digital indigenous and digital immigration. This concept emerged in 2000 and later, has a similar meaning in essence, although it is defined differently by different researchers.

The digital indigenous concept is used for individuals who are born in an environment where all kinds of technological opportunities exist and use these technological opportunities most efficiently. Individuals who aren't born in such a digital and technological environment but have the tendency and necessity to use these tools are called digital immigrants (Arabacı & Polat, 2013, p.13).

Digital natives are mostly students. The thinking styles and processes of students are quite different from parents and teachers. Because they are in constant interaction with technology from the moment they are born. Parents and teachers were introduced to technology later and started to use it (Çukurbaşı and Işman, 2014, p. 29).Therefore, there are significant differences between digital indigenous and digital immigrants.

These differences are also quite different from how digital natives seek, use and create information. It is seen that digital hybrids can provide information needs such as new generation young people who are dominant in technology after the birth of 1970 and can write messages while listening to music at the same time. Also, digital hybrids do not give up the printed material. Therefore, it is considered appropriate to call this group of people born between 1970 and 1999 as digital hybrids. In this respect, digital hybrids do not and do not resemble both digital natives and digital immigrants. Although they try to take advantage of all the technological possibilities, they cannot use the technology competently like the digital natives. Although they find the paper more intimate and sincere, they are not as resistant to technology as digital immigrants. To summarize briefly, in the age of developing technology and communication, digital natives were born in this age without the need to do anything, and digital immigrants were unable to keep up with this later age and resisted. Digital hybrids, on the other hand, emerge as the group that prepares or tries to prepare themselves for the new era.

4. On the Achievements/Losses of Digital Culture

As a source of the differentiation of societies that differ in terms of knowledge and technology as productive and consumer societies, in societies where information and technology are produced, social, economic, political, especially as a result of the cultural industry realized within the dominant ideology, according to the conditions of these commodities, (Oskay, 1993) and in industrial society, the recipients of all values produced within the dominant ideology are also the recipients of the values presented.

The combination of all these elements prevented the existence of consumer societies as subjects in all areas and under all kinds of competition conditions and made it necessary to harmonize these societies in the field of values. Because values are made up of social information and as a result of this, the individual or society creates information that changes the field to perform a different and effective action (Doğan, 1995).

According to Toffler, it is information that initiates and accelerates social change (1981, pp. 34-35). Information society, information sectors, such as the information age society, political economy, and culture, including concepts that develop and transform emerged, the production of objects rather than the production of information has become an important and necessary state (Doğan, 1995, p. 197). Science as a product created or discovered by humans is largely associated with technology (Inam, 20034).Just as the printing house achieved a mass standardization through the exchange of cultural images and determined values in this way the impact of images produced by the challenges of activities such as advertising, public relations and marketing in today's technology is increasingly replacing a mental judgment (Duverger, 1998). Because in this age when information becomes information, the world in our image is being restructured (McLuhan & Povers, 2001, p. 157). Modernization has imposed the divergence between traditional and modern values and can be achieved by having the objects produced by the meaning criterion of life.

According to Erich Fromm, nowadays, human beings have become what they have. Along with modernism, man is alienated against everything, including himself. This situation has emerged as a lack of communication, narcissism, and selfishness by strengthening these concepts as a value began to make (Bobaroglu, 2002).The modern man of the West, who did not compromise his individualism, started to look for an escape route instead of the values he deemed invalid and destroyed by the old (Scognamillo, 2003). In other words, the benefit-benefit mentality, everything except the person himself, at the same time the other societies of societies as "other by making the individual

believes that the center of life. However, in fact, the individual loses his / her own value against objective values.

In modern societies, the individual is limited by institutions or rules, and in traditional societies, the individual is limited by power and charisma (Doğan, 1995).According to Inglehart (2001), there are two institutions that limit the individual and actually initiate the modernization process: mass production and bureaucratic organizations.In modern industrial societies, there are numerous production processes, institutions that centrally control people and make standardization possible. In addition, technology was used as a war threat at the end of the 20th century and natural disasters caused by damages to the environment caused individuals' belief in science to be shaken and alienated. This change, which derives its power from emotions, has changed the current value systems and led to the transformation of religion and tradition. This transformation that changes value systems through cultural change is defined as postmodernism (Inglehart, 2001).Postmodernism or culture (Sarıbay, 1990), which emerges from the reinterpretation of modernity, does not mean superiority against modernism, but in fact, criticizes modernism and directs it.

Both traditional and modern values are shaped by "economic scarcity". According to this assumption, the individual primarily reflects the socio-economic environment in which he lives (Inglehart 2001).The change in values and the economy affect each other mutually.

5. Conclusion

Throughout history, cultures have competed with each other to impose their own values and goals on society under changing and evolving conditions. With the development of technology and the transformation of the concept of information into informational, the concept of time and space disappeared and as a result, a new culture emerged. Castells explains this informational culture with the concept of the social network. According to him, the network is composed of interconnected nodes, and although the social organization has taken place at other times and in other places, technology provides the material basis that spreads this structure to the whole society (Castells, 2013). Networks are structures that can expand infinitely and integrate easily with new nodes. This situation is an extremely dynamic and continuous structure of social networks open to innovations and global dimensions. From a broader historical perspective, the network society, which represents qualitative change, also represents the change between nature and culture. The major splits of the information age can be listed as follows (Castells, 2013).

- First, the concept of labor is that it is falling apart between producers and displaceable labor.

- The second is the social exclusion of a significant proportion of individuals who are ignored.

- Finally, it is the separation of the capitalist logic of global networks of capital flows and the human experience of workers' lives.

Network society deeply affects not only the social and cultural structure but also the power structure. Because cultural expressions, which are abstracted from history and geography, are mostly transferred electronically, personalizing the concept of leadership within the media system, and politics exist within the media system including computerized communication networks. The political structure existing in the electricity-based media system is of great importance for the objectives of political actors and political processes (Castells, 2013, p. 630).Even though the concept of social network primarily aims to change cultural movements and social structure, it affects the power structure as well as affects every stage of society. Therefore, unlike the previous cultural structure of digital culture, it has affected all areas of society and has subjected all areas equally and voluntarily to digital culture.

References

Acun, Fatma (2008). Küresel Rekabette Dijital Kültür [Digital Culture in Global Rivalry]. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları (Hütad) [Hacettepe University Turkiyat Studies (Hütad)], 9, 11 – 46.

Arabacı, İ. B. & Polat, M., (2013). "Dijitalyerliler, Dijital Göçmenler ve Sınıf Yönetimi" [Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants and Class Management] *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* [Electronic Journal of Social Science], 12(47), 11-20.

Bauman, Z. (2001). *Bireyselleşmiş Toplum [Individualised Society], (Y. Alogan, Trans.). İstanbul, Turkey: Ayrıntı Yayınları*

Bobaroğlu, M. (2002). Aydınlanma Sorunu ve Değerler [Enlightment Problems and Values], *İstanbul, Turkey: Ayna Yay.*

Castells, M. (2009). *The Rise of The Network Society: Volume I: The Information Age: Economy, Society, And Culture.* London, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Castells, M. (2013). *Enformasyon Çağı: Ekonomi, Toplum ve Kültür (Üçüncü Cilt: Binyılın Sonu [Informationa Age: Ecenomicy, Societ and Culture (3rd volume)](E. Kılıç, Trans.). İstanbul, Turkey: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.*

Cunbur, M. (1981). Atatürk'e Göre Bilim, Kültür, Kitap Ve Kütüphane [Science, Culture, Book and Library According to Atatürk]. *Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği Bülteni* [Turkish Libraries Association], *30*(3), 119-127.

Çukurbaşı, B. & İşman, A. (2014). Öğretmen Adaylarının Dijital Yerli Özelliklerinin İncelenmesi (Bartın Üniversitesi Örneği) [Examination of Teacher Candidates' Digital Natives Features (Example of Bartın University)]. *Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* [Journal of Bartın University], 3(1), 28–54.

Doğan, İ, (1995). Sosyoloji, [Sociology]. *Ankara, Turkey: Sistem Yay.*

Duverger, M. (1998). *Siyaset Sosyolojisi (5th ed.) [Sociology of politics]. İstanbul, Turkey: Varlık Yay.*

Erdem, A. R. (2003). Üniversite Kültüründe Önemli Bir Unsur: Değerler [A Significant Factor in University Culture: Values]. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi,* [Journal of Values Education], *1*(4), 55-72.

Erdem, M. N. (2017). Dijital Çağda Kültür, Yeni Tüketici Kapitalizmi Ve Reklam Anlatısı [Culture at the Digital Age and Capitalism of New Consumer]. Paper presented at the 1st International Conference on New Trends in Communication.

George, G. (1998). Cultivation Analysis: An Overview. *Mass Communication and Society*, 1(3-4), 175-194. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/15205436.1998.9677855?needAccess=true

Gere, C. (2008). *Digital Culture* (2nd Ed.) London, UK: Reaktion. Http://Mediaartscultures.Eu/Jspui/ Bitstream/10002/597/1/Digital-Culture.Pdf,

Güvenç, B. (2015). İnsan ve Kültür [Human and Culture]. *İstanbul, Turkey: Boyut Yayıncılık.*

Güzel, E. (2016). Dijital kültürve çevrimiçi sosyal ağlarda rekabetin aktörü: "Dijital Habitus" [Digitsl Culture and the Actor of Competition in online Social Networks: Digital Habitus]. *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi* [Gümüşhane University of e-Journal of Faculty of Communication]. 4(1), 81-103.

Havel, V. (1994). Siyaset Ve Bilinç [Politics and Conscious] (H. Tufan, Trans). *Cogito,* 2, 176, İstanbul, Turkey: Yapı Kredi Yay.

Huyssen, A. (1994). Postmodernitenin Haritasını Yapmak (2nd ed.) [Mapping Postmodernity] Modernite Versus Postmodernite. In M. Küçük (Ed.). Ankara, Turkey: Vadi Yay.

Kaplan, K. & Ertürk, E. (2012). Dijital Çağ Ve Bireyin İdeolojik Aygıtları [Digital Age and Ideological Tools of Individuals]. *The Turkish Online Journal Of Design, Art And Communication – Tojdac,* 2(4).

Kluckhohn, F. R. & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). *Variations in Value Orientations*. Row Peterson, Evanston, Il.

Lama, D. (2001).*Yeni Bin Yılın Değerleri [Valiues of the new millenium]. İstanbul, Turkey: Dharma Yay.*

Lull, J. (2001). *Medya, İletişim, Kültür [Media, Communicaiton, Culture] (N. Güngör, Trans.). Ankara, Turkey: Vadi Yay.*

Mcluhan, M. (2001). *Global Köy [Global Village] (B. Öcal Düzgören, Trans.). İstanbul, Turkey: Scala Yay.*

Inglehart, R. F. (2001). Değişen Değerler, Ekonomik Kalkınma Ve Siyasi Değişim [Altered Values, Economic Development and Political Change] (A. Koçak, Trans.). *Sosyoloji Dergisi* [Journal of Sociology], 8(9).

İnam, Ahmet, (2003). "İnsan Haddini Bilmeli" [], Npq, Cilt: 5, Sayı: 4, 24.

Oskay, Ü. (1993). Kitle İletişimin Kültürel İşlevleri [Cultural Functions of Mass Communication]. *İstanbul, Turkey: Der Yay.*

Özlem, D. (2002). Değerler Sorununda Nesnelcilik/Mutlakçılık Ve Öznelcilik/Rölativizm Tartışması Üzerine [On the Debate of Objectivism/ Absolutism and Subjectivsm in the Values Matters], In Ş. Yalçın (Ed.), *Bilgi ve Değer* [Knlowledge and Value]. Ankara, Turkey: Vadi Yay.

Özer, Ö. (2004). Yetiştirme Kuramı: Televizyonun Kültürel İşlevlerinin İncelenmesi [Cultivaiton Theory: A Research on Cultural Functions of Television]. *Eskişehir, Turkey: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yay.*

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature Of Human Values*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Sarıbay, A. Y. (1990). Postmodernite, Sivil Toplum Ve İnsan (2nd ed.) [Postmodernity, Civil Society and Human]. *İstanbul, Turkey: İletişim Yay.*

Scognamıllo, G. (2003). Batı'nın Bunalımı [Crises of the West], *Npq*, 5(4), 19.

Toffler, A, (1981). *Üçüncü Dalga [Third Wave] (A. Seden, Trans.). Turkey: Altın Kitaplar Yay.*

Toku, N. (2002). Değerlerin Dilemması: Sübjektiflik Ve Objektiflik [Dilution of Values: Subjectivity and Objectivity]. In Ş. Yalçın (Ed.), *Bilgi Ve Değer* [Knlowledge and Value] Ankara, Turkey: Vadi Yay.

Yalçınkaya, Y. (2016). Dijital kültür ve dijital kütüphane [Digital Culture and Digital Library]. *Türk kütüphaneciliği* [Turkish Librarianship], 30(4), 595-618.

Yetim, N. (2002). Küresel Üretim Yapılanmasına Kültürel Yanıtlar: Ulusal-Yerel [Cultural Responses to the Global Production Structure: National-Local]. *Doğu Batı* [East West], 5(18), Ankara. Turkey: Felsefe, Sanat Ve Kültür Yay.

Walters, J. D. (1995). Modern Düşüncenin Krizi [Crisis of the Modern Thought] (Ş. Yalçın, Trans.). İstanbul, Turkey: İnsan Yay.