

Digital Humanities in Developed and Emerging Markets

Verena Laschinger
University of Erfurt

Follow this and additional works at: <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb>



Part of the [Comparative Literature Commons](#), and the [Critical and Cultural Studies Commons](#)

Dedicated to the dissemination of scholarly and professional information, **Purdue University Press** selects, develops, and distributes quality resources in several key subject areas for which its parent university is famous, including business, technology, health, veterinary medicine, and other selected disciplines in the humanities and sciences.

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access learned journal in the humanities and social sciences, publishes new scholarship following tenets of the discipline of comparative literature and the field of cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." Publications in the journal are indexed in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (Chadwyck-Healey), the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (Thomson Reuters ISI), the Humanities Index (Wilson), Humanities International Complete (EBSCO), the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America, and Scopus (Elsevier). The journal is affiliated with the Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies. Contact: [<clcweb@purdue.edu>](mailto:clcweb@purdue.edu)

Recommended Citation

Laschinger, Verena. "Digital Humanities in Developed and Emerging Markets." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 13.3 (2011): [<http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.1807>](http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.1807)

This text has been double-blind peer reviewed by 2+1 experts in the field.

The above text, published by Purdue University Press ©Purdue University, has been downloaded 523 times as of 11/07/14.

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access learned journal in the humanities and social sciences, publishes new scholarship following tenets of the discipline of comparative literature and the field of cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." In addition to the publication of articles, the journal publishes review articles of scholarly books and publishes research material in its *Library Series*. Publications in the journal are indexed in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (Chadwyck-Healey), the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (Thomson Reuters ISI), the Humanities Index (Wilson), Humanities International Complete (EBSCO), the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America, and Scopus (Elsevier). The journal is affiliated with the Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies. Contact: <clcweb@purdue.edu>

Volume 13 Issue 3 (September 2011) Article 21
Verena Laschinger, "Digital Humanities in Developed and Emerging Markets"
<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol13/iss3/21>>

Contents of *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 13.3 (2011)
Thematic issue *New Perspectives on Material Culture and Intermedial Practice*.
Ed. Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek, Asunción López-Varela,
Haun Saussy, and Jan Mieszkowski
<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol13/iss3/>>

Abstract: In her article "Digital Humanities in Developed and Emerging Markets" Verena Laschinger discusses the impact e-culture has on humanities pedagogy both in affluent countries and emerging markets. Claiming that e-literacy training generally offers opportunities to recover the traditional agency of the humanities thus catapulting the disciplines into the educational forefront of the creative economy, special attention is given to the chances digital humanities education offers in Turkey's emerging market economy. Given that technology promotes the country's economic development, which includes a rapidly growing private educational sector, digital humanities education helps citizens to adjust to critical democratic exchange, to facilitate and sustain processes of self-governance, thus reducing social, economic, and juridical disparities. Digital humanities education will work to the benefit of both local and global communities, if educators everywhere embrace their chance to educate future community leaders in integrated digital humanities programs.

Verena LASCHINGER

Digital Humanities in Developed and Emerging Markets

In this article I address examples of humanities institutions, pedagogy, and digital humanities with the example of an emerging market — Turkey — within the socio-economic frame of creative economy, a term coined to describe the recent synergism of technology and creativity as generators of innovation and thus wealth for the global community (Howkins; Florida, *Rise*). My discussion of the humanities and digital humanities in Turkey is located in relation to the current situation of e-culture in developed markets such as Australia, Germany, and the U.S. Acknowledging "the profundity of what the internet offers humanity as a model of a learning institution," the humanities are adapting increasingly to the demands of the creative economy's e-culture (Davidson and Goldberg 2). Seen as a symptom of "what has been termed the 'culturalization of economic life'" (Hartley 36), this adaptation is discussed critically and has been met with considerable reluctance by some traditionalist scholars in the Western world (see, e.g., Nida-Rümelin; Münch). Old-guard keepers of the institutional status quo are still "grappling with the question of whether and how they can educate for the new economy" (Hartley 25; see also López-Varela and Tötösy de Zepetnek; Tötösy de Zepetnek). And given the historical prerogative of academic freedom and absence of direct instrumental valuation, creative economy poses challenges for change and renewal to the old-European-model in the humanities, some which are admittedly hard to accommodate.

As a result of this critical dialogue on the one hand, but spearheaded by innovative scholars and institutional endeavors on the other, technological and economic demands become integrated into disciplinary identity. However, the imperatives and processes of this integration of e-culture into humanities pedagogy vary across borders and cultures. When we compare the state of the humanities in affluent countries and in an emerging market like Turkey, different educational trajectories become apparent. Despite both domestic and global economic disparities and unevenness, Turkey embraces — albeit uncritically — technology to promote the country's economic development, which includes a rapidly growing private educational sector. In Turkey humanities teachers educate increasingly large numbers of intelligent and eager young people from rural areas, many of whom are in dire need of vocational skills, but are often lacking a foundational education in critical thinking, as well as analytical skills. Thus, while students everywhere need to be provided with the intellectual tools to critically read, understand, prioritize, structure, and evaluate easily accessible, highly interdisciplinary and randomly assembled online information, the social, cultural and political urgency of integrated digital literacy training in the humanities is most pressing in emerging markets. While in affluent Western countries digital literacy, online creativity, and ethics are add-ons to the traditional learning objectives in the humanities, they are paramount in an emerging market like Turkey. Clearly, given the economic and political trajectory of Turkey, education in an integrated humanities and e-readiness works to the benefit of society and will help to reduce social, economic, and juridical disparities.

In *Blogs, Wikipedia, Second Life, and Beyond: From Production to Prodisage*, Axel Bruns describes how the internet changes our thinking and how in fact a new e-culture is being created. He defines the key principles of this e-culture as "open participation, communal evaluation ... fluid heterarchy, *ad hoc* meritocracy ... unfinished artefacts, continuing process" (24-27). These principles signify a fundamental redefinition of notions of authorship and intellectual property, and thus of the juridical and social outlines of our lives. In Bruns's view, they have a revolutionary potential. Ultimately, they will overturn the established cultural order and will lead to grassroot forms of corporate communication, to heterarchical ways of governance and a new world of education: "Open software development reacts against the corporately driven model of software innovation; citizen journalism corrects the biases built into the top-down, commercialized industrial news and media system; *Wikipedia* breaks the stranglehold of 'dead white men' on defining what is and is not deserving inclusion and preservation in the knowledge spaces of humanity — folksonomies undermine models of top-down classification which emerged in their current form alongside the modern sciences and put in place a canonization of 'worthy' knowledge and intellectual pursuits which no longer represents the lived experience of humanity" (195).

As one of the main pillars of culture and a repository of knowledge and authority, the university in the West is affected by the repercussions of the digital revolution and its e-culture. Traditionally, a professor could maintain a superior position once certain academic credentials were obtained. Today's e-culture challenges notions of intellectual authority based on doctorates. Expertise is short lived and constantly being put to test. Knowledge is actively re-created in a model of exchange. It is hybrid, multicultural, multiethnic, multisexual, and multidimensional. Hierarchical relations of command and control are substituted by heterarchical modes of cooperation, which demand humility and ask everybody to take a position among peers. The common resource is creativity. In itself creativity defies status, age, race, ethnicity, gender and religion: "Creativity is the great leveler. It cannot be handed down, and it cannot be 'owned' in the traditional sense," suggests Richard Florida in his book *The Rise of the Creative Class* (xiv). Diversity is welcome and puts an end to cultural arrogance. Authorities shift established hierarchies, which "means especially a rethinking of the roles of teachers and learners, much as the roles of experts and amateurs are being rethought" (Bruns 340). With e-culture being both a threat and a blessing, Bruns predicts the "casual collapse of conventional education" (344). In *The Future of Learning Institutions in a Digital Age*, a project conducted in collaboration with scholars and educators on the virtual network HASTAC, Cathy N. Davidson and David Theo Goldberg also claim that the internet triggers a revolutionary change of learning institutions, in fact of "learning itself," owing to the "potential for shared and interactive learning" that is built into "its structure, its organization, its model of governance and sustainability" (1). The common claim is that internet technology, but more importantly the technosocial community including its innovative cohorts in research centers and university departments facilitate a dramatic change of the conservative education system by way of introducing innovative forms of knowledge production, content management, and distribution.

While traditionally the humanities have not been understood as primary industry partners, they made a transformative step towards a more outcome-driven educational regimen with the turn to cultural studies in the 1990s. This development was paralleled by global economic activity shifting from goods to services, from producers to consumers. Information technology and content were made the principal sources of value production. With experts closely observing the general process of corporatizing the university, the turn to cultural studies has been criticized as one symptom of the increasing influence of economic logic on educational institutions. The concerns about cultural studies for being too strongly tied to economic interests, with outcomes being too practice oriented were themselves often presented as a more general fear of popularized knowledge and low standards of education. Literature specialists started to teach "rather profane vocational skills" like creative writing and translation studies and disciplinary hybrids such as neurolinguistics were created to have research results "directly and successfully implemented into logopedic treatment" (Münch 236). Similarly, in the German academy some find traditional *Bildung* put at risk, the very ideal of profound scholarship, scientific integrity, and academic freedom that brought the German university system to the cultural forefront in the nineteenth century. On the critical side, for example Richard Münch finds the humanities desecrated, made common, too close to popular culture, and worst of all, too praxis oriented (235-36) and Julian Nida-Rümelin sets his hope on the advent of a "humanistic revolt" (9) opposing the reduction of educational goals in the humanities to a mere skills training of the *homo oeconomicus*, favoring the holistic development of personalities instead.

There are, of course, also many scholars who embrace digital humanities and e-culture. In *The Last Professors: The Corporate University and the Fate of the Humanities*, Frank Donoghue analyzes structural change at US-American universities. Teachers in the humanities are under scrutiny by a standardizing, numbers oriented administrative apparatus. Tenured liberal arts professors get increasingly replaced by adjunct lecturers. The latter not only cost less, but are trained to teach employment skills rather than fostering intellectual scholarship and research in themselves or their students. According to Donoghue, "tenured and tenure-track professors currently constitute only 35 percent of college teaching personnel" (56). While "this number is steadily falling" (56), the world of higher education becomes increasingly market-driven, thus making traditional humanities professors and their idealistic learning objectives obsolete. According to Donoghue, the "corporate under-pinnings

of modern-day higher education" (70) have long deemed solipsistic humanist inquiry irrelevant and there is no turning back to the old days.

Stanley Fish, now a regular blogger for *The New York Times*, managed to make the transition from academic to public intellectual by making the lineaments of e-culture work in his favor. Questioning whether "the academic analysis of works of literature, philosophy, and history ha[s] instrumental value," the senior professor of literature is not opposed to a solid reality check in his field: "The challenge of utility is not put ... to literary artists, but to the scholarly machinery that seems to take those operating it further and further away from the primary texts into the reaches of incomprehensible and often corrosive theory" (<<http://fish.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/01/13/the-uses-of-the-humanities-part-two/>>). Fish does not claim that the humanities are obsolete, but that humanities educators must embrace to do what is the main concern of the humanities to begin with: teaching and researching ways to understand the world as it is now. And the developed markets of the world are digital: It favors creativity and knowledge as the main sources of global future. Seen from this perspective, the situation of the humanities is actually a joyous one: disciplines with notoriously vague, albeit essential learning objectives have much to offer to the revenue of the global creative economy, to local communities, as well as to scientific progress. The core creative and intellectual assets clustered in the humanities are susceptible to application in Web 2.0 and 3.0, where their critical, analytical, logical, and informed impact on knowledge formation processes, citizen journalism, and open source projects become beneficial for great parts of the global community. Creativity, conceptual, complex critical thinking, and analytical skills are not only productive factors of the creative economy, but also paramount as intellectual force to introduce and stimulate race, gender and class sensitive arguments as well as ethics, ecology, and democracy oriented values into the swarm-intelligence of a technology-driven, global e-culture. Pragmatically speaking, by shifting the paradigms e-culture provides a plethora of job opportunities for humanities people.

Founding creative industries' faculties like the Institute of Creative Industries and Innovation at the Queensland University of Technology in Brisbane is one exemplary response to the new e-culture. Such a high-end research and service institute plays a key role transferring knowledge generated in the human and social sciences to industry and community. But it also provides new opportunities for academic research. So does the Berlin Zentrum für Literatur- und Kulturforschung. Established in 1996 at the academic periphery, from the beginning the Center employed innovative knowledge production processes. Based on an axiomatic understanding of literature as an archive of analogies and correspondences between the sciences and the arts, the Center dedicates its activities to the theory and history of European literatures and knowledge cultures. At the Center interdisciplinarity, networking and peer "produsage" dominate the operating modes of its cultural professionals. While only the best get to work at the Center, there is no room for scholarship based on isolated acts of genius. Instead, a dialogue among peers across all disciplinary boundaries is cultivated. About fifty literature specialists, philosophers, psychologists, historians, musicologists, who work in interdisciplinary projects such as "Emotion and Motion," or "Freud and the Natural Sciences," favor combinations of disciplinary paradigms and methods, mind experiments with uncertain, but highly promising outcomes.

Another example of trendsetting educational as well as entrepreneurial foresight is the Harvard University Extension School, where online education for degree credit with tuition fees has been offered since 1997. According to the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) some "56 percent of all 2- and 4-year degree-granting institutions offered some form of distance education" (Pace and Kelley 1) by 2001. As of now, more than 100 courses from the Liberal Arts and Sciences, Management, and Computer Science are offered at the School. Today, a good number of scholars maintain their own websites, blogs, or self-fabricate their distance learning programs by lecturing via podcasts, some of which are later found on *iTunes University*, *Uchannel*, or *Edutopia*.

Agents and institutions of the creative economy define and shape actively the new e-culture both publicly and inside the academy. Their work pulls the institutional center towards a better future proving that "produsage" and interdisciplinarity does not diminish sophistication and disciplinary knowledge. They show that academic freedom does not necessarily get jeopardized by adding an

economic tier to institutional objectives. By proliferating publications and stirring public debate on websites such institutions provide a bridge between professional intellectuals, researchers and an informed public. While, for example, a proponent of e-culture like Richard Florida is regularly disdainfully (and I suspect enviously) scoffed at, the very popularity of his scholarship shows its impressive level of applicability. While parts of the academy still resist crediting publications in peer-reviewed online journals in the same way as publications in print, e-culture intellectuals do not waste their time with anachronisms in either economic or academic perspectives. By now the success and foresight of e-culture intellectuals and practitioners reverberates back into the old-model-university, where humanities departments are striving to create a creative academy. In the face of technological and cultural change interdisciplinary excellence clusters are formed to service the world outside the ivory tower with high-end research and cater to the needs of highly skilled scientists with much needed funding. If "tapping and stroking the creative furnace inside every human being is the great challenge" as Richard Florida claims (*Cities* 4), these German, Australian, and US-American projects show how the humanities can successfully make the e-cultural turn as a result of a critical discourse and an unbiased approach to technology and economy.

For various reasons the situation of the humanities, however, is different in the emerging market, for example in Turkey. First, Turkey still struggles to overcome the disadvantages of the digital divide, while embracing simultaneously technologies wherever possible. Second, the new Turkish university system was founded only seventy-six years ago and owing to its political orientation towards the West, much of the cultural richness of Turkey's history, the diversity of its literatures, and the enormous amount of expertise accumulated in the scholarly tradition of the Ottomans failed to receive appropriate curricular attention. It was only as recent as 1995, when the Ege University Cultural Studies Symposium in Izmir first introduced cultural studies, that Turkish scholars formally found a "particularly apt approach to exploring and critiquing the decidedly hierarchical and patriarchal character" of Turkish society (Pultar and Kirtunç 130). Third, in a political climate long characterized by censorship and centralized governance, it was no primary educational goal to create citizens critical of authorities, apt of independent thought and creative arguments. Thus, e-culture in Turkey is characterized by a simultaneously desired, enthusiastically used, but unevenly allocated amount of e-as in electronic and economic, and a lack of critical culture to feed creative controversy.

On 1 August 1933 the term "university" appeared for the first time in Turkish legal terminology: Istanbul University was established as the first of many initiatives in the reform of higher education in Turkey (Doğramacı 2). Ihsan Doğramacı, Chairman of the Bilkent University Board of Trustees in Ankara and leading figure in Turkish educational politics, explains the rationale of the reform at the International Conference of Higher Education in 2007 as follows: "The goal of the reform, an important part of the revolution that Atatürk directed, was to bring education, teaching, and research studies up to the level of Western countries; and to transfer the university administration systems of Western countries to Turkey" (Doğramacı 2). Following the model of such US-American universities as Harvard, Princeton, and Yale, an amendment allowing the foundation of private, non-profit universities was added to the Turkish constitution in 1982 (5). In 2007 students in Turkey could go to one of 115 universities, 30 of which were private (Doğramacı 5). Between 2004 and 2007 the university sector exhibited a growth rate of nearly 60 percent within three years (for a summary on educational reform activities and growth in Turkey see Aksit). All universities in Turkey are annexed to the Ministry of Higher Education (YÖK) and the educational trajectory remains centralized and oriented toward the Western model. However, the difference between the Turkish and old world European universities is fundamental. As Davidson and Goldberg point out, "of all existing institutions in the West, higher education is one of the most enduring" (9). In contrast, the Turkish academy is young and the private sector of the academy is even younger. However, this difference has done nothing to inhibit the quality of tertiary education in Turkey and the emergence of a hugely sophisticated coterie of Turkish scholars whose work has global impacts. But the private Turkish university in particular has a very different institutional tradition and follows a very different trajectory in the educational market place than European and US-American universities which draw on the traditional and senior institutions for models of education and conduct in the tertiary education sector. Set in an emerging market, the private university in Turkey is a product of the country's recent economic rise. Funded with the assets

and profits of private investors, these institutions — even if strictly non-profit making — are far less opposed to forms of institutional governance modeled on management principles usually applied to corporations. Furthermore, created in a climate of economically upward, and ideologically westward, mobility, these institutions are less conflicted about streamlining and adjusting their pedagogy and scholarship to meet pragmatic (and political) ends than old European and some American universities.

Many private Turkish universities are results of the country's emerging economic strength and thus open to proactively embracing the capitalist logic of the creative economy for their own benefits while struggling with the greater democratic challenges and opportunities internet technologies and designs entail. They embrace internet technology whole-heartedly to increase their visibility on websites, to standardize administrative work via intranet platforms and to manage communication with their students, staff and faculty. Digital libraries are established to accommodate research and to reduce the cost of building "hard copy" research collections. Scholarly performances are evaluated technocratically. While humanities educators enjoy great liberties in the questions as to what and how they teach, their educational effectiveness is strictly monitored and managed in corporatized models: "customer" and "stakeholder" satisfaction are prime and are surveyed digitally and in radically standardized ways. As long as publications in indexed journals help to increase the institution's productivity coefficient itself monitored by the YÖK, short-term-contracted scholars are free to choose their approaches and topics. A rationalist hire and fire approach is applied when outcomes fail to be satisfactory to both or either. These institutions operate in the ways outlined by Donoghue for US-American universities. In private Turkish universities scholars in both the sciences and the humanities cater to a huge student body in need of intellectual and vocational skills because they are about to enter a markedly competitive and unstable economic environment. Foreign faculty in literature departments are employed to advance students' capacity to succeed nationally and to compete internationally. While the aim in humanities education remains to enable students to develop their personalities, academics employed in this emerging market often find it difficult to overlook their role in the Turkish chain of wealth production. However, many students show considerable deficits in general reading, science, and problem solving skills (see, e.g., Aksit 132). For some, the university is the first place to acquire these skills. Once admitted to humanities departments many of these students actually have an enormously steep learning curve from grappling with English as language of instruction to struggling with the academic methods and scopes of their respective disciplines. The practical aspects of how to harvest internet sites for free literary analyses are learned quickly and often with little concern for intellectual property rights, too (for a survey on computer ethics of Turkish students see Beycioglu). Most students have no ideological opposition to technology, but also no e-readiness skills. The national internet accessibility level is lower than in affluent Western countries and larger numbers of people have less or no experience with digital technologies. In her study on the implementation of information and communication technologies into the primary and secondary education system since 1984, Sadegül Akbaba-Altun suggests that despite centralized reform activities in Turkey "there are too few computers, slow internet connections, insufficient software in the native language, and a lack of peripheral equipment at schools" (185). While the Turkish government is in fact much dedicated to raising the educational level in order to meet EU-accession criteria, crossing the digital divide has been identified as a milestone on the way.

Those who cannot access the internet at all or do not have access to hardware equipped to use the latest web technologies are at a distinct competitive disadvantage as individuals and representatives of their national, ethnical, cultural, social, religious and economic peer group: "The digital divide still very much exists, across affluent countries such as the United States and throughout the wealthiest nations in Europe, and, with even greater disparity, across Third World countries" (Davidson and Goldberg 6). Annual e-readiness rankings provided by the Economist Intelligence Unit in co-operation with the IBM Institute for Business Value show the qualitative and quantitative disparities in the level of digital development among seventy countries. Emphasizing that "a country's digital advancement is dependent on progress in other, interconnected areas, such as the business environment, education, support for innovation legal frameworks, and government policy and vision" (Economist Intelligence Unit 2), the consultants ranked Denmark, Sweden, and the Netherlands as the top three, and Iran, Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan at the bottom of e-readiness in 2009. The United

States ranked in fifth place; Australia in sixth; Germany in seventeenth, and Turkey in forty-third. This ranking demonstrates a close relationship between affluence, GNP, and e-readiness. It shows us that innovative e-culture is almost solely driven by affluent individuals and corporations in affluent post-industrialized economies. In the digital realm Western hegemony still prevails despite having its cultural values and modes subjected to massive change. Only seventy countries made it into the e-readiness list, which "provides companies that wish to invest or trade internationally with an overview of the world's most promising business locations" (1). The rest of the world's e-readiness goes unmentioned. In its omissions, the study shows that vast populations are still excluded from the beneficial effects of the digital revolution. Not only do their economies suffer, but their voices remain unheard in the politicized renegotiations of cultural values. With its acknowledgement of the close interdependence of education and e-readiness the study also alerts us to the fact that what ever educational agenda is set forth in the humanities, its impacts largely depend on where in the world the classroom happens to be. While teaching in the humanities obliges educators to teach the tools and methods of critical thinking, enabling students to read and understand the world as it is, the immediate needs of what being in this world requires vary depending on whether one teaches in the German or US-American academic system, or in a second language learning environment in Turkey's emerging market (just as it makes a difference whether one teaches at one of the poorer community colleges or at a highly funded excellence institution).

The humanities are dedicated to facilitations of personal growth and cultural empowerment, engagement in projects, activities or simply, lives lived in ethical ways. They first and foremost want students to develop into self-confident, critical, valuable members of their societies. Thus, humanities educators in the creative economy need to balance the specific geo-economic factors of their place of employment with the imperatives of their profession in order to do justice to their students, their communities and not least in order to be true to the core traditions and values of their academic field. While technology infrastructure and mobile connectivity are still low in many rural regions in Turkey, urban centers such as Istanbul, Ankara, and Izmir are well wired and thriving. These heavily economized hubs also offer the best opportunities to the huge young population from the country's provinces to earn a University degree and thus have a better chance at profitable employment. Given that many Turkish students make first contact with internet technology as freshmen, it is rather impressive to see how quickly they learn to conduct online research. Given the students' late, rapid and simultaneous exposure to both technology and liberal arts knowledge, a profound and integrated education in digital literacy, creativity and ethics is needed. And while students might learn how to use the internet in all faculties, it is a key asset as well as a key responsibility of humanities educators to teach their students how to use digital designs critically, self-reflexively, ethically and to democratic ends. While the role these students will later come to play in their local communities is not to be underestimated, for them the use of internet technology will not only be a key to greater wealth and more influential positions, but it will remain their main tool for knowledge acquisition. If they are taught how to use it creatively, knowledgeable and in an ethically informed fashion it could also become a key for democratic activity and critical social dialogue within and across national borders. In an economic and technocratic rather than an idealistically motivated teaching environment, humanities education has to be pragmatic.

In Turkey's private universities, *homo academicus* in Pierre Bourdieu's sense operates in a field different from say, the French academic system. While the latter defines the field's core values solipsistically from the center, the younger private Turkish institution acts from the periphery adopting simultaneously the Western model and striving for its own specific identity. This distinct identity emerges from the economic frame in which the young Turkish university is set. In the old model academic field in the West only the higher faculties namely, theology, medicine, and jurisprudence cater directly to the social community, the lower faculties such as history, philology, philosophy work without direct worldly impact (Bourdieu 121).

To ignore the pervasive technocratization, while continuing to teach Shakespeare in the very traditional ways oneself was taught twenty years ago, is a pedagogical disaster. Better to analyze critically *Wikipedia* entries on Shakespeare together with the students rather than altogether (and in vain) banning the online encyclopedia. Even more so, because many authors, whom we may assume

to be of universal relevance, do not resonate automatically with students from a different cultural background. In a US-American literature course, where students are openly contemptuous of the U.S., while embracing Microsoft and Apple technology, it seems fit to form a digital classroom community via blog or on Facebook to communicate to teach the responsible use of intellectual property, the dangers of piracy, the benefits of privacy and ethical and ecological awareness. It is better to let students peer review their classmates and to make them collaborate on cross-disciplinary, cross-cultural and intermedial work in progress assignments in order to familiarize them with the benefits and complexities of logically and fairly evolved evaluation methods rather than subjecting them to indisputable authoritarian decisions as Mark C. Taylor proposed in "End the University as we Know it" — only in some places we might have to do that faster than in others.

While teachers of cultural disciplines need to provide students everywhere with the intellectual tools to critically read, understand, prioritize, structure, and evaluate easily accessible, interdisciplinary, and randomly assembled online information, the social, cultural, and economic results of digital literacy training vary according to where in the world one teaches. While digital humanities and literacy, online creativity, and ethics are generally learning objectives in the humanities they are paramount educational goals in an emerging market like Turkey. Here, e-readiness works to the benefit of local societies as well as for the international community trying to reduce social, economic and juridical disparities on a global scale. Given that the internet is a central tool of discursive knowledge formation and thus power, it is essential to familiarize students from emerging and developing markets with the use of digital technologies and designs in order for them to be involved in economically, culturally and politically relevant discursive ways. But the risk of censorship is twofold. Once market penetration is reached, social networking providers apply radical controlling measures to cut operating costs: "Increasingly, however, these sites have been scaling back the content and services that can be accessed by their customers outside of the US. The commercial logic is unassailable: while the user-generated content of these social utility sites is effectively free, the hosting of extrabytes of travel photos, graphics, and videos generated by their millions of users is not, and many of these are increasingly in poorer countries that do not interest advertisers as much as users in the U.S." (Economist Intelligence Unit 15). The internet is simultaneously facilitator, carrier, and main representation of an e-culture, whose principal characteristic is the mutually beneficial, close interconnection of individuals and corporations, profit-orientation and self-governance, freedom and control, entertainment and politics. It is, however, by no means a globally leveled phenomenon.

Given the threat of exclusion of poorer countries from Web 2.0 and given the democratizing power the key principles of "produsage" can hold for them, social networks and the *Wikipedia* should become a foundational cultural studies course to train analytical and critical thinking in a digital environment. If the humanities teach to read the world in order to make it understandable, to bridge the gap between seemingly controversial realms of life, to act and think self-confidently and independently, to orient one's actions and thoughts on humanistic values, while defying forms of formalism as much as ideological constraints, in short to become a responsible and accountable human being, e-readiness must be on the curriculum. Educators need to take on the challenge the internet poses while taking into account the immediate economic and political situation of the sites of their employment: "What educational institutions must now do is on the one hand to ensure their own pedagogical approaches are not so out of step with the realities of "produsage" that they hinder rather than help such processes of self-determination, and on the other hand to engage especially in enabling those learners who have yet to join their more advanced peers to develop their own literacies and capacities to participate effectively in collaborative produsage projects as well as the collaborative project of social and societal produsage overall" (Bruns 356).

While acknowledging their students' openness to technology, educators must teach digital literacy and ethics as the most immediate tool for their students' empowerment but also their critical self-reflexivity. No doubt, they will become influential, constitutive agents of political and cultural value formation processes in their own communities. Teaching them not only how to use the internet, but how to use it critically and within internationally accepted boundaries helps them to become the educated elite of their country by doing what most characterizes an educated elite anywhere: to

question, interrogate and have an impact on the means the masses and the mighty employ for mere profits. Only e-ready students in emerging markets could later become the technologically, critically and ethically trained intercultural agents so surely needed in global disparity. Such humanities pedagogy could catapult the discipline into the educational forefront of the creative economy both in affluent countries and emerging markets, where it could help citizens to adjust to and to engage in democratizing processes, to allow and train self-governance, to collaborate and communicate across racial, ethnic, sexual or religious boundaries. E-ready humanities pedagogy offers an opportunity to recover the traditional agency of the disciplines: educating students to facilitate and sustain democracy, and to play a key role in establishing a decent value system and ethical framework for the global community. By targeting educators and students in the 1970s, Apple CEO Steven Jobs might not have foreseen the role technology would play for the further development of knowledge and cultural politics, but to make the PC a mass-market machine sure was a visionary decision. All it takes now is for humanities educators both in developed and in emerging markets to take this technology and teach to use it for the best of humanitarian ideals.

Works Cited

- Akbaba-Altun, Sadegül. "Complexity of Integrating Computer Technologies into Education in Turkey." *Educational Technology & Society* 9.1 (2006): 176-87.
- Aksit, Necmi. "Educational Reform in Turkey." *International Journal of Educational Development* 27 (2007): 129-37.
- Beycioglu, Kadir. "A Cyberphilosophical Issue in Education: Unethical Computer Using Behavior. The Case of Prospective Teachers." *Computers & Education* 53 (2009): 201-08.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Homo academicus*. 1984. Trans. Bernd Schwibs. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1988.
- Bruns, Axel. *Blogs, Wikipedia, Second Life, and Beyond: From Production to Producership*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2008.
- Davidson, Cathy N., and David Theo Goldberg. *The Future of Learning Institutions in a Digital Age*. Cambridge: MIT P, 2009.
- Doğramaci, Ihsan. "The Transformation of Higher Education in Turkey 1981-2007." Keynote speech, *International Conference on Higher Education* (2007): <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/highereducation/ehea2010/bilkent/Ihsan%20Dogramaci_%20Part1_text.pdf>
- Donoghue, Frank. *The Last Professors: The Corporate University and the Fate of the Humanities*. New York: Fordham UP, 2008.
- Economist Intelligence Unit. "E-readiness Rankings 2009." *The Economist* (2009): <http://www-935.ibm.com/services/us/gbs/bus/pdf/e-readiness_rankings_june_2009_final_web.pdf>
- Fish, Stanley. "The Uses of the Humanities, Part Two." *nytimes.com* (13 January 2008): <<http://fish.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/01/13/the-uses-of-the-humanities-part-two/>>.
- Florida, Richard. *Cities and the Creative Class*. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Florida, Richard. *The Rise of the Creative Class*. New York: Basic Books, 2002.
- Hartley, John. "Creative Industries." *Creative Industries*. Ed. John Hartley. Malden: Blackwell, 2005. 1-40.
- Howkins, John. *The Creative Economy: How People Make Money from Ideas*. London: Penguin, 2001.
- López-Varela, Asunción, and Steven Tötös de Zepetnek. "Towards Intermediality in Contemporary Cultural Practices and Education." *La intermedialidad / Intermediality*. Ed. Freda Chapple. Special Issue *Cultura, Lenguaje y Representación / Culture, Language and Representation* 6 (2008): 65-82.
- Münch, Richard. "Der König ist tot, es lebe der König!" *Forschung & Lehre* 4 (2008): 234-36.
- Nida-Rümelin, Julian. "Zur Zukunft der Geisteswissenschaften." Public Lecture, European Institute of International Affairs (2003): <<http://www.nida-ruemelin.de/schrift.html>>.
- Pace, Larry A., and Frances A. Kelley. "Multimedia Presentation Software Solutions for Internet-Based Courses." *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration* 9.3 (2006): 1-19. <http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/search_results_id.php?id=384>.
- Pultar, Gönül, and Ayşe Lahur Kırtunç. "Cultural Studies in Turkey: Education and Practice." *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 26 (2004): 129-53.
- Taylor, Mark C. "End the University as We Know It." *nytimes.com* (27 April 2009): <<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/27/opinion/27taylor.html>>.
- Tötös de Zepetnek, Steven. "Aspects of Scholarship and Publishing in the Age of New Media Technology." *Literatures in the Digital Era: Theory and Praxis*. Ed. Amelia Sanz and Dolores Romero. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007. 171-84.
- Tötös de Zepetnek, Steven. "The 'Impact Factor' and Selected Issues of Content and Technology in Humanities Scholarship Published Online." *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 42.1 (2010): 70-78.

Author's profile: Verena Laschinger teaches US-American literature at the University of Erfurt. Her fields of interests in research include urban, visual, and digital studies. Laschinger's recent publications include "The Reluctant Orientalist: A Photoessay," *Actual and Virtual Cities* (Ed. Mariana Net and Asunción López-Varela, 2009) and, with Vivian Blaxell, "Worldliness in Orhan Pamuk's *Istanbul: Memories of a City*," *Urbana* (2008), and her book publications include *Fictitious Politics-Factual Prose. Amerikanische Literatur, politische Praxis und der neorealistic Roman* (2000) and the edited volume *E-Motion: Sentiment and Technology* (with Ralph J. Poole, 2009). E-mail: <verena.laschinger@uni-erfurt.de>