Published online: 28 March 2024 DOI: 10.54254/2753-7102/6/2024047

The Digitalization Dialectic: A Critical Analysis of Technology's Role in Cultural Formation and Social Change

Jia Xiao[1,a,*]

[1] Faculty of Business and Economics, Universiti Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Wilayah Persekutuan Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
a. Moshook@163.com
*Corresponding author

Abstract*:* The digital revolution, marked by the swift advancement and dissemination of information and communication technologies (ICTs), has significantly impacted societal structures, cultural norms, and individual behaviors, heralding the emergence of a networked society. This paper explores the profound influence of digitalization on cultural norms, values, and practices, highlighting the dialectical relationship between digital technologies and cultural dynamics. Through a comprehensive review of existing literature and theoretical frameworks, it examines how digital technologies have facilitated new forms of cultural expression and interaction, while also addressing challenges posed by the digital divide, privacy concerns, and socio-economic implications of automation and datafication. The study delves into the transformation of cultural capital in the digital age and the role of networked social movements in shaping contemporary cultural landscapes. Furthermore, it discusses the implications of digitalization for global cultural flows and local cultural practices, contributing to the debate on cultural convergence and divergence in the digital era. By engaging with critical theories, this paper provides insights into the intricate relationship between the digital revolution and culture, underscoring the necessity of nuanced perspectives in understanding the complexities of contemporary social dynamics and the ongoing transformation of cultural identities and social structures.

Keywords: Digital Revolution, Cultural Dynamics, Networked Social Movements, Digital Divide, Cultural Capital

1. Introduction

In the sociological context, the digital revolution represents a profound shift in the fabric of society, marked by the transition from traditional industrial economies to ones based on the information and communication technologies (ICTs) [1] [2]. This transformative era, initiated in the late 20th century, is characterized by the rapid development and dissemination of digital technologies such as the internet, mobile computing, and artificial intelligence, fundamentally altering how individuals interact, communicate, work, and participate in various spheres of life including politics, education, and the economy. For instance, the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) reported that global Internet usage increased from 16.8% of the world's population in 2005 to 62.8% in 2023, and almost 40% of the world's population is now covered by 5G. This underscores the expansive reach of digital connectivity across the globe [3]. Sociologically, this revolution has ushered in significant changes in social structures, cultural norms, and individual behaviors, leading to the emergence of a networked society where digital connectivity is a central aspect of social life [4]. The digital revolution, as underscored by the World Economic Forum's "Global Risks Report 2023," not only brings to the forefront opportunities for innovation and efficiency but also amplifies discussions around critical issues such as the digital divide, privacy, and the socio-economic implications of automation and datafication [5]. This evolution challenges traditional sociological theories and compels the development of new frameworks to navigate the complexities of contemporary social dynamics, particularly in light of concerns over job displacement, privacy breaches, and escalating inequality.

Castells [6] noted that humanity has created a networked, globalized world, which has given rise to new forms of expression, social interaction, cybercrime, work, and social movements. For instance, the "Climate Strike" movement in recent years, which calls for global governments to take stronger actions against climate change, has made extensive use of social media channels, with participants often live streaming their protest activities online. This serves as a vivid example of what Castells describes as "networked social movements". These movements focus on conceptual issues such as the environment, gender preferences, or the selfless struggle to support the oppressed. The participants of these movements are status groups in the sense of Weber [7], that is, communities organized around lifestyles and cultural values—those that confer upon them moral prestige (now referred to as networks) [8].

In this process, the internet undeniably plays an irreplaceable core role. This paper seeks to extend the discourse by examining the digital revolution's profound impact on culture. It will explore how this technological paradigm shift influences cultural norms, values, and practices, thereby reshaping the societal landscape. In doing so, it will address the ways in which digital technologies have facilitated new forms of cultural expression and interaction, while also considering the challenges posed by the digital divide, privacy concerns, and the socio-economic implications of automation and datafication. Through a comprehensive review of existing literature and theoretical frameworks, this study seeks to offer insights into the transformation of cultural capital in the digital age and the role of networked social movements in shaping contemporary cultural landscapes. Moreover, the paper will

delve into the dialectical relationship between culture and society in the context of digital transformation, examining how digital technologies have both reflected and reshaped cultural identities and social structures. By engaging with critical theories, this study will contribute to the ongoing debate on the digital revolution's role in fostering cultural convergence and divergence, and its implications for global cultural flows and local cultural practices.

2. Evolution and Impact of Cultural Concepts

2.1. Historical Evolution of the Concept of Culture

The concept of culture, due to its historical complexity, has become one of the most challenging terms in the English language, comparable in complexity to its often-considered opposite, "nature" [9]. The notion of culture originated in the 15th century, initially referring to the care of crops and animals in agriculture, but over time, this concept was expanded to encompass human society, implying the "cultivation" and enhancement of people's thoughts and ideas. In the 18th century, academic discussions in Germany formed a dichotomy between culture and civilization, where culture was considered to have deeper values. Moving into the 19th century, the understanding of culture, or cultures in their entirety, was further deepened, marking the establishment of its usage in modern social sciences. Within this framework, culture is defined as the collection of all learnable elements within a society's way of life, encompassing aspects such as language, values, social norms, beliefs, customs, and laws, becoming a key dimension for distinguishing between different societies or communities [10] [11]. This understanding emphasizes that culture is not merely an ornament or appendage of social life but is the foundation of social structures and individual behaviors.

Throughout the 20th and into the 21st century, the concept of culture has been significantly transformed, reshaped by advances in anthropology, sociology, and psychology, as well as the forces of globalization and digital technology. Early century anthropologists like Franz Boas, Margaret Mead, and Ruth Benedict revolutionized the understanding of culture by challenging ethnocentric views and advocating for cultural relativism, emphasizing the rich diversity and complexity of cultures worldwide [12] [13] [14]. This groundwork paved the way for mid-century British cultural studies scholars such as Raymond Williams and Stuart Hall, who expanded the notion of culture to encompass everyday life, media, and popular culture, thereby democratizing it and underscoring its role in power dynamics and societal structures [15]. The late 20th and early 21st centuries further saw culture being reevaluated in the light of globalization and digital advancements, with thinkers like Arjun Appadurai illustrating how global cultural flows—mediascapes, technoscapes, finanscapes, ethnoscapes, and ideoscapes—interact in complex ways, and digital technology fostering the emergence of hybrid cultures through the rapid dissemination and remix of cultural forms [16]. This era has made culture more fluid and dynamic, challenging traditional boundaries and highlighting new issues of identity, community, and power within digital spaces. These shifts underscore that culture is not a static concept but an ever-evolving facet of human life, reflecting the intricacies of social interaction, power relations, and the global interconnectedness, continually shaped by historical events, technological progress, and scholarly discourse.

2.2. Sociological Perspectives and Cultural Capital

Sociology commonly examines culture in conjunction with social relations and social structures. For instance, studies grounded in Marxism or historical materialism tend to view the entire edifice of culture and the cultural production system as superstructures built atop the irrational social relations of production inherent in capitalism. Therefore, the rational existence of religious beliefs, philosophy, dominant ideologies, core values, and social norms serves to support and legitimize the exploitative economic system of social relations [17]. This is exemplified by the emergence of Protestantism following the 16th-century religious reforms and the rationalist philosophy initiated by Descartes. In the 1930s, the critical theory of the Frankfurt School posited that emerging mass culture acts as a form of social control, leading, over time, to a widespread loss of critical consciousness and a passive consumption of trivial entertainment among the majority [18]. This critique, most notably, distinguished between high culture and mass culture, asserting the greater value of the former, even though it remained the preserve of the educated upper classes. The concept of cultural reproduction in sociology extends beyond the transmission and development of language, universal values, and norms to a deeper exploration of the persistent reproduction of social inequalities. Theoretically, education is seen as a "great leveller," ideally providing a platform for talented individuals of different genders, classes, and races to overcome social barriers and achieve their life goals and aspirations. However, research over the past four decades has revealed a contrary trend [19], where the education system in practice often reinforces existing cultural differences and social stratification rather than narrowing them.

To date, the most systematic and general theory of cultural reproduction is that of Pierre Bourdieu, which underscores the tight interconnections among economic conditions, social status, and symbolic capital with cultural knowledge and skills [20]. Bourdieu's theory meticulously dissects the mechanisms of capital flow and transformation within the social structure and its impacts on individuals' social positions and cultural practices. According to Bourdieu, capital is not solely a manifestation of economic wealth; it also encompasses social capital, cultural capital, and symbolic capital, each playing a decisive role in the social space, facilitating social stratification and the positioning of individuals within society. Social capital refers to the resources an individual gains through their network of social relationships, valued for the quality and breadth of connections within the network; cultural capital can take three forms: embodied state of long-term internalized skills and knowledge (such as education and aesthetic preferences), objectified state of cultural goods (such as books and artworks), and institutionalized state (such as academic degrees). This capital highlights the crucial role of knowledge and education in social mobility; symbolic capital consists of the collection of recognized honor, prestige, or status, resulting from the positive recognition of other forms of capital within the social gaze; economic capital refers to resources directly convertible into money, including wealth, assets, and income.

Bourdieu's theory also reveals the convertibility between different forms of capital, for example, how cultural capital, acquired through education, can later be converted into higher social status (symbolic capital) or economic benefits. This conversion is not spontaneous but facilitated through the involvement and certification processes of social institutions, such as the education system. These exchanges typically occur within the fields or social arenas that organize social life, each with its own set of rules, forms of capital, and power structures. The actions and interactions of individuals within these fields are constrained by the capital structures they possess, yet they also strategically utilize these capitals to change or maintain their positions in the social space.

Cultural capital reflects an individual's accumulated knowledge, skills, and aesthetic sensibilities in areas such as education, art, and lifestyle. It manifests in three forms: the Embodied State, which represents the capacity and knowledge internalized through education and socialization; the Objectified State, embodied in physical cultural goods such as books and artworks; and the Institutionalized State, such as academic credentials, which serve as an official recognition of cultural capital. The use and transformation of these various forms of cultural capital within society play a critical role in an individual's social mobility and status attainment, simultaneously acting as a mechanism for the maintenance and reproduction of social inequality structures. Through certification by educational and other societal institutions, cultural capital can be converted into economic and social capital, thereby enhancing an individual's competitive advantage in society.

Microsociology does not deny these patterns but focuses on another dimension of social life. For Durkheim and his tradition, primary social interactions are sought through emotions and collective effervescence [21]; culture appears more localized and fragmented as people focus on the shared symbolic symbols of their group, making culture flicker in and out of our consciousness. Microsociologists like Goffman have shown how various small rituals are revealed to constitute the dramas of our private lives, imbuing daily life with meaning [22]. The era of the digital revolution has not changed this aspect. Sociologists have found that people primarily use these technological products to maintain small ritualistic contacts with those they know and with the culture they feel most intimately and familiarly. Despite the dehumanizing and alienating aspects of computerization [23], the micro-dimensions of the world have not become more conflicted or alienated. This is because, at the micro-level, people are active, energetic agents, and what we most desire is to engage in more Goffman-style micro rituals.

The consumer society is usually associated with the development of Western society in the latter half of the 20th century, where economic growth and technological advancement spurred mass production and a diversity of product supply, making consumption the center of economic activity and social life [24]. In such a society, individual value and social status are increasingly defined by possession and consumption of goods, with a society's economy, culture, and social life primarily driven by consumer behavior and consumer values. This society is characterized by aggressive advertising and media promotion of consumption, diversity of goods and services, and the ubiquity of consumer culture. However, postmodern theorists argue against such value judgments, viewing these as merely different preferences and tastes, not as a matter of high and low culture [25]. For some, erasing these cultural differences is seen as liberating, allowing popular cultural forms to enter the realm of serious sociological study for the first time.

3. Digital Transformations and Societal Shifts

3.1. Digital Era and Societal Changes

For some, digitalization has not only altered the nature of capitalism but has also fundamentally transformed the world of work. We have witnessed the rise of the "gig economy," where employees become self-employed and companies transform into online platforms that merely allocate tasks, thereby circumventing various responsibilities traditionally held by employers. Nick Srnicek [26] theorized this phenomenon as the advent of the "platform capitalism" era, highlighting data as a key resource for capitalist expansion. In this era, the collection, mining, and development of data to improve services and products, followed by profiting from selling these services and products, has become a new economic model. However, this model also poses significant risks to privacy and personal secrecy, especially as the boundaries between public and private spheres become increasingly blurred. For instance, Shoshana Zuboff [27] in her book "The Age of Surveillance Capitalism" revealed an emerging, rogue form of capitalism, termed "surveillance capitalism," where companies use devices such as smart assistants, smart thermostats, speakers, routers, and even home security systems to collect and analyze various data to predict consumer behavior, thereby enhancing sales performance.

Simultaneously, as the digital revolution becomes more deeply integrated into our daily lives and work, the core characteristics associated with digitalization begin to shape contemporary culture. David Lyon [28] sought to understand today's "surveillance culture" based on digital technology, considering it an unprecedented phenomenon. The novelty of this surveillance culture lies not in perceiving individuals as passive victims of government surveillance but in seeing them as active participants in monitoring themselves and others. When we post information on social media platforms, view someone's profile, send texts, tweet, comment on products, or share personal information through electronic devices, we are actively participating in this culture. Unlike George Orwell's "Big Brother" surveillance, the "surveillance" in this culture has become a way of life, demonstrating how individuals, while enjoying the interactive pleasures of online shopping, social media, and online gaming, are also unconsciously involved in the quantification, tracking, and potential economic exploitation of data. This decentralized collection and use of data illustrate how digitalization profoundly affects our ways of living and working.

3.2. Globalization, Cultural Dynamics, and the Digital Divide

The advent of the digital revolution era signifies not only a leap in technological progress but also can be deeply understood through the lens of globalization theories. In this era, the fusion of information technology and the internet has birthed a vast

economy, closely connected different regions and jointly driving markets to new heights, thereby forming a tightly connected global society [6]. Globalization theories particularly emphasize the significance of culture, one of their core aspects being the exploration of the bidirectional or multidirectional flow of cultural products on a global scale. A key issue continually debated is whether the world is transitioning towards a singular global cultural model—sometimes referred to as "McDonaldization"—or whether local cultures still have their space to exist [29]. In this discussion, Robertson [30] introduced the concept of "glocalization," highlighting how local cultures adapt and restructure global cultural patterns, revealing the complex interactions between the global and the local. Meanwhile, Wallerstein's world-systems theory offers another perspective [31], viewing the United States as the global hegemon post-World War II, closely associated with the global cultural dominance of Hollywood movies and American television series. World-systems theory further emphasizes that cultural flow and dominance are not isolated phenomena but are part of the material interests and economic control strategies within the capitalist economic system. Together, these theories provide a multidimensional explanatory framework for understanding the phenomena of globalization in the digital revolution era, revealing the complex interrelations between technological advancement, cultural flow, and economic forces.

The so-called digital divide, characterized by inequalities in network accessibility and ownership of digital devices, reflects the impact of socioeconomic status, education level, age, and geographical location on individuals' ability to access digital resources [32]. For instance, The World Bank's Digital Development Overview highlights that about one-third of the global population, or 2.6 billion people, remained offline in 2023. Despite over 90% of individuals in high-income countries using the internet in 2022, only one in four people in low-income countries had access [33]. Specifically, poorer communities and individuals with lower educational levels often struggle to obtain high-speed internet and modern digital devices, limiting their opportunities to access information, participate in online education, and compete in the market. Additionally, older individuals tend to have a lower degree of integration with technology, placing them at a disadvantage in the digital lifestyle. The digital divide between urban and rural areas is also pronounced, with urban regions typically enjoying faster network speeds and a wider range of technological services. This divide not only exacerbates existing social inequalities but may also hinder economic development and social integration, leaving some populations on the margins when it comes to enjoying the conveniences and opportunities brought about by digitalization.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

The impact of digital transformation in the realm of human communication is significant, yet whether this transformation constitutes a true "revolution" remains a topic worthy of in-depth discussion. As Zuboff [27] pointed out, despite the dazzling array of novel applications, the profit-driven essence of capitalism continues to be the core force driving socio-economic changes. To date, the production relations of our industrialized society have not undergone fundamental transformation; new technologies and products still rely on the basis of industrial production [34]. From a sociological perspective, these phenomena do not represent entirely new developments, but rather appear as continuations and repetitions of existing patterns. This suggests that, although digitalization has brought about significant changes in modes of communication, it may only represent another manifestation of the dynamics of existing capitalism within a broader socio-economic structure, rather than a disruptive social revolution.

Undoubtedly, the concept of the digital revolution will continue to play a key role in contemporary society. However, it is noteworthy that current debates on the digital revolution have moved beyond simple dichotomies to adopt more complex and nuanced perspectives. Recent research challenges the traditional notion of a fundamental distinction between cyberspace and the tangible world of physical society, revealing that online life is actually an extension, rather than a simplification, of the real world [35]. This is clearly evidenced in social media research literature, which finds that most internet users interact with their existing friends, relatives, and people they know from offline activities in the virtual world, rather than with complete strangers or anonymous online "profiles" [36] [37]. Baym [38] further emphasizes that a more realistic interpretation is the continuous transformation and influence between online and offline interpersonal relationships in today's society. As digital technologies become increasingly integrated into our daily lives, this interpenetration of online and offline relationships may well be the phenomenon we hope for and expect. This indicates the need to rethink the impact of the digital revolution on social structures and individual behavior, recognizing that digital technology does not simply replace the real world but interacts with it in complex ways, shaping a new social reality.

In conclusion, the digital revolution has undeniably ushered in a new epoch in the sociological landscape, intertwining deeply with the fabric of culture and societal norms. This exploration has underscored the profound impacts of digitalization on cultural norms, values, and practices, spotlighting both the opportunities and challenges that arise from this technological paradigm shift. From the reshaping of cultural capital in the digital age to the emergence of networked social movements, the digital revolution has both mirrored and molded cultural identities and social structures. This paper has traversed the intricate relationship between digital technologies and cultural dynamics, highlighting the significance of understanding this interplay to grasp the complexities of contemporary social dynamics fully. As we navigate through the digital age, it becomes increasingly crucial to critically assess the implications of digitalization on social inequality, privacy, and the socio-economic landscape, recognizing that the digital revolution is not a mere technological upheaval but a multifaceted phenomenon that continues to shape the contours of our social reality. Engaging with and expanding upon theoretical frameworks, this study contributes to the ongoing discourse on digital transformation, advocating for a nuanced understanding of its role in fostering both cultural convergence and divergence.

Future research in the nexus of digital technologies and cultural dynamics is paramount, inviting scholars to delve into territories of how digitalization reshapes cultural capital, identity, and social structures. This necessitates a multifaceted

investigation into the dual role of digital platforms in democratizing access to cultural capital and perpetuating social inequalities, the implications of networked social movements on cultural practices, and the nuanced challenges digital privacy, misinformation, and socio-economic disparities present. Moreover, the paradox of cultural convergence and divergence in the digital era calls for a deeper understanding of global cultural flows and their impact on cultural homogenization and diversity. Therefore, advancing theoretical frameworks and empirical research to comprehensively explore these dimensions will be crucial for unraveling the complex interrelations between digital technologies, culture, and society, ensuring a nuanced appreciation of the digital revolution's multifaceted impact on contemporary social dynamics.

References

[1] Øverby, H., & Audestad, J. (2021). The Digital Economy. Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews, 50, 416 - 417. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-78237-5_1.
[2] Makridakis, S. (2017). The Forthcoming Artificial Intelligence (AI) Revolution: Its Impact on Society and Firms. Futures, 90, 46-60. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FUTURES.2017.03.006.
[3] International Telecommunication Union (ITU). (2023). Facts & Figures 2023. Retrieved March 2024, from https://www.itu.int/itu-d/reports/statistics/facts-figures-2023/
[4] Vanden Abeele, M., De Wolf, R., & Ling, R. (2018). Mobile media and social space: How anytime, anyplace connectivity structures everyday life. Media and Communication, 6(2), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v6i2.1399
[5] World Economic Forum. (2023). Global risks report 2023. Retrieved March 3, 2024, from https://www.weforum.org/publications/global-risks-report-2023/
[6] Castells, M., & Cardoso, G. (Eds.). (2006). The network society: From knowledge to policy (pp. 3-23). Washington, DC: Johns Hopkins Center for Transatlantic Relations.
[7] Weber, M. (2013). From Max Weber: essays in sociology. Routledge.
[8] Katz, N., Lazer, D., Arrow, H., & Contractor, N. (2004). Network theory and small groups. Small Group Research, 35(3), 307–332. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496404264941
[9] Yang, H. (2008). Ancient Meaning of Culture and Its Implicit Intention. Journal of Huaqiao University.
[10] Schudson, M. (1989). How culture works. Theory and Society, 18(2), 153–180. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00160753
[11] Williams, R. H. (2013). Culture and social movements. The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470674871.wbespm429
[12] Boas, F. (1901). The mind of primitive man. Science, 13(321), 281-289.
[13] Mead, M. (1928). Coming of age in Samoa: A psychological study of primitive youth for western civilisation (Vol. 44). Blue ribbon books.
[14] Benedict, R. (2019). Patterns of culture. Routledge.
[15] Hall, S. (1993). Culture, community, nation. Cultural studies, 7(3), 349-363.
[16] Appadurai, A. (1996). Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization (Vol. 1). U of Minnesota Press.
[17] Marx, K. (1909). Zur Kritik der politischen ökonomie (Vol. 30). JHW Dietz Nachf.
[18] Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. (1947). Dialectic of Enlightenment. Philosophical Fragments. Stanford University Press.
[19] Igarashi, H., & Saito, H. (2014). Cosmopolitanism as Cultural Capital: Exploring the intersection of globalization, education and stratification. Cultural Sociology, 8(3), 222–239. https://doi.org/10.1177/1749975514523935
[20] Bourdieu, P. (2018). Distinction a social critique of the judgement of taste. In Inequality (pp. 287-318). Routledge.
[21] Durkheim, E. (2016). The elementary forms of religious life. In Social theory re-wired (pp. 52-67). Routledge.
[22] Goffman, E. (2016). The presentation of self in everyday life. In Social theory re-wired (pp. 482-493). Routledge.
[23] Turkle, S. (2011). Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other. Basic Books.
[24] Baudrillard, J. (1998). The Consumer Society: myths and structures. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526401502
[25] Jameson, F. (1983). Postmodernism and consumer society. The anti-aesthetic: Essays on postmodern culture, 111-125.
[26] Srnicek, N. (2017). Platform capitalism. John Wiley & Sons.
[27] Zuboff, S. (2023). The age of surveillance capitalism. In Social theory re-wired (pp. 203-213). Routledge.
[28] Lyon, D. (2018). The culture of surveillance: Watching as a way of life. John Wiley & Sons.
[29] Ritzer, G. (2021). The McDonaldization of society. In In the Mind's Eye (pp. 143-152). Routledge.
[30] Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. Global modernities, 2(1), 25-44.
[31] Wallerstein, I. (2020). World-systems analysis: An introduction. duke university Press.
[32] Van Dijk, J. A., & Hacker, K. L. (2003). The digital divide as a complex and dynamic phenomenon. The Information Society, 19(4), 315–326. https://doi.org/10.1080/01972240309487
[33] World Bank. (2023). Digital Development. Retrieved March 2024, from https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/digitaldevelopment/overview
[34] Moraitis, A. B. (2021). From the post-industrial prophecy to the de-industrial nightmare: Stagnation, the manufacturing fetish and the limits of capitalist wealth. Competition & Change, 26(5), 513–532. https://doi.org/10.1177/10245294211044314
[35] Porter, D. (Ed.). (2013). Internet culture. Routledge.
[36] Subrahmanyam, K., Reich, S. M., Waechter, N., & Espinoza, G. (2008). Online and offline social networks: Use of social networking sites by emerging adults. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 29(6), 420–433. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2008.07.003
[37] Lieberman, A., & Schroeder, J. (2020). Two social lives: How differences between online and offline interaction influence social outcomes. Current Opinion in Psychology, 31, 16–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.06.022
[38] Baym, N. K. (2015). Personal connections in the digital age. John Wiley & Sons.