



How to cite: Sofilkanych, M. (2022). The formation of a new information culture of the future: the socio-philosophical content. *Futurity Philosophy*, 1(1), 58-68. <https://doi.org/10.57125/FP.2022.03.30.05>

The formation of a new information culture of the future: the socio-philosophical content

Maryna Sofilkanych

PhD in Philosophy, Dean, Teacher in Transcarpathian Academy of Arts, Faculty of Fine Arts. Department of Culture and Social Sciences and Humanities, Uzhgorod, Ukraine, marinasofilkanych82@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6793-4807>

Received: January 17, 2022 | **Accepted:** March 13, 2022 | **Published:** March 30, 2022

Abstract: The article deals with the socio-philosophical perspectives of the transformation and creation of information culture process. The actual context of this phenomenon and prognostic abstractions are highlighted. The **research goal of the** presented work is to systematise the content of information culture from the ontological position of the social reality of our time. The research process is focused on a comprehensive study of the intersections of culture and information as fundamental categories in the context of their merger in the relevant concept. In addition, the transformational impact of the new culture on ethical frameworks and epistemological reality is analysed. The **research methodology is** formed on the basis of a dialectical approach with an encapsulating intention, in order to expand the subject matter and cover related constructs. The **results made** possible the concretisation and operationalisation of the elements of the studied process. The dyadic definitions of information culture as a contextual and instrumental reality are presented. Given its recursive nature of connection with epistemological reality, manipulation of values and ideas is considered as promising. Selectivity is defined as a cross-cutting process of constructing an ethical norm, and the collective nature of the norm is considered through the evolutionary significance of the information system. The **implications are the** prospects of applying the conceptual framework for interventions aimed at reconstructing public information standards, innovations in the educational process and management. The objectification of the process of creating a new culture provides the necessary method for its cognition and direction. The value transformation, in turn, is the basis for regulating the social reality.

Keywords: epistemological reality, information society, societal evolution, postdigital.

Introduction

The new way of organising the socio-cultural reality of the post-industrial period is primarily characterised by a change in the position of the *information* construct in the structure of formative processes. Information has become a fundamental variable and a determinant of current trends, which leads to the introduction of a new information standard in various fields. The tradition of post-digital eco-pedagogy has been formed in the educational paradigm (Jandrić & Ford, 2020). The prospects of virtual economic architecture are postulated (Stoica et al., 2019). A strategy for ensuring data-driven, direct democracy has been implemented (Godinho et al., 2021). It is worth noting that information warfare has also become a critical aspect of the new reality, particularly for Ukrainian society (Shaikan et al., 2020). These changes are fundamentally transforming the way society functions. Particularly, the development of information production implies an increase in the number of information workers who form new social hierarchies (Piwowarski, 2020). In turn, the accessibility of information provided by the strengthening of technological infrastructure guarantees the involvement of individuals in public discourse (Beniger, 1968). At the same time, technological ecosystems define the user as a driving force that modifies other components (Fonseca Escudero et al., 2018). Therefore, society is taking on the role of an agent, a driver of a new phase of anthropogenesis. Accordingly, the question arises as to the nature of these changes and their direction.

Research Problem

Mostly, the construct of information culture is presented as the contextuality of social reality in the disclosure of a certain phenomenon. A natural issue that is highlighted in research studies is the determination of a number of relevant phenomena by the parameters of information culture. At the same time, even this issue is not sufficiently considered, as noted by Widén and Karim (2018) in their literature review. At the same time, the desire of specialists to empirically substantiate the contribution of information culture often narrows the concept (Aboaoga et al., 2020). Thus, the approach closest to the ontology of the phenomenon under study is the use of the extended UTAUT model (Mukred et al., 2017). However, the subject orientation of the operant limits the explanatory power of the concept of information culture. Accordingly, the problem is the inability to adequately disclose the ontological and epistemological dimensions. Despite the numerous quantitative representations of aspects of information culture, it is worth paying attention to the fundamental nature of the phenomenon itself, which reflects the intersection of information and culture. It should also be noted that the ethical question of the implementation of the principles of a particular culture in the processes of the information society remains open. Given the widespread impact of information standards, namely, on social, political, and economic systems, it is important to study the ways in which information culture shapes power relations in relation to information, values and moral norms.

Research Focus

The present study aims to highlight the content and direction of the processes of forming a new information culture as a standard of post-industrial society. The ideas and values shaped by information culture have a characteristic projection onto the basic constructs of society. Therefore, a number of questions remain relevant regarding the impact of a particular information culture on the realities of a particular individual's life, such as health, safety, morality, etc. In particular, the study aims to investigate the various dimensions of the new information culture - including the impact of technology, the role of media, globalization, etc. - as an indivisible unity that transforms socio-philosophical paradigms. In addition, the study aims to examine the ethical implications of the new culture, as well as

the epistemological significance of this culture for the broader discourse. The development of the presented issues involves the study of the relationship between information and the constructs of knowledge and communication. It is important to determine what role information plays in shaping society phenomenally, but not quantitatively. Finally, the epistemological analysis of information culture includes the study of the ways in which information systems are generated and their impact on the construction of reality.

Research Aim and Research Questions

The purpose of the article is to systematise the contents of information culture with regard to the ontology of social reality. The study is aimed at a comprehensive analysis of the formation of a new information culture and its socio-philosophical content, as well as at identifying its transformational impact.

RQ₁: What is the intersection of culture and information in the realities of the information society?

RQ₂: How does the formation of a new information culture determine our epistemological reality?

RQ₃: Where is the limit of the ethicality of the information culture of post-industrial society?

Literature Review/Theoretical Overview

The heterogeneity and contradictory interpretations of the process of creating an information culture are characteristic, which makes the corresponding discourse possible. Table 1 presents the main works that form the basis of the study of the socio-philosophical content of the formation of a new culture. In fact, the presented primitives reflect the way a cultural norm is implemented in the social space of our time, which is detailed further in the paper.

Table 1

Constructs of socio-philosophical content of information culture

Relevant works	Society	Constructs	Solutions
Ginman (1993)	Finland	open culture	Timely response to the context
Castells, 2000	Spain	information network	Affirmation of value, formation of an alternative
Oliver & Foscarini, 2014	Australia	background and context, the value to records, information preferences, "people problem"	Adjustment of information culture strategy
Muzyka & Kravtsov, 2022	Ukraine	"logosphere", new rationality	Transition to the state "for-itself"
Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017	EU	information disorder	Clear ethical guidelines for information sharing
Damasceno, 2021	USA	participatory culture, disinformation disorder	Multiliteracies

Source: Compiled by the author based on a literature review.

The tabular presentation of the review of key publications allows quickly comprehending the historical and theoretical context of the problem field. It should be noted that the selection of constructs is realized by the category of representation of the solution, which selects the strategy of the designated ethno-cultural group. The various perspectives and approaches to solving the problem of implementing a cultural standard demonstrate the complexity and contextuality of the topic. In accordance with a specific socio-cultural basis, it is advisable to reproduce and continue the research tradition, as well as

to completely destroy it. The nature of the cognitive process will be determined by the requirements of social dynamics.

Research Methodology

The article implements a dialectical methodology of epistemological research aimed at synthesising approaches to understanding information culture. This method makes it possible to create a subsidiary model of the cultural standard of information in a broader view, which is not limited to the categories of the initial perspectives. Based on the fundamental principles of the method (thesis, antithesis, synthesis, exposition), the author defines a theoretical framework that facilitates a meaningful critique of the genesis of information culture and its impact on the dynamics of the relationship between information, culture and society. The chosen research approach provides an encapsulation of the constructs that form the epistemological reality of the information society and can clarify the socio-philosophical definition of the topic. Using the method of dialectic, the authors reveal the hidden tension inherent in different traditions of conceptualisation of the concept.

Research Results

RQ₁ : What is the intersection of culture and information in the realities of the information society?

A clear description of the intersection of culture and information is limited by its contextuality. For example, Nath considers the content of information in terms of the component of social reality that plays a leading role in a particular cognitive task. The description can be realised “in terms of the probabilities of occurrence of symbols and its quantity is measured in bits” (2017, p. 21). At the same time, each symbol or the frequency of its occurrence may lose its meaning due to the cultural context, the saturation of the space with meanings, or their nature. That is, culture will serve as a determinant of information, since information is a component of the cultural field. At the same time, attempts to operationalise through the domains of information operations reveal the essence of culture as a way (Chen et al., 2020). Moreover, values play a key role in this case, which shows the cultural conditionality of certain methods of “being with information”. It is incomplete to define information culture through instrumentality (culture of interaction with information) or contextuality (cultural field of information), since the process of constructing reality involves synergy. However, the primacy of culture over information as a way of generating information is undeniable (Bedford & Kucharska, 2020).

The term “information society” is currently used to define information culture. However, there is no consensus on the definition or characteristics of this form of society. Attempts to conceptualize the features of such a society are again limited by the perspective of cognition (Lupač, 2018). Nevertheless, the restructuring of the internal structure contributes to the understanding of this concept. The construction of knowledge and the economy based on information products and information services guarantee the creation of a new niche, information workers. The corresponding expansion of the social paradigm contributes to the formation of new connections and the transformation of the hierarchy (Piwowski, 2020). It is also important to note that the new groups are not homogeneous in terms of cultural descriptions, and the ways of interaction that have emerged do not provide sufficient insight into the information orientation of the new culture. Information handling is the basis for the formation of new institutions, the production process is based on the value of information production, but it is difficult to determine the relationship between information and culture through the definitions of the social. Moreover, this category is subject to manipulation in the political process, given the lack of a clear conceptual framework. Innovation without substantive justification is justified in terms of the values of the “information society” (Blom et al., 2020). Therefore, an acceptable simplification is to define information transactions through bonds.

However, this way of describing requires more details. Information handling as an integral component in this context includes the entire range of operations that a particular symbolic system can

provide. That is, it is not only about storage, synthesis, coding, and other forms, but also about their orientation. A certain ideological axis (political, cultural, or philosophical) or specific agents (governmental structure, mass media, research group) that determine the nature of operations have a rather large impact on the product that is being formed. Accordingly, the antithesis regarding the intentionality of such operations is meaningful. There is no guarantee of preserving information in a cultural context, since its agents have the power to select operations. In fact, proliferation and polarization are illustrative of natural manifestations of such a distortion of the information channel (Hills, 2019). Therefore, it is appropriate to describe them as a component of information culture. It is noteworthy that quantitative assessments are mostly insufficient in the context of cultural transformations caused by the transition to a post-industrial society, so the issue of internal structure remains relevant.

It is important to emphasise the multidimensional nature of culture as a phenomenon (Hofstede, 2001). There are often attempts to oversimplify culture, especially in the context of organisational culture. Such reduction limits the understanding of the subtle interplay of cultural elements and their contribution to the social reality of post-industrial society. In particular, these oversimplifications in the English-speaking world are manifested in the populist identification of the agent (a certain person, group or culture that determines the nature of operations) and the operation (as a process of interaction between culture and information). Obviously, this raises the issue of the bio cyclic episteme. If we consider a particular algorithm as an institution of information culture, but not a means of selection, it is necessary to determine what is the cornerstone characteristic of the cultural. The output symbolic product may not preserve the original information and given the dependence of the information society on such a product, we can talk about the personalization of constructed realities (Just & Latzer, 2017). For example, algorithmic bias and filter bubbles can limit access to diverse viewpoints and reinforce existing cultural hierarchies. Thus, the question of whether culture is the result of a specific selection or describes the actual selection process implemented in society becomes relevant. Currently, the research process presents two relevant clusters of definitions: information culture as a cultural environment in which the cornerstone process that characterises the information environment (contextuality) is realised or a set of values and ideas that determine this process (Oliver, 2017).

Using a dialectical approach, it is possible to arrive at a complex conceptualization of information culture as a combination of the information that constitutes the context and the set of guiding values and ideological constructs that define it. This synthesis emphasizes the symbiotic relationship between contextual structure and underlying principles, which together shape the way information is decoded, disseminated, and used within distinct cultural paradigms. By considering the interconnectedness of these elements, the philosophical discourse on information culture is enriched, contributing to an understanding of the phenomenon as having a dyadic nature, which is constantly influenced and shaped by the dynamic interaction between the cultural landscape and the normative values that dictate the unfolding of information-related processes.

RQ₂ : How does the formation of a new information culture determine our epistemological reality?

Changes in epistemological reality can be clarified through the concept of knowledge. It should be noted that this category goes beyond the concept of information. Information in its original form can be viewed through various descriptive systems, but retains its fundamental reflective quality. Instead, knowledge is a way of embodying isolated data points, a way of counteracting entropy (Shannon, 1948). The metamorphosis of information into knowledge occurs when these heterogeneous elements are subjected to interpretation (Dretske, 1981). It is at this stage of the alchemical process of comprehension - that is, filling the meaning with a certain sense - that the formative influence of information culture is manifested. Since experience plays an important role in the implementation of

information in its perceptual and perceptual context of knowledge creation or reproduction, culture is a determinant. In particular, the agent of culture, through representation, guarantees the embodiment of data points in the social symbolic system (Jovchelovitch, 2019). However, given that the agent of representation is the main source, a personalized reality is formed (Keen, 2007). In this context, it is appropriate to define knowledge as presented information.

On the other hand, considering the agent's perceptuality, the primary role of information as a reality that determines the way of representation is affirmed (Floridi, 2019). In this case, agency partially loses its ultimate meaning, as the network of information can produce impersonal knowledge that is in line with the cultural norm (Mainzer, 2018). Since information can be both real and ideal, this allows for a dyadic definition of the phenomenon under study. In this case, the culture of information handling can be considered both a context and a method. Accordingly, the formation of a new information culture, which is highlighted in the paper, generates a concomitant transformation in the ways of obtaining, processing, and interpreting knowledge as a projection of information. The construction of epistemological reality is dependent on socio-cultural norms.

To summarise, it is knowledge that adapts to the changing contours of truth, given its interpretive nature. In this context, the concept of knowledge acts as a prism through which to reflect the ramifications of evolving information cultures (Capurro, 2009). Collective and individual epistemic landscapes depend on the socio-cultural structure that mediates the assimilation and transformation of data and information into contextually relevant and actionable ideas. Thus, knowledge reflects the dynamic interaction of the cultural environment, dominant epistemological paradigms, and social networks of meaning-making and interpretation. Naturally, the method of knowledge creation can be seen as a cornerstone aspect, more significant than the information itself, given its social nature (Janich, 2018). Thus, the presented antithesis confirms the rationality of knowledge in symbolic social logic, which is not reduced to the category of episteme, but provides an exhaustive description of it (Nikitenko, 2018).

However, at the next stage, the transmission of information, the problem of the recipient is actualized. The multiple dominance of knowledge as an ideal form implies dialogicity. Consequently, the relationship with the cultural landscape has a concrete embodiment. Therefore, the epistemological reality of post-industrial society is also determined by communication. The dynamics of communication as a conductor and, at the same time, a transformer are highlighted in the category of agency, but the way of interaction is also important (O'Sullivan & Carr, 2018). The creation of new ways of communication is a catalyst for the reconfiguration of the episteme. The individual is forced to deconstruct established paradigms and explore a new information perspective. The standard of interaction is lost under the pressure of numerous alternatives. Moreover, identity is being erased, which is now becoming not just social, but networked (Turkle, 2011).

In contrast, the concept of post-digital identity is emerging as a reflection of the superimposition of computerized "on-off" logic on social logic (Pepperell & Punt, 2000, p. 2). Since the new information-oriented culture implies the disruption of the continuity of the individual's existence, the intervention of discrete logic, and social reality, in turn, tends to self-preservation, there is a tendency to biologise information culture. In this case, we are not talking about reduction, but about the ultimate orientation of operations. The way information is handled is postulated by its functionality from the perspective of society's vital activity (Uda, 2020). The signal as a separate element, a data point, is separated from the symbol, which can be seen as a procedural characteristic of the signal in a particular constellation. In this way, the symbolic system is seen as a way of adapting to the realities of social reality. And since adaptation implies not only reproduction but also construction, information culture serves as a norm and a tool for changing epistemological reality in equal measure (Manola, 2019).

RQ₃ : Where is the limit of ethicality of the information culture of post-industrial society?

The cultural standard is faced with the fundamental question of the usefulness of knowledge. The tradition of biodigital reflects an important aspect of the intentionality of information culture - the distinction between practical knowledge (focused on maintaining the status quo) and useful knowledge (aimed at development) (Jonson, 2007). In particular, it is also in the desire of specialists to assess the feasibility of this approach (Peters et al., 2021). Thus, the development of the post-digital era and its corresponding culture requires a balance of knowledge to address current needs and deeper issues that require the transformation of society (Jandrić, 2021). In fact, when navigating the new culture (in the sense of the environment), the subject agent will primarily focus on truly useful knowledge, which is why he or she will implement instrumental cultural principles. Accordingly, the transparency of the information epic will contribute to the meaningful separation of useful and dangerous (Benkler, 2006). And since information will not become an integral part of knowledge, but will retain its discreteness, selection will remain the basis of culture. In particular, the agent will act as a situational censor. Moreover, selection algorithms will ensure the counter-suggestiveness of society or an individual actor. The question of accessibility as a derivative of the selection process remains open (Castells, 2010).

It is worth noting that the ethical principles of the cultural can be considered through the natural substrate of counter-suggestion. The representation of culture through the linguistic level, given the applied significance of this system, leads to a loss of information about the dynamics of its biological development (Johnson et al., 2021). In fact, opinion as a natural correlate of information is a projection of the energy generated by changes in the constellation. Accordingly, selection is the basis of information culture, and social construction of knowledge is a way to optimize it through the norm. At the same time, the following antithesis is appropriate: the evolution of information culture is a standard of social adaptation to the environment, but the essence of change is not reduced to the direct consequences of environmental changes. It is possible to identify characteristic internal trends that determine the appropriate level of cultural inertia (Piwowarski, 2019). In other words, the ethical framework may not be respected during a paradigm shift, given the heterochronicity of selective processes. It is necessary to purposefully produce standards (Zuboff, 2019). Information as an independent reality retains the connotation, in particular, the negative one, that is inherent in its representation (Markos et al., 2018). The synthesis of these positions has been realised by the changes of the COVID-19 pandemic. The intensification of digital interaction at this stage has demonstrated the importance of collective research in defining cultural boundaries. The common information field formed by multimodality of communication and pluralism of knowledge has become not only a cultural context but also an environment of editorial offices, i.e., the embodiment of information standards (Willinsky 2017).

Discussion

Since the bond quality of post-industrial society is its focus on the information system, the problem of cultural norms is a determinant of its epistemological reality. The operational orientation of the modern society emphasises the limitations in the definition of information as the main resource and product, but affirms the idea of cultural conditionality of development processes (Schneider, 2017). Accordingly, the emphasis on the intensity of the latter, which can be traced in the work of Żywucka-Kozłowska and Dziembowski (2021), is consistent with the context of the restructuring of the culture of our time. The evolution of the concept of information culture reflects the transformations in the ways of interacting with it, which lay the foundation for the targeted improvement of the common reality beyond the information dimension. In addition, the presented conceptualisation of information culture as a dynamic, open system, in particular, with regard to the category of ethics, is superimposed on the postulates of cultural diversity (Diller, 2018). It is worth noting that the concept of dyadic essence does not contradict current methods of value-based interventions (Donelli, 2019). Thus, the description of

culture as a form of information existence (contextuality) and the ideological structure of its operation (instrumentality) provides a wider space for structural and functional analysis without divergence from social practice. This dualism simultaneously demonstrates the comprehensiveness of the phenomenon, but also details the channels of influence on individual and collective reality. Thus, the transformative potential generated by alternatives emphasizes the need for societies to actively transform information landscapes (Murphie & Potts, 2017).

The way people interact with knowledge as information integrated into culture determines the prospects for further development of the educational paradigm. In this context, the latter reflects the leading communication channel for the retransmission of the information standard. Given that a certain intersection of culture and information transforms the epistemological social reality, the concepts of co-creation of knowledge can be detailed through the presented constructs (Freedman, 2018). And the defined connection between the ethical boundary and the selectivity of operations is the basis for the implementation of the idea of the editing space in the collaborative research approach (Stull, 2019). In addition, the category of the information society as a new standard of social hierarchy, taking into account the culture of information processing, serves as a basis for modifying interventions aimed at the socio-psychological level of the organisation (Hiekkataipale & Lämsä, 2019).

In conclusion, the highlighted socio-philosophical concept of the formation of a new information culture retains the balanced matrix that does not imply dominance in the system, as noted by Castells (2000). Therefore, it is advisable analysing the analysis of specific forms and technologies of cultural influence on the collective representation of reality as a prospect for further work. It will be meaningful to highlight the prospects for counteracting cultural bias in defining ethical boundaries. In particular, it is important to pay attention to the aspect of selectivity of information culture, which contributes to the disproportion of the emergence of symbolic embodiment of values and shapes dominant cultural perspectives. However, it is very important to recognize that the outlined boundaries can be subjective as well as subjective and have a pronounced contextual definition. Accordingly, there is a problem of studying the trends of glocalisation and assimilation of cultural constructions in the context of technologisation and informatization of social reality.

Conclusions and Implications

The cultural development of the information society, which is shaped by information operations, requires the merger of contextuality and instrumentality as the defining qualities of information culture. This merger generates a unique interaction between the cultural environment and the values that determine the nature of the selection of operations, ultimately forming the information landscape. The landscape, while retaining the properties of an open system, anchors the epistemological norms of reality, while functioning as a transformative force for that same reality. This dual role emphasises the complexity and recursive nature of information culture as a product and agent of change in the realities of the constant construction of knowledge. In turn, ethical boundaries that postulate the norm of accessibility of operations are inextricably linked to the selectivity of information culture. This selectivity not only supports the social framework, but also facilitates the distinction between appropriate and unacceptable content, ensuring the retransmission of values in the post-digital space.

Finally, the social aspect of information culture gives rise to a collective space for modifying the content, identifying the necessary revisions, and revising epistemological norms. Joint efforts guarantee a dynamic balance between the individual and the social, contributing to the continuous evolution of the information ecosystem in accordance with ethical imperatives and the revision of imperatives in accordance with constructed knowledge. To summarise, the complex interdependencies between information systems, epistemological reality, and ethical boundaries in the information society reveal

the dyadic nature of culture. As both a driving force and a product of social change, information culture is constantly reconstructing the ethical, social and epistemological dimensions of human experience. In particular, this article, as a representation of the knowledge constructed in the flow of transformations, at the same time contributes to the further development of postulated ideas and values.

1. The main characteristic of the information society is its focus on information management;
2. Information culture is a dyad of the information environment that shapes the culture (contextuality) and the systems of values and structures of ideas that determine the way information is handled (instrumentality);
3. Information culture sets the norm of epistemological reality and imposes itself on it, while transforming this reality;
4. Ethical boundaries are realised by the main property of information culture - selectivity;
5. The social nature of information culture provides a common space for editing content in accordance with ethical imperatives.

References

- Aboaoga, M., Aziz, M. J. A., & Mohamed, I. (2020). A conceptual model of institutional information culture and interpersonal conflict which influence the information system success: user's perception. *International Journal of Business information systems*, 33(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBIS.2020.104801>.
- Bedford, D. A., & Kucharska, W. (2020). Relating information culture to information policies and management strategies. IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-4315-3>.
- Beniger, J. (2009). *The control revolution: Technological and economic origins of the information society*. Harvard university press.
- Benkler, Y. (2006). *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*. Yale University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08997760701193787>.
- Bessarab, A., Mitchuk, O., Baranetska, A., Kodatska, N., Kvasnytsia, O., & Mykytiv, G. (2021). Social networks as a phenomenon of the information society. *Journal of Optimization in Industrial Engineering*, 14(Special Issue), 17-24. <https://doi.org/10.22094/JOIE.2020.677811>.
- Capurro, R. (2017). Digitization as an ethical challenge. *AI & Soc* 32, 277-283. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-016-0686-z>.
- Castells, M. (2000). Materials for an exploratory theory of the network society. *The British journal of sociology*, 51(1), 5-24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2000.00005.x>.
- Castells, M. (2010). Globalisation, networking, urbanisation: Reflections on the spatial dynamics of the information age. *Urban studies*, 47(13), 2737-2745. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098010377365>.
- Chen, L., Zhang, X. and Li, Z. (2020), Understanding the Chinese information culture and its impact on IT perceptions. *Information Technology & People*, 33(1). 56-82. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-03-2018-0128>.

- Damasceno, C. S. (2021). Multiliteracies for Combating Information Disorder and Fostering Civic Dialogue. *Social Media + Society*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120984444>.
- Dattakumar, A., Chong, G., Malone, L., Sharma, R. S., & Valenzuela, J. F. (2016). Knowledge societies and their role in sustainable development. In 2016 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management (IEEM) (pp. 681-685). <https://doi.org/10.1109/IEEM.2016.7797962>.
- Diller, J. V. (2018). *Cultural diversity: A primer for the human services*. Cengage Learning.
- Donelli, F. (2019). Persuading through culture, values, and ideas. *Insight Turkey*, 21(3), 113-134. <https://doi.org/10.25253/99.2019EV.04>.
- Dretske, F. (1981). The pragmatic dimension of knowledge. *Philos Stud* 40, 363-378. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00646423>.
- Floridi, L. (2019). *The logic of information: A theory of philosophy as conceptual design*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198833635.001.0001>.
- Fonseca Escudero, D., Conde-González, M. Á., & García-Peñalvo, F. J. (2018). Improving the information society skills: Is knowledge accessible for all? *Universal Access in the Information Society*, 17(2), 229-245. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10209-017-0548-6>.
- Freedman, K. (2018). Art education as social production: Culture, society, and politics in the formation of curriculum. In T. S. Popkewitz (Eds.), *The formation of school subjects* (pp. 63-84). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429454165>.
- Godinho, M. A., Borda, A., Kariotis, T., Molnar, A., Kostkova, P., & Liaw, S.-T. (2021). Knowledge co-creation in participatory policy and practice: Building community through data-driven direct democracy. *Big Data & Society*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517211019430>.
- Hiekkataipale, M. M., & Lämsä, A. M. (2019). (A) moral agents in organisations? The significance of ethical organisation culture for middle managers' exercise of moral agency in ethical problems. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 155(1), 147-161. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3511-9>.
- Hills, T. T. (2019). The dark side of information proliferation. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 14(3), 323-330. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691618803647>.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's recent consequences: Using dimension scores in theory and research. *International Journal of cross cultural management*, 1(1), 11-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147059580111002>.
- Jandrić, P. *Biology, Information, Society*. *Postdigit Sci Educ* 3, 261-265 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-021-00220-0>
- Jandrić, P., & Ford, D. R. (Eds.). (2022). *Postdigital Ecopedagogies: Genealogies, Contradictions, and Possible Futures*. Springer Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-97262-2>.
- Janich, P. (2018). *What is information?* (Vol. 55). U of Minnesota Press.
- Johnson, M., Maitland, E. & Torday, J. (2021). Covid-19 and the Epigenetics of Learning. *Postdigit Sci Educ* 3, 389-406. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-020-00190-9>

- Johnson, R. (2007). 'Really useful knowledge': Radical education and working-class culture 1790–1848. In CCCS Selected Working Papers (pp. 769-796). Routledge.
- Jovchelovitch, S. (2019). Knowledge in context: Representations, community and culture. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315173368>.
- Just, N., & Latzer, M. (2017). Governance by algorithms: reality construction by algorithmic selection on the Internet. *Media, culture & society*, 39(2), 238-258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443716643157>.
- Keen, B. D. (2007). Sticky Price And Sticky Information Price-Setting Models: What Is The Difference?. *Economic Inquiry*, 45(4), 770-786. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-7295.2007.00045.x>.
- Lupač, P. (2018). Beyond the digital divide: Contextualizing the information society. Emerald Group Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1108/9781787565470>.
- Mainzer, K. (2018). The digital and the real world. *Computational foundations of mathematics, science, technology, and philosophy*. <https://doi.org/10.1142/10583>.
- Manola, M. (2019). The Impact of Information Society and Cyber-Culture in Greek Tourism Phenomenon. *Informatica Economica*, 23(1), 61-71. <https://doi.org/10.12948/issn14531305/23.1.2019.06>.
- Markos, E., Labrecque, L. I., & Milne, G. R. (2018). A new information lens: The self-concept and exchange context as a means to understand information sensitivity of anonymous and personal identifying information. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 42(1), 46-62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2018.01.004>.
- Mukred, A., Singh, D., & Safie, N. (2017). Investigating the impact of information culture on the adoption of information system in public health sector of developing countries. *International Journal of Business Information Systems*, 24(3), 261-284. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBIS.2017.082036>.
- Murphie, A., & Potts, J. (2017). Culture and technology. Bloomsbury Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-08938-0>.
- Nikitenko, V. (2018). Education as a factor of creative personality establishment and development in information society. *Humanitarian Bulletin of Zaporizhzhia State Engineering Academy*, (74), 150-158. <https://doi.org/10.30839/2072-7941.2018.149674>.
- O'Sullivan, P. B., & Carr, C. T. (2018). Masspersonal communication: A model bridging the mass-interpersonal divide. *New media & society*, 20(3), 1161-1180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816686104>.
- Oliver, G. (2017). Understanding information culture: conceptual and implementation issues. *Journal of information science theory and practice*, 5(1), 6-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1633/JISTaP.2017.5.1.1>
- Pepperell, R., & Punt, M. (2000). The postdigital membrane: Imagination, technology and desire. Intellect Books. <https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.4499.4241>.
- Peters, M. A., Jandrić, P., & Hayes, S. (2022). Biodigital philosophy, technological convergence, and postdigital knowledge ecologies. In Peters, M.A., Jandrić, P., Hayes, S. (Eds.), *Bioinformational philosophy and postdigital knowledge ecologies* (pp. 3-22). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-95006-4_1.
- Piwowski, J. (2019). The security (culture) rhombus. Redefining security environment. *Kultura Bezpieczeństwa. Nauka-Praktyka-Refleksje*, (34), 141-154. <https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0013.5190>.

- Piwowarski, J. (2020). Information Society and the Protective Influence of Security Culture. In Ramírez, J.M., Biziewski, J. (Eds.), *A Shift in the Security Paradigm. Advanced Sciences and Technologies for Security Applications* (pp. 209–234). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-43253-9_13.
- Schneider, K. (2017). Taking data-driven decision making to the next level. In N. A. Valcik, J. A. Johnson (Eds.), *Institutional Research Initiatives in Higher Education* (pp. 100-115). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315136042>
- Shaikan, V., Datsko, K., Ivaniuk, N., & Batiuk, A. (2020, March). Collaborationism and War Crimes as Phenomena in the Information Society. In III International Scientific Congress Society of Ambient Intelligence 2020 (ISC-SAI 2020) (pp. 116–126). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.200318.015>.
- Shannon, C. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell system technical journal*, 27(3), 379-423. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x>.
- Stoica, M., Ghilic-Micu, B., & Mircea, M. (2019). Restarting the information society based on blockchain technology. *Informatica Economica*, 23(3), 39–48. <https://doi.org/10.12948/issn14531305/23.3.2019.04>.
- Stull, D. D. (2019). *Collaborative research and social change: Applied anthropology in action*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429040573>.
- Turkle, S. (2011). *Evocative objects: Things we think with*. MIT press.
- Uda, S. (2020). Application of information theory in systems biology. *Biophysical reviews*, 12(2), 377-384. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12551-020-00665-w>.
- Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). *Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policymaking* (Vol. 27, pp. 1-107). Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Webster, F., Blom, R., Karvonen, E., Puoskari, E., Melin, H., & Nordenstreng, K. (Eds.). (2004). *The information society reader*. Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203622278>.
- Widén, G., & Karim, M. (2018). Role of information culture in workplace information literacy: a literature review. In A. Mobasheri, J. Li, J. Jr. Nakahara (Eds.), *Information Literacy in the Workplace: 5th European Conference* (pp. 21-29). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74334-9_3.
- Willinsky, J. (2017). *The intellectual properties of learning: A prehistory from Saint Jerome to John Locke*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/9780226488080>.
- Zuboff, S. (2019, January). Surveillance capitalism and the challenge of collective action. In *New labor forum* (Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 10-29). Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1095796018819461>.
- Żywucka-Kozłowska, E., & Dziembowski, R. (2021). Społeczeństwo informacyjne w perspektywie wybranych aktów prawnych Unii Europejskiej. *Media - Kultura - Komunikacja Społeczna*, 3(16), 77–90. <https://doi.org/10.31648/mkks.6620>.