Turnitin Originality Report

makale by Burçin Yersel

From makale (deneme)

> Processed on 04-Mar-2019 18:16 +03
> ID: 1087447113
> Word Count: 3849

Similarity Index	Similarity by Source		
	Internet Sources:		1%
5%	Publications:		5%
	Student Papers:		N/A

---

sources:

1   1% match (publications)

International Journal of Bank Marketing, Volume 26, Issue 4 (2008-06-30)

---

2   1% match (publications)

Teo, T.S.H.. "Adopters and non-adopters of business-to-business electronic commerce in Singapore", Information & Management, 200412

---

3   1% match (publications)

Everett M Rogers. "Diffusion of preventive innovations", Addictive Behaviors, 2002

---

4   < 1% match (publications)

Akhter Ali. "The Adoption of Genetically Modified Cotton and Poverty Reduction in Pakistan", Journal of Agricultural Economics, 02/2010

---

5   < 1% match (Internet from 27-Oct-2002)

http://www.cdt.luth.se/~dick/UtDirekt/EdMedia98/Final.html

---

6   < 1% match (publications)

Fernando, A.A.J., and I.M. Pandey. "Corporate social responsibility reporting: a survey of listed Sri Lankan companies", J for International Business and Entrepreneurship Development, 2012.

---

7   < 1% match (publications)

Firouzjaie, A. Ahmadi, H. Sadighi, and M. A. Mohammadi. "The Influence of Social Capital on Adoption of Rural Development Programs by Farmers in the Caspian Sea Region of Iran", American Journal of Agricultural and Biological Sciences, 2007.

---

8   < 1% match (publications)

S. M. Chan-Olmsted. "Audience knowledge, perceptions and factors affecting the adoption intent of terrestrial digital television", New Media & Society, 10/01/2006

---

9   < 1% match (publications)

International Journal of Operations & Production Management, Volume 26, Issue 2 (2006-09-19)

---

10   < 1% match (publications)

Manuela Pérez Pérez, Angel Martínez Sánchez, Pilar de Luis Carnicer, María José Vela Jiménez. "The synergism of teleworking and information and communication technologies",

Journal of Enterprise Information Management, 2005

| 11 | < 1% match (publications) |

Daniel W Surry, Susan M Land. "Strategies for Motivating Higher Education Faculty to Use Technology", Innovations in Education and Training International, 2010

| 12 | < 1% match (publications) |

Jianhua Zhao, Yingjian Jiang. "A Factor Analysis on the Differences of Group Learning between Classroom-Based and Web-Based Learning Environments", 2008 International Workshop on Education Technology and Training & 2008 International Workshop on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 2008

| 13 | < 1% match (publications) |

Hollingsworth, Leslie Doty. "Africentric Theory as a Predictor of Adoption Among African Americans : An Exploratory Study", Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 2000.

| 14 | < 1% match (publications) |

Sonja Grabner-Kräuter. "Assessing the Probability of Internet Banking Adoption", Advances in Advertising Research (Vol 1), 2010

| 15 | < 1% match (publications) |

Constantiou, I.D.. "Economic factors and diffusion of IP telephony: Empirical evidence from an advanced market", Telecommunications Policy, 200804/05

| 16 | < 1% match (publications) |

Jaemin Jung, Sylvia Chan-Olmsted, Bellnine Park, Youngju Kim. "Factors affecting e-book reader awareness, interest, and intention to use", New Media & Society, 2011

paper text:

International Journal of Human Sciences 1 ISSN:2458-9489 Volume 16 Issue 1 Year: 2019 3 2 4 Adoption factors of digital TV platforms in Turkey 1 Burçin Yersel The main aim of this study is to understand digital TV platform adopters' media usage and adopting factors by identifying their profile in Turkey. According to this aim, it was tried to find out the demographic characteristics of digital TV broadcasting adopters, media usage level and the factors of adopting. In addition, it was tried to find out demographic variables, media usage frequency differences between adopters of digital TV platform and non-adopters. The result of analysis shows that, while it was found

4**significant differences between adopters' and non-adopters'** education; was **not**

found

13**significant differences between adopters' and non-adopters' age**

and sex. There is no

1**significant differences between adopters' and non-adopters'** media uses. According **to** the results **of**

factor analysıs shows that there are 5 reason to adopting digital TV platform. Abstract Keywords: Technologic adoption, new media, digital broadcasting, interactive TV, digital TV platforms Introduction Nowadays, digital technology is all around our daily life. The life is changing together in the same speed with the technology. Most of the people in the world lives mobile. New facilities and opportunities like interaction, easiness and speed bring given to people by digital mobile technologies. Although the television seems like traditional media it had a big convergence with digital technology. Since 2000 we have able to place television in the new media category. Although the rapid change of the technology television can able to keep its popularity in households. Television as a new media gave new opportunities to the viewers. Swedlow (2006) argues that by the digital television broadcasting, television transformed into more participant, using for more infotainment, nonlinear, 1 The study is an expanded version of the paper, which was prepared from the PhD thesis titled "Digitalization in information age and adoption to the new technology: The case of digital television broadcasting in Turkey", which was accepted by the social sciences institute of the Anadolu universities in 2008, and

11**presented at the 22nd Annual Conference of International** Academy of **Business**

Disciplines (IABD) 2010. ? Associate Professor, Eskişehir Teknik Üniversitesi, Porsuk MYO, bispir@eskisehir.edu.tr focus more advertising, and two-way information platform. Television is positioned as a device that 18 is used for information and communication by the viewer. Interaction in the television defined as 19 new TV viewing experience that viewer able to control over what, when and how he/she watch or 20 actively participate the program (Jensen, 2001, p.352). In Turkey, digital television broadcasting 21 started delivering programs to the viewer via digital platforms at beginning of 2000's. late of 2010's 22 digital platform broadcasting diffused by different suppliers. With digital platforms, facilities such as 23 interactivity, the watching ability of coded programs can be served to the subscribers. The digital 24 platform subscribers' experiences and perception which determines transforming from analog TV 25 broadcasting to digital broadcasting, will effect diffusion of this broadcasting technology. 26 27 Early majority of Digital TV platform Subscribers 28 The special features of digital TV platforms gives new dimensions uses and positions of TV 29 as an interactive mass communication vehicle. However it's not well known how the special features 30 of digital TV broadcasting will affect existence of this new technology. Because the thoughts of 31 people, who are the first user of new technology and known as "critical mass", are an important 32 factor define the life of new technology. The first studies about adoption and diffusion of new 33 technologies was done by Everett M. Rogers. The theory of "diffusion of innovation" of Rogers is 34 an area of communication studies which try to explain how the new technologies adopting by the 35 people and how innovations diffusing in the society (Mutlu, 1998, p.371). Diffusion of innovation 36 theory explains how the users moved the new technologies to the others, evaluated new technologies 37 and adopted (Kang, 2002: 1995). Diffusion of innovations theory that foregrounds technology and 38 ideology was introduced by Rogers and Shoemaker in 1973. Rogers revised the theory according to 39 the new communication technology in 1995 and argues five stages for innovation decision process: 40 Knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation and confirmation (Rogers, 2003, p.169). 41 Diffusion of innovation speed is important factor for diffusion of new technology. Because 42 the factors that affect diffusion of innovation speed, also affects the ratio of adoption of innovation. 43 These factors

16**are relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability and observability.**

Receivers 44 adopt an innovation in a short time if the innovation has more

15**relative advantage, compatibility,** 45 **complexity, trialability and observability** than **the**

others (Mahler and Rogers, 1999, p.723). Rogers 46 (2003, p.279) define five adopter categories in the innovation of diffusion theory. These are 47 innovators,

5**early adopters, early majority, late majority, laggards. Individuals in** these **categories differ**

48 from others according to their various characteristics (Kang, 2002, p.196). The criterion for adopter 49 categorization is innovativeness,

3**the degree to which an individual or other unit of adoption is** 50 **relatively** early **in adopting new ideas than other members of social system**

(Rogers, 2003, p.280). 51 According to Rogers (2003, p.281) 2.5% of individuals in a system are innovators, 13.5% of 52 individuals are early adopters, 34% of individuals are early majority, 34% of individuals are late 53 majority and 16% of individuals are laggards. 54 Demographic characteristics such as personality, education, social economic status, age, etc. 55 of individuals in these categories differ from each other. For example, while late majority can be 56 defined as individuals who have low income, more conservative, negative attitudes toward new 57 technologies, innovators can be defined as individuals who have more income, curious, positive 58 attitudes toward new technologies (Rogers, 2003, p.281–283; Dupagne, 1999, p.40). Studies about 59 diffusion of innovation focused mostly characteristics of individuals who tend to adopt new 60 technology. Diffusion of innovation theory defines adopters of new media as more daring, less 61 dogmatic, and more risk taken individuals in order to satisfy their self-needs (Atkin et al, 2003, p.162). 62 The studies based on adopter categories of Rogers focused on innovators and early majority. 63 Innovators are passionate lover of technology and adopt new technology for their enjoyment. We 64 can define innovators as a passionate lover of technology who is the first adopter of the new 65 technology. Early majority is curious adopters following innovators. Early majority group determine 66 the continuity of the product (Chan-Olmsted at al. 2005, p.331). Demographic characteristics and media usage behavior was investigated as a predictor of new media adoption in the new technology adoption studies. In these studies generally independent variables are demographic variables, media 69 usages, technology ownership, adoption need, and satisfaction, depended variable is adoption 70 categories (Chan-Olmsted at al. 2005, p.328). 71 72 Digital TV Platform Broadcasting and Viewers in Turkey 73 Digital TV platform broadcasting can be called as new communication technology in Turkey. 74 Digital platform subscribers' penetration rate was 7% (2010) and now its % 41 (2018). In 2010 75 there was only one digital broadcasting platform but in 2018 there are 8 digital tv broadcasting and 76 IPTV platforms. Different channels and interactivity opportunities are given to the subscribers. With 77 the name of "The Digital Eyes of Turkey" research which

was made by Twentify shows some media 78 usage and demographic results about digital tv platform subscribers. According to the research on 79 digital tv platform subscribers in Turkey shows that social economic status are effective variables on 80 adoption process. a of the subscribers have higher social economic status. According to this 81 research shows that the content of the broadcasting platform and channels are effective variables for 82 choosing the subscription of a platform. Sex is not an effective variable for using this technology. In 83 2012 while viewers were watching 222 minutes, in the year of 2017, 330 minutes were watched on 84 tv. According to new and mobile technology watching tv is an involuntary attitude in Turkey. 85 Nowadays when we look to the penetration rate we can say that these subscribers can be called as 86 early majority. Digital platform subscribers' perception about this diffusing technology, also these 87 subscribers can be called as critical mass; will determine the future of this broadcasting technology in 88 Turkey. 89 90 Methodology 91 The main aim of this study is to understand digital TV broadcasting adopters' media usage and 92 adoption factors by identifying their profile in Turkey. According to this aim, following research 93 questions was determined. 94 ? What are the demographic profiles (age, sex, education) of digital TV platform adopters? 95 ? Are there any significant differences between demographic profiles of digital TV 96 broadcasting adopters and demographic profiles of non-adopters? 97 ? Are there any significant differences between media usage frequency of digital TV 98 broadcasting adopters and media usage frequency of non-adopters? 99 ? What are the adopting factors of digital TV platform adopters? 100 Respondents were selected with Systematic random sampling technique from the Anadolu 101 University workers. Survey was distributed 819 respondents via mail. 513 surveys returned. Response 102 rate is 63%. Survey has three parts. In the first part, demographic variables (age, sex, education) were 103 collected. Age is continuous variable; sex and education categorical variable. The second part of the 104 survey includes media usage level. In this stage TV watching, newspaper and magazine reading, uses 105 of internet, and movie going frequency were asked. The third part of survey includes a scale to find 106 out the factors of adoption. 107 In order to statistical analysis a new nominal variable was created by coding digital platform 108 subscribes as adopters and non-subscribers as non-adopters. The category named adopters coverage 109 innovators, early adopter and early majority of Rogers' adoption category. The category named non- 110 adopters coverage late majority and laggards. For the statistical tests, T-test, independence chi-square 111 test and Principles Component Factor analysis was used according to the variable type. 112 113 Results 114 The mean of age is 33.5 for adopters and 32.1 for non-adopters. To find out difference 115 between adopter and non-adopter according to the age, T-test was used. The T-test results can be 116 seen in Table 1. T-test results show that while

2**there is no significant difference between** mean of **adopters'** age **and non-adopters.**

119 Table 1. T- test results

4**between adopters and non-adopters** according to **the** age Variable Adopting **categories**

N Mean t p Age Adopters 99 33.54 Non-adopters 408 32.15 1.548 0.124 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 *p<0,05 64% of adopters are women, 36% of male. 53% of non-adopters are women, 47% of are male. Chi-square independence test was used to find out

1**differences between adopters and non- adopters** according **to the**

sex. According to

> 9**the chi-square test** results **there** is **no significant** relationship **between** adopters' sex **and**

non-adopters' sex (X2= 3.519, df=1 p>0.01). Additionally, Chi-square independence test was used to find out

> 1**differences between adopters and non-adopters** according **to the**

education. According to the chi-square test results

> 2**there is significant** relationship **between adopters'** education **and non-adopters'**

education (X2= 40.310; df= 5; p<0.01). Adopters more educated than non-adopters. The average weekday TV viewing time of adopters is 2.8 hours and the average weekday TV viewing time of non-adopters is 2.9 hours. The average weekend TV viewing time of adopters is 4.1 hours and the average weekend TV viewing time of non-adopters is 4.4 hours. According to the T- test result which was done to the find out differences between weekday-weekend TV viewing time of

> 6**adopters and non-adopters,** there is **no significant** difference **between adopters and non-adopters**

(Table 2). Table 2. T-tests result between weekday-weekend tv viewing time of adopters and non-adopters Variable Adopting categories N Mean t p 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 Weekday TVviewing time Weekend TVviewing time Adopters Non-adopters Adopters Non-adopters 99 2.85 408 2.94 99 4.14 408 4.47 -0.4929 -11.485 0.622 0.252 p>0,05 Average internet usage time of adopters is 4.6 hours in a day and average internet usage time of non-adopters is 3.86 hours in a day. According to the T-test result which was done to the find out differences between daily internet usage time of adopters and non-adopters,

> 2**there is significant difference between adopters and non-adopters** (Table 3). **In**

other word adopters are using internet mostly. Table 3. T-test result between daily internet usage time of adopters and non-adopters Variable Adopting categories N Mean t p Daily internet usage time Adopters Non-adopters 99 4.6 408 3.8 25.334 0.012* *p<0,05 Average movie going time of adopters is 1.1 days in a month and Average movie going time of non-adopters is 1.1 days in a month. According to the average movie going times, it's possible to say that there is no difference between movie going time of

> 10**adopters and non-adopters. The** mean **of** newspaper reading **in** a week **is** 5 **.1**

day for adopters and 2.5 day for non-adopters. The mean of magazine reading in a week is 1.6 day for adopters and 1 day for non-adopters. 4% of adopters and 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 7.8% of non-adopters are never reading a newspaper in a week. 27

14.**3% of adopters and** 50.2% **of non-adopters are**

never reading magazine in a week. To find out difference between newspaper-magazine reading mean

7**of adopters and non- adopters, T-test was** used. According **to the**

T-test results, there is significant difference between adopters' newspaper-magazine reading mean and non-adopters' newspaper-magazine reading mean (Table 4). Adopters read more newspaper and magazine than non-adopters. Table 4. T-test results between newspaper-magazine reading mean of adopters and non-adopters Variable Adopting categories N Mean t p 164 Newspaper Adopters 99 5.1 Non-adopters 408 4.5 2.598 0.010* Magazine Adopters 99 1.6 Non-adopters 408 1.0 3.235 0.000* 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 *p<0,05 A scale of 22 expressions was used to demonstrate the reasons for adoption. factor analysis (Principal Component Factor) was conducted to group, classify these 22 expressions and to determine the main factors causing adaptation. Bartlett's and KMO tests were performed to determine whether the data set was appropriate for factor analysis (Table 5). According to the results of the tests, the KMO value is above 0,50 and the Bartlett test is also significant (p<0,05). Table 5.

12**Results of** the **KMO and Bartlett's** Tests **Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin**

Bartlett's Test 0,70 Chi-Square sd P 621,72 153 0,000* *p<0,05 In the factor analysis, it is recommended to remove the statements with common variance below 0,50 from the analysis (Kalaycı, 2006, p.329). As a result of the first analysis, the common variances of the 22 statements were examined and the statements of 4, 12, 19 and 22 having a common variance below 0,50 were removed from the analysis. Second factor analysis was conducted over 18 statements. In factor analysis, the substances are asked to have high load value in one factor and low load value in other factors. It is desired that a substance (statement) it gives a load value with a second factor other than a factor it gives a high load value is not less than 0,10 (Büyüköztürk, 2002, p.119). Based on this criterion, since the difference between the loads the 1st statement gives in the first and sixth factors is 0,05 and the difference between the loads the 5th statement gives in the second and third factors is 0,04, these statement was also removed from the analysis. At this stage, third analysis was conducted over 16 statements. As a result of the third analysis, the 17th statement having a common variance below 0,50 was also removed from the analysis and at the final analysis, five factors were obtained as adaptation to digital television broadcasts (Table 6). Statement 15 7 6 8 2 3 13 11 9 16 20 21 10 14 18 Table 6. Factors related to reasons for adaptation Factors COM. Factor Loads Value Interaction Opportunity Because I can make transactions such as Banking, Shopping, Stock Market from television Because it can provide interaction opportunity Because it broadcasts the Turkish football league For watch&pay system (Movie halls) Near Environment and Self Because everyone around me has subscribed Because my friends recommend it To be able to follow the programs that everyone watches Having a digital platform will make me privileged Channel Numerousness Since many channels are available To be able to watch the latest movies Foreign Language Selection Option Since international channels broadcasting in a foreign language are available Because language selection option is available Following Technology

Because I want to follow the new technology Since all broadcasting will be digital in the near future Because there are channels for children (Specific Factor) Total Explained Variance 2,17 0,82 2,94 0,76 2,70 2,70 0,72 0,63 1,99 2,41 2,14 0,85 0,79 0,61 2,12 0,57 3,45 3,25 0,88 0,72 3,80 0,88 3,84 0,86 3,13 0,73 2,76 0,61 3,03 -0,59 % of the Variance Explained 4,36 29,05 1,96 13,07 1,46 9,71 1,35 9,02 1,01 6,76 67,62 Alpha 0,79 0,73 0,69 0,73 0,62 As a result of the analysis, 5 factors whose values were greater than 1 were found as the reason of adaptation. These 5 factors explain 67,6% of the total variance. It can be stated that the percentage of total variance explained by the five factors resulting from factor analysis is high. When Table 6 is examined, the first factor given as a reason of adaptation consists of four variances and is named as "interaction opportunity", the second consists of four variances and is named as "near environment and self", the third consists of two variances and is named as "channel numerousness", the fourth consists of two variances and is named as "foreign language selection option" and the fifth consists of three variances and is named as "following technology". The reliability coefficient for each factor (Cronbach-alpha) ranges between 0,79 and 0,62. Depending on the Alpha coefficient, if it is $0,60≤α≤0,80$ the scale is interpreted as highly reliable (Kalaycı, 2006, p.405). Accordingly, the reliability coefficients for each factor are acceptable. When Table 6 is examined, the point that should be considered is that the factor load of the 18th factor is negative. Negative and small factor loaded statements can mean specific factor. These factor loads are loaded with other specific information other than the common factor (Şencan, 2005, p.393). The 18th statement was considered to be a specific factor due to the fact that it is negative loaded with a small factor and it does not comply with the fifth factor considering the meaning it has. In other words, the fact that there are channels for children as the reason for non-adaptation is a 218 specific factor. 219 Validity and reliability tests of the structures obtained as a result of factor analysis are required. 220 Reliability measurements were made using Cronbach's Alpha coefficients. Alpha was calculated as 221 0,80 for 15 variables subjected to the factor analysis at the scale. Alpha reliability coefficient was 222 found to be 0,79 for the first factor; 0,73 for the second factor; 0,69 for the third factor; 0,73 for the 223 fourth factor and 0,62 for the fifth factor Depending on the Alpha coefficient; if it is $0,60≤α≤0,80$, 224 the scale is interpreted as pretty reliable (Kalaycı, 2006, p.405). Accordingly, the reliability coefficients 225 for each factor are acceptable. 226 Convergent validity and discriminant validity tests were performed as validity tests. Bagozzi 227 and Yi (1988) show that the factor loads of the statements exceed 0,70 as a proof of the validity of 228 the adaptation. For Child (1970), the factor load factor of 0,50 and above is considered to be sufficient 229 for the validity of the adaptation. When the factor loads of the statements in Table 6 are examined, 230 it can be seen that these factor loads have acceptable levels of adaptation validity on desired 231 structures. 232 The discrminancy validity refers to the adequate degree of discriminancy of measurements in 233 different structures from other structures. It is requested that the binary correlation values between 234 the factors for discriminancy validity should not exceed the critical value of 0,90 (Hair, Anderson and 235 Tatham, 1998). When the correlation coefficients of the structures in Table 7 are examined, it is seen 236 that the values are below 0,90. Accordingly, it can be said that the scale has a discriminancy validity. 237 238 Table 7. Correlation matrix and averages between factors of reason for adaptation Factors 1 2 3 4 5 Interaction Opportunity Near Environment and Self Channel Numerousness Language Selection Following Technology *p<.05 ; ** p< .01 1,00 0,39** 1,00 0,45** 0,29** 0,11 -0,04 0,49** 0,27** 1,00 0,22 1,00 0,46** 0,21* 1,00 Conclusion As a descriptive study, it was tried to find out demographic characteristics and media usage level of digital tv platform adopters and non-adopter in Turkey. Young people are more disposed to adopt new technologies than elders (Bjoerner, 2003, p.94). Bjoerner (2003, p.94) argues that age and sex are important variables for adopting new technologies. Males are more disposed to adopt new technologies than females. On the contrary of Bjoerner findings, it's was not found any

1**differences between adopters and non-adopters** according to **the** age and sex **in**

this study. On the other hand, parallel to the literature, this study found

8**that adopters are** more **educated and have** more **income than non-adopters.**

Studies about adopting rate argue that more educated people and people who have high income adopt new technologies faster than other (Chan-Olmsted at al., 2005, p.328). Education is important variable to understand messages which were sent via mass communication vehicles. The variables which affect awareness level of innovation are the usage of different communication medium, income and sex (Atkin at al. 2003, p.161). In addition these variables, in this study, number of household member and child number were found as variables which affect adopting level. Less people are living in the adopters' household and adopters have fewer children than non-adopters. According to the Svennevig's study (2004, p.157) people are viewing TV 4 hour in a day. This TV viewing time is higher than any other activities time such as conversation with friends, eating foods, doing house works, reading, and shopping. In addition TV 261 viewing time is higher than other communication vehicles exposure. Findings of this study does not 262 support Svennevig's finding about TV viewing. On the other hand adopters use more internet and 263 read magazine and newspaper than the non-adopters. 5 factors effecting the adoption to digital tv 264 platform. 265 In this study, five adopter categories of Rogers were coded as adopters and non-adopters and 266 analyses based on these two categories. Rogers' five adopter categories should be investigated in the 267 further research. 268 269 270 References 271 Atkin, David J., Kim Neuendorf, Leo W. Jefress and Paul Skalski "Predictors of Audience Interest 272 in Adopting Digital Television". The Journal of Media Economics, 16 (3), 2003, 159-173. 273 Bagozzi, Richard P. and Yi, Youjae. "On the Evaluation of Structural Equations Models". Academy 274 of Marketing Science Journal 16 (1): 74–94. 1988 275 Bjoerner, Thomas. "The Early Interactive Audience of a Regional TV-Station (DVB-T) in 276 Denmark", Proceedings of the 1st European Conference on Interactive Television: From 277 Viewers to Actors?, U.K:Brighton, 2003, 91-97. 278 Büyüköztürk, Şener, Sosyal Bilimler için Veri Analizi El Kitabı. Ankara: Pagem Yayıncılık, 2002. 279 Chan-Olmsted, Sylvia M., Jack C.C. Li and Jaemin Jung "The Profiling of Cable Modem Broadband 280 Consumers: Characteristics, Perceptions and Satisfaction", Journal of Targeting Measurement 281 and Analysis for Marketing, 13 (4), 2005, 327-345. 282 Child, Dennis. The Essentials of Factor Analysis. London: Holt, 283 Rhinehart and Winston, 1970. 284 Dupagne, Michel. "Exploring the Characteristics of Potential High Definition Television Adopters", 285 The Journal of Media Economics, 12 (1), 1999, 35-50. 286 Fidler, Roger. Understanding New Media, California: Pine Forge Press, 1997. 287 Jensen, Jens F. "So, What Do You Think, Linda? Media Typologies for Interactive Television". In 288 Agger, G. and Jensen, J. F. eds. The Aesthetic of Television, Media & Cultural Studies 2, 289 Aalborg: Aalborg University Press. 2001, 349-396. 290 Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tatham, R. and Black, W. (1998) Multivariate Data Analysis. 5th Edition, 291 Prentice Hall International, London. 292 Kalaycı, Şeref. SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistik Teknikleri. Ankara: Asil Yayınları, 2006. 293 Kang, Myung-Hyun. "Digital Cable: Exploring Factors Associated with Early Adoption", Journal of 294 Media Economics, 15 (3), 2002, 193-207. 295 Mahler, Alwin and Everett M. Rogers. "The Diffusion of Interactive Communications and the 296 Critical Mass: The Adoption of Telecommunications Services By German Banks" 297 Telecommunications Policy, 23 (10&11), 1999, 719-740. 298 Mutlu, Erol, Communication Dictionary, Ankara: Ark, 1998 299 Rogers, Everett M. Diffusion of Innovations, U.S.A.: Free Press, 2003 300 Rose, Nancy L., and Paul L. Joskow "The Diffusion of New Technologies: Evidence from the 301 Electric Utility Industry", Journal of Economics, 21 (3), 1990, 354-373. 302 Svennevig, Michael. "The Interactive Viewer: Reality or Myth", Interactive Marketing, 6 (2), 2004, 303 151-164. 304 Swedlow, Tracy. (2006). "2000: Interactive Enhanced Television: A Historical and Critical 305 Perspective", http://www.itvt.com/etvwhitepaper.html (accessed, 13.3.2006). 306 Şencan, Hüner.(2005) Güvenilirlik ve geçerlilik. Ankara:Seçkin Yayınevi 307 Türkiye'nin dijital gözü Araştırması (2018) available at online https://www.twentify.com/ (February, 308 2019) 309 310 311 312 313 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 239 240 241 242 243 244 245

246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 17 2 Yersel, B. (2018). Adoption factors of digital TV platforms in Turkey. Journal of Human Sciences, 15(1), NNN-NNN. doi:10.14687/jhs.v15i1.NNNN 68 3 Yersel, B. (2018). Adoption factors of digital TV platforms in Turkey. Journal of Human Sciences, 15(1), NNN-NNN. doi:10.14687/jhs.v15i1.NNNN 118 4 Yersel, B. (2018). Adoption factors of digital TV platforms in Turkey. Journal of Human Sciences, 15(1), NNN-NNN. doi:10.14687/jhs.v15i1.NNNN 156 5 Yersel, B. (2018). Adoption factors of digital TV platforms in Turkey. Journal of Human Sciences, 15(1), NNN-NNN. doi:10.14687/jhs.v15i1.NNNN 199 6 Yersel, B. (2018). Adoption factors of digital TV platforms in Turkey. Journal of Human Sciences, 15(1), NNN-NNN. doi:10.14687/jhs.v15i1.NNNN 217 7 Yersel, B. (2018). Adoption factors of digital TV platforms in Turkey. Journal of Human Sciences, 15(1), NNN-NNN. doi:10.14687/jhs.v15i1.NNNN 260 8 Yersel, B. (2018). Adoption factors of digital TV platforms in Turkey. Journal of Human Sciences, 15(1), NNN-NNN. doi:10.14687/jhs.v15i1.NNNN 9 Yersel, B. (2018). Adoption factors of digital TV platforms in Turkey. Journal of Human Sciences, 15(1), NNN-NNN. doi:10.14687/jhs.v15i1.NNNN 67 117 198