

# A FUNNIER MONK: A MULTIMODAL APPROACH TO TRANSNATIONAL TV SERIES ADAPTATIONS

---

IBRAHIM ER

**Name** Ibrahim Er

**Academic centre** University of Maryland, Baltimore County

**E-mail address** er11@umbc.edu

## KEYWORDS

Transnational television; format adaptations; multimodal analysis; localization; *Monk*; *Galip Derviş*.

## ABSTRACT

In their book *Reading Television* (1978: 64-5), John Fiske and John Hartley define television as a medium that provides the members of a particular community with a “confirming, reinforcing version of themselves.” Although the introduction of the unfamiliar and innovative via televisual productions is a business imperative as well as a cultural necessity today, television continues to function as a mirror of its receiving society, and provide its viewers with culturally appropriate

content through its various semiotic modes of communication situated within the visual, verbal, and sound tracks. Televisual productions, in this sense, can be viewed as one of the most salient multimodal texts through which our everyday politics are continuously materialized, fictionalized, and rendered into an entertaining popular language that shapes our everyday perceptions and expectations. Transnational format adaptations, in particular, stand out as ample content-rich texts in which the processes of localization and appropriation, realized through individual semiotic choices made by producers, manifest themselves. It is the goal of this paper to trace back such semiotic choices made during the *re*-production phase of transnational format adaptations, and reveal sociocultural and political interventions in meaning making at the time, through a multimodal analysis of an American comedy crime series, *Monk*, and its Turkish adaptation, *Galip Derviş*.

## INTRODUCTION

The true success of a TV series adaptation is not rooted in how closely it follows its source, but rather how it is *re-interpreted*. This is because a remake of a work usually necessitates some *re-formation* and editing to develop a closer “cultural proximity” to the host culture, which Straubhaar (1991) defines as a characteristic that reflects the traditional, regional and cultural values of a people. This localization process, however, is not only and necessarily materialized through one mode, i.e., *verbal language*. It is also done through other important modes of communication situated within the *visual track*, which includes the camera work, lighting, and frame composition; and the *sound track*, that is, the musical score, sound effects and sound design. In other words, the re-created and culturally appropriated message, along with its ideological, political and sociocultural baggage, is incarnated at different levels and through different modes of a multifaceted semiotic system that transcends the realm of monomodality and gets into that of multimodality (Kress and van Leeuwen, 1996; Kress and van Leeuwen, 2001; Machin, 2013). These multiple modes, functioning as an organic whole within each televisual narrative, are used by producers artfully and strategically in order to constitute a culturally oriented narrative structure that promises more viewer ratings, and thus more profit.

This epistemological move from a less multimodal society to a complex multimodal society can be seen in alignment with the paradigmatic shifts happening in the fields of Linguistics and Semiotics in the last century; that is, from a predominantly linguistic-oriented and structuralist view of language that foregrounded the alleged universality of system, or the *langue* as named by Saussure (1983), to a more multimodal and post-structuralist view that highlighted the *social* and its workings through individuals’ various semiotic choices in creating meanings (Kress, 2001). The relationship between a form (sign) and an individual’s act of choosing that form (sign) to convey a specific message has come to be seen as less arbitrary, more motivated, as the individual’s such choice is prompted by various sociocultural and political factors, as well as the aptness of a particular choice in signifying the intended meaning (Kress, 2001; Kress, 2003). In other words, it has become clear that the individual user has the autonomy to manipulate through various paradigmatic and syntagmatic choices in the system, and has a decisive effect on the final meaning (while reserving the viewer’s own capacity and background, as another competent user of the system, in decoding the message). Adopting this view, Kress (2001) argued that, by tracking back an indi-

vidual’s choices in the production of a text, we could reveal the sociocultural and political structures that the creator(s) of the meaning faced at the time of the production. Based on this theoretical foundation, this paper conducts a comparative cross-cultural multimodal analysis of an American comedy crime series, *Monk* (2002-2009), and its Turkish adaptation, *Galip Derviş* (2013-2014). In doing so, it explores how meaning is re-formed and manipulated in transnational TV series adaptations through various semiotic modes located in the *visual*, *verbal*, and *sound tracks* of an audio-visual text. Thanks to its transnational frame, it also traces culturally specific connections between such paradigmatic/syntagmatic choices made during a re-production and certain sociocultural and political dynamics of the day, and opens up a new transnational perspective for discussion in the ever-evolving field of multimodality.

The Emmy Award-winning television series *Monk* was created by Andy Breckman, an American television and film writer, and produced by Mandeville Films and Touchstone Television in association with Universal Television. The series, with a total number of 125 episodes in eight seasons, originally ran on *USA Network* from 2002 through 2009, and at different times on various other TV channels across the country and the world. In addition to its subtitled and dubbed versions, the series was also remade with a different cast in other countries, including Turkey. The Turkish version, entitled *Galip Derviş*, was produced by Barakuda Film, and aired on *Kanal D* between the years of 2013 and 2014, consisting of three seasons with a total number of 56 episodes. Thanks to its high production values and airing time, the Turkish series also achieved great success, especially in its first two seasons. When compared, the two versions conspicuously diverge from each other visually, verbally, and acoustically at particular points where there is a crucial cultural difference in terms of topics such as family life, religion, and workplace. It is the goal of this paper to explore these multimodal semiotic divergences between the series, and their intervention in meaning making, in light of two selected scenes from the first and fourth episodes of *Monk*, and their corresponding scenes in the first and third episodes of *Galip Derviş*, respectively.

## TRANSNATIONAL TELEVISION: TV SERIES ADAPTATION IN THE AGE OF GLOCALIZATION

The media today are less confined to the physical space of nation-state or city boundaries than ever before (Sparks,

2007). With the advent of new communication technologies and transnational corporations in the second half of the last century, particularly following the neoliberal reforms in the last quarter of it, media globalization has become more and more influential on national and world politics, and on their sociocultural implications in local discourses, threatening the long standing epistemological monopoly of the nation state. In the face of this evolving global marketplace, the introduction of the unfamiliar and innovative via the media, especially in the entertainment sector, has been a business imperative as well as a cultural necessity.

Within this context, the years 1980s and 1990s saw an unprecedented growth in television channels around the world with the advent of cable and satellite television systems, which established the ground for trade in television programs and formats across cultures (Steeimers, 2014). One of the axiomatic indicators of this industrial trend was the increase in the transnational circulation of finished products, such as soap operas (e.g. *Dallas*, *The Young and the Restless*), which Albert Moran and Silvio Waisbord called “canned programmes” that required no localization except for subtitling or dubbing (as cited in Mikos, 2015). Through these unmodified texts, except for possible censoring cuts, local cultures started to become exposed to a great flow of culturally foreign ideas and narratives more than ever.

This massive transformation in the television industry and its social implications acted as a catalyst for an already inaugurated debate over the effects of the new media on the idea of globalization and homogenization of world cultures. Conventionalist theorists such as Guback (1969), Miller et al. (2001), and Ritzer (2004) accounted for this global media frenzy as a unidirectional manifestation of the imperialist ideologies of the Western world, particularly the United States, over the rest of the world in the name of *modernity*. Progressive theorists such as Robertson (1995) and Appadurai (1996), on the other hand, saw it as the beginning of a novel and more complex level of interaction between world cultures. Colin Sparks (2007) explains this separation between the conventional and non-conventional approaches by drawing a difference between what he calls the “weak theories” of globalization that opt for seeing the new world order through conventional, dichotomous, and unidirectional lenses; and the “strong theories” of globalization that proclaim the rise of radically new and complex parameters that complicate and disorder the relationship between the already-equivocal concepts of global and local. In this sense, the advocates of the theory of media imperialism, who can be associated

with Sparks’ category of the “weak theories,” argue that what is happening is an Americanization, or in Ritzer’s (2004) terms, “McDonaldization” of the whole world rather than globalization. For those aligned with the “strong theories” of globalization, on the other hand, there is neither a single global culture nor an explicable body of global or Western cultures. The line between global and local is already blurred.

The fate of the *local* within this context has been a much debated topic as the world has started to be viewed as evolving into a “global village,” in Marshall McLuhan’s (1964) terms, threatening indigenous cultures.

However, Marshall McLuhan never meant the “global village” to be a mantra for those who believed in the chimera of fusion of cultures and a succeeding ataraxia. “Global village”<sup>1</sup> was, on the contrary, a harbinger of a more culturally diverse and heterogeneous future (Stearn, 1967). As McLuhan states (Stearn, 1967: 272), “there is more diversity, less conformity under a single roof in any family than there is with the thousands of families in the same city. The more you create village conditions, the more discontinuity and division and diversity. The global village absolutely insures maximal disagreement on all points.” Thus, within this cacophony of ideas and practices that the global village generates, the local choices and constraints continue to play a crucial role in the *re*-formation and maintenance of local (television) cultures today. One of its manifestations is the emergence and growing numbers of regional markets and multiple production centers in the media industry around the world (Sparks, 2007). For Fiske and Hartley (2003), and Straubhaar (1991), it is because societies throughout history have always been inclined to make an active choice in viewing and hearing locally produced and/or culturally familiar texts, if available, which in return have given them a sense of cultural membership, security and involvement. Similarly, Steemers (2014) lists three reasons for the persistence of the local despite the boom of TV channels and the exponentially growing circulation of transnationally imported programs through them: “[1] complex national markets with their cultural, legal, and regulatory barriers; [2] the preference for local production if it [is] available; and [3] the role of national buyers as gatekeepers who [regulate] the flow of imports.” Also, Moran and Aveyard (2014) reiterate the strong connection between televisual texts, and time/places, as they argue that formats do not always translate

1 Also, “Global village” and the cultural diversity it enhanced did not yield egalitarian conditions for societies. For more on the issues of enriched diversity and continuing problem of unequal representation, (see Johnson, 2007).

readily to other locations. That is, the local is where globalization idiosyncratically happens.

Transnational remakes, in this regard, are the nexus where the global meets the local (Moran, 2004), and the local meets the global. Robertson (1995: 30) explains this two-way normalization process occurring in the midst of a tension between the global versus local<sup>2</sup>, or globalization versus particularism, with the notion of *glocalization*, in which he sees localization as part of the globalization process because the latter, in fact, reconstructs and perpetuates the local, *home*, contrary to the general assumption that it destroys our sense of home. On a similar note, Buonanno (2008: 109) suggests that adapting a foreign text is realized through a process of *hybridization*,<sup>3</sup> meaning “a conception of culture as a symbolic and material complex that is ‘in the making,’ in constant tension between permeability and resistance to the external influences that have to be faced with the passage of time.” Among these hybridized texts, TV series adaptations, as one of the most popular episodic televisual *re*-productions at the heart of glocalization, stand out as content-rich cultural artefacts in terms of tailoring of information to societies. They constitute a perfect example of how meaning that originates in another culture is meticulously *re*-constructed and *re*-fictionalized for its new target audience. By virtue of the multimodal nature of TV series, such tailoring and re-tuning of meaning occur at multiple levels and through multiple modes of communication in the visual track, the verbal language, and the musical score.

## MULTIMODALITY IN TRANSNATIONAL TELEVISION

According to David Machin (2013), the multimodal research approach starts with two groundbreaking works, both by Kress and Van Leeuwen; namely, *Reading Images* (1996), and *Multimodal Discourse* (2001). These two books, as well as many other succeeding works including Kress (2003; 2010), Jewitt (2009), O’Halloran & Smith (2011), Bateman & Schmidt (2012), and Machin (2013), emphasize the fact that humanity is moving away from monomodality to multimodality, as we

continue to discover and/or invent new ways of deploying and using various forms of tangible and intangible, real and virtual, analog and digital semiotic resources to produce and communicate everyday discourses. In this regard, the invention of the *moving image*, which began with Eadweard Muybridge’s photographic experiments with horses in the 1870s with the intent of finding an answer to the long-standing question of whether all four hooves of a horse are off the earth (Smith, 2013), and its subsequent integration with the *sound* at the turn of the twentieth century in the short films of the Edison Company can be seen as two of the milestones in the development of today’s multimodal world. More recent technological advancements in the digital world (e.g., 3D, 4D, and 5D) have expedited this process even further. Within this trajectory, Kress (2012: 36), deriving from the theories of Halliday and Hasan (1976), van Leeuwen (2005), Bezemer and Kress (2008), and Kress and Bezemer (2009), underscores the fact that every text consists of various dimensions of meaning, which have been made into a coherent entity “through the use of semiotic resources that establish cohesion both internally, among the elements of the text, and externally, with elements of the environment in which texts occur.” And television, as the quintessential medium of multimodality today, cannot be exempted from the multimodal scrutiny.

Defining “mode” should be one of the first steps in understanding “multimodality.” Bateman (2011) defines it by, first, highlighting the fact that perception of a mode can change across communities/groups within and across societies. That is, the way people interpret a sign within a semiotic system –be it a linguistic sign or any other material or virtual substrate– depends on their *a priori* knowledge of that sign and its discourse. For instance, the way a bibliophile sees his/her collection of books may differ significantly from an e-reader’s view of such collections. Second, the semiotic mode, according to Bateman, should be paradigmatically and syntagmatically manipulable and controllable by a group of users so that an intended meaning/sign could be created and fixated using it as a tool. Finally, it is crucial to understand that the materiality and affordances of a selected mode may also play a key role in the construction of meaning (Bateman, 2013; Kress, 2003).

The fact that modes are rarely presented in isolation from each other complicates the situation further. Even in the case of the codex in its historical sense, the material used in its creation, the way it was preserved and presented, the layout, the color of the pages, as well as its typography always intervened in the meaning making process throughout the eras of various literacies (Campbell, 2013). Also, in the case of spoken

2 For more on this illusory dichotomy established between the notions of “local” and “global,” see Wilson, R. and Dissanayake, W., 1996. *Global/local: cultural production and the transnational imaginary*. Durham: Duke University Press.

3 Hybridization is a concept that is often associated with Argentine-born theorist Néstor García Canclini. For further information, see Canclini, N. G., 1990. *Hybrid cultures*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

language, the verbal has always been accompanied by gestures, mimics, eye-contact and/or the features of the voice. With the advent of new technologies and the new media, though, the complexity of multimodality has been moved into the digital realm, and has become more of an issue because of the advanced technological tools the digital world offers. Texts today come in such a cohesive organic whole that their complex structures blur the networks of modes in function, which results in either a seamless interrelation of meanings, or, otherwise, multiplication of meaning (Bateman, 2011). This prevents the understanding of how much each mode actually intervenes in the meaning making, and even what modes exist within each artefact in the first place (Bateman, 2011). Televisual (as well as filmic) narratives in particular are the epitomes of this “complexity” and “multimodality” in the sense that they continuously send messages to the viewer at multiple levels and through multiple co-existing modes. Thus, the viewer’s perception of a televisual message depends not on a single mode of communication but on the sum of meanings that are sent through the image, lighting, camera angles, music, background effects (e.g. laughter track), and dialogues, as well as the *a priori* knowledge s/he uses to interpret the multimodal flow of messages. What is more to this is that, when scrutinized, these complex multimodal structures also show traces and markers of sociocultural and political dynamics that may have steered the creators of these messages into making certain choices. This fact forces researchers to concentrate on the processes of production by which such texts are made.

There is a recently evolving body of literature that focuses on the multimodal nature of filmic and televisual messages (Bateman, 2008; Bateman and Schmidt, 2012; Bateman, 2013; Chuang, 2006; Jewitt, 2009; Kress, 2003; Machin, 2013; Mubenga, 2009; O’Halloran et al., 2011; O’Halloran et al., 2013; and, Bezemar and Mavers, 2011). Bateman (2008, 2013) developed an empirical model, named *Genre and Multimodality (GeM)*, that aims to enable the analysis of the textual metafunction of audio-visual texts. According to Bateman (2013), this can be done in two ways: by focusing on various elements within a segment (*mise-en-scène*); or across segments by looking at how scenes are combined (*montage*). In other words, the product is reverse-engineered (Bordwell, 2005). Kay O’Halloran is another key figure in this newly emerging field. Especially, the software program she and her team developed and called *Multimodal Analysis Video/Image/Text/Website* is an open manifestation of her passion for creating new interactive digital tools that will make multimodal research a more manageable and analyzable research area. In

one of their exemplary analyses, O’Halloran et al. (2013) study the linguistic as well as visual and acoustic semiotic choices that two individuals on Fox news make during a live interview, and connect their findings to various macro-level patterns in the society. In another work, O’Halloran et al. (2011) split the studies in multimodal research into two complementary categories: (1) *issues*, which explores more general and theoretical issues regarding multimodality; and (2) *domains*, which focuses on specific discourses in order to find out how multimodality operates within them. One another leading figure in the field of multimodality is Gunther Kress, who, in his works, argues that a sole linguistic theory can no longer provide researchers with a full understanding of communication, as language and literacy have now become only a partial bearer of meaning (Kress, 2003). He suggests that all aspects of form in a multimodal text are meaningful and should be carefully read in order to unlock the meaning (Kress, 2003). Bezemar and Mavers (2011) also contribute to the literature of multimodality significantly through their work on how to transcribe (or transvisualize) multimodal texts for a fuller representation of complex operations within them. Finally, studies such as Chuang (2006) and Mubenga (2009) expand multimodal research into a transnational frame by examining subtitle translations in films in relation to other existing visual and acoustic [semiotic] modes, as they argue that all the semiotic modes in a film contribute meaning(s) to the film text simultaneously. As a step forward in the same direction, this study conducts a comparative cross-cultural analysis of a television format that has been produced and re-produced in two national contexts, and explores the complex web of semiotic modes in play in the construction of a cohesive meaning. To this end, it traces back the culturally-specific individual semiotic choices made particularly during the *re-interpretation* of the adapted series, and explores the sociocultural and political meanings hidden in the cracks of multimodal borders.

## A COMPARISON OF MONK AND GALIP DERVIŞ

Television in Turkey began its broadcasting life in 1968 with the foundation of the first state-run channel, named TRT (*Turkish Radio and Television*) (Aksel, 2011). However, it was not until 1972 when the viewers had their first experience of an imported TV series (Aksel, 2011; Kesirli Unur, 2015). The sudden growth and increasing popularity of these dubbed foreign works among the viewers, as well as the decline in

the cinema industry in the presence of a more accessible medium, *television*, prompted a lot of local film producers and directors of the time to turn to the television industry (Aksel, 2011; Yanardağoğlu, 2014; Kesirli Unur, 2015). This turn resulted in a boom of local series and TV movies, which were mostly adapted from either the classics of Turkish literature or popular foreign television productions of the time. The arrival of the first and several subsequent private channels in the 1990s boosted the local productions even further, as the production capacity and the culturally appropriate imported foreign works failed to sufficiently feed the increased airtime of broadcasting in the country (Aksel, 2011; Yanardağoğlu, 2014; Kesirli Unur, 2015). In the course of all these events, the idea of adapting from already-successful TV formats in other countries has come to be seen by producers and broadcasters as a short-cut to success, an example of which we have recently seen in the case of *Galip Derviş*, which was adapted from the American series *Monk*.

*Monk* is an American comedy crime series that features a brilliant detective named Adrian Monk as its protagonist. After having served in the homicide division of the police force for a number of years, Monk is temporarily suspended from his job due to a mental breakdown caused by the loss of his wife, Trudy, in a bombing incident. During the three subsequent years he detaches himself from society, some of his lifelong obsessions and phobias are aggravated and take over his life. Only after he starts getting some professional help from a nurse, named Sharona Fleming, is he able to go back to active duty as a private detective despite his obsessive compulsive disorder, and is frequently called in by his previous boss, Captain Stottlemeyer, to consult on inexplicable cases. During this continued but slow recovery period, viewers meet Monk and his extraordinary skills and compulsions that help him solve even the most mysterious cases. The Turkish version, *Galip Derviş*, exhibits a certain degree of “fidelity” to the initial American version in terms of the characters, narrative structure, and locations; whilst certain divergences/modifications occur at particular moments due to culturally different interpretations of certain contentious issues such as religion, domesticity, sexuality, womanhood, taboos, and social stratification. Various multimodal interventions are employed to tailor and re-tune the meaning in certain parts of the series where there is a need for cultural proximity. One of these multimodal proximity features in *Galip Derviş* is carried out along the lines of power relations between the characters.

According to Cotta (1976: 176), inequality of power is an essential component of any entity that aims to function as an

organization because inequality precludes “disorder,” to a certain extent, among members by regulating the decision-making mechanism. However, the distance of this inequality, or the *power distance*, socially accepted by the members of that community can vary culturally, which Hofstede (2001) explains through the concepts of “low” and “high” power distance cultures.<sup>4</sup> According to his theory, in lower power distance cultures, such as the United States, the implications of inequality are at minimum; that is, both subordinates and superiors are still viewed more or less as independent individuals with equal rights despite the established hierarchical roles for convenience. On the other hand, in higher power distance cultures, such as Turkey, there appears to be an existential hierarchy between the members of an organization or community, and this perception turns individuals with superior roles into “superior persons” that should be respected at all times. It is usually the privileged members of this second group that make the decisions and direct their subordinates by giving instant orders. As a result, any violation of this hierarchical structure in higher power distance cultures is more likely to result in organizational crisis, and even the collapse of the whole organizational functionality.

Comedy and comical situations in cultures and the arts are often used as a means to mediate and negotiate such cultural boundaries as power relations, and their violations. This strategy is also employed in TV series and TV series adaptations that revolve around these contentious issues. In the rest of the paper, I conduct a multimodal analysis of the implications of power relations in the two series by focusing on two particular scenes from the first and fourth episodes of *Monk*, and their corresponding scenes in the first and third episodes of *Galip Derviş*, respectively.<sup>5</sup> The reason for selecting these particular scenes is that they include various moments in which Derviş (the equivalent of Monk) and Hülya (the equivalent of Sharona) violate the local hierarchical norms, at least from a Turkish cultural standpoint, when talking to their boss, Başkomiser Merdan (Captain Stottlemeyer); and it is at those moments of violation that the musical score, the visual track and the verbal track all diverge meaningfully and significantly from the American version to re-regulate the lost hierarchical structure.

4 My point in including “low” and “high” power distance cultures here is *not* to conceptualize these concepts as good or bad, respectively, based on an Orientalist frame.

5 All the transcriptions and the translations from Turkish to English for the analysis of the two scenes have been done by the author.

## ANALYSIS OF THE SCENES

The analysis of the collected multimodal data reveals that, when a culturally foreign work is adapted into a new culture, its content is meticulously adjusted and localized so as to achieve a cultural proximity to the host society. The desired and culturally appropriate message can be achieved, sometimes, by having different modes of communication conform to each other while, at other times, by having them to contradict each other in order to create a paradoxical meaning that diverts the viewer's perception to a different meaning. However, no matter how complex the interaction between different modes of communication gets during the production phase, the viewer usually processes and perceives the multimodal message as a complete whole, without dispersing it into individually perceived components. In this regard, I aim to *reverse-engineer* the two scenes below in order to reveal a number of elaborate localization strategies that are used to re-interpret power relations between the characters in a way that conforms to the ideologies of the receiving Turkish culture.

*SCENE 8: Could you grab this, Chief?*  
(Monk, "Mr. Monk and the Candidate (Part 1)" (1.01)  
– 00:16:35 – 00:17:44)  
(Galip Derviş, "Başkana Suikast" (1.01) – 00:19:26  
– 00:20:57)

The first sequence of the eighth scene in the pilot episode(s) opens with Monk (Derviş) standing at a crime scene and investigating the surrounding area by using his idiosyncratic body movements under others' confused glances. After a while, Monk (Derviş) discovers a clue, a *twisted drawing*, and turns to Captain Stottlemeyer (Chief Merdan) to reveal the details of his discovery. He explains that it is often used in the Special Forces to steady shots, which the Chief and others immediately approve of. In fact, Monk (Derviş), as the protagonist of the series, is well known for finding and bringing such hidden clues to light throughout the whole series; and that always puts him in a more favorable and powerful position in the eyes of the viewer, against and despite the constant presence of a hierarchically superior character, the chief. The fact that a series based on such a hierarchically anomalous order is adapted into a higher power distance culture like Turkey certainly shows that its plot is not perceived as a violation of power relations in general. However, the difference between the low and high

power distance cultures does come to surface in the *re-interpretation* of particular moments where there is a direct interaction from a subordinate to a superior. As is the case in the next sequence, Monk (Derviş) decides to run a quick experiment with the clue he has found, and asks Captain Stottlemeyer (Chief Merdan) to grab a stick that lies on the floor and to hold it like a rifle, which violates, at least from a Turkish cultural standpoint, the power relation between the two. Although both Monk and Derviş use a polite form of language when making such a request (almost a command) from their chief, there appears to be an extra effort in the Turkish version to emphasize the anomaly in such a hierarchically upward request as a result of the culturally different reading of this segment. First, the tailoring of the scene to Turkish viewers is done more overtly in the visual and verbal tracks. One of the most striking divergences in the verbal track of this conversation is the number of times Monk and Derviş use the word "Captain," and its Turkish equivalent "Chief."

*Monk: Captain, could you grab this?*  
*It'll just take a minute.*

...

*Monk: How tall are you?*

...

*Monk: No, really.*

---

*Galip Derviş: Just a second, Chief.*  
*Could you grab this?*

...

*Galip Derviş: How tall are you, Chief?*

...

*Galip Derviş: Really, how tall are you, Chief?*

As is seen in the transcriptions, Galip Derviş's frequent use of the word "Chief" at the end of each statement reminds the audience that he is talking to his boss whereas his questions seem to challenge and tarnish the chief's superior position. This linguistic divergence in the number of times the characters use honorific forms of address can be understood more clearly if Galip Derviş's speech is analyzed in light of the superior – subordinate discourse in Turkish language. Turkish is a language that contains a lot of formulaic devices such as honorific forms of address. Depending on the discourse, these honorific forms of address are sometimes used so excursively that they do not contribute directly to the meaning at the sentence level, but at the discourse level.

What I mean by this is that their frequent use in consecutive utterances causes them to lose their primary meaning and function, which is to capture the attention of the addressee before starting a conversation. Instead, they turn into a signal word that continuously alerts listeners, and even the speaker himself/herself, about the hierarchical relationship between the interlocutors. This linguistic adjustment in the Turkish version of *Monk* constitutes a perfect example of the localization process at the linguistic level.

Localization of this particular scene in terms of power relations becomes even more overt at the level of visual track when Monk (Derviş) asks Captain Stottlemeyer (Chief Merdan) to grab the stick from the ground. While Captain Stottlemeyer does what Monk says and picks the stick from the ground by himself, Chief Merdan, in the Turkish version, indirectly dismisses Derviş's culturally "inappropriate" request by asking the lieutenant standing on the side to grab the stick for him. More importantly, he does so with a quick hand move rather than verbally, which further highlights his authoritative stance over others. Furthermore, the Turkish lieutenant, besides grabbing the stick for his boss, also stands

on the side throughout the whole scene, and takes notes while Chief Merdan talks. All these visual additions and adjustments highlight the hierarchical superiority of the chief in the Turkish context, as opposed to Captain Stottlemeyer's relatively "egalitarian" stance.

The last but not the least of localization examples occur at the level of scoring. During the time Monk (Derviş) investigates the surrounding area at the beginning of the scene, the viewer, in both versions, hears a similar musical cue that transmits the emotive state of suspense (see below). Both cues aim to amplify the visually intended message by conforming to the mysterious and suspenseful movements of the protagonist. When Monk (Derviş) discovers the clue, and turns to Captain Stottlemeyer (Chief Merdan) to explain his discovery, both cues arrive at their climax and then cease.



MONK, "MR. MONK AND THE CANDIDATE (PART 1)" (1.01) (00:16:35 - 00:17:18) - THE OPENING CUE IN THE EIGHTH SCENE



GALİP DERVİŞ, "BAŞKANA SUIKAST" (1.01) (00:19:26 - 00:20:10) - THE OPENING CUE IN THE EIGHTH SCENE



With the subsequent musical silence in the narrative structure, Monk (Derviş) reveals the details of his discovery. However, the musical cue in the two versions diverge significantly when Monk (Derviş) asks Captain Stottlemeyer (Chief Merdan) to grab the stick. In the American version, the whole conversation between Monk and Captain Stottlemeyer happens without a cue in the background whereas in the Turkish version, the viewer starts to hear a comedic musical cue at the very moment when Galip Derviş asks Chief Merdan to grab the stick. The continued musical proximity mediation in the sequence is especially needed in the Turkish version because, after Chief Merdan holds the stick like a rifle, Galip Derviş uses him like an assistant (or figurant), and asks him questions about his height to make some insightful connections between the height of the drawstring and that of Chief Merdan. Furthermore, Chief Merdan is also ridiculed when Galip Derviş understands that the Captain lies about his height in his first answer. Although the Turkish version follows the American version closely in this sequence, the amplified depictions of these moments as relatively more comedic situations with the help of comedic music in the Turkish version, which may stem from the producers' individual culture-oriented understandings and interpretations of the original sequence, as members of the host culture, reveal one of the subliminal ways the local culture mediates any violations of power relations, and perpetuates the related ideologies within such narratives. In alignment with other linguistic and visual adjustments mentioned above, the comedic score also mitigates the protagonist's violation of power relations, and induces Turkish viewers to perceive the sequence as more of a comic situation to be laughed at than a real violation of power relations to be taken seriously (see notation below). It is crucial to note here that this does not necessarily mean Monk, in the American version, seriously aims to challenge and tarnish Captain Stottlemeyer's authority, and that there is no humor at all. On the contrary, the American version also provides a sense of humor when Captain Stottlemeyer lies about his height. However, what is striking from a multimodal perspective is how meticulously the producers apply changes to all verbal, visual and musical tracks simultaneously, which

re-orient the humor that exceeds the limits of existing power relations in Turkish culture.

*SCENE 3: We need to talk, Chief!*  
 (Monk, "Mr. Monk Meets Dale the Whale" (1.04)–  
 00:03:45 – 00:04:38)  
 (Galip Derviş, "Fil Hamdi" (1.03)– 00:06:31 – 00:07:33)

In the second scene, the producers of the Turkish adaptation implement similar localization techniques to tailor and tune the message to its new target audience group. The main concern behind this localization also revolves around the hierarchical relationships between the characters

Looking at the linguistic data, we immediately realize that the Turkish adaptation starts with an additional opening conversation in which a police officer meets Galip Derviş and Hülya at the door, and welcomes them. Despite its simplistic content, this additional dialogue occurring at the door dignifies the pair's arrival at the crime scene. Next, three of them walk towards Chief Merdan and the lieutenant who have been waiting for them in the middle of the yard. In the American version, this whole welcoming sequence is reduced to a line spoken by Captain Stottlemeyer:

*Captain Stottlemeyer:* Hey Monk!  
 Glad you are here! Miss Fleming.

---

*Male Police Officer (Ali):* Welcome.  
*Galip Derviş:* Thank you, Ali.  
*Hülya:* Hi.  
*Male Police Officer:* This way, please.  
*Hülya:* OK, this way.

What is striking in these transcriptions is the selection of the character that is to welcome and honor the protagonist and his assistant. In the Turkish version, Chief Merdan is totally excluded from the conversation in contrast to Captain Stottlemeyer's active participation in the American version. One of the reasons behind this divergence might be the fact that power relations in Turkish workplace discourse do not



GALIP DERVIŞ, "BAŞKANA SUIKAST" (1.01) (00:20:23 – 00:20:43) – THE COMEDIC CUE USED IN THE SCENE

approve of a chief meeting his subordinate at the door. Yet, another reason might also lie in the succeeding statement in the two conversations:

*Sharona:* Glad you're here? God, you must really be desperate. Usually the mayor's office has to shove us down your throats.

*Hülya:* İzzet Abi? How come? To what do we owe this? Is it? Is it again the Mayor's request?

As is seen above, the conversation continues with Sharona's and Hülya's humiliating statements regarding the fact that Captain Stottlemeyer and Chief Merdan, respectively, needed the pair's help in another case. This can surely be considered as a violation of power relations in both contexts; however, the effects of this violation are mitigated in the Turkish version by changing Hülya's humiliating comment from a "riposte" to an "opening" of a new conversation with Chief Merdan. In other words, Hülya does not talk back to Chief Merdan. Furthermore, Hülya starts the conversation with an intimate form of address using Chief Merdan's first name (İzzet) and an honorific word used for elder brothers (Abi) in Turkish. This immediately establishes some intimacy between the two, and lightens the mood for her further statements.

*Captain Stottlemeyer:* Fact is, the mayor's office did call, but this time I did not argue. We have an unusual situation here.

*Chief Merdan:* This is a special case, Hülya. It is no good.

Next, the Captain's and the Chief's responses to Sharona's and Hülya's questions also diverge from each other in that while the first admits that he has received a call from Mayor and has not argued with him this time, the latter gives ambiguous personal explanations. The exclusion of the detail about the call in the Turkish version protects the superior positions of both Mayor and the Chief. First, taking Captain Stottlemeyer's words as they are in the American version would challenge the Mayor's superior position to the Chief in the Turkish setting because Captain Stottlemeyer's words clearly imply that he did argue with the Mayor previously. Second, using Captain Stottlemeyer's words would also harm the Chief's superior position to Galip Derviş and others at the

crime scene because they would imply that he is overruled by external powers.

Then, we see another addition to the verbal conversation when the lieutenant intervenes with the ongoing dialogue in the Turkish version and says:

*Lieutenant Ahmet:* Welcome, Derviş Abi.

*Galip Derviş:* Thank you, Ahmet. Eee... So, I am listening. What is the case?

This interjection has multiple functions in the overall conversation. First, it dignifies the involvement of Galip Derviş in the investigation. Second, it again signifies that there is an intimate relationship between the characters regardless of the hierarchical differences. This intimacy is also amplified by his word of choice ("Abi") when addressing Galip Derviş. Finally, this interjection also ends Hülya's attempt to challenge the Chief and changes the subject. In the meantime, the American version instead includes some further explanations on the case by Captain Stottlemeyer, which are deferred until the next scene in the Turkish version.

The most striking differences between the two versions of the scene occur after Sharona and Hülya take out a pile of documents for Captain Stottlemeyer and Chief Merdan to sign.

*Sharona:* Adrian. Wait, wait!

*Monk:* What?

*Sharona:* Uh, Captain, before we get started, could you just initial this agreement? It's our standard consultation fee.

...

*Captain Stottlemeyer:* It's what?

*Sharona:* Our standard consultation fee.

*Hülya:* Eee, wait a second please... Before we start, İzzet Abi, I need to talk to you about something.

*Chief Merdan:* What is it, Hülya?

*Hülya:* Eee, well... We haven't been paid even once for the last month. This leaves me in a very difficult situation, as well.

...

*Hülya:* You know, I have a lot of expenses: school expenses, my son, grocery, housekeeping, and so on. Thank God, I am not paying any rent.

*Chief Merdan:* (*Interrupting her speech*) OK, Hülya. I got it. What do you want?

*Hülya: (Passing the documents she has been holding)*  
I want you to sign this.

In the American version, Sharona interrupts the conversation by saying, “wait, wait,” which makes it sound harsh and unexpected. Furthermore, she leads in the topic by directly revealing that the folder has their standard consultation fee, and that she wants the Captain to sign it. On the other hand, in the Turkish version, Hülya interrupts the conversation by first asking Chief Merdan if they could have a word before they start the investigation. The fact that Hülya initially asks for the chief’s permission before talking to him about the matter, as opposed to Sharona’s direct manner, can be considered as Hülya’s first attempt to soften her approaching request from a figure of higher authority. Furthermore, after she gets the chief’s permission, Hülya does not get right down to the business as Sharona does, either. Instead, she starts by talking about a series of excuses as seen in the conversation, which again aims to mitigate Hülya’s imminent violation of power relations. This continues until Chief Merdan authoritatively interrupts and asks her to just say it. Only then does Hülya get to the point and mention the consultation fee.

*Captain Stottlemeyer:* Could we take care of that later, Sharona?

*Monk: (Turning his face to Sharona)* Not now.

*Sharona: (Looking at Monk) Adrian. (Turning her face to Captain Stottlemeyer)* I prefer to take care of business first.

*Lieutenant Disher:* Bet that’s not the first time you’ve said that.

*Sharona:* Bite me.

---

*Galip Derviş:* Hülya, is this the right time?

*Chief Merdan:* Visit me in my office during the week. I’ll take care of it.

*Hülya:* Nope! It can’t wait until then İzzet Abi because, well, Galip doesn’t want to start working on the case before you sign this, right Galip?

*Galip Derviş:* No, no... I didn’t say anything like that, Chief!

In the rest of the conversation, Captain Stottlemeyer and Chief Merdan asks if they could take care of that later. Monk (Derviş) also objects to Sharona’s (Hülya’s) impetuosity by saying, “not now,” and “Hülya, is this the right time?” respectively.

However, the divergent part is that while Sharona, herself, insists on taking care of business first, Hülya chooses to relinquish her responsibility by making Galip Derviş the “scape-goat” in response to Chief Merdan’s authoritative manner. Galip Derviş reacts to Hülya’s escape from responsibility and denies that he said what Hülya reported. Also he finishes his statement with the honorific form of address, *Chief*. Finally, both Captain Stottlemeyer and Chief Merdan, who do not want to dwell on it, agree to sign the contract.

As in the first pair of scenes, the localization processes in this scene are not restricted to the verbal track, either. All the linguistic adjustments are supported by various appropriations in the visual track. For instance, in the opening sequence of the Turkish scene, we see that the male police officer meets Galip Derviş and Hülya at the door, and escorts them to the middle of the yard where Chief Merdan and the lieutenant wait. In this sense, the visual track, in line with the verbal track, visualizes the dignification of Derviş’s arrival and involvement in the case. More importantly, though, it fulfills a much more crucial duty in terms of power relations. Because the male police officer escorts the two upon their arrival, Chief Merdan does not feel the need to walk toward the two, whereas in the American version, it is Captain Stottlemeyer who walks toward Monk and Sharona and welcomes them at the door. Another important divergence in the visual track of the Turkish version occurs when Hülya starts to talk about the payment. The lieutenant and another male officer who have been standing next to the other three until then immediately leave the scene upon hearing Hülya’s statement about the payment. Their sudden slinking, as opposed to the continued presence of the lieutenant in the American version, clearly conveys the message that the Turkish officers do not want to witness (and indirectly be “complicit” in) the conversation any more because they expect that Hülya will cross the hierarchical line.

Analyzing the verbal and the visual tracks paves the way for other localization adjustments initiated in the sound track as all three tracks, aligned with each other, constitute a single narrative structure. To start with, it is crucial to start my analysis of the sound track in the second scene by stating that throughout the whole scene in the American version, viewers do not hear any musical cues whereas the Turkish version includes two different comedic cues at various parts of the conversation. When scrutinized, it becomes apparent that these cues are not scattered around the verbal and visual texts randomly but placed in a particular pattern in alignment with the overarching narrative structure of the scene.



GALIP DERVIŞ, “FIL HAMDI” (1.03) (00:06:54 – 00:07:03) – THE COMEDIC CUE (I)

The punctuated musical cue above is the first comedic cue used in the scene when Hülya starts talking about the fact that they have not been paid for the last month. Looking at the exact moment the viewer hears this particular cue, one can conclude that the cue aims to turn Hülya’s “discourtesy” into a comedy, or it is an indicator of the Turkish producers’ cultural interpretation of Hülya’s “discourtesy” as a comedy. Although it could be argued that the situation, by its nature, is already a comic situation, comparing the two versions of the same scene reveals that scoring emotively amplifies the humorous aspect of the message. The careful and precise juxtaposition of the succeeding cues along with the rest of the conversation also makes this tendency crystal clear. As shown in the transcription, after Hülya enumerates all her excuses in a “humorous” way with the help of the comedic cue in the background, Chief Merdan suddenly interrupts her by saying, “OK, Hülya. I got it. What do you want?” What is more striking than his authoritative voice and words is the abrupt cessation

of music in the background. The sudden silence of the score brings his authoritarian reaction to the forefront. This example shows that not only the juxtaposition of a cue but also its absence at a particular moment of a scene can supplement the meaning conveyed. Next, in response to Chief Merdan’s reaction, Hülya feels obliged to come to the point and says: “I want you to sign this.” The moment she utters this statement, we again hear the first two notes of the first comedic cue. This clearly indicates that the comedic scoring is aligned with Hülya’s turns in the conversation. In that vein, music again stops playing in the background in the succeeding two lines in which Galip Derviş and Chief Merdan, respectively, imply that it is not the right time to talk about the payment. However, Hülya does not give up and insists that it is her own as well as Galip Derviş’s priority to take care of it first. It is no surprise anymore that her turn in the conversation is again accompanied with another similar comedic cue (see below) which lasts until she persuades Chief Merdan to sign the contract:



GALIP DERVIŞ, “FIL HAMDI” (1.03) (00:07:12 – 00:07:31) – THE COMEDIC CUE (II)

To sum up, the two scenes described thus far illustrate how the multimodal nature of audio-visual texts functions in transnational TV series adaptations, resulting in the modification of culturally discordant dialogues and actions that may, otherwise, subvert the existing values of a culture such as hierarchical relationships between superiors and subordinates. To be more precise, the examples show that the American way of having a conversation with a superior is interpreted differently and rejected saliently by the Turkish producers, and it is tailored to Turkish norms by various means and through multiple modes.

## CONCLUSION

Television constitutes a perfect stage for multimodal analysis at the trans/national level because of its increasing global prevalence and the growth of televisual productions across cultures. On the one hand, its multimodal nature certainly enhances the expressive power of audio-visual communicative devices by accommodating multiple signifiers to render a message well structured and coherent. Enhancement of this power not only eases the meaning-making process for producers, but also helps audiences to perceive messages in a more entertaining and colorful way. On the other hand, the complexity of multimodal texts also allows room for the inclusion and perpetuation of certain ideologies. This double-edged situation requires researchers, as well as any other readers, to embrace an even-growing critical approach to all multimodal texts including televisual productions.

To this end, this paper presented a multimodal analysis of two sample scenes from the two versions of the same TV series that have been produced and re-produced in two national contexts. By doing so, it revealed some of the culturally oriented tailoring interventions that are frequently implemented in the remake of TV series with the aim of reflecting the ideologies and values of a new spectator group. It is also crucial to note that such tailoring can be done not only by reframing and appropriating a foreign message according to the host culture's dominant norms, but also by depicting and "othering" any discordant meanings within a particular framework that is already familiar to domestic audiences. In this way, local TV channels, as well as producers, undertake, on the one hand, the mission of achieving cultural proximity through localization, which consequently preserves the harmony and assumed unity within their respective communities against any discordant effects of foreign ideologies and values. On a global scale, on the other hand, they also join the co-construction of an ever-evolving global world culture by following the transnational trajectory in the world of televisual productions and developments in the cross-cultural milieu. Its transnational approach to multimodality constitutes one of the crucial aspects of this study.

Another crucial aspect in this study is the inclusion of the musical score in relation to visual and verbal modes. Music has an important place in multimodal analysis because human beings are inclined to prioritize the verbal dialogue and the visual message when reading a multimodal text while overlooking the scoring inattentively. However, music does supplement the story emotively, and steers viewer interpretation. In fact, music is a major part of the story. Based on this

rationale, this paper emphasized particularly the localization interventions in the musical score for the purpose of exploring music's "constant" interplay with the other modes of communication in the meaning-making process. It is "constant" because, as the findings have shown, not only the presence of a musical cue in the background but also its absence (silence) at a particular moment convey elaborate messages within the multimodal flow of information.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Dr. Edward Larkey, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Maryland, and Dr. Emek Ergün, Keene State College, for their continuous support and assistance in numerous ways throughout the research and writing of this paper.

## REFERENCES

- Aksel, Yağcı, Sevgi Can (2011). 'Yerli Dizi Serüveninde 37. Sezon', pp. 13-47 in S. C. Yağcı Aksel (ed.), *Beyaz Camın Yerlileri*. Kocaeli: Umuttepe.
- Appadurai, Arjun (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bateman, John A. (2008). *Multimodality and Genre: A Foundation for the Systematic Analysis of Multimodal Documents*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bateman, John A. (2011). 'The Decomposability of Semiotic Modes', pp. 17-38 in K. L. O'Halloran and B. A. Smith (eds.) *Multimodal Studies: Exploring Issues and Domains*. London: Routledge.
- Bateman, John A. (2013). 'Multimodal Analysis of Film within the Gem Framework'. *Ilha Do Desterro: A Journal of English Language, Literatures in English and Cultural Studies* 064: 49- 84.
- Bateman, John A., and Schmidt, Karl-Heinrich (2012). *Multimodal Film Analysis: How Films Mean*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Bezemer, Jeff and Kress, Gunther (2008). 'Writing in multimodal texts: a social semiotic account of designs for learning'. *Written Communication* 25(2): 166-195.
- Bezemer, Jeff, and Mavers, Diane (2011). 'Multimodal Transcription as Academic Practice: A Social Semiotic Perspective'. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 14(3): 191-206.

- Bordwell, David (2005). *Figures Traced in Light: On Cinematic Staging*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Buonanno, Milly (2008). *The Age of Television: Experiences and Theories*. Bristol & Chicago: Intellect Books.
- Butler, Jeremy (2014). 'Statistical Analysis of Television Style: What Can Numbers Tell Us about TV Editing?'. *Cinema Journal* 54(1): 25–44
- Campbell, James W. P. (2013). *The Library: A World History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chuang, Ying-Ting (2006). 'Studying Subtitle Translation from a Multi-Modal Approach'. *Babel: Revue Internationale de La Traduction/International Journal of Translation* 52(4): 372–383.
- Cotta, Alain, (1976). 'An Analysis of Power Processes in Organisations', pp. 174–192 in G. Hofstede and M. S. Kassem (eds.), *European Contributions to Organisation Theory*. Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum.
- Fiske, John, and Hartley, John (1978). *Reading Television*. London & New York: Methuen.
- Guback, Thomas H. (1969). *The International Film Industry: Western Europe and America Since 1945*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. and Hasan, Ruqaiya (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hofstede, Geert (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Jewitt, Carey (2009). *The Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, June (2007). *Global Issues, Local Arguments: Reading for Writing*. New York: Pearson Longman.
- Kress, Gunther, and van Leeuwen, Theo (1996). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London: Psychology Press.
- Kress, Gunther, and van Leeuwen, Theo (2001). *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*. London: Arnold.
- Kress, Gunther (2001). 'From Saussure to Critical Sociolinguistics: The Turn towards a Social View of Language', pp. 29–38 in M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, and S. J. Yates (eds.) *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*. London: Sage.
- Kress, Gunther (2003). *Literacy in the New Media Age*. London: Psychology Press.
- Kress, Gunther and Bezemer, Jeff (2009). 'Writing in a multi-modal world of representation', pp. 167–181 in R. Beard, D. Myhill, M. Nystrand, and J. Riley (eds.) *SAGE Handbook of Writing Development*. London: Sage.
- Kress, Gunther (2010). *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. London: Routledge.
- Kress, Gunther (2012). 'Multimodal Discourse Analysis', pp. 35–50 in J. P. Gee, and M. Handford (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Machin, David (2013). 'What is Multimodal Critical Discourse Studies?'. *Critical Discourse Studies* 10(4): 347–355.
- McLuhan, Marshall (1964). *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: McGraw and Hill.
- Mikos, Lothar (2015). 'From The Office to Stromberg: Adaptation Strategies in German Television'. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 29(5): 694–705.
- Miller, Toby, Govil, Nitin, McMurria, John, and Maxwell, Richard (2001). *Global Hollywood*. London: British Film Institute.
- Moran, Albert (2004). 'Television Formats in the World/The World of Television Formats', pp. 1–8 in A. Moran, and M. Keane (eds) *Television across Asia: TV Industries, Program Formats and Globalisation*. London: Routledge.
- Moran, Albert and Aveyard, Karina (2014). 'The Place of Television Programme Formats'. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 28(1): 18–27.
- Mubenga, Kajingulu S. (2009). 'Towards a Multimodal Pragmatic Analysis of Film Discourse in Audiovisual Translation'. *Meta* 54(3): 468–484.
- O'Halloran, Kay L., and Smith, Bradley A. (2011). *Multimodal Studies: Exploring Issues and Domains*. London & New York: Routledge.
- O'Halloran, Kay L., Marissa, K. L. E, Podlasov, Alexey, and Tan, Sabine (2013). 'Multimodal Digital Semiotics: The Interaction of Language with Other Resources'. *Text & Talk* 33(4/5): 665–690.
- Ritzer, George (2015). *The McDonaldization of Society* (8th edition). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Robertson, Roland (1995). 'Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity', pp. 25–43 in M. Featherstone, C. Lash, and R. Robertson (eds) *Global Modernities*. London: Sage.
- Saussure, Ferdinand La, and Riedlinger, Albert (1983). *Course in General Linguistics*. Chicago: Open Court.
- Smith, Shawn M. (2013). *At the Edge of Sight: Photography and the Unseen*. Durham: Duke University Press Books.
- Sparks, Colin (2007). *Globalization, Development and the Mass Media*. Los Angeles & London: Sage.
- Stearn, Gerald E (1967). *McLuhan, Hot & Cool*. New York: Dial Press.

- Steemers, Jeanette (2014). 'Selling Television: Addressing Transformations in the International Distribution of Television Content'. *Media Industries*, 1(1), <http://www.mediaindustriesjournal.org/index.php/mij/article/view/16/76CachedThe> (09-09-2015).
- Straubhaar, Joseph D. (1991). 'Beyond Media Imperialism: Asymmetrical Interdependence and Cultural Proximity'. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 8(1991): 39-59.
- Unur, Kesirli, Ayşegül (2015). 'Discussing Transnational Format Adaptation in Turkey: A Study on *Kuzey Güney*'. *Series* 1(2): 139-150.
- van Leeuwen, Theo (2005). *Introducing to Social Semiotics*. New York: Routledge.
- Yanardağoğlu, Eylem. (2014). 'TV Series and the City: Istanbul as a Market for Local Dreams and Transnational Fantasies', pp. 47-63 in D. Ö. Koçak and O. K. Koçak, (eds.) *Whose City Is That? Culture, Design, Spectacle and Capital in Istanbul*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publisher.