

Biopolitics, Digital Surveillance and the Transformation of the Family

Muhammed Ramazan DEMİRCİ
Giresun Üniversitesi
muhammed.demirci@giresun.edu.tr
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6726-7370

Araştırma Makalesi

DOI: 10.31592/aeusbed.1809352

Geliş Tarihi: 23.10.2025

Revize Tarihi: 12.02.2026

Kabul Tarihi: 20.02.2026

Atf Bilgisi

Demirci, M. R. (2026). Biopolitics, digital surveillance and the transformation of the family. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12(Özel Sayı), 525-544.

ABSTRACT

This article explores the transformation of the family in the digital age through Michel Foucault's concepts of biopolitics and surveillance, integrating complementary perspectives from Shoshana Zuboff, Gilles Deleuze, Donna Haraway, Zygmunt Bauman, and David Lyon. The study argues that the family, historically a site of intimacy and socialization, has become a key biopolitical and surveillance mechanism that integrates individuals into digital regimes of power. Drawing on Foucault's notion of disciplinary power and Deleuze's concept of control societies, the article conceptualizes the *digital family* as both an agent and object of surveillance capitalism. Within this framework, algorithmic systems restructure parenting, reshape privacy boundaries, and mediate intra-family trust through data-driven technologies. The article also analyzes global variations across liberal democracies, hybrid regimes, and authoritarian contexts, demonstrating that the digital family is politically contingent rather than universal. While the state uses e-government infrastructures to monitor populations, the market exploits family-generated data for profit, creating overlapping pressures on autonomy and privacy. Yet families also develop micro-level resistance strategies—through digital literacy, selective technology use, and ethical awareness. Methodologically, the article adopts a comparative theoretical approach that synthesizes fragmented debates in sociology, political science, and digital studies. It concludes that the family, far from dissolving in the digital era, is reconstituted as a hybrid institution where biopolitical regulation, market surveillance, and resistance coexist.

Keywords: Biopolitics, digital family, surveillance capitalism, algorithmic parenting, Michel Foucault.

Biyopolitika, Dijital Gözetim ve Ailenin Dönüşümü

ÖZ

Bu makale, Michel Foucault'nun biyopolitika ve gözetim kavramları üzerinden dijital çağda ailenin dönüşümünü incelemekte ve Shoshana Zuboff, Gilles Deleuze, Donna Haraway, Zygmunt Bauman ve David Lyon'un kuramsal katkılarını bir araya getirmektedir. Çalışmanın temel savı, tarihsel olarak mahremiyet ve sosyalleşme alanı olarak görülen ailenin, dijital iktidar düzeneklerine bireyleri dâhil eden bir biyopolitik ve gözetim mekanizmasına dönüşmüş olduğudur. Foucault'nun disiplinci toplum ve Deleuze'ün kontrol toplumu kavramları çerçevesinde *dijital aile*, gözetim kapitalizminin hem öznesi hem de nesnesi olarak ele alınmaktadır. Algoritmik sistemler ebeveynlik pratiklerini yeniden biçimlendirmekte, mahremiyet sınırlarını dönüştürmekte ve veri temelli teknolojiler aracılığıyla aile içi güven ilişkilerini yeniden tanımlamaktadır. Makale ayrıca liberal demokrasiler, melez rejimler ve otoriter yönetimler arasındaki küresel farklılıkları analiz ederek dijital ailenin evrensel değil, siyasal bağlama göre şekillenen bir olgu olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Devlet, e-devlet altyapılarıyla nüfus verilerini izlerken; piyasa, aile tarafından üretilen verileri ekonomik değere dönüştürmektedir. Bu çift yönlü baskı, aile mahremiyeti ve özerkliğini sınırlandırmaktadır. Bununla birlikte, aileler dijital okuryazarlık, seçici teknoloji kullanımı ve etik farkındalık yoluyla mikro ölçekte direnç biçimleri geliştirmektedir. Nitel karşılaştırmalı kuramsal bir yaklaşıma dayanan çalışma, biyopolitika, gözetim toplumu ve dijital kültür tartışmalarını bütüncül bir çerçevede sentezlemekte; dijital çağda ailenin çözülmediğini, yeniden kurulduğunu ileri sürmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Biyopolitika, dijital aile, gözetim kapitalizmi, algoritmik ebeveynlik, Michel Foucault.

Introduction

The family, as one of the most central social institutions within sociology and political science, has historically fulfilled a critical role not only in processes of individual socialization and identity formation but also in the continuity of social order, the reproduction of political power, and the stability of economic structures (Giddens, 1992; Parsons and Bales, 2007). This multifaceted role highlights the extent to which familial structures serve as both a site of interpersonal interaction and a mechanism through which broader systems of authority and resource distribution are sustained.

Accordingly, structural and functional transformations within the family institution influence not only micro-level everyday relationships but also macro-scale social, political, and economic processes.

The technological revolution ushered in by the digital age has generated profound transformations across nearly every sphere of life—from modes of communication to practices of production and consumption, from everyday lifestyles to the governance techniques of the state (Castells, 2010). This transformation has deeply affected the family as well, reshaping intra-familial roles, intergenerational relations, the boundaries of privacy, and the modes of communication between parents and children (Turkle, 2011). Interactions formed through online platforms, parents' digital surveillance practices over children, and the integration of algorithmic technologies into daily life have rendered the phenomenon of the *digital family* not merely a sociological issue, but rather an interdisciplinary object of inquiry (Lupton, 2015).

The purpose of this study is to examine the transformation of the family in the digital age through the theoretical lens of Michel Foucault's concepts of biopolitics and surveillance. This theoretical orientation allows for a deeper understanding of how contemporary technologies reshape the ways in which power circulates within intimate and domestic spheres. The central research question is formulated as follows: In an increasingly digitalized world, how does the family integrate individuals into mechanisms of surveillance and biopolitical regulation? In this context, the family is approached not solely as a unit regulating private life, but also as a site of population management, social discipline, and the reproduction of power relations.

While the theoretical framework is grounded in Foucault's notions of biopolitics and the Panopticon, it is further enriched with contemporary debates. Shoshana Zuboff's (2019) analysis of surveillance capitalism, Deleuze's (1992) theorization of the *society of control*, Haraway's (1991) discussions on technology and gender, Bauman's (2000) conceptualization of *liquid modernity*, and Lyon's (2018) approach to the *surveillance society* collectively provide a multidimensional map of the power relations surrounding the family in the digital era. This theoretical synthesis brings classical analyses of power into dialogue with contemporary digital surveillance practices and reconceptualizes the transformation of the family through an interdisciplinary lens. By situating the family at the intersection of biopolitical regulation, data extraction, algorithmic governance, and shifting forms of subjectivity, the framework also illuminates how intimate life becomes a strategic site of digital power.

The significance of this study lies in its refusal to confine the family to the boundaries of the private sphere, instead situating it at the intersection of the state's biopolitical strategies, the market's data-driven regulatory mechanisms, and the surveillance practices of digital technologies. This expanded perspective underscores the extent to which the family operates as a conduit through which macro-level power relations penetrate everyday life. In doing so, the family is conceptualized as a central mediating institution in the incorporation of individuals into processes of surveillance, discipline, and control.

The remainder of the introduction proceeds as follows: first, a comprehensive review of the relevant literature will be presented; second, the methodological approach adopted in this study will be explained in detail. This structure aims to provide the reader with a clear roadmap of the analytical trajectory and the rationale behind the chosen research design. The discussion section will then examine the transformation of the family in the digital age through the lens of biopolitics, surveillance, and power relations, and the conclusion will highlight the study's theoretical contributions while also offering suggestions for future research.

Methodology

This study is designed as a qualitative and theoretical inquiry that examines the transformation of the family in the digital age through the lenses of biopolitics and surveillance theories. Rather than aiming to generate empirical data, the research seeks to develop a comprehensive conceptual

framework by comparatively analyzing key approaches within the social theory literature. Accordingly, the methodological approach is structured under the following subheadings.

Research Design

This study is designed as a qualitative theoretical inquiry grounded in Alvesson and Sköldbberg's (2018) interpretive and reflexive methodological approach. Rather than seeking to generate empirical data, the research aims to develop a comprehensive conceptual framework through a comparative analysis of key approaches within the social theory literature. In the analytical process, Foucault's (1995) interpretive and genealogical approach is employed; the concepts of biopolitics, disciplinary society, and control society are examined along the axes of historical continuity and structural transformation. Within this framework, Foucault's theoretical perspective is evaluated in conjunction with Deleuze's (1992) conception of the society of control and Zuboff's (2019) analysis of surveillance capitalism.

Population and Sample

As the study is theoretical in nature, no population or sample is defined in the conventional sense. Instead, the research is based on a purposive selection of key theoretical texts in the fields of biopolitics, surveillance society, digital culture, and family sociology. Within this framework, the works of foundational thinkers such as Foucault (1990; 1995), Deleuze (1992), Zuboff (2019), Haraway (1991), Bauman (2000), and Lyon (2018) were identified as the primary theoretical sources. These texts were comparatively analyzed in terms of their explanatory capacity for conceptualizing the phenomenon of the digital family.

Data Collection Tools

The data for this study were obtained from secondary sources. The literature review was conducted in line with Snyder's (2019) critical literature review approach and Torracco's (2005) integrative literature synthesis model. During the data collection process, academic databases such as Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar were used, and studies addressing themes of biopolitics, surveillance capitalism, the digital family, and algorithmic parenting were purposively selected.

Data Collection and Analysis

The collected theoretical materials were examined through a thematic conceptual analysis. The texts were categorized under the headings of biopolitics, surveillance society, surveillance capitalism, algorithmic parenting, and children's rights. The interdisciplinary synthesis process was structured in accordance with Repko's (2008) conceptual integration approach, enabling the establishment of analytical bridges between distinct theoretical traditions.

Research Ethics

As this study does not involve empirical research with human or animal subjects, ethical committee approval was not required. The research is based entirely on published academic sources. Throughout the study, principles of scientific research and publication ethics were strictly observed, and all sources were appropriately cited. In addition, AI-assisted translation tools were used in certain sections of the manuscript solely for linguistic refinement; this use was limited to language editing and did not affect the conceptual content or analytical integrity of the study.

Findings

This section presents the main theoretical findings of the study and organizes them into interconnected thematic subheadings. Rather than reporting empirical data, it synthesizes key debates on biopolitics, surveillance, surveillance capitalism, the digital family, algorithmic parenting,

children's rights, and family–state relations. Through this structure, the section demonstrates how the family in the digital age operates simultaneously as a biopolitical device, a node of data extraction, and a site of both compliance and resistance. Each subheading thus elaborates a different dimension of the same overarching argument: that the family has not disappeared under digital conditions but has been reconstituted within new regimes of power and surveillance.

Biopolitics: Michel Foucault's Concept of Power and Life

Biopolitics, conceptualized by Michel Foucault as a fundamental component of modern power, refers to the specific modalities of governance exercised over life itself. According to Foucault (1990), power extends beyond the classical understanding of sovereignty, which rested solely on the right to *take life or let live*. Modern forms of power, by contrast, develop techniques and strategies aimed at preserving, directing, and optimizing life. This transformation establishes a new logic of power summarized as the capacity *to make live and to let die*. The modern state, rather than merely exercising the prerogative to kill, seeks to foster, enhance, and render populations productive, while simultaneously tending to abandon or marginalize those deemed valueless or threatening (Foucault, 2003).

At the center of biopolitics lies the management of populations. States monitor biological and demographic indicators—such as birth rates, levels of health, and life expectancy—through statistical methods and intervene with targeted policies (Rabinow and Rose, 2006). Public health campaigns, vaccination programs, birth control measures, and family planning initiatives are concrete manifestations of biopolitical strategies. In this sense, the legitimacy of modern power no longer derives from the *threat of death*, but rather from the claim to safeguard and sustain life (Foucault, 2008). Consequently, domains such as health, hygiene, population growth, sexuality, and family policies have become central concerns of political authority.

Within this process, the family emerges simultaneously as one of the primary targets and instruments of biopolitics. The family constitutes the initial social unit in which new generations are born, raised, and disciplined according to prevailing social norms. Foucault (1990) explicitly identifies *the regulation of health, heredity, family, 'blood,' and normality* as direct manifestations of the biopolitical order. Modern nation-states have instrumentalized the family for both the quantitative management of populations (e.g., policies to increase or reduce birth rates) and their qualitative regulation (e.g., educational practices, disciplinary techniques, or eugenic discourses) (Esposito, 2008).

In Foucault's theory of biopolitics, the family functions as a micro-site of power in which individual bodies and behaviors are shaped according to social norms. Everyday disciplinary practices within the family—such as the regulation of children's eating habits, sleeping routines, education, and sexuality—are in fact extensions of broader population management. Power thus encircles society from within through the family: not only as an external force of coercion, but also through individuals' internalization of self-discipline, which marks the success of the biopolitical order. Foucault (1995), drawing on Jeremy Bentham's model of the Panopticon, highlights how modern power situates individuals within an environment of constant surveillance, thereby compelling them to monitor themselves. The seeds of this internalized surveillance are first sown within the family.

Subsequent thinkers, such as Giorgio Agamben (1998) and Hardt and Negri (2000), have extended Foucault's theorization in different directions. Yet, the common ground remains the tendency of modern power to *politicize life*. One of the central conclusions of the biopolitics literature is that power penetrates the most intimate domains—bodies, illnesses, reproductive practices, and family life. For this reason, any examination of the family in the digital age would be incomplete without a biopolitical perspective. The digital technologies that mediate family life provide new mechanisms through which individuals are observed, guided, and disciplined, thereby making the biopolitical framework an indispensable analytical lens.

Surveillance Theories: From the Panopticon to the Society of Control

The phenomenon of surveillance has become one of the defining characteristics of modern societies. In its broadest sense, surveillance may be understood as the systematic, routine, and focused monitoring of individuals' personal information, behaviors, and modes of communication (Lyon, 2018). Such monitoring is undertaken for diverse purposes, including governance, regulation, protection, and discipline.

Michel Foucault, in his analysis of the disciplinary societies of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, conceptualized Jeremy Bentham's model of the Panopticon as a symbolic apparatus of modern power. In *Discipline and Punish* (1995), the Panopticon is described as a mechanism in which individuals are subjected to constant visibility, unable to escape observation, and thereby internalize surveillance. A central feature of this apparatus is the invisibility of the observer: although prisoners cannot confirm whether they are being watched at any given moment, the assumption of perpetual surveillance compels them to exercise self-control. For Foucault, modern institutions such as schools, factories, hospitals, and barracks functioned according to this panoptic logic, producing *docile* and *normalized* bodies through disciplinary surveillance techniques. Within this framework, the family can also be regarded as a micro-panopticon: parental surveillance over children, and children's learned behavior of acting as if under parental scrutiny even in its absence, exemplify the ways in which power infiltrates everyday life.

By the late twentieth century, Gilles Deleuze expanded upon Foucault's analysis by proposing the concept of the *society of control*. In his *Postscript on the Societies of Control* (1992), Deleuze argued that the closed institutions characteristic of modernity—such as prisons, schools, factories, hospitals, and even the family—were entering into crisis. He maintained that individuals were no longer disciplined subjects moving between discrete institutions, but rather entities embedded in continuous, boundaryless networks of surveillance. Within this shift, the family too is transformed: no longer merely a closed, interior unit, it increasingly takes shape as an open structure exposed to ongoing interaction and monitoring through digital networks.

The most salient feature of control societies is that surveillance is no longer constrained by spatial or temporal limits but is instead enacted through continuous flows of data. Whereas in Foucault's disciplinary society monitoring was ensured through examinations, schedules, and rituals within enclosed spaces, in the society of control it is sustained through lifelong assessment, flexible yet incessantly monitored labor practices, and digital technologies. This transformation has reached its apex in the age of big data analytics, artificial intelligence, and algorithmic surveillance.

Sociologist David Lyon (2018) characterizes the contemporary world with the notion of the *surveillance society*, while Zygmunt Bauman emphasizes that modernity has become liquid, with uncertainty shaping surveillance relations as well. Their joint work *Liquid Surveillance* (Bauman and Lyon, 2013) highlights how contemporary surveillance regimes are increasingly invisible, fluid, and mediated through processes of data circulation. Surveillance, in this sense, has ceased to be confined to fixed institutional settings and has instead become an infrastructural condition of everyday life, facilitated by smartphones, social media, wearable technologies, and Internet of Things devices.

One of the prominent metaphors in the surveillance literature for the digital age is that of the *digital Panopticon*. Shoshana Zuboff (1988), for instance, conceptualized the use of computer technologies in workplaces to monitor employees as an *information Panopticon*, adapting Bentham's model to new technological environments. Today, this panoptic logic has expanded beyond workplaces to encompass the entirety of social life. Camera surveillance, online activity monitoring, geolocation tracking, and facial recognition technologies have rendered surveillance an ordinary and pervasive dimension of everyday experience.

In summary, classical surveillance theories conceptualized the family as an extension of the disciplinary order, whereas contemporary approaches situate the family within diffuse and networked

forms of control. Yet whether viewed as a closed micro-panopticon or as an open node within digital networks, the family remains both a subject and an object of surveillance. In the digital age, family members are simultaneously positioned as agents seeking protection against digital risks and as objects increasingly subject to technologically mediated forms of monitoring. This duality necessitates an analytical framework that integrates the insights of Foucault with those of Deleuze, Lyon, Bauman, and Zuboff.

Surveillance Capitalism: The Family and Data from Zuboff's Perspective

With the rise of digital economies and the expansion of internet-based global corporations, Shoshana Zuboff's (2019) conceptualization of *surveillance capitalism* has become a central theme of debate in the social sciences. Zuboff identifies a new phase of capitalism in which corporations treat individuals' personal experiences and behaviors as raw material to be processed and converted into economic value. Surveillance capitalism operates by harvesting the vast amounts of digital data generated in everyday life and analyzing them through artificial intelligence and algorithmic systems, with the dual aim of predicting and shaping future behaviors. Every trace left online—search engine queries, social media posts, biometric data, and location histories—becomes a strategic resource in this new economic order. In this regard, the oft-cited metaphor that *personal data are the new oil* aptly captures the essence of surveillance capitalism.

The family represents a crucial site within this system, functioning simultaneously as a target audience and as a primary source of data. Technology companies frequently market their products and services under the rhetoric of *facilitating family life*. Smart home systems are advertised with promises of security; baby monitors and GPS-based devices are promoted as tools for child protection; and social media platforms are framed as means of maintaining ties with distant relatives. Yet behind these practices lies a continuous process of data extraction. For example, a smart baby monitor not only observes an infant's room but also records details about parents' sleep patterns and the household's thermal environment. Similarly, smart televisions track family viewing habits to generate personalized advertising suggestions, while smartphone applications extract extensive information about family life ranging from messaging patterns to shopping lists.

A particularly significant contribution to the understanding of surveillance capitalism's impact on children comes from Veronica Barassi. In *Child Data Citizen* (2020), Barassi demonstrates how children's data are collected even before birth. Pregnancy applications, baby development websites, and digital health records contribute to the construction of digital profiles for children from the prenatal stage onward. Drawing from personal experience, Barassi strikingly observed: "I realized that Google knew I was pregnant with my second child before my family did," thereby underscoring how surveillance capitalism captures individuals at their most vulnerable moments. From this perspective, and in line with Zuboff's (2019) notion of *behavioral surplus*, families emerge as one of the most fertile *harvest fields* of the digital economy. The effects of surveillance capitalism on the family can be analyzed across several dimensions:

Consumption Culture and Advertising: The Family under Digital Surveillance

Historically, families have been among the primary targets of the advertising industry. With the advent of digitalization and the development of surveillance technologies, the family has become even more firmly embedded at the center of consumer culture. Through digital tracking techniques, the interests, daily needs, and even vulnerabilities of family members are identified in detail, enabling the development of personalized marketing strategies (Turow, 2011). For instance, when a young mother conducts several online searches for baby products, her social media feed is soon filled with advertisements for infant formula, diapers, and toys. This illustrates how targeted advertising penetrates everyday life practices.

Within the digital economy, *data brokers* compile extensive datasets on families. Information regarding the number of children, their ages, hobbies, and consumption habits is aggregated from

diverse platforms and sold to marketing firms, transforming families into consumption units meticulously tracked by the market (Zuboff, 2019). In this sense, the family emerges not only as a site vulnerable to privacy violations but also as a social category through which consumer culture is reproduced and market logics deeply infiltrate. As Bauman (2007) underscores, in modern societies consumption is not merely an economic activity but also a central mode of identity and belonging. Digital surveillance techniques extend these processes of identity construction into the most intimate aspects of family life.

Behavioral Steering and Algorithmic Control within the Family

Surveillance capitalism is not limited to the identification of existing needs but also encompasses mechanisms aimed at shaping individual behaviors. As Zuboff (2019) argues, technology companies employ large datasets not only to predict but also to *shape behavioral futures*. Algorithms embedded in family-oriented digital platforms provide individualized content that subtly influences everyday practices.

Video-streaming platforms such as YouTube and Netflix, for example, recommend specific cartoons for children and interest-based content for parents, thereby shaping intra-family consumption habits. While appearing to offer personalized choice, such recommendation systems in fact narrow individuals' interests and channel their preferences in predetermined directions (Pariser, 2011). These algorithmic architectures function as new mechanisms of *soft control* within family life.

Often without conscious awareness, individuals begin consuming content aligned with the platform's predictions or strategic aims. Sunstein (2017) describes this dynamic as the emergence of *algorithmic echo chambers*, where individuals' exposure to diverse perspectives diminishes, weakening the democratic public sphere. Similarly, Yeung (2017) conceptualizes algorithmic systems as forms of *nudge* technologies, highlighting their profound implications for autonomy. For Zuboff (2019), such algorithmic interventions represent a significant threat to both personal autonomy and democratic decision-making, as the manipulation of choices erodes the very idea of free will and embeds *behavioral power* into everyday life, including family relations.

The Erosion of Privacy: Families and Digital Traces

In the era of surveillance capitalism, privacy increasingly becomes a privilege accessible only to certain groups (Zuboff, 2019). Family privacy is directly implicated in this transformation. In-home digital assistants such as Amazon Alexa or Google Home record family conversations and transmit acoustic data to cloud servers, exposing the most intimate aspects of domestic life to data flows. Similarly, smart toys capable of recording children's voices transmit such data to corporate servers, thereby both violating privacy and constructing children's digital profiles from the earliest stages of life (Holloway and Green, 2016).

Barassi (2020) emphasizes that the personal information of infants and young children is archived in ways often unnoticed by parents, producing *digital shadows* that may reappear later in life. The creation of digital identities before individuals are capable of consent raises serious ethical concerns, particularly given their potential long-term effects on opportunities, social status, and economic prospects (Livingstone and Third, 2017). For instance, childhood health data collected at an early age might one day be utilized in insurance risk assessments, amplifying anxieties surrounding the consequences of surveillance capitalism for families (Nissenbaum, 2010). Thus, the erosion of privacy in the context of surveillance capitalism is not merely an individual issue but a structural one, directly centered on families and, in particular, children. This situation necessitates critical ethical reflection from both data privacy and children's rights perspectives.

Family Relations and Digital Fragmentation

Technology companies frequently market their products through the rhetoric of strengthening family bonds. Promises such as storing family photo albums in the cloud or enabling video calls between grandparents and grandchildren are presented as means of supporting family communication. Yet the same technologies direct each family member toward individualized devices and algorithmically curated content streams. This fragmentation reduces opportunities for shared experiences and widens intergenerational cultural divides (Livingstone, 2009; Turkle, 2011).

Parents may spend time on Facebook while children immerse themselves in Instagram or TikTok, inhabiting distinct cultural universes despite sharing the same physical space (Boyd, 2014). This fragmentation illustrates how digital platforms cultivate individualized media environments that reduce opportunities for intergenerational interaction. Algorithmic infrastructures reinforce this separation by delivering content that maximizes individual engagement, thereby undermining the potential for constructing a shared family culture.

In this light, the literature on surveillance capitalism is crucial for understanding the political economy of the family in the digital age. The family is no longer solely a unit of intimacy and solidarity but has also become a data-generating actor embedded within market logics of consumption and behavioral management. Zuboff's (2019) conceptual framework demonstrates how digital technologies bind families to an invisible market order, giving rise to the phenomenon of the *traceable family*. This traceability may sometimes provide security and convenience—such as locating a lost child via GPS—but it simultaneously generates new ethical and social concerns surrounding the erosion of privacy and the curtailment of individual freedoms.

The Digital Family: Transforming Roles And Virtual Extensions

In the digital age, the family as a social institution has transcended its traditional boundaries, expanding with new meanings and being redefined in multiple ways. The term *digital family* refers not only to the use of technology by family members in everyday life but also to the reconstruction of intra-family relationships, modes of communication, and practices of socialization through digital technologies (Lupton, 2015). In classical sociology, theorists such as Durkheim (1997) and Parsons and Bales (2007) viewed the family as the cornerstone of society, a stable unit that transmits identity, norms, and values to its members. Today, however, modes of communication have undergone radical change, and perceptions of time and space have been reshaped. Even family members who share the same household may immerse themselves in separate virtual worlds through different digital devices, transforming the quality of shared time at home. Research shows that television, once a focal point bringing families together, has lost this role, as individualized and personalized content consumption increasingly fosters individualization and isolation (Livingstone, 2009).

Digital technologies have also reshaped intergenerational relations. Prensky's (2001) notion of *digital natives* captures the younger generation raised alongside the internet and smart devices, in contrast to parents, who, as *digital immigrants*, typically encountered such technologies only in adulthood. This generational gap often hinders parents' ability to guide their children's digital experiences. Faced with emerging issues such as cyberbullying or online privacy violations, traditional parenting frameworks may prove insufficient (Livingstone and Blum-Ross, 2020). Parenting thus increasingly entails not only providing discipline but also offering guidance within digital environments. As Haraway (1991) notes, the transformative effects of technology on gender and family structures are directly linked to the unraveling of patriarchal family ideologies. Her concept of *kin-making* underscores the growing significance of technology-mediated communities that extend beyond the biological family model.

With digitalization, family forms have become more diverse, and the nuclear family has ceased to be the singular norm. Single-parent households, LGBTQ+ families, child-free partnerships, and *remote families* who sustain ties through digital communication despite geographical distance are

now increasingly common (Weston, 1997). The internet reconfigures kinship, enabling new forms of belonging and intimacy not grounded in blood ties but sustained in virtual settings. Online gaming communities and social media groups can evoke experiences of kinship, including feelings akin to siblinghood or parenthood (Lupton, 2015).

Another dimension of digital family debates is the rise of domestic surveillance technologies. Baby monitors, smart cameras, GPS-based tracking devices, and parental control software are marketed with promises of safety and security, yet simultaneously establish a culture of surveillance within the family (Leaver, 2017). In this respect, the parent–child relationship can resemble a digital panopticon: when children are aware of tracking devices, they regulate their behavior as though constantly under parental observation (Lyon, 2018). Likewise, spouses monitoring each other’s locations through digital applications blur the boundaries of domestic privacy, increasingly grounding trust in *digital evidence*.

One of the most salient dilemmas posed by the digital family is the tension between privacy and security. While risks such as cyberbullying, exposure to inappropriate content, and online exploitation legitimize parental use of surveillance technologies, excessive monitoring raises concerns regarding children’s autonomy and right to privacy (Livingstone, 2009). This tension introduces new ethical, pedagogical, and psychological debates within the family.

Feminist theory provides valuable insights in this regard. Technologies initially perceived as reinforcing patriarchal structures (e.g., household appliances that intensified domestic labor) have also become tools for women’s participation in the public sphere and increased visibility in online networks (Wajcman, 2004). Haraway’s (1991) *cyborg* metaphor illustrates how women and marginalized groups can creatively repurpose technology to challenge gender norms. Thus, the digital family is not only a site for the reproduction of biopolitical power relations but also a stage where gender roles are renegotiated and transformed.

In conclusion, the literature on the digital family demonstrates that the family is not a static but a historically contingent institution. Digital technologies act as both catalysts and transformative agents in this process. Family roles are being redefined: parents increasingly function not only as disciplinarians but also as digital guides, while children serve not only as learners but also as actors capable of leading parents with their technological expertise. This transformation situates the family as a key site where both biopolitical power and surveillance capitalism are enacted and contested.

Algorithmic Parenting: The Reconfiguration of Child-Rearing Practices in the Digital Age

In the digital age, parenting is no longer confined to the transmission of biological and cultural heritage; it has increasingly become a process shaped by algorithmic systems. This shift highlights the extent to which everyday parental decisions and practices are mediated by platforms that curate, predict, and influence behavior. In this context, algorithmic parenting can be understood as a new conceptualization that captures how child-rearing practices are restructured through algorithms, digital surveillance tools, and data-driven technologies.

The digital instruments employed by parents to monitor, protect, or guide their children—such as parental control software, GPS tracking systems, screen-time regulators, and smart toys—do more than provide safety. They also foster the internalization of behavioral patterns aligned with algorithmic norms. This dynamic resonates with Foucault’s (1995) notion of panoptic surveillance, while simultaneously reflecting Deleuze’s (1992) analysis of the *society of control*, in which monitoring becomes continuous, fluid, and diffused into everyday life—including the intimate sphere of the family. Algorithmic parenting can be examined across three dimensions:

Surveillance Dimension

Children's digital activities—such as internet use, social media behavior, and geolocation data—are continuously tracked. This constant monitoring demonstrates how childhood increasingly unfolds within environments where visibility is engineered rather than incidental. These data are utilized not only by parents but also by technology companies (Livingstone and Blum-Ross, 2020; Leaver, 2017).

Guidance Dimension

Algorithmic systems indirectly shape parenting by offering *recommended* content, educational applications, or advertisements tailored for children. This dynamic illustrates how digital platforms subtly intervene in parental decision-making by framing certain options as more beneficial or developmentally appropriate. In this sense, parenting becomes increasingly dependent on algorithmic prescriptions of *best practices* (Zuboff, 2019).

Normative Dimension

In striving to secure their children's safety, parents often enforce digital rules strictly, sidelining children's rights to autonomy and privacy. This situation reveals a growing tension between protective intentions and the developmental need for children to exercise independent judgment in digital environments. Family authority is thus reinforced through algorithmic mediation, and the standards of *good parenting* are progressively defined by technology companies themselves (Leaver, 2017).

The concept of *algorithmic parenting* provides a powerful analytical tool for understanding the transformation of traditional parenting roles in the digital age. Parents, while retaining agency, often find it difficult to act independently of the data and recommendations offered by algorithms. Consequently, parenting practices emerge as both the objects and the reproducers of digital surveillance. Within this framework, the family operates not only as part of the broader biopolitical order but also as a site embedded within the logics of algorithmic governance.

Ethical Dimensions: Privacy and Children's Rights

In the digital age, the family is positioned not only as an object of biopolitical and surveillance strategies but also at the center of pressing ethical debates. This expanded role underscores how familial relations increasingly intersect with technological infrastructures that reshape fundamental notions of autonomy and responsibility. Among the most significant issues are the formation of children's digital identities even before birth, the transformation of the right to privacy, and the reconfiguration of trust within the family through digital monitoring tools.

Barassi (2020) highlights how children's digital data are collected at an early stage via pregnancy applications, prenatal health records, and child development platforms. This process results in children possessing enduring digital footprints long before they are capable of providing informed consent, thereby exposing them to potential social, economic, and political disadvantages later in life. Zuboff's (2019) concept of *behavioral surplus* helps explain how children's data are commodified and leveraged by markets as a strategic resource. In this sense, children should not be seen as merely passive subjects of digitalization but rather as central components of the data economy (Lupton and Williamson, 2017).

Parents' reliance on digital surveillance technologies to protect their children frequently risks infringing upon their right to privacy. For example, smart toys that record children's voices (Holloway and Green, 2016) or GPS-enabled devices that continuously track location can curtail children's individual autonomy. These practices mirror the logic of surveillance articulated in Foucault's (1995) panopticon model, reproduced at the scale of the family. Consequently, the notion of *trust* within

familial relationships is increasingly mediated through the production of digital evidence and practices of monitoring.

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), in Article 16, establishes the right to privacy as a universal principle. Yet, in the digital era, the applicability of this principle is deeply contested. Livingstone and Third (2017) conceptualize children's online rights through a triad of *provision, protection, and participation*, underscoring the particular significance of digital privacy for vulnerable groups. Children's digital footprints may generate *digital shadows* that carry long-term implications, such as potential discrimination in insurance, education, or employment contexts.

Within this framework, the most critical ethical dilemma facing families is the tension between security and privacy. While parents turn to monitoring mechanisms to shield their children from digital risks, excessive surveillance may compromise children's autonomy and right to privacy. Thus, parenting in the digital age entails not only the responsibility of protection but also an ethical obligation to balance security with privacy. Failure to strike this balance risks serious consequences for both the safeguarding of individual rights and the sustainability of social trust.

Global Comparisons: The Digital Family in Liberal Democracies and Authoritarian Regimes

In the digital age, the family is reshaped not only by technological transformations but also by the dynamics of state–market relations and the nature of political regimes. The distinction between liberal democracies and authoritarian regimes is crucial for understanding how families are integrated into digital surveillance and biopolitical strategies. The character of political regimes directly influences the boundaries of digital privacy, the protection of children's digital identities, and the configuration of intra-family surveillance practices (Hintz, Dencik, and Wahl-Jorgensen, 2019).

In liberal democratic contexts such as the European Union and North America, the digital family is primarily discussed in terms of individual rights, privacy, and freedoms. The European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) represents one of the most comprehensive legal frameworks designed to safeguard children's digital privacy. Within this framework, parents are granted legal rights over their children's online identities, while technology companies are constrained by stringent data protection regimes. Nonetheless, despite such regulations, algorithmic surveillance, targeted advertising, and behavioral profiling continue to shape family life through largely invisible mechanisms. Thus, while the digital family in liberal democracies is strengthened through the discourse of rights protection, it simultaneously remains subject to the hidden strategies of market-driven surveillance capitalism.

By contrast, in authoritarian contexts such as China, Russia, and several Middle Eastern states, the digital family becomes directly embedded within the biopolitical and securitizing strategies of the state. China's Social Credit System, for example, not only monitors individuals' economic and social behaviors but also extends such scoring mechanisms to the family unit, creating a framework of collective responsibility (Dai, 2018). This can be interpreted as an authoritarian digital manifestation of Foucault's (2008) notion of biopolitics. During the COVID-19 pandemic, contact-tracing applications and digital quarantine regimes in China and Singapore directly regulated the spatial mobility of families, visibly enhancing the surveillance capacity of the state (Lyon, 2021). In these contexts, the family is transformed less as a locus of individual autonomy and more as an instrument of collective security and state stability.

In countries such as Brazil, India, and Turkey—where democratic institutions have weakened—the family is simultaneously exposed to the strategies of market-based surveillance capitalism and the paternalistic population policies of the state. India's Aadhaar biometric identification system has facilitated family members' access to state services but has also generated intense debates over the right to privacy (Eubanks, 2018; Rao and Nair, 2019). In Turkey, the e-Government (*e-Devlet*) platform has provided functional efficiency in accessing social services, while also enabling the state to monitor family data through integrated databases. In Brazil, under Bolsonaro,

the family functioned both as an ideological vehicle of conservative–populist discourse and as a surveillance unit mediated through digital platforms. These hybrid cases point to a model of the digital family situated in the gray zones between liberal democracy and authoritarianism.

From a global perspective, the transformation of the digital family is not merely the outcome of technological developments but is equally shaped by the character of political regimes and cultural contexts. In liberal democracies, surveillance tends to operate predominantly through market-driven algorithmic mechanisms, whereas in authoritarian regimes, state-centered biopolitical surveillance prevails. In states undergoing democratic erosion, these two tendencies intersect to produce hybrid models. This comparative analysis thus underscores that the digital family cannot be understood as a universal category but must instead be examined as a socially and politically contingent formation shaped by specific legal, cultural, and regime contexts.

Family and the State: Population, Policy, and E-Government in the Digital Era

The relationship between family and state has long been a central theme in political science and sociology, from classical social contract theorists to modern welfare state theories. Throughout history, states have regarded the family both as a value to be protected and as a social unit to be regulated. With the rise of the modern nation-state, the family became central to political strategies as the site of population production and reproduction (Donzelot, 1979). In Foucault's (2008) analysis of biopolitics, family policies emerge as a key mechanism for the governance of populations. Marriage incentives, campaigns targeting birth rates, and maternal and child health programs exemplify biopolitical strategies aimed at regulating the population both quantitatively and qualitatively. The pronatalist (population-increasing) and antinatalist (population-limiting) policies implemented in many countries throughout the twentieth century legitimized direct interventions in families' reproductive decisions.

In the digital age, family–state relations have acquired new dimensions through e-government applications and digital governance. E-government platforms, designed to accelerate services and reduce bureaucratic burdens, directly engage families as their primary users. Examples include the digital integration of birth registrations, the monitoring of vaccination schedules through electronic systems, and the online accessibility of student report cards. In the Turkish context, the *e-Devlet* portal has digitized a wide range of family-related services, including birth allowances, family benefits, marriage permits, and applications for social assistance. While this digitalization has facilitated access to public services, it has also enabled the state to collect more comprehensive and real-time data on family members. Through integrated data analysis, governments can generate projections about future population profiles and adapt their policies accordingly.

The use of digital technologies by the state extends beyond service delivery to include the promotion of family values and social regulation. Social media campaigns aimed at promoting the image of the *strong family*, projects designed to reduce divorce rates, or strategies addressing children's digital safety are indicative of this process. In this sense, the family becomes both the object of supportive and regulatory policies in the digital era.

One of the most contested dimensions of digital state practices, however, concerns the potential infringement of family privacy under the guise of surveillance and security. Mass surveillance programs conducted in the name of national security may extend into family communications. The COVID-19 pandemic provided a striking example: in many countries, smartphone-based contact-tracing applications and quarantine monitoring systems were deployed, subjecting families' movements to direct observation (Lyon, 2021). This can be read as a contemporary manifestation of Foucault's concept of biopolitics: in the name of protecting population health, the state integrated family members into digital surveillance regimes.

Evaluating family–state relations in the digital age also requires attention to the permeability between the public and private sectors. On the one hand, technology companies (e.g., Google,

Facebook) may cooperate with governments by sharing citizens' data; on the other, authoritarian regimes may regulate or co-opt digital platforms in order to monitor family life. Thus, a reciprocal entanglement exists between the commercial infrastructures of surveillance capitalism and the biopolitical strategies of the state.

In sum, digitalization plays a *dual role* in family–state relations. On the one hand, it facilitates service provision and enhances family welfare; on the other, it expands state capacities for control and poses significant threats to family privacy. This dual dynamic positions the family in the digital age simultaneously as the subject of welfare policies and as the object of surveillance strategies.

Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendations

In the digital age, the family has both transformed some of its historically embedded functions and acquired new roles. This transformation necessitates a redefinition of the family's biopolitical and surveillance functions within the context of contemporary power relations and digital technologies. From the perspective of Foucault's theory of biopolitics, the family has long functioned as a biopolitical instrument for modern states. As the locus of population renewal, the family has shaped demographic structures through births, deaths, marriages, and divorces; in the twentieth century, nation-states implemented pronatalist and antinatalist policies through families as responses to war and economic crises (Foucault, 2008; Donzelot, 1979). In the digital era, this function persists but is reconfigured: states now monitor fertility rates, marriage ages, and regional demographic distributions through big data analytics. Each newborn is immediately registered in digital identity systems and becomes the object of data surveillance from birth onward.

The surveillance function of the family has also been intensified by digital technologies. In Foucault's (1995) disciplinary society, the family was the primary institution preparing children for social life. Today, parental control software, GPS-based tracking applications, and domestic surveillance cameras transform the family into a digital Panopticon (Lupton, 2015). For children, the sense of being constantly monitored narrows the space of privacy, while for parents it produces new tensions between protection and anxiety. As Lyon (2018) argues, surveillance has become an infrastructural condition of modern societies, extending into the intimate realm of family privacy. Health systems collect families' vaccination and medical records to construct population profiles; insurance companies employ such data in risk assessments; educational technologies record students' learning patterns in databases; and private corporations repurpose these data for marketing strategies (Eubanks, 2018).

From the perspective of Zuboff's (2019) theory of surveillance capitalism, families have become both consumers and products of the digital economy. Household consumption habits provide valuable data for digital platforms; Netflix's *family profiles* and Amazon's integration of household information into targeted advertising exemplify how families are incorporated into the economic cycle of surveillance capitalism. At the same time, the state's digital shadow extends control over families. In China, the Social Credit System incorporates family members into collective scoring mechanisms, transforming the family into a unit of collective surveillance (Dai, 2018). The COVID-19 pandemic offered another vivid example: contact-tracing applications and digital quarantine controls redefined families as both quarantine units and surveillance nodes (Lyon, 2021).

Yet families are not passive objects of digital surveillance. As Foucault reminds us, where there is power, there is also resistance. Practices such as digital detox strategies, the adoption of privacy-focused technologies, or the limitation of children's online visibility represent ways in which families attempt to maintain agency (Livingstone and Blum-Ross, 2020). Moreover, the opportunities afforded by digitalization should not be overlooked. Migrant families can sustain daily communication with relatives across borders, individuals with disabilities can engage in new forms of socialization, and parents gain enhanced access to educational resources. In this respect, digital transformation not only deepens processes of surveillance and discipline but also provides tools that can empower and support families. Haraway's (1991) metaphor of *hopeful monsters* is instructive here: technological

transformations may destabilize existing structures but simultaneously open up possibilities for new and potentially emancipatory practices.

In the digital age, the family has been reconfigured beyond its classical meaning, emerging as both a biopolitical and surveillance mechanism. The theoretical discussions undertaken in this article demonstrate that the family is not merely a sphere of intimacy, reproduction, and socialization, but also a social unit through which strategies of governing life are enacted and through which surveillance systems are embedded via digital technologies. Michel Foucault's conceptualization of biopolitics clarifies how modern states discipline populations and optimize life through the family, while Shoshana Zuboff's analysis of surveillance capitalism reveals how the digital economy subjects families to data extraction in order to predict and shape behavior. Gilles Deleuze's theory of the society of control underscores the dissolution of the disciplinary family model and the rise of a permeable, networked family form, helping us to conceptualize the phenomenon of the digital Panopticon. Donna Haraway's feminist perspective highlights how gender roles and identities within families are renegotiated through technology, whereas Bauman's notion of liquid modernity and David Lyon's analysis of the surveillance society show how the family is reduced to a traceable social unit within fluid surveillance regimes.

One of the study's key findings is that relations between the state, market, and family have become both more intensive and more indirect in the digital era. The family remains a carrier of nation-states' long-term population policies (e.g., family-oriented digital transformation strategies and e-government services), while simultaneously being monitored by global digital platforms. This dual process generates a double pressure on family privacy and autonomy. State-driven digital surveillance, undertaken in the name of security and welfare, may be protective in intent yet produces paternalistic frameworks, while market-driven data mining subjects family members to the continuous cycles of consumption. Families, however, are not entirely passive in this process: practices such as digital literacy, privacy protection strategies, and the conscious limitation of technology use demonstrate forms of micro-level resistance.

The contribution of this article lies in its interdisciplinary theoretical approach to the transformation of the family in the digital age, bringing together diverse theoretical perspectives into a coherent framework. Themes often treated separately in the literature—biopolitics, surveillance society, digital culture, and family policy—are here synthesized into an integrated analysis. This holistic approach allows social science researchers to situate the digital family within biopolitical, surveillance, and cultural contexts simultaneously. By ensuring conceptual consistency while applying complex theoretical debates to the phenomenon of the family, the article also provides a solid foundation for future empirical research.

In conclusion, under the shadow of the digital Panopticon, the family emerges simultaneously as the subject of the state's digitized population policies and as the object of the surveillance economy. Intra-family relationships are reshaped through digital technologies, with values such as love, trust, and privacy undergoing new tests. This transformation generates effects not only at the micro level but also at the macro scale, influencing societal value systems, political preferences, and economic consumption patterns. Yet the family is not only a site of dissolution but also of reconstruction. It is a locus where continuity and rupture coexist, where old and new elements intertwine. Drawing on Foucault and contemporary theorists, the analysis concludes that the digital family is more familiar than it may appear—yet reshaped by new tools and surveillance technologies. The central argument advanced here is that the family has not dissolved in the digital age; rather, it has been reconstituted, continuing to function as a central component of social order. The family may stand under the shadow of the digital Panopticon, but it also persists under the very light that casts that shadow, gaining new meanings and sustaining its relevance.

Authors' Contribution Rate

Since this article is a single-authored study, the author's contribution rate is 100%.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest related to this study.

References

- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Alvesson, M. and Sköldbberg, K. (2018). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*. (3. ed.). Sage.
- Barassi, V. (2020). *Child data citizen: How tech companies are profiling us from before birth*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2007). *Consuming life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. and Lyon, D. (2013). *Liquid surveillance: A conversation*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Boyd, D. (2014). *It's complicated: The social lives of networked teens*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Castells, M. (2010). *The rise of the network society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dai, X. (2018). Toward a reputation state: The social credit system project of China. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 6(10), 1–61. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3193577>.
- Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscript on the societies of control. *October*, 59, 3–7. Retrieved from <https://arsenal.arch.ethz.ch/site/assets/files/8808/voluptas-h78mjgdrvcl8zo17nw95-pdf.pdf>.
- Donzelot, J. (1979). *The policing of families*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Durkheim, E. (1997). *The division of labor in society*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Esposito, R. (2008). *Bíos: Biopolitics and philosophy*, T. Campbell (Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality, Volume 1: An introduction*, R. Hurley (Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*, A. Sheridan (Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (2003). *Society must be defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–76*, D. Macey (Trans.). New York, NY: Picador.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–79*, G. Burchell (Trans.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Giddens, A. (1992). *The transformation of intimacy: Sexuality, love, and eroticism in modern societies*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Haraway, D. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*. New York: Routledge.
- Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hintz, A., Dencik, L. and Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2019). *Digital citizenship in a datafied society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Holloway, D. and Green, L. (2016). The internet of toys. *Communication Research and Practice*, 2(4), 506–519. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22041451.2016.1266124>.
- Leaver, T. (2017). Intimate surveillance: Normalizing parental monitoring and mediation of infants online. *Social Media + Society*, 3(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305117707192>.
- Livingstone, S. (2009). *Children and the internet*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Livingstone, S. and Blum-Ross, A. (2020). *Parenting for a digital future: How hopes and fears about technology shape children's lives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Livingstone, S. and Third, A. (2017). Children and young people's rights in the digital age: An emerging agenda. *New Media and Society*, 19(5), 657–670. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816686318>.
- Lupton, D. (2015). *Digital sociology*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lupton, D. and Williamson, B. (2017). The datafied child: The dataveillance of children and implications for their rights. *New Media and Society*, 19(5), 780–794. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816686328>.
- Lyon, D. (2018). *The culture of surveillance: Watching as a way of life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lyon, D. (2021). *Pandemic surveillance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Nissenbaum, H. (2010). *Privacy in context: Technology, policy, and the integrity of social life*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the internet is hiding from you*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Parsons, T. and Bales, R. F. (2007). *Family, socialization and interaction process*. New York: Routledge.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10748120110424843>.
- Rabinow, P. and Rose, N. (2006). Biopower today. *BioSocieties*, 1(2), 195–217. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1745855206040014>.
- Rao, U. and Nair, V. (2019). Aadhaar: Governing with biometrics. *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, 42(3), 469–481. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00856401.2019.1595343>.
- Repko, A. F. (2008). *Interdisciplinary research: Process and theory* (First ed.). Sage.

- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. New York: Basic Books.
- Turow, J. (2011). *The daily you: How the new advertising industry is defining your identity and your worth*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing Integrative Literature Reviews: Guidelines and Examples. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4(3), 356-367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484305278283>.
- United Nations. (1989). *Convention on the rights of the child*. General Assembly resolution 44/25. https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_44_25.pdf.
- Wajcman, J. (2004). *TechnoFeminism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Weston, K. (1997). *Families we choose: Lesbians, gays, kinship*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Yeung, K. (2017). ‘Hypernudge’: Big data as a mode of regulation by design. *Information, Communication and Society*, 20(1), 118–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1186713>.
- Zuboff, S. (1988). *In the age of the smart machine: The future of work and power*. New York: Basic Books.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. New York: PublicAffairs.

Genişletilmiş Özet

Giriş

Dijital çağ, toplumsal ilişkilerin, siyasal yapının ve gündelik yaşamın her alanını köklü biçimde dönüştürmüştür. Bu dönüşümden en çok etkilenen kurumlardan biri de ailedir. Geleneksel olarak sevgi, dayanışma, bakım ve toplumsallaşma gibi işlevlerle tanımlanan aile, günümüzde dijital teknolojiler aracılığıyla gözetim, veri toplama ve davranış yönlendirme süreçlerinin merkezinde yer almaktadır. Bu makale, Michel Foucault'nun biyopolitika ve gözetim kavramları temelinde, dijital çağda ailenin geçirdiği dönüşümü ele almakta; Shoshana Zuboff, Gilles Deleuze, Donna Haraway, Zygmunt Bauman ve David Lyon'un kuramsal katkılarını bir araya getirerek çok katmanlı bir çözümleme sunmaktadır.

Çalışmanın temel amacı, ailenin dijital çağda yalnızca bir özel yaşam alanı olarak değil, aynı zamanda bireylerin dijital iktidar mekanizmalarına dâhil edildiği bir toplumsal ara yüz olarak nasıl konumlandığını açıklamaktır. Foucault'nun biyopolitika kavramı, yaşamın yönetimi ve nüfusun denetimi üzerinden modern iktidarın işleyişini ortaya koyarken; Deleuze'ün *kontrol toplumu* yaklaşımı, bu iktidar biçimlerinin dijital çağda süreklilik kazandığını vurgulamaktadır. Zuboff'un *gözetim kapitalizmi* kavramsallaştırması, aileyi piyasa merkezli veri ekonomisinin hem üreticisi hem tüketicisi haline getirdiğini açıklamaktadır. Haraway'ın *siborg* ve *akrabalık* tartışmaları, teknolojiyle dönüşen toplumsal cinsiyet ve aile yapısına ışık tutmaktadır. Bauman ve Lyon'un modernite, akışkanlık ve gözetim kültürü analizleri ise bu dönüşümün etik ve kültürel boyutlarını anlamak açısından tamamlayıcı bir çerçeve sunmaktadır.

Yöntem

Bu çalışma, nitel bir kuramsal sentez olarak kurgulanmıştır. Ampirik veri üretmeyi hedeflemekten ziyade, farklı düşünürlerin teorilerini karşılaştırmalı bir perspektifle yeniden okumayı ve yorumlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu bağlamda Foucault'nun disiplin toplumu anlayışı, Deleuze'ün kontrol toplumu çözümlemesiyle birlikte ele alınmakta; Zuboff'un dijital ekonomi eleştirisi ise aile kurumunun piyasa ve devlet mekanizmaları aracılığıyla nasıl yeniden biçimlendiğini ortaya koymak üzere tartışmaya dâhil edilmektedir.

Kuramsal yöntem, aileyi hem biyopolitik bir düzenleme alanı hem de gözetimsel bir aktör olarak değerlendiren iki yönlü bir çerçeve üzerine kuruludur. Foucault'nun iktidar anlayışı, bireyin yaşam süreçlerinin yönetimi üzerinden devletin nüfus politikalarına odaklanırken; Deleuze'ün kontrol toplumu, bu yönetim biçiminin dijital teknolojiler aracılığıyla kesintisiz hale geldiğini ileri sürer. Zuboff'un analizinde ise gözetim kapitalizmi, bireysel deneyimlerin veri olarak işlenmesiyle ekonomik bir değere dönüşür.

Bu çalışmanın yöntemi, söz konusu üç kuramsal hattı birbirine eklemelendirerek aile kurumunun dönüşümünü çok boyutlu bir perspektiften kavramayı amaçlamaktadır. Haraway'ın feminist yaklaşımı, toplumsal cinsiyetin dijital ortamda yeniden inşa edildiğine işaret ederken; Bauman ve Lyon'un modernlik analizleri, güven, mahremiyet ve kimlik gibi temel kavramların dijital çağda giderek daha akışkan ve değişken bir nitelik kazandığını ortaya koymaktadır. Bu kuramsal bütünlük, aile olgusunun disiplinler arası bir çerçevede daha kapsamlı ve bütüncül biçimde ele alınmasına imkân sağlamaktadır.

Bulgular

Çalışmanın temel bulgusu, dijital çağda ailenin hem devletin biyopolitik müdahalelerinin hem de piyasa temelli gözetim stratejilerinin kesişim alanında konumlandığını ortaya koymaktadır. Bu bağlamda aile, yalnızca sosyalleşme, bakım ve kimlik aktarımının gerçekleştiği bir toplumsal birim olmaktan çıkarak, dijital verilerin üretildiği, işlendiği ve dolaşıma sokulduğu merkezi bir mekânsal ve

işlevsel düğüm noktasına dönüşmüştür. Dolayısıyla aile, modern dijital yönetim süreçlerinde hem düzenleyici iktidarın nesnesi hem de veri ekonomisinin sürekliliğini mümkün kılan bir üretim alanı olarak yeniden tanımlanmaktadır.

İlk olarak, aile içi gözetim pratikleri dijital araçlar yoluyla yoğunlaşmıştır. Ebeveynler, çocuklarının güvenliğini sağlamak amacıyla konum takibi, çevrim içi etkinlik kontrolü ve ekran süresi sınırlaması gibi yöntemleri kullanmakta; bu durum çocukların mahremiyet ve özerklik alanlarını daraltmaktadır. Bu süreç, Foucault'nun *panoptikon* modelinde tanımladığı içselleştirilmiş gözetimin dijital çağdaki uzantısı olarak yorumlanabilir.

İkinci olarak, gözetim kapitalizmi ailenin tüketim alışkanlıklarını yönlendiren temel güç haline gelmiştir. Akıllı ev sistemleri, çevrim içi alışveriş platformları ve sosyal medya algoritmaları, aile bireylerinin tercihlerini sürekli olarak analiz eder. Zuboff'un tanımladığı *davramısal artık* kavramı, aile yaşamında üretilen her verinin ekonomik değere dönüştürülmesi anlamına gelir. Böylece aile hem pazarın hedef kitlesi hem de veri sağlayıcısı konumuna yerleşir.

Üçüncü olarak, devletin dijitalleşen biyopolitik stratejileri aileyi nüfusun yönetiminde merkezî bir konuma taşımıştır. E-devlet uygulamaları aracılığıyla doğum, evlilik, sağlık ve eğitim bilgileri dijital sistemlerde depolanmakta; bu durum hizmetlerin hızını artırırken aynı zamanda bireylerin özel yaşamını izlenebilir hale getirmektedir. Bu süreç, Foucault'nun *yaşamın yönetimi* fikrinin dijital altyapılarla yeniden üretilmiş biçimi olarak değerlendirilebilir.

Dördüncü olarak, teknolojinin toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri üzerindeki etkisi dikkat çekicidir. Haraway'in *siborg* metaforu, kadınların ve farklı toplumsal kimliklerin teknolojiyi hem denetim hem de özgürleşme aracı olarak kullanabileceğini öne sürer. Dijital aile ortamında kadınlar hem görünürlük kazanmakta hem de yeni biçimlerde gözetim ve baskı deneyimlemektedir.

Son olarak, Bauman ve Lyon'un modernliğin akışkanlaşmasına ilişkin analizlerinin de gösterdiği üzere, dijitalleşme aileyi durağan bir toplumsal yapı olmaktan çıkararak sürekli dönüşen bir ilişkiler ağına dönüştürmektedir. Günümüzde aile üyeleri aynı fiziksel mekânı paylaşıyorlar dahi, farklı dijital platformlarda ve çevrimiçi kültürel evrenlerde konumlanarak gündelik yaşamı parçalı bir biçimde deneyimlemektedir. Bu durum, ortak zaman ve ortak deneyim alanlarının giderek daralmasına, dolayısıyla aile içi etkileşimin niteliğinin hem mekânsal hem de duygusal açıdan yeniden tanımlanmasına yol açmaktadır.

Sonuç, Tartışma ve Öneriler

Çalışma, dijital çağda ailenin çözülmediğini, aksine yeniden kurulduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Aile hem devletin biyopolitik yönetim araçlarının hem de piyasanın dijital gözetim ekonomisinin aracısı haline gelmiştir. Bu dönüşüm, mahremiyet, güven ve aidiyet kavramlarının sınırlarını yeniden tanımlamaktadır. Foucault'nun biyopolitika anlayışı, devletin yaşam süreçlerini düzenleyici iktidarını anlamamıza imkân verirken; Deleuze'ün kontrol toplumu kavramı, bu düzenlemenin dijital teknolojilerle kesintisiz hale geldiğini gösterir. Zuboff'un gözetim kapitalizmi analizi, piyasanın veriyi iktidar aracına dönüştürmesini açıklarken; Haraway, Bauman ve Lyon'un yaklaşımları, dijitalleşmenin etik, kültürel ve cinsiyet temelli boyutlarını görünür kılar.

Aile, dijital çağda bir yandan devletin biyopolitik düzenleme mekanizmaları ile piyasanın veri temelli gözetim stratejilerine eklenmekte, diğer yandan ise bu çok yönlü baskı karşısında kendi özerkliğini sürdürme yönünde çeşitli pratikler geliştirmektedir. Bu bağlamda aile üyelerinin dijital farkındalık düzeyi ve teknolojiyi seçici, eleştirel ve bilinçli biçimde kullanma kapasiteleri, sürecin yönünü ve etkilerini belirleyen temel değişkenler arasında yer almaktadır. Dolayısıyla dijital çağın aile üzerindeki etkileri, yalnızca dışsal iktidar mekanizmalarının niteliğiyle değil, aynı zamanda ailelerin bu mekanizmalar karşısında geliştirdikleri uyum ve direnç stratejileriyle birlikte değerlendirilmelidir.

Dijital çağda aile, modern toplumun hem en korunaklı hem de en şeffaf kurumlarından biri haline gelmiştir. Bu ikili yapı, Foucault'nun *iktidar her yerde* tezini doğrular niteliktedir. Aile, hem iktidarın yeniden üretildiği bir mikro alan hem de bireylerin öz-denetim geliştirdiği bir pratik sahasıdır. Deleuze'ün belirttiği gibi, dijital gözetim artık kapalı kurumların sınırlarını aşarak gündelik hayatın her anına sızmıştır. Bu dönüşüm, aynı zamanda Zuboff'un tarif ettiği ekonomik düzende, verinin yeni bir güç biçimi haline gelmesine neden olmuştur. Haraway'ın perspektifinden bakıldığında, bu süreç yalnızca denetim değil, aynı zamanda kimliğin yeniden biçimlenmesi anlamına da gelir. Kadınlar, ebeveynler ve çocuklar, dijital ağlar üzerinden farklı iktidar ilişkilerine maruz kalmakta, aynı zamanda bu ilişkileri yeniden kurma potansiyeline de sahip olmaktadır. Bauman ve Lyon'un ortaya koyduğu *akışkan modernlik* kavramı, aile kurumunun artık sabit bir kimlik taşımadığını, sürekli değişen dijital ortamlar içinde yeniden tanımlandığını gösterir. Bu durum hem belirsizlik hem de esneklik üreten bir dinamiğe sahiptir.

Gelecekteki araştırmaların, dijital ailenin farklı siyasal rejimlerdeki biçimlerini karşılaştırmalı olarak incelemesi önem taşımaktadır. Liberal demokrasilerde piyasa merkezli gözetim biçimleri baskınken, otoriter rejimlerde devlet temelli biyopolitik kontrol mekanizmaları öne çıkmaktadır. Bu iki yapının kesiştiği *melez rejimler*, aileyi hem devlet hem de piyasa tarafından çift yönlü bir denetim alanına dönüştürmektedir. Ayrıca, dijital etik, mahremiyet ve çocuk hakları konularının aile temelli eğitim programlarına dâhil edilmesi gerekmektedir. Aile bireylerinin dijital farkındalık düzeyini artırmak, gözetim kültürüne karşı bilinçli direnç biçimleri geliştirmek açısından önemlidir.

Sonuç olarak, dijital aile olgusunun çok katmanlı yapısını daha derinlikli biçimde analiz edebilmek için disiplinler arası araştırmaların güçlendirilmesi ve kuramsal tartışmaların ampirik çalışmalarla desteklenmesi önem arz etmektedir. Sosyoloji, siyaset bilimi, iletişim çalışmaları ve etik gibi farklı disiplinlerin ortak sorunsallar etrafında iş birliği geliştirmesi, dijital dönüşümün aile üzerindeki etkilerini daha bütüncül bir çerçevede değerlendirme imkânı sunacaktır. Bu tür bir metodolojik ve kuramsal çeşitlilik hem kavramsal tartışmaların zenginleşmesine hem de dijital aileye ilişkin politika geliştirme süreçlerinin daha sağlam temellere oturtulmasına katkı sağlayacaktır.