

# The Social Surveillance and Generational Compliance in New Mediation

Khamis Juma Abdalla

State University of Zanzibar, Kilimani, Zanzibar

This article explores the social transformation on account of surveillance conception preoccupied through the technology diffusion thanks to the Web 2.0 novel features. The new mediation abstracts the social provisions into radical customs of surveillance. It primes the supposition of socialization hitherto to transpire the scrutiny of the mutual rehearses of vertical and horizontal surveillance. Hence, the ultimate conversion keeps on through self-exposition notion in views of social interaction which so far posit the question of the privacy and public boundary owing to the hypothetical undue freedom of self-expression through Web 2.0. Thus, this paper examines the Surveillance Society in a comprehensive scope of the social structure vis-à-vis the ideas of generational submission towards social transformation. Using the dichotomy of digital revolutions, the Digital “Natives” are classified as typically addicted digital consumptions bearing the community outlooks, while Digital “Immigrants” persist in semi obedience along with the traditional adherence. Ultimately, the Panopticon conceptualizes the certainty of social surveillance by dint of proliferation of information flows keen on social conducts automated in both online and offline paths through technological appliances.

*Keywords:* generational divide, new mediation, self-expression and exposition, social transformation, Surveillance Society, Web 2.0

## Introduction

The proliferation of new way of communication tends to intensify across the social world keen on a variety of approaches. New media becomes a critical matter of discourse determining the entire social conducts through virtual contrivance, regarding to plentiful compliance with this conversion. Based on this drastic obedience, Social surveillance turns into prevalent impression considering daily consumptions. Counting the level of community relationship molded through decentralized structure, whereby individual and organizational entities prevail in a reciprocal mode (Boyd, 2009; Marwick, 2012). Individuals as common users are disposed to subject themselves by chance or by choice to invisible technological institutions. Through this commitment, individuals monitor themselves instantly by internalizing the practice of social surveillance on a choice of relevant channels, so far they consent the route of being monitored by others (ibid).

Tokunaga (2011) asserts the emerging surveillance in various customs of undertakings and distinctive from ordinary perspectives. According to him, “horizontal” surveillance is applied to the approach of keeping in touch as the primary goal of new media obligation, such as spectators rely on searching tag for socialization meant for

---

Khamis Juma Abdalla, Dr., lecturer, Department of Communication and Media Studies, State University of Zanzibar, Kilimani, Zanzibar.

generating manifold friendships. This system embeds on Web 2.0 specifically athwart interactive applications and websites to nature classic two-way communication structure. Unlike the traditional surveillance through vertical perspective of managing the population crosswise their surroundings, the new mediation tends to be too strategic to demonstrate asymmetrical surveillance, presence of a strong hierarchical power structure “spy” profoundly, managing the individual characters like demographic data (Andrejevic, 2005).

According to Marwick (2012), social surveillance metaphor in the emerging communication tends to reflect our ideal community postures; we shift and manage them for digital affiliation. It’s typical about self-management across the evolving version. Accordingly, the exclusive features accessible throughout the prevalent platforms yield the exciting community headed for expression and progress of human communication. Let’s think about the images and emoticon in chatting; they are potential to afford us ironic recognition among our individual feelings. On account of this inclination, communicators stick at the surveillance for being observed instantly, while observer lasts perpetually veiled.

According to Boyd (2009), the online surveillance power remains more complex than traditional undertakings thanks to four eminent characteristics: persistence, replicability, scalability, and searchability. In a broad sense, the information we share widespread through diverse technological platforms persists in spontaneous records and archive. Hence invisible entities take part in accession, distribution, and sharing with mysterious publics who potentially duplicate the contents in their ways. The reproduction of the content as geared by Web 2.0 formats lets numerous spectators to access through searchable links and web searches. This grows to the complexity, since the initiators do not have such command to nurse further users as well as the ultimate consumptions of the data.

### **Is It Shaping, Shaped, or Neutral?**

On the assumption that social transformation is evolving throughout the new system, twisting the social bearings as well. This astonishing thesis is prospective to screw some intimate individual conducts in the society, from the telephone invention to the computer applications (Özçağlayan & Çelik, 2014). Hence, the exceptional mediation utterly transforms society to supplement common relationship. This assertion of technology diffusion is yet to liberate the social settings into other form of socialization, comprising hierarchical surveillance to horizontal observance, with the proviso that technology is largely shaping the societal sceneries towards a positive way of liberating the entire arenas (Buckingham, John, & Catherine, 2008). Likewise, the other contentions are on the transparency that technological surveillance abstracts the social context and nature disorganized spheres (Howard, 2011), thanks to the provision of multiple forms and channels of communication prospective to spur further polarizations in due course.

On the other hand, some scholars keep at the argument that technology is merely a neutral good that centers to reflect the existing social being simply, with assumptions on the subject of communication model, for human needs to spread and access sufficient information democratically (Meyrowitz, 1985; Boyd, 2009; Peterson, 2009). This neutral argument relies on the determinist perspective in the wider dialogue of the social structure; hitherto transformation is neither shaped nor shaping over predominant configurations (Howard, 2011). It’s presumed that communication vis-à-vis technological endowment is insignificant cause of conversion due to its historical backgrounds emerged in unexpected methods (Willett, 2008). So far the heterogeneous based community in term of wealth, culture, and political ideologies is unlikely to bring out changes in the occurrence, unless to persevere the ultimate conflicting provisions.

### **Hypothetical Self-Exposition and Personal Security**

The subject of social surveillance with digital communication is a discourse which can be constructed in a broad sense of individuality regarding self-expression conception. Tracing this new mode of communication with diverse features in relations to hypothetical excessive freedom of expression in a wide range of egoisms, hence the individual security expands this subject to explore. The entire freedom that an individual puts the proposition in accessing new media posits a quest to examine it intensely through self-creating and complete goal of self-expression (Horning, 2014). The apparent trust and submission on the archetypal consumptions so far do not promise any kind of security over belief of freedom. So far as individual assumption is engaged with significant components notably widespread photos, video, and text with target contacts and public a whole, the compound surveillance simultaneously traces the movement. Let's think about security concerns, when governments or intelligence intuitions take dominance on retrieving the intact content determinedly for advance consumptions.

The question of freedom and trust in self-expression tends to pledge considerable individualities and security viewpoints. The contents generated and shared with colleagues advance the hypothesis through numerous reproductions alike. As long as the nature of the space inclines to stuff duplicable and visible phenomenon, the unknown amount of users with the indeterminate consumptions endure. The controversy is yet when users familiarize with social conducts customized into denoted platforms. Several cases clue on this idea relating to the imprecise contents; there is an incident about one couple: Wayne Forrester, 34, in London 2018, killed his wife with kitchen knife simply after she changed her Facebook profile to "single"<sup>1</sup>. The two-way-communication does not grant ultimate satisfaction, attributable to the way our interaction derived from other's perspectives. It still prompts us back to traditional surveillance facilitated enormously through face to face podium, inducing accessibility with gestures and other supporting icons. For the digital public space, the sense of worldwide postulates our reciprocity unconditionally, while the confession among acquaintances in the midst of human proximity unlikely to play part.

Tufekci (2008) speculates horizontal surveillance in views of socialization model through self-exposition ideas. New media users are sensible about the privacy blurred and safety; they hitherto cannot be practically responsive, due to the presumption of retaining social linkage. They tend to assume zero surveillance with extraordinary confidence. Such hypothesis tempts individuals even to engage with fake contrivance to cope with ideal freedom of expression. Given that the deliberation to socialize through new media intensifies, the interpersonal surveillance through a wide range of approaches deepens (Andrejevic, 2005). The self-exposition by dint of widespread data on the digital space so far implicates to the activeness of the public engagement. Equally, the escalation for personal jeopardy by means of horizontal surveillance approaches the certain degree of social recognition. Though some are hypothetically endeavoring primary settings to hide potential information from public, presumptions are limited to the host of the platforms, as they have abundant surveillance instruments not only to the personal data but also to open to other sources whenever required. For instance, the setting of newsfeed is also inefficient yet to hide the Facebook information accessed from others, which can be persistently preserved for future and remains searchable through search webs, and commonly grant a blank check for uneven self-exposition and personal security.

---

<sup>1</sup> A jealous husband stabbed his wife to death because he felt "humiliated" over a posting she made on the social networking website Facebook was jailed for life (BBC News, 17 October 2008), <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7676285.stm>.

### **Blurring Private and Public Boundary; a Collapsed Context?**

The conceptualization of social transformation through emerging surveillance cannot overlook the public and privacy dichotomy. The scope of ordinary private margin transforms to the uneven public stances which tend to deprive the human contentment in the social life. Boyd (2011) put forward the “collapsed context” notion meant for the practices of new media in setting up the denial of privacy boundary over public comportments. According to them, the information revelation on rich backgrounds, remarkably at workplaces, homes, school, implies huge repercussions to the deliberation of private life, even if an individual takes on indicators of boundaries of approaching friends and family. Taking into accounts our professional conducts as far as journalism concerned, the simultaneous public mediation automatically entails conspicuous complexity, when journalist considers his identical space to address miscellaneous publics. Consequently, the audiences come across to fix the social context over professional postures.

The Web 2.0 grants exceptional prospects for internet users, having enough access to the entire contents and straight reproduction as well as disseminating to others, in another word: co-author of the content. The User Generated Content (UGC) cherishes importunity to the model of social behavior over ordinary settings (Marwick, 2012). The status quo simply points to distort the privacy margin through widespread self-photos or video so as to transform each and peculiarity to the public viewpoints. Life-streaming is also very common in tracking personal information and distribution to the multiple networks (Marwick, 2012). Besides, the thesis of new social mediation stipulates further through economic perspectives on configuring public periphery, for examples business companies, marketers, and government institutions opt in gathering sufficient amount of data loaded on the social network sites including personal data and demographics in attaining their assorted goals. Marketers speculate even consuming behaviors to every user, so that affect self-representations in everyday manners.

The social realm designed by new media does not correspond to the individual sovereignty in the social life, due to the powerful mechanisms on our everyday routines, so far shaping insomuch as the way of thinking. It happens to digital communication dispersion touching our regular plans concerning the social context or professional practices. It comes about many times that we change our straight menu and dressing styles because of the photos, video, or text instituted on the friend’s walls. Think about a number of adverts provided on the social media platforms with their creative copywriting and other eye-catching components. We are branded through our schedules, since the digital nature enables to strengthen their monitoring and target everlasting. The new media evolves marketing surveillances, through their media networks twist offline scenario as a result of providing news that guide to new informational life.

Whilst, Kennedy (2009) views “Facebook stalking” as the strategic enough for social surveillance that publicly enlightens individual privacy by the publics. Through Facebook walls, pictures, and status updates, extract public recognition on individual’s doings, thus far highlights admirations for others. The visitors get too much confidence on recounting others’ conducts in view of social context. Grimmelmann (2008) argues on the online privacy through the Web 2.0 in the midst of the gaze among users that clue to divisive privacy perspectives. The distinguished features on the online space notably persistence, replicability, scalability, searchability tend to spur uncertainty of information flow. Whereas the privacy goes uneven exposed without consideration of social context. This retains the concept of the collapsed contexts of the data regardless of the partition in the ordinary social environment. Hitherto we fail to detach the context for the appropriate spectators since information widespread horizontally and retrieved via various central source of information search. So far as the

consumptions of personal information remain mysterious, the self-censored does not justify the end of the context collapse.

Farinosi (2011) contends on the individual attempts of self-protection for managing the key setting of critical information as a shop-window for our personal communication in self-promotion and unveiling our identities willingly. The scrutiny firms in the boundary of private and public because of the complexity of social context consistent with the multiplicity nature of publics. The users halt in a tight spot for the sort of public to address in respect of proper tone and approaches. It's notorious in the communication studies that the audience always attributes the ways and can influence the content and message designed by the sender. The digital mediation uncertainly justifies the model, in reference to disparity that intensively distorts the content. Through this boundary it is unlikely to attain the pleasing privacy through the public platforms, and will stay unrealistic, when tracing the traditional boundary of public and privacy, for instance, when classified documents keep records at very confidence with even security guards surrounded it. In this digital age it has not certainly proven successful yet for the documents hidden online. As per the emerging of cyberhacktivism notion unfluctuating to the even powerful states which are technologically sophisticated, grant a clear picture around this argument for the public and privacy dichotomy.

### **The Attempts of Universal Surveillance**

It's just a matter of time in the transformation when biocentric civilization emerged from the foundation of biopower, liable to build up the transition (Foucault, 1978). The technology diffusion plays a great role to embody the state power from institutional controls. The construction of electronic surveillance is supremely determined by structures of power which signify to the emergence of the universal surveillance state. The self-expression is a determinant process meant for dynamic, changing, diverse, and under constant discussion, which also calls for termination in the new world of technology. The emergence of the universal surveillance state responds to the technological evolving features, which so far embark on the post cold wars for the sake of national security. It's known clearly during the cold wars that the national security was just for the matter of single national exertions, through its military aptitude.

The transformation is about technopower that has come to replace biopower through the inevitable undertaking of digital flow of communication. Although, new media users are not mindful about the technological power which extracts the social system in the line of commercial scheme, this indicates the patent transformation of universal surveillance and novel renewal of social world. It's just inadequate prospect for the rich publicness, due to the economic control by the social elites which eliminate identical occasion to others. Consequently, a little number of users with popularity might dominant the space solely with evolving profiles, while a large number of marginalized last with voiceless or slow down their voice likely. Albeit, given the prestigious persons like politician, artists, sportsmen, etc., in the society, it is virtually expected that the surveillance will come targeting more about their personal circulation data as opposed to the voiceless (Grand Strategy, 2014). As long as, we spend much time online to gain huge exposure, multicultural publics econcounter our perspectives. We tend to create our self-image bearing of the various occurrences, even if many users are aware that the Web 2.0 affords enormous linkage to the social context with very crucial data and individualities.

The implication of the universal surveillance state derived from the entire surveillance to the citizens in the country, through the perception of Proptocon where individuals are responsive of being monitored all over the places by mysterious observer. This situation generates wide concerns in the public on preventing from the burden

of national security. The state applies strategic approach in comprehensive surveillance to the citizens; this includes the horizontal and vertical way of surveillance. There is algorithm of normalcy to detect the public behavior in the course of national security progression (Grand Strategy, 2014). The social structure along diverse traditional and digital communication channels likely to cope intensively. Universal political dominance may influence the stream of the universal security information, regarding the existing powers, including wealth, celebrity, etc., while other elite groups can emerge from the boundary of the surveillance in the contemporary life, so far the dominant groups might not be pleased enough from the emergence of a new surveillance regime.

### **Digital “Immigrants” vs. Digital “Natives”**

The supposition of generational divide on the subject of new media signifies the novel perspectives of personal communication an interaction on a daily basis ratio meant for social transformation. The young generation abundantly shifts to the online sphere as the primary space for the execution of social basics. The metaphor of global village intellects the young people on the suitability of the wired space, whereby significant linkage can be established, including past and current friends, along with future acquaintances. Whilst, social surveillance pertains to this pattern, tracing young generations and their social acts moving to the online settings, for recalling and prediction of their life and switch to new socialization (Boyd, 2009). Although it’s strongly considered an exclusive prospect for the exposition towards future progress, this remains on the discourses of collapsed context because of the occurrence of indiscernible spectators. The young peoples accounted for the invisible audience in the midst of horizontal surveillance, so far they unacquainted the vertical surveillance for their replicable personal data, commencing designation for scalability to the merchants and persistently retrieved via the search engines like Google and others.

Prensky (2001) views that the new transformation places young rather fitting the move, since they are digital “natives”, simply to cope with this situation in an attempt to arrive at democratic, creative, an innovative generation. He discerns with the digital “immigrants” referring to adults who just come to meet this exposition on the progress later now; they are typically differentiated on the basis of offline adoption including cultures, belief, speaking. The digital “natives” intensify themselves likely digital degeneration with peculiarities, while immigrants ideally comply with the traditional scenario and integrate with a new style of digital generation. According to the wide revolution in the scope of generational diversity, the digital “natives” endure new forms of communication with digital demanding, rather than adults whereby communication prototype for them is widely hierarchical, inflexible, and centralized (Buckingham et al., 2008).

Buckingham et al. (2008) conceptualize “cyberkids” as technologically empowered generation of young people and put their faith in the internet as primary power for their burdens. According to him they are still minority and unable to influence more than prevalent generations, due to the trivial engagement on global agenda in preference to build local networks. Moreover, Herring (2008) affirms that young people overtake the power of internet ineffectually to the social changes as a replacement for commercial immersion, due to the fact that civic participation is geared by a good number of youth and adults insomuch as on the online sphere. Young’s embracement on online activities like gaming and chatting about social media signifies to ineffectiveness in social participation. Such commitment is simply substantial for the commercial capitalists, along with adults since the payment generates the national economy back to their parents’ pockets, seeing the digital impression for young generation still debatable, as the student-centered learning model whereby the “fun” blurs the boundaries between learning and play (Boyd, 2009).

Whilst, the mobility generated on new media platforms tempts young people to engage in the online space, they contextualize the social background in the new mediation to reach their social information widespread. Given young people are not energetic social and political actors, then potential active on the social changes. It perseveres that the large quantity of young people dominates the social media with cultural surroundings; the thesis of new culture adoption traces the young internet users in route for their own identity. Nevertheless, the diversity in the midst of cultural transformation can be vividly twisted by the commercial constraints from social class, gender, and backgrounds (Buckingham et al., 2008). The transformation of the culture among the young is determined with momentum loyalty to the digital media as now several uncultured and immoral contents evolving across the digital spaces.

The supplementary scrutiny of generational divide stresses the young people on the identical consumptions of the technological appliances, social media in particular that creates their remarkable social systems (Willett, 2008), while other consumptions like games are in critical discussion over their potential contents which touch psychological and cultural traits. Consequently, multiple platforms like Blogs, Facebook, and Tweeter grant social changes, including culture commonly targeting the young people. The adjustment is visible through revolutionary culture derived from various internet products branding the digital natives. So far, the new communication adds backs the online marketers to gather information and specifically target the young people, through their parents' attachment as wells. On this dissertation of digital generation continues to be branded by commercial, blurring the diversity of culture, race, and social class towards identical identity.

### **Can We Sidestep From Social Surveillance?**

The continuous discourse of social transformation and surveillance crosswise the new mediation entails a broad hypothesis of social circumvent. The idea is preoccupied around the usages of social media, to the label of the social information (Özçağlayan & Çelik, 2014). Consider abundant traditional media shift and huge encouragement of their audiences on using the new media in accessing their news flow and other forms of journalism. Whilst, the governments and other intelligences employ assorted mechanism which inspires citizens to custom the digital spaces for storing personal information. The distinguished features of the internet reinforce the surveillance practice more realistically to every step. The use of hyperlink for example makes it possible by hyperlinked information to infer the context in which particular bits of information appear online without the meaning of those bits, as well as Google's handling to aggregate all these endorsements for search results (Howard, 2011).

The governments mechanize surveillance both online and offline, by knowing or not, in keeping citizens' vital records. Then people surrender through their communication details including address, location, connection logs. So far, our communication devices as well as the handsets, telephone numbers, email address, and data neither pledge personal security. Thus, the surveillance is designed for every single entity accessible in the community including online and offline. Özçağlayan and Çelik (2014) confess on the substantial concerns with the attempts of governments in keeping records of identity cards, health certificates, banking details, resident documents, passports, which are still used for monitoring and surveillance as well as for future consumptions including the personal and professional realms.

Farinosi (2011) argues about the operation of surveillance to our social scenario; its application undergoes throughout everyday life, whether at home, work, leisure, or out on the streets. According to him, this kind of Panopticon has to a large extent influenced our ordinary life and social order. The pressure groups in the society,

including the government institutions which manage to make use a number of the Electronic Panopticon to monitor and control every single act by individual in the daily life. The ruling and social elites persist to entertain this way of monitoring while other groups will struggle to uncertainty. The proliferation of information flows is inevitable yet to monitor our social life and hamper about our identities on the hands of a powerful minority.

Thus, the study of surveillance through digital infrastructure comes to be inexorable to our modern routine hitherto. We might fall on horizontal or vertical surveillance, yet a proof that the watchers and watched could not know each other, including our portable devices comprising smartphones involved in monitoring. According to Özçağlayan and Çelik (2014), we cannot so far be immune from the scrutiny due to the electronic architecture which utterly systematize our regular social and economic conducts through indiscernible ways. Since the online space is surveyed with signals of cell phones, IP numbers of computers, e-mail, the offline space is included through geolocation data, street camera, etc. Albeit, the vertical surveillance is determined on the new mediation when business company benefited from the data explored from the social media users, while horizontal surveillance enables social media participant to manipulate themselves on the self-expression notion through the online sphere. So far the division of those observed and the observers is likely persevering.

### Conclusion

Commitments to internet sovereignty endow with frequent epitomes, whereby the surveillance discourse is inclusive to every step of social life, throughout online and offline daily routines. The metaphor around Panopticon sticks at the classic surveillance supposition of watching and adjusting direct or incidental every entity in the society, given that the technological communication archetypal prompts anyone to be controller or controlled in the direction of social transformation. Notwithstanding the online space remains more complex because of exceptional features with multiple challenging platforms, which makes possible for the invisible observer to peculiarly monitor the observed entities. The digital realm is characterized with scalability, replicability, researchable, and persistence which all come to heighten the tentative surveillance to universal abstracting social transformation, especially for young generation which drastically evolves in the digital proliferations speciously.

The provision of Web 2.0 extracts undue freedom of information that triggers critical questions on cybercrime and censorship escalation on the subject of privacy. As long as the social surveillance of this version inclines multifaceted substance designed in the diverse setups, individuals are instantly detected with a number of visible and indiscernible whether digital or local paths but are still under a new form of surveillance. The Panopticon nearby the critique calls for further scholarly concerns such as media literacy for the young people in particular. Accordingly, the quest is also needful counting content analysis to scrutinize the young generation' supremacy and aptitudes in exercising the self-exposition typology in the basis of social aftermath, for the betterment of social configurations which stuck asymmetrically in a wide scope of practices when blurring the boundary between privacy and public.

### References

- Andrejevic, M. (2005). The work of watching one another: Lateral surveillance, risk, and governance. *Surveillance & Society*, 2(4), 479-497. Retrieved January 17, 2023 from [http://www.surveillance-and-society.org/articles2\(4\)/lateral.pdf](http://www.surveillance-and-society.org/articles2(4)/lateral.pdf)
- Andrejevic, M. (2007). Surveillance in the digital enclosure. *The Communication Review*, 10(4), 295-317.
- Buckingham, D., John, D., & Catherine, T. (2008). Introducing identity. In *Youth, identity, and digital media* (pp. 1-26). MacArthur Foundation Series on Digital Media and Learning. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.



- Barney, D. (2001) *Prometheus wired: The hope for democracy in the age of network technology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Boyd, D. (2009). Taken out of context. American teen sociality in networked publics (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, 2009). Retrieved January 17, 2023 from <http://www.danah.org/papers/TakenOutOfContext.pdf>
- Farinosi, M. (2011), Deconstructing Bentham's panopticon: The new metaphors of surveillance in the Web 2.0 environment. *TripleC*, 9(1), 62-76.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, Vol. 1*. (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Pantheon.
- Grand Strategy. (2014). Retrieved from <https://geopoliticatus.wordpress.com/2014/03/31/the-emergence-of-the-universal-surveillance-state/>
- Grimmelmann, J. (2008). Saving Facebook. *Iowa Law Review*, 94, 1137-1206.
- Herring, S. (2008). Questioning the generational divide: Technological exoticism and adult constructions of online youth identity. Indiana University, School of Library and Information Science. Retrieved January 10, 2016 from <http://ella.slis.indiana.edu/~herring/macarthur.pdf>
- Hindman, M. (2009). *The myth of digital democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Horning, R (20014), *Social Media is Self-Expression*, accessed on <http://thenewinquiry.com/blogs/marginal-utility/social-media-is-not-self-expression/>
- Howard, P. N. (2011). *The digital origins of dictatorship and democracy: Information technology and political Islam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kennedy, C. (2009). Facebook and panopticism: Healthy curiosity or stalking? (Thesis, Ohio University, 2009). Retrieved January 20, 2023 from <http://etd.ohiolink.edu/view.cgi/Kennedy%20Mary.pdf?ohiou1258038346>
- Marwick, A. (2012). The public domain: Social surveillance in everyday life. Microsoft Research New England, Cambridge, USA. Retrieved January 18, 2016 from [http://library.queensu.ca/ojs/index.php/surveillance-and-society/article/viewFile/pub\\_dom/pub\\_dom](http://library.queensu.ca/ojs/index.php/surveillance-and-society/article/viewFile/pub_dom/pub_dom)
- Özçaglayan, M., & Çelik, R. (2014). Self-expression, exposition and surveillance in social media (A qualitative study on the transformation of surveillance through the digital information). Retrieved January 15, 2016 from <http://www.mediacritiques.net/index.php/jmc/article/viewFile/17/13>
- Peterson, C. (2009). Saving face. The privacy architecture of Facebook (Senior thesis, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, 2009). Retrieved January 14, 2023 from <http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=cpeterson>
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1-6.
- Tufekci, Z. (2008). Can you see me now? Audience and disclosure regulation in online social network sites. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 28(1), 20-36.
- Thorseth, M., & Ess, C. (2009). *Technology in a multicultural and global society*. London: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Tokunaga, S. (2011). Social networking site or social surveillance site? Understanding the use of interpersonal electronic surveillance in romantic relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(2), 705-713.
- Willet, R. (2008). Consumer citizens online: Structure, agency, and gender in online participation. Institute of Education, University of London, Centre for the Study of Children, Youth and Media. Retrieved January 18, 2023 from [http://research.ioe.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/consumer-citizens-online-structure-agency-and-gender-in-online-participation\(8aff7f77-f415-401e-ad54-b7eb949c3ff1\)/export.html](http://research.ioe.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/consumer-citizens-online-structure-agency-and-gender-in-online-participation(8aff7f77-f415-401e-ad54-b7eb949c3ff1)/export.html)
- Wolcott, P., & Goodman, S. (2000). *The internet in Turkey and Pakistan: A comparative analysis*. Palo Alto, CA: Center for International Security and Cooperation, Stanford University.