



Selected Papers of #AoIR2025: The
26th Annual Conference of the
Association of Internet Researchers
Niterói, Brazil / 15 – 18 Oct 2025

THE DIVERSITY OF EVERYDAY EXPERIENCES OF FAMILIES AND CHILDREN WITH DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES

Inês Vitorino Sampaio
Federal University of Ceara

Dinusha Bandara
Deakin University

Luci Pangrazio
Deakin University

Lídia Marôpo
Instituto Politécnico de Setúbal and CICS.NOVA

Ana Jorge
Lusofona University and CICANT

Andra Sibak
University of Tartu

Parenting children and young people through their early digital experiences can be both joyful and stressful. Playing, gaming, learning, and communicating with family can now be facilitated through digital technologies, bringing children and families a sense of connection, fun and belonging. However, discourses around digital parenting are not straightforward and often contradictory. Parents are told that their children must develop digital skills for future employment and general well-being (Dijk & Deursen, 2014; Livingstone et al., 2023); by contrast, the negative implications of screen time and privacy breaches are well researched and reported upon (Schmidt et al., 2012; Lissak, 2018).

In the context of platforms and families, technologies have become “matters of care”, as they facilitate and enable different modes of care and caring (Zakharova & Jarke, 2022). Sharenting has recently become a popular activity performed by parents to collect memories, inform friends and family about their children, look for support and advocacy, and to self-present themselves as good or prideful parents (Borda, 2015; Lopez, 2009; Tiidenberg & Baym, 2017; Verswijvel et al., 2019). In this context, children

Suggested Citation (APA): Vitorino Sampaio, I., Bandara, D., Pangrazio, L., Maropo L., Jorge, A., & Sibak, A. (2025, October). *The Diversity of Everyday Experiences of Families and Children with Digital Technologies*. Panel presented at AoIR2025: The 26th Annual Conference of the Association of Internet Researchers. Niterói, Brazil: AoIR. Retrieved from <http://spir.aoir.org>.

are imbricated in the content created by their influencers or celebrity parents. For families and children who are not from privileged families, these challenges are intertwined with issues related to the digital divide.

In this panel, we examine how parents and carers make decisions about the access and use of digital technologies by their young children. With many family practices now mediatized and “reliant on technologies of caring and sharing” (Mascheroni & Siibak 2021: 5), we explore the conditions under which family members (re)negotiate their understandings about their children’s relationship with technology and the tensions that emerge.

This panel combines five papers which focus on the diversity of daily digital experiences of families and children in four countries (Australia, Brasil, Portugal and Estonia). The papers use diverse theoretical and methodological approaches such as: the technological, legal and economic analysis of apps, participant observation, thematic analysis of interviews, and multimodal content analysis. They draw on case studies, critical data studies and migration studies to unpack the diverse and divergent practices and understandings families have of digital technologies across the world.

The first paper focuses on the strategies families and children employ to cope with adversities associated to the digital divide in the context of an Indigenous community in Brazil. It argues about the implications this digital divide has for parental guidance and supervision of children's digital access and use, aiming to contribute to a deeper understanding of these questions by analyzing them through the lens of children's rights and their best interests.

The second and third papers are based on Australian families yet investigate different cultural groups and aspects of daily digital life. Working with Sri Lankan Australian families with young children in Melbourne, Australia, paper three explores how they integrate (or resist) data-generating technology in their homes while they co-construct their transnational experiences, identities and values in everyday settings. The third paper unpacks the data assemblage of a popular edtech app StoryPark to show how parents, children and educators are positioned by policies, discourses and practices to engage with this technology and ultimately aid data generation.

The fourth article seeks to examine children’s playbour in commercial sharenting practices, through two sub-questions: What are the sharenting content strategies used by the influencers as affective mechanisms? And how is children’s play represented? It explores these questions through case studies in Brazil and Portugal, discussing the challenges faced by children growing up in the public eye, with their names, images, life stories, and personal experiences widely known.

The fifth article explores how three-generational families in Estonia have started to make use of platforms for “doing family” and the role that platforms play in their family care arrangements. It aims to explore how digital platforms are embedded in the lives and practices of “doing family”. Furthermore, it investigates the role platforms play in shaping family practices of care, and thereby, potentially conceptualisations of privacy.

Together the five papers that compose this panel identify crucial challenges for parents to protect and promote the rights of their children in this complex and evolving digital environment. Some of these challenges are common to all papers, but others are substantially different, particularly when contrasting case studies in the Global North and Global South.

References

- Borda, J. L. (2015). Cultivating Community Within the Commercial Marketplace: Blurred Boundaries in the 'Mommy' Blogosphere. Em A. T. Demo, J. L. Borda, & C. H. Krolokke (Eds.), *The Motherhood Business: Consumption, Communication, and Privilege* (pp. 121–150). University of Alabama Press. https://scholars.unh.edu/comm_facpub/19
- Lissak, G. (2018). Adverse physiological and psychological effects of screen time on children and adolescents: Literature review and case study. *Environmental Research*, 164, 149-157. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.01.015>
- Livingstone, S., Mascheroni, G., & Stoilova, M. (2023). The outcomes of gaining digital skills for young people's lives and wellbeing: A systematic evidence review. *New Media & Society*, 25(5), 1176-1202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211043189>
- Lopez, L. K. (2009). The radical act of «mommy blogging»: Redefining motherhood through the blogosphere. *New Media & Society*, 11(5), 729–747. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444809105349>
- Mascheroni, G., & Siibak, A. (2021). *Datafied Childhoods: Data Practices and Imaginaries in Children's Lives*. Peter Lang.
- Mayer-Schönberger, V., & Cukier, K. (2013). *Big Data: A Revolution that Will Transform how We Live, Work, and Think*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Schmidt, M. E., Haines, J., O'Brien, A., McDonald, J., Price, S., Sherry, B., & Taveras, E. M. (2012). Systematic Review of Effective Strategies for Reducing Screen Time Among Young Children. *Obesity*, 20(7), 1338-1354.
- Tiidenberg, K., & Baym, N. K. (2017). Learn It, Buy It, Work It: Intensive Pregnancy on Instagram. *Social Media + Society*, 3(1), 2056305116685108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305116685108>
- van Dijk, J., & van Deursen, A. (2014). *Digital Skills: Unlocking the Information Society*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Verswijvel, K., Walrave, M., Hardies, K., & Heirman, W. (2019). Sharenting, is it a good or a bad thing? Understanding how adolescents think and feel about sharenting on social network sites. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 104, 104401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.104401>
- Zakharova, I., & Jarke, J. (2022). Educational technologies as matters of care. Learning, Media

and Technology, 47(1), 95-108.

PARENTAL APPROACHES TO CHILDREN 'S ACCESS AND USE OF TECHNOLOGIES: A CASE STUDY OF AN INDIGENOUS COMMUNITY IN BRAZIL

Inês Vitorino Sampaio
Federal University of Ceara

The increasing access of children and adolescents to the internet has been widely documented in robust studies worldwide (Livingstone et al., 2019; Byrne et al., 2016). A significant portion of young people are deeply immersed in the digital environment. In post-industrial societies, particularly in Global North countries, this immersion tends to begin at an increasingly younger age and occurs more frequently, fostering a fluid relationship between online and offline experiences. On the internet, children and adolescents watch videos, listen to music, conduct school research, communicate with peers, family members, and friends, create content, and express their identities and interests, among other activities. Through this daily engagement with digital screens, they explore both opportunities and risks (Livingstone, Mascheroni and Staksrud, 2015), which has significant implications for the exercise of their rights and well-being, as highlighted by General Comment No. 25 (2021).

This fascinating and complex internet ecosystem, shaped by global configurations, is also permeated by power relations linked to the business model that sustains it. This model shapes not only the internet's informational infrastructure but also the narratives circulating within it, which algorithms and recommendation systems either amplify or suppress.

Thus, while children play and entertain themselves online, technology companies compete for their attention. To this end, they collect countless data, seek to cultivate brand and product loyalty, and profoundly shape children's cultural repertoires, values, and ethical conduct.

For all these reasons, the internet is far from being a completely safe and protective environment. On the other hand, it is essential to acknowledge that in a networked society (Castells, 2023), the exercise of fundamental rights, including access to information and knowledge, is substantially dependent on internet access (La Rue, 2011).

Ensuring meaningful access and a safe, protected digital experience for children has become an increasing challenge for families (Pew Research Center, 2020). This challenge takes on different contours depending on the socioeconomic and cultural contexts in which these families are situated. Since mediation involves the approaches, parents use to guide, discuss, and oversee children's media use (Livingstone & Helsper, 2008), it is also closely linked to the informational and cultural background of families.

In this panel, which explores the diversity of everyday experiences of families and children with digital technologies, this article aims to discuss how parents mediate the access and use of technology in a Xavante (Indigenous people) community in Brazil. As documented in previous studies (Rennie, Thomas and Wilson, 2019), Indigenous communities—like other socially marginalized populations—are among those facing the problem of digital exclusion.

This is also a reality in Brazil. In a country structurally marked by social inequality, Indigenous families and children experience deprivation of meaningful access to information and communication technologies (ICTs). When addressing this phenomenon of the digital divide, many studies, such as those by (Cullen, 2001), focus on the issue of social exclusion as a problem to be overcome.

These studies emphasize its urgency, analyze strategies, and present recommendations. Such contributions are undoubtedly valuable and fundamental for shaping a future in which these children, families, and communities can fully exercise their digital rights. However, considering the present reality of families and children in this situation of social vulnerability, we know less about how they engage with digital technologies in a context of restricted access. After all, while these families and their children do not enjoy the quality and diversity of access available to more privileged social groups, they are also not entirely excluded from ICTs, as they interact with these technologies daily and navigate the challenges they present.

In these vulnerable contexts, what strategies do children and families use to cope with the adversities they face in their digital access? What implications does this digital divide have for parental guidance and supervision of children's digital access and use?

Considering the communal experience of Xavante's families, how does this more collective approach to technology use, under conditions of restricted access, differ from parental mediation practices oriented toward individualistic paradigms? From this perspective, can the community-based model of parenting be seen as a rupture from conventional approaches to digital parenting, particularly in shaping Xavante children's digital access and use?

This paper examines these questions through the lens of children's rights and best interests, drawing on fieldwork in the Xavante territory conducted as part of a 2024 consultation for Alana Institute, a Brazilian NGO. The consultation, involving children from different regions of Brazil, aimed to understand digital practices and parenting approaches so children's voices could inform digital rights policies.

This study involving Xavante children and families adopted a multi-method approach, consistent with the tradition of research conducted by LabGRIM, the Research Laboratory on Childhood, Youth and Media at the Federal University of Ceará. The study involved a participant observation, with a five-day immersion in the Xavante territory. Nationally, we listened to children aged 4 to 8 years old, while in the Xavante community all children and adolescent participated at community's request. The community comprises 61 people, 29 adults and 32 children.

Playful methodologies and interactive techniques were employed to facilitate specific engagement with Indigenous children regarding their use of digital devices. More specifically, activities included drawing, clay modeling, and a specially developed board game designed for this purpose.

Our field observations of Xavante families and children reveal the resilience of this community, which makes the most of limited digital access while continuing to advocate for their right to connectivity. Children play more outdoors, explore the natural resources around them, spend more time with their peers and families, and are less exposed to consumerist narratives, among other things. Mobile phones are mostly in the hands of parents and teenagers, while young children have restricted access to them. This is the general guideline.

This collectivity and its parental approaches concerning technology, however, should not be idealized, as it, like any other social group, encompasses its own contradictions. On the only television available during our time there, children and adults shared the same repertoire of programs, without expressing many concerns about some of its content (e.g. violence). They watched videos of Xavante community gatherings that celebrated their traditions, while also being exposed to various forms of advertising.

In their contact with digital devices, they have opportunities to be informed, connect with other communities, and have fun with games. However, even with limited connectivity, they still face high-impact risks, especially related to content, contact and contract. Access to technology is shaped by collective parenting. Decisions are made within the community, and individualistic models don't fully explain how digital mediation works in this context.

Considering all this, our study raises an important question: Given the current balance between digital opportunities and risks, could staying connected to nature, peers, and family offer a more meaningful path for these children? And, in light of children's right to safe play, should we still prioritize closing the digital divide—at least for the youngest? It concludes by reflecting on community-based parenting and, drawing on Xavante experience, analyzing how this collective approach shapes children's engagement with digital technologies.

References

- Byrne, J., Kardefelt-Winther, D., Livingstone, S., & Stoilova, M. (2016). Global Kids Online Research Synthesis, 2015-2016. UNICEF Office of Research Innocenti and London School of Economics and Political Science.
<https://www.unicef.org/innocenti/reports/view-all>
- Castells, M. (2023). The network society revisited. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 67(7), 940- 946. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642221092803>
- Cullen, R. (2001). Addressing the digital divide. *Online Information Review*, 25(5), 311- 320. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14684520110410517>
- La Rue, F. (2011, May 16). Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection

of the right to freedom of opinion and expression: Addendum, communications to and from governments (A/HRC/17/27). UN Human Rights Council. <https://www.refworld.org/reference/countryrep/unhrc/2011/en/90245>

Livingstone, S., Kardefelt-Winther, D., & Saeed, M. (2019). Global Kids Online Comparative Report. UNICEF Office of Research - Innocenti. <https://www.unicef.org/publications/1059-global-kids-online-comparative-report.html>

Livingstone, S., Mascheroni, G., & Staksrud, E. (2015). Developing a framework for researching children's online risks and opportunities in Europe. EU Kids Online, The London School of Economics and Political Science. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/64470>

Livingstone, Sonia. & Helsper, E.J. (2008) Parental Mediation of Children's Internet Use, Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 52:4, 581-599, DOI:10.1080/08838150802437396

Rennie, E., Thomas, J., & Wilson, C. (2019). Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and digital inclusion: What is the evidence and where is it? Communication Research and Practice, 5(2), 105-120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22041451.2019.1601491>

UN Committee on the Rights of the Child. (2021, March). General comment no. 25 on children's rights in relation to the digital environment (CRC/C/GC/25). <https://www.ohchr.org/en/documents/general-comments-and-recommendations/general-comment-no-25-2021-childrens-rights-relation>

HOW MELBOURNE BASED SRI LANKAN AUSTRALIAN FAMILIES USE DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY IN EVERYDAY FAMILY ROUTINES

Dinusha Bandara
Deakin University

Digital technologies are now woven into every stage of family life, from pregnancy and parenting to everyday family routines at home (Barassi, 2020; Mascheroni & Siibak, 2021). The family home is also full of smart and connected technologies, with children increasingly using popular technologies like Google Nest, Amazon Alexa and other smart home assistants (Livingstone & Sefton-Green, 2024; Pangrazio & Mavoa, 2023). Family members often focus on the immediate benefits of these technologies, such as convenience and entertainment, while overlooking the data they generate through everyday routines. Data collected from these family routines, such as interactions with smart home assistants and voice commands, contributes to the process of datafication (Mascheroni & Siibak, 2021; Mayer-Schönberger & Cukier, 2013; Pangrazio & Mavoa, 2023; Pangrazio & Sefton-Green, 2022). Such data can be used to track and profile parents and children, raising concerns about privacy and surveillance. However, research addressing the complexities of everyday digital experiences and the nuanced understanding of datafication within families with young children remains scarce (Mascheroni, 2018; Mascheroni & Siibak, 2021). To date, there is no known research examining the integration of digital technologies into everyday family routines and how

this transforms the domestic and cultural boundaries within Sri Lankan Australian families.

This paper focuses on the study of how Sri Lankan Australian families with young children in Melbourne integrate (or resist) digital technologies in their homes while they co-construct their transnational experiences, identities and values in everyday settings. In Australia, over half of the Sri Lankan population lives in Melbourne, and nearly 60 percent of Sri Lankan migrants in Melbourne are families with children (Victoria State Government, 2021). The preponderance of Sri Lankans in greater Melbourne has made it home to the largest Sri Lankan community hub outside of Sri Lanka. Despite the growing presence of Sri Lankan migrant families in Melbourne, very little research on this unique group exists to date. Most studies on migrant experiences in Australia focus on larger, more established communities, often overlooking smaller yet significant migrant populations like the Sri Lankan Australians. Generating new knowledge about their everyday digital experiences is essential in understanding the complex interplay of factors that shape the digital experiences and datafication of migrant families. By examining how these families integrate, use and negotiate digital technologies within their domestic spaces, this paper contributes to the broader discourse on digital migration, transnationalism and datafication. It focuses on insights into how migrant families with young children maintain cultural heritage and manage intergenerational relationships, through digital interactions, thereby filling a critical gap in understanding children's digital lives within Sri Lankan Australian families.

This study builds on critical data studies and digital migration studies, while moving beyond them, to: (1) examine how Sri Lankan families use digital technologies and engage in digital practices at home; and (2) investigate how they understand and experience datafication in everyday life. In doing so, it extends a literature that has largely centred on white Anglo-Australian experiences, contributing to a broader understanding of datafication across diverse migrant communities. The study is guided by three research questions: (1) What digital technologies do Sri Lankan families use and why? (2) How do these families engage in digital practices at home? (3) How do they understand and experience datafication in everyday settings? To address these questions, the study adopts a mixed methods design with multigenerational, multilingual and multi-phase orientation. The study involved 108 Sri Lankan Australian families in Melbourne, including parents, grandparents, aunts and uncles living with at least one child aged eight years or younger.

Data collection was conducted in several phases following the pilot phase. Initially, 108 participants completed a 15-minute online survey about their technology use, providing insights into how digital technologies are integrated and used within family routines. From this group, 55 participants agreed to engage in 45-minute semi-structured interviews that offered deeper insights into the cultural and intergenerational factors shaping digital technology use. Of these, 20 participants were selected for follow-up discussions, conducted either online or in person, to gain a better understanding of how technologies mediate relationships and influence everyday family routines. Finally, five home visits were conducted, including digital technology tours and participant-led media scroll-back discussions, offering contextual perspectives on how digital technologies are embedded within the home. During these visits, participants demonstrated the use of

various digital devices and explained their importance within the household, revealing their impact on family dynamics, communication and cultural practices. Data from all phases, including visual representations of technologies within homes, facilitated a detailed examination of the dynamic and evolving nature of technology integration and use within Sri Lankan Australian family routines.

This paper presents a few selected key findings on the integration and use of digital technology in Sri Lankan Australian families' everyday family routines. Firstly, the paper examines how families embrace, balance or resist digital technologies (Livingstone & Blum-Ross, 2020), guided by both practical needs and cultural values. Secondly, the paper sheds light on how media technologies, such as smart home assistants like Google Nest and Amazon Alexa, are integrated into everyday family routines, particularly in the absence of extended family support. Thirdly, it discusses how the display of digital technologies, such as digital photo frames or television frames, reflects families' identities and values while connecting them to cultural heritage and influencing their social standing. Lastly, the paper highlights how intergenerational living strengthens family bonds as parents, young children and co-residing extended family members share digital experiences, while navigating challenges related to differing levels of digital literacy.

This study highlights how the use of digital technologies in the Sri Lankan Australian context influences family dynamics, family roles, parenting, religious practices and intergenerational relationships. The integration of digital media fosters communication and cultural exchange across generations and borders, enabling language maintenance, religious and ritual participation and everyday co-presence at a distance. However, families often navigate challenges related to privacy and surveillance across generations, prompting a re-evaluation of how these technologies influence family roles and intergenerational interactions in migrant homes. As reliance on data-generating technologies for everyday routines grows, families also often encounter tensions surrounding datafication. The paper concludes with recommendations for researchers, policymakers and migrant support networks to better support the digital experiences and practices of Sri Lankan Australian families.

References

- Barassi, V. (2020). *Child data citizen: How tech companies are profiling us from before birth*. MIT Press.
- Livingstone, S., & Blum-Ross, A. (2020). *Parenting for a digital future: How hopes and fears about technology shape children's lives*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Livingstone, S., & Sefton-Green, J. (2024). *The Platformization of the Family*. In *The Platformization of the Family*. Springer Nature Switzerland Cham.
- Mascheroni, G. (2018). Datafied childhoods: Contextualising datafication in everyday life. *Current Sociology*, 68(6), 798-813.
- Mascheroni, G., & Siibak, A. (2021). *Datafied Childhoods: Data Practices and Imaginaries in Children's Lives*. Peter Lang Publishing, Inc. New York.
- Mayer-Schönberger, V., & Cukier, K. (2013). *Big Data: A Revolution that Will Transform how*

We Live, Work, and Think. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Pangrazio, L., & Mavoa, J. (2023). Studying the datafication of Australian childhoods: learning from a survey of digital technologies in homes with young children. Media International Australia, 1329878X231162386.

Pangrazio, L., & Sefton-Green, J. (2022). Learning to live with datafication: Educational case studies and initiatives from across the world. Routledge.

Victoria State Government. (2021). Melbourne's Sri Lankan Community Retrieved 15 November 2022 from <https://liveinmelbourne.vic.gov.au/discover/multicultural-communities/srilankan>

AUSTRALIAN FAMILIES IN THE EDTECH DATA ASSEMBLAGE: THE CASE OF STORYPARK

Luci Pangrazio
Deakin University

In Australia, datafication is now evident across the domains of home, childcare and school, and integral to everyday family practices such as caring, communicating, and learning (Pangrazio & Mavoa, 2023). Datafication refers to the translation of online interactions and behaviours into data that can be collected, mined, and processed for a range of purposes (Mayer-Schoenberger & Cukier, 2014). Unlike digitization, datafication is not just a process of turning an analog object into a digital form. Datafication is also profoundly shaping of these social activities and spaces, due to the role it plays in enabling other processes like recommendations, content curation and automated decision-making. Not only are the implications of datafication difficult to discern, but many of the data infrastructures are hidden from user scrutiny, throwing the question of how parents can make informed decisions about their children's practices in the age of datafication.

While datafied technologies are often marketed as making parenting and family life easier, safer, or more efficient, the lived experience of using these technologies is not so clearcut. An array of hidden consequences like algorithmic bias, breaches of privacy and the commercialisation of personal data can impact the child and the family in a whole host of ways that only become evident over time (Barassi, 2020; Smith et al., 2024). Whether families have knowledge of these implications and how they negotiate these as part of their parenting practices has not been well researched. Data has shaped how children and families experience digital technologies and how they negotiate these, but the understandings and values that underpin these are largely unknown.

Important to understanding datafication in family life is the concept of the "data assemblage" (Kitchin, 2014). This can be described as "the technological, political, social and economic apparatuses and elements that constitute and frame the generation, circulation and deployment of data" (Iliadis & Russo 2016, p.1). Data

assemblages bring together various people, places, processes and practices, as well as systems of thought, forms of knowledge and underpinning infrastructures. Examples of such data assemblages might include a social media platform such as Instagram, the online production of national school rankings, or an internet connected baby monitor. Any assemblage is constituted by the data that it is concerned with producing. In other words, data and its assemblage are “bound together in a set of contingent, relational and contextual discursive and material practices and relations” (Kitchin & Lauriault 2018, p.8).

Digital parenting involves an array of data assemblages for school, communication, family organisation and health, involving different institutions, authorities, actors and public discourses. In addition, the discourses and practices promoted in one assemblage might be in tension with another making this a confusing and complicated set of issues for parents to analyse and navigate. Against this backdrop, this paper will address the following research questions: What are the elements involved in an edtech data assemblage? And how do parents understand their position within it?

To answer these questions, I conducted case study analysis of the data assemblage of the edtech app Storypark. Storypark is used by early childcare educators to document learning and communicate with families. With headquarters in New Zealand Storypark is used in over 10,000 childcare centres across the world and is the most popular app used in Australian centres. Using Kitchin’s (2014) model of the data assemblage, I analyse the different technological, political, social and economic apparatuses involved in the Storypark data assemblage to investigate how Australian parents, educators and children are positioned by the app and the ways in which they understand and navigate it in their everyday life.

Deconstructing the data assemblage involved identifying the variety of entwined ‘apparatuses’ and ‘elements’ that are structured and organised to ensure the ongoing generation and use of data. To do this, the research design adopted a mixed methods approach that included the following: technological, legal and economic analysis of the app; thematic analysis of interviews with parents, children, educators and the company founder; and discourse analysis of policy documents and marketing materials associated with Storypark. Unpacking and deconstructing a data assemblage (see Williamson, 2017; Redden, Dencik & Warne, 2020) helps to identify and understand the work they do in the world and how they are shaped by local contexts, situations, and policies. Kitchin (2014, p.24) explains that the “apparatus and their elements frame what is possible, desirable and expected of data”. In this way, the analysis reveals something of how family life and child development are datafied, as well as the possibilities to rupture the flow of data into the digital economy.

Analysis of the Storypark data assemblage shows that its infrastructure and business model, as well as the practices and modes of thought it encourages, are all geared toward the generation and sharing of children and families’ personal data. Parents use of this app, combined with the child’s compliance around the documentation processes by childcare staff, clearly play a pivotal role facilitating the generation of data. When these practices are combined with technical features such as third-party data sharing and less than adequate data regulation in Australia, the generation of children’s data is

optimised (Zhao et al., 2024).

The paper reflects on the issues and opportunities associated with the Storypark data assemblage. It considers how the data assemblage raises tensions in parents' and guardians' beliefs and practices regarding both digital technologies and parenting. It explores the increasing complexity involved in digital parenting in the age of datafication, arguing for the need to place more responsibility on software designers, regulators, and policymakers to ensure digitally raising the next generation is seen as a collective effort. It concludes by considering how these might be countered and addressed by parents and educators.

References

- Barassi, V. (2020). *Child Data Citizen: How Tech Companies Are Profiling Us from Before Birth*. MIT Press.
- Bolin, G. (2023). Mediatisation, digitisation and datafication: The role of the social contemporary data capitalism. *Central European Journal of Communication*, 1(33), 7- 18. [https://doi.org/10.51480/1899-5101.16.1\(33\).1](https://doi.org/10.51480/1899-5101.16.1(33).1)
- Iliadis, A., & Russo, F. (2016). Critical data studies: An introduction. *Big Data & Society*, 3(2), 2053951716674238. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716674238>
- Kitchin, R. (2014). *The Data Revolution: Big Data, Data Infrastructures, & Their Consequences*. Sage.
- Kitchin, R., & Lauriault, T. P. (2018). Towards critical data studies: Charting and unpacking data assemblages and their work. In J. Thatcher, A. Shears, & J. Eckert (Eds.), *Thinking Big Data in Geography* (pp. 3-20). University of Nebraska Press.
- Lissak, G. (2018). Adverse physiological and psychological effects of screen time on children and adolescents: Literature review and case study. *Environmental Research*, 164, 149-157. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.01.015>
- Livingstone, S., Mascheroni, G., & Stoilova, M. (2023). The outcomes of gaining digital skills for young people's lives and wellbeing: A systematic evidence review. *New Media & Society*, 25(5), 1176-1202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211043189>
- Mayer-Schoenberger, V., & Cukier, K. (2013). *Big Data: A Revolution That Will Transform How We Live, Work and Think*. John Murray.
- Pangrazio, L., & Mavoia, J. (2023). Studying the datafication of Australian childhoods: learning from a survey of digital technologies in homes with young children. *Media International Australia*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X231162386>
- Redden, J., Dencik, L., & Warne, H. (2020). Datafied child welfare services: Unpacking politics, economics and power. *Policy Studies*, 41(5), 507-526.
- Schmidt, M. E., Haines, J., O'Brien, A., McDonald, J., Price, S., Sherry, B., & Taveras, E. M. (2012). Systematic Review of Effective Strategies for Reducing Screen Time Among Young Children. *Obesity*, 20(7), 1338-1354.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1038/oby.2011.348>

Smith, L. (2016). Big data knows if you're pregnant. The Verge.

<http://www.theverge.com/2016/2/17/11032606/big-data-employers-health-info>

van Dijk, J., & van Deursen, A. (2014). *Digital Skills: Unlocking the Information Society*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Williamson, B. (2017). Decoding ClassDojo: Psycho-policy, social-emotional learning and persuasive educational technologies. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 42(4), 440-453.

Zhao, X., Ng, R., Zomer, C., Duffy, G., & Sefton-Green, J. (2024). Database as method: Exposing 'data' about educational technology through a design intervention. *Computers and Education Open*, 6, 100188.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2024.100188>

THE PLAYBOUR OF CHILDREN OF INFLUENCER MOMS IN BRAZIL AND PORTUGAL

Lídia Marôpo

Instituto Politécnico de Setúbal and CICS.NOVA

Ana Jorge

Lusofona University and CICANT

Background

Sharenting is a trending activity performed by parents to collect memories, inform friends and family about their children, look for support and advocacy, and to self-present themselves as good or prideful parents (Borda, 2015; Lopez, 2009; Tiidenberg & Baym, 2017; Verswijvel et al., 2019). Furthermore, this widespread practice of sharing images and detailed information about one's child on social media (Cataldo et al., 2022) could be seen as an opportunity to commodify children's and parenting experiences. This commercial sharenting is practiced by "mummy influencers" (Jorge, Marôpo, Coelho et al., 2022), (emergent) "dad influencers" (Campana et al., 2020), influencers specializing in distinct areas such as lifestyle, beauty, and fashion, and celebrities (Garrido et al., 2023; Jorge, Marôpo & Neto, 2022). Children promote relatability between celebrities and their audiences and increase the perceived authenticity of their parents (Jorge, Marôpo & Neto, 2022), leveraging the engagement of audiences. Also, regular parents looking for extra income practice sharenting as an intentional form of capitalizing intimacy (Ruiz Gomez, 2023). Thus, across different levels of visibility, children act as emotional (Dale et al., 2017) or digital capital (Ågren, 2023).

This visibility is sustained by "calibrated amateurism" (Abidin, 2017), an artificial yet apparently authentic family lifestyle in which children are imbricated in the content created by their influencers or celebrity parents. Holiday et al. (2022) argue that children are presented as their parent's extended self and Jiang (2023) (on racialized

representations) states that children are only apparently agentic, sometimes camouflaging forms of digital labor. Parent influencers construct a family narrative anchored in children's playbour, a combination of play and work, as a useful strategy for generating authenticity (Van den Abeele, Hudders and Vanwesenbeeck, 2024). Often, momfluencers trade off the benefits of openness, such as emotional and economic capital, for children's privacy; they do so by relying on unconscious biases (i.e. immediate gratification, optimistic bias, integrated daily life habit, social influence, and the illusion of control – Van den Abeele, Vanwesenbeeck, and Hudders, 2024). This is done with content constantly being adapted to social media ambiances and vernaculars, and by evading existing regulation, or exploring empty spots of regulation on social media platforms (Divon et al., 2025).

Methods

This paper seeks to examine children's playbour in commercial sharenting practices. To further this research goal, we pose two sub-questions: What are the sharenting content strategies used by the influencers as affective mechanisms? How is children's play represented?

It explores these questions through case studies in Portuguese-speaking countries, Brazil and Portugal. These countries with postcolonial ties have substantial cultural and economic differences, which form the background of our exploration. Culturally, Brazil is oriented to humor as a way of dealing with social problems, which makes it an especially intense meme culture (Chagas et al., 2019).

We selected two cases of famous mother influencers, focusing on their visibility on Instagram: Morgana Secco, in Brazil; and Madalena Abecasis, in Portugal. The former focuses on parenting content, while the latter focuses on lifestyle, humorous content. Besides being popular on other platforms, on Instagram Morgana Secco has over 4 million followers (as of September 2025). She is a professional photographer who started sharing videos in 2021 of her baby daughter, Alice, repeating difficult words and talking

fluently that went viral. The girl, now 6 years-old, became famous in Brazil, appeared in mainstream news, and starred in a television ad. In 2022, Secco had a second girl, Julia.

The Portuguese case, Madalena Abecasis, has close to 750,000 followers on Instagram (as of late September 2025). She is a mother of four – one teenage girl and three children (a girl and two boys) – and was a designer before working as a full-time influencer. She comes from a privileged socioeconomic background and uses humor in her presentation. This paper focuses on how the young daughter, Júlia, aged 7, is represented.

We purposively retrieved posts about the focal children (Alice and Júlia) from their mothers' Instagram feeds from their first appearance until September 2025. This generated a corpus of 82 posts and 12 stories for Secco/Alice, and 95 posts and 20 stories for Abecasis/Júlia. We performed a multimodal content analysis (Bouvier and Rasmussen, 2022) and proceeded inductively: We built descriptive accounts of each post and story, developed categories, and then discussed themes iteratively.

We consider the content on Instagram as a public textual resource similar to a television program; thus, we did not ask for consent (franzke et al., 2020; Harris, 2016; Townsend et al., 2016). Nevertheless, since we are also dealing with children, as sensitive subjects, we do not include the URLs; use black-and-white sketches of actual images and blur the children's faces in a presentation; and reproduce captions and hashtags translated into English (Ågren, 2023).

Findings

The two accounts show significantly different parenting styles, content strategies and affective mechanisms (Marôpo et al., 2025). In Secco's sharenting narratives of passionate devotion, the child is at the center of the routine and attention of the dedicated parents. Distinctly, Abecasis stands out for transgressive sharenting, performing ambivalent motherhood in which humor and discomfort with children's actions are combined with expressions of affection.

Consequently, representations of their children are distinct. Alice (Secco) is presented as charismatic, agentic, and creative, performing as a prodigy with precocious abilities. She is shown engaging in creative activities such as singing, drawing, role-playing, and playing with her younger sister. At times, Alice is seen as leading the action and teaching something to adults. As a result of her viral success, she takes part in a mainstream television show, recording from home. Morgana has taken the role of parenting coach, selling courses, and an alternative, mindful lifestyle personality.

Abecasis combines humor and affection to present Júlia growing up from an antisocial personality and unathletic child into an active and cute young girl. While cringe (Dahl, 2018) is still evoked, for instance in the form of throwbacks and memes, Júlia is increasingly shown as agentic, interacting with the mother's content creation, including commercial content, or even leading in producing videos. Nevertheless, the girl's play is mostly without screens – playing with her siblings, with dolls, with a pet. Her play as part of the extended self of her mother's lifestyle, entertaining presentation.

Concluding remarks

Both sharenting strategies and presentation of the girls by the mom influencers in our cases work affectively, moved by 'adoration' for the girls (Projansky, 2014) as well as 'adorkability'. Play and humor, from the parent influencers as well as the children, are constructed differently – in Secco's case, the playful child is represented as cute or as inspirational for the audience; in Abecasis, playing with the child can be both a way to laugh with the child and a way to invite a humorous reaction from the audience. Children's playbour is capitalized in media (Secco) or social media advertising (Abecasis).

References

Abidin, C. (2017). #familygoals: Family Influencers, Calibrated Amateurism, and Justifying Young Digital Labor. *Social Media + Society*, 3(2), 2056305117707191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305117707191>

- Ågren, Y. (2023). Branded childhood: Infants as digital capital on Instagram. *Childhood*, 30(1), 9–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09075682221129367>
- Borda, J. L. (2015). Cultivating Community Within the Commercial Marketplace: Blurred Boundaries in the ‘Mommy’ Blogosphere. In A. T. Demo, J. L. Borda, & C. H. Krolokke (Eds.), *The Motherhood Business: Consumption, Communication, and Privilege* (pp. 121–150). University of Alabama Press. https://scholars.unh.edu/comm_facpub/19
- Campana, M., Bossche, A. V. den, & Miller, B. (2020). #dadtribe: Performing Sharenting Labour to Commercialise Involved Fatherhood. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 40(4), 475–491. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0276146720933334>
- Cataldo, I., Lieu, A. A., Carollo, A., Bornstein, M. H., Gabrieli, G., Lee, A. & Esposito, G. (2022) From the Cradle to the Web: The Growth of “Sharenting”—A Scientometric Perspective. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/5607422>
- Chagas, V., Freire, F., Rios, D., & Magalhães, D. (2019). Political memes and the politics of memes: A methodological proposal for content analysis of online political memes. *First Monday*, 24(2). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v24i2.7264>
- Dahl, M. (2018). *Cringleworthy: A Theory of Awkwardness*. Portfolio/Penguin.
- Dale, J. P., Goggin, J., Leyda, J., McIntyre, A. P., & Negra, D. (2017). The Aesthetics and Affects of Cuteness. In J. P. Dale, J. Goggin, J. Leyda, A. P. McIntyre & D. Negra (Eds.), *The Aesthetics and Affects of Cuteness* (pp. 1–34). Routledge.
- Divon, T., Annabell, T., & Goanta, C. (2025). Children as concealed commodities: Ethnographic nuances and legal implications of kidfluencers’ monetisation on TikTok. *New Media & Society*, 14614448241304657. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448241304657>
- franzke, aline shakti, Bechmann, A., Zimmer, M., Ess, C. M., & Association of Internet Researchers. (2020). *Internet Research: Ethical Guidelines 3.0* Association of Internet Researchers. <https://aoir.org/reports/ethics3.pdf>
- Garrido, F., Alvarez, A., González-Caballero, J.L., Garcia, P., Couso, B., Iriso, I., Merino, M., Raffaeli, G., Sanmiguel, P., Arribas, C., Vacaroaia, A., & Cavallaro, G. (2023). Description of the Exposure of the Most-Followed Spanish Instamoms’ Children to Social Media. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(3), 2426. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20032426>
- Holiday, S., Norman, M. N., & Densley, R. L. (2022) Sharenting and the extended self: self representation in parents’ Instagram presentations of their children. *Popular Communication*, 20(1), 1–15, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15405702.2020.1744610>
- Jiang, X. (2023). Performing Eurasianness, Chineseness, and cosmopolitanism as racialized

- digital labor: Sharenting mixed-blood children on Douyin. *Information, Communication & Society*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2023.2216767>
- Jorge, A., Marôpo, L., Coelho, A. M., & Novello, L. (2022). Mummy influencers and professional sharenting. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 25(1), 166–182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13675494211004593>
- Jorge, A., Marôpo, L., & Neto, F. (2022). ‘When you realise your dad is Cristiano Ronaldo’: Celebrity sharenting and children’s digital identities. *Information, Communication & Society*, 25(4), 516–535. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2022.2026996>
- Lopez, L. K. (2009). The radical act of «mommy blogging»: Redefining motherhood through the blogosphere. *New Media & Society*, 11(5), 729–747. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444809105349>
- Marôpo, L., Jorge, A., Carvalho, B. J. de, & Neto, F. (2025). Memeability and sharenting: The affective economy of children on social media. *New Media & Society*, 14614448251320370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448251320370>
- Projansky, S. (2014). *Spectacular Girls - Media fascination & celebrity culture*. University Press.
- Ruiz-Gomez, A. (2023). *Commercial Sharenting on Instagram: How Parents Build Social Capital and Monetize Baby Accounts*. Doctoral dissertation, Universidad Complutense de Madrid - Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Empresariales.
- Tiidenberg, K., & Baym, N. K. (2017). Learn It, Buy It, Work It: Intensive Pregnancy on Instagram. *Social Media + Society*, 3(1), 2056305116685108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305116685108>
- Van den Abeele, E., Hudders, L., & Vanwesenbeeck, I. (2024). Managing authenticity in a kidfluencers’ world: A qualitative study with kidfluencers and their parents. *New Media & Society*, 14614448231222558. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448231222558>
- Van Den Abeele, E., Vanwesenbeeck, I., & Hudders, L. (2024). Child’s privacy versus mother’s fame: Unravelling the biased decision-making process of momfluencers to portray their children online. *Information, Communication & Society*, 27(2), 297–313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2023.2205484>
- Verswijvel, K., Walrave, M., Hardies, K., & Heirman, W. (2019). Sharenting, is it a good or a bad thing? Understanding how adolescents think and feel about sharenting on social network sites. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 104, 104401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.104401>

PLATFORMS AS THE MATERIALITY OF CARE: EXPERIENCES AND PRACTICES OF THREE-GENERATIONAL FAMILIES FROM ESTONIA

Andra Sibak

University of Tartu

Families can be viewed as places of care with different care arrangements. Presently, when many families “conduct their internal and external relationships through digital platforms” (Livingstone & Sefton-Green 2025: 8), it is getting increasingly important to consider care not only as the physical (oftentimes invisible) labour that care-giving entails but care giving and care receiving should be viewed from a broader socio-material arrangements perspective (Criado & Rodríguez-Giralt, 2016). Thus, in the context of platforms and families, technologies have become the “matters of care”, as they facilitate and enable different modes of care and caring (Zakharova & Jarke, 2022). In the present-day platform society, care-work is distributed between humans and things, with some tasks being delegated to things (Criado & Rodríguez-Giralt, 2016). At the same time, care is more than a form of labour; it also reflects individuals’ practices and values (Held, 2006).

Digital technologies and platforms provide an opportunity to expand “doing family”, i.e. relational practices enabling to construct a family (Manell, Sefton-Green & Erstad 2025: 97) beyond the physical space. In short, platforms have started to transform “how, and with what implications, family life, care, and relationships can be practiced beyond home” (Mannel, Hegna & Stoilova 2025: 36) as family members can nowadays engage in “caring dataveillance” (Lupton, 2020). While dataveillance, a form of continuous surveillance through the use of (meta)data (Raley, 2013), is often seen in negative terms as a restriction of autonomy and privacy of those who are being watched (Lupton, 2016), in families, the practice can also entail the expression of love and attention (Lupton, 2020). At the same time, such a practice also requires that family members (re)negotiate their understandings about privacy, autonomy and intimacy. Furthermore, once family practices become mediatized and increasingly “reliant on technologies of caring and sharing, they are simultaneously imbued with a data- driven business logic called surveillance capitalism” (Mascheroni & Siibak 2021: 5). Hence, while domesticating platforms into their mundane family practices, negotiations about trust, safety and control become equally important.

Extended-domestication theory (Mannel, Sefton-Green & Erstad 2025: 102) will be used as a framework for exploring how three-generational families in Estonia have started to make use of platforms for “doing family” and the role that platforms play in their family care arrangements.

Method and Participants

The empirical data was collected as part of the PlatFAMs: Platforming families – tracing digital transformations in everyday life across generations project which focuses on studying intergenerational experiences in relation to the platformisation of family life in Norway, Estonia, Romania, Spain and the UK. The current presentation is based upon the semi-structured individual interviews conducted with the members of three generational families (N=11, 33 individuals) in Estonia. Most of the families (N=10) were located within Estonia – with 13 family members living bigger cities, 13 living in rural areas and 7 living in smaller cities. In one family two of the younger generations were living abroad, while the grandparents lived in Estonia. Eighteen of our interviewees were women, fifteen were males; the youngest person interviewed were 9 years old, while the

oldest was 75 years old.

During the individual interviews with one child, parent and grandparent from each family we aimed to explore how are the digital platform embedded in the lives and practices of “doing family”. Furthermore, we were interested in finding out what role do the platforms play in shaping family practices of care, and thereby, potentially conceptualisations of privacy.

Preliminary findings

Preliminary findings of our interviews reveal that the practices of “caring dataveillance” (Lupton, 2020) have become to normal and normative part of “doing family”. In fact, in many families it has become “the general background of everyday life” (Couldry & Hepp, 2019: 124). Our finding indicate that platforms are crucial not only for the transnational family in our sample, but also for those families were the three generations live in different households.

Families forming our sample were making use of various platforms e.g. tracking apps, health wearables, education apps; in addition to different communication-oriented platforms like Whatsapp, Signal, Messenger, to check up and keep an eye on each other. Although parents were most used to “stretching” their parenting practices (Mannell, Hegna & Stoilova 2025) through the use of parental controls, tracking apps and dataveillance on school platforms; such platforms were sometimes also used for mutual surveillance by the whole family.

At the same time, such tracking was not considered intrusive or was not viewed as a breach in personal privacy. Rather, such affordances were considered convenient and useful and deeply embedded in their “materialities of care” (Lupton 2020: 399) enabling practices of care and feelings of connectedness despite physical distances. Our participants were used to sharing their everyday mundane experiences with each other through exchanging text messages, video calls, and photos and thereby “reinforce, extend and potentially reconfigure existing forms of relationality that used to rely on geographical and temporal co-presence to construct family” (Erstad et al. 2024: 6).

References

- Cockburn, T. (2005). Children and the feminist ethic of care. *Childhood*, 12(1), 71–89.
- Creasy, R., & Corby, F. (2019). *Taming Childhood?: A Critical Perspective on Policy, Practice and Parenting*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Criado, T. S., & Rodríguez-Giralt, I. (2016). Caring through design? En torno a la silla and the ‘joint problem-making’ of technical aids. In C. Bates, R. Imrie, & K. Kullman (Eds.), *Care and design: Bodies, buildings, cities* (pp. 198–218). John Wiley & Sons.
- Erstad, O., Hegna, K., Livingstone, S., Negru-Subtirica, O., & Stoilova, M. (2024). How digital technologies become embedded in family life across generations: Scoping the agenda for researching ‘platformised relationality’. *Families, Relationships and Societies*, 13, 164. <https://doi.org/10.1332/20467435Y2024D000000023>

- Held, V. (2006). *The ethics of care: Personal, political, and global*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Livingstone, S. & Sefton-Green, J. (2025). The platformisation of the family. In: Sefton-Green, J., Mannell, K., & Erstad, O. (eds.) *The Platformisation of the family. Towards a research agenda*. Palgrave. (pp. 7-23).
- Lupton, D. (2020). Caring dataveillance: Women's use of apps to monitor pregnancy and children. In L. Green, D. Holloway, K. Stevenson, T. Leaver, & L. Haddon (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to digital media and children* (pp. 393–402). New York: Routledge.
- Lupton, D. (2016). The diverse domains of quantified selves: Self-tracking modes and dataveillance. *Economy and Society*, 45(1), 101–122.
- Malone, K. (2007). The bubble-wrap generation: children growing up in walled gardens. *Environmental Education Research*, 13(4), 5.
- Mannel, K., Hegna, K. & Stoilova, M. (2025). The home as a site of platformisation. In: Sefton Green, J., Mannell, K., & Erstad, O. (eds.) *The Platformisation of the family. Towards a research agenda*. Palgrave. (pp. 25-45).
- Mannel, K., Sefton-Green, J., & Erstad, O. (2025). Conclusion: towards further research into the platformisation of the family. In: Sefton-Green, J., Mannell, K., & Erstad, O. (eds.) *The Platformisation of the family. Towards a research agenda*. Palgrave. (pp. 93-109).
- Raley, R. (2013). *Dataveillance and counterveillance*. In L. Gitelman (Ed.), 'Raw Data' is an Oxymoron (pp. 121–146). MIT Press.
- Zakharova, I., & Jarke, J. (2022). Educational technologies as matters of care. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 47(1), 95-108.