

# Tracking Childhoods: Inter-generational Perspectives on Parent-Child Relationships and the Ethics of Digital Monitoring

Eelco Herder  
Utrecht University  
Utrecht, Netherlands  
e.herder@uu.nl

Ana Cîrnu  
Utrecht University  
Utrecht, Netherlands  
anamaria.cirnu10@gmail.com

## Abstract

This research set out to examine how using digital tracking tools shape the relationship between parents and children. For this purpose, semi-structured interviews were conducted with participants from four generations, followed by open-ended questions. The findings indicate that the impact of tracking technologies is shaped not only by the tools themselves, but largely by the parental approach and by the quality of the communication surrounding tracking, limits, and boundaries. We conclude that progress does not lie in redefining the mechanisms of surveillance, but in adaptive and context-aware design that promotes trust and communication.

## CCS Concepts

• **Security and privacy** → **Social aspects of security and privacy**; • **Information systems** → **Web applications**; • **Social and professional topics** → **Surveillance**.

## Keywords

Digital Monitoring, Tracking Tools, Parenting, Privacy, Trust

### ACM Reference Format:

Eelco Herder and Ana Cîrnu. 2026. Tracking Childhoods: Inter-generational Perspectives on Parent-Child Relationships and the Ethics of Digital Monitoring. In *18th ACM Web Science Conference (WebSci Companion '26)*, May 26–29, 2026, Braunschweig, Germany. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3795513.3810454>

## 1 Introduction

Childhood is a blank canvas that each person paints in their own way, and so it is lived in billions of unique forms. However, specific experiences are shared among children and the generation in which a person grew up plays an important role in shaping these experiences. Those who grew up in the same period often share cultural, societal, and technological influences, which can reveal many insights into how they behave in the later stages of their lives.

One context that can be used to differentiate a generation from another is parent-child relationships, particularly regarding the levels of trust and control. When looking at people who grew up in the 1970s-1980s and comparing them to children today, we can observe how the changes in the parent-child dynamic over the

years have influenced how they develop and form interpersonal relationships.

In the past, children generally enjoyed a higher level of freedom, engaging in plenty of activities that do not require technology [7]. They would also spend significantly more time outside, playing in the park, biking, running, or playing sports. Growing up this way, they developed a higher degree of independence, discovering their surroundings, limits, and dangers.

But to achieve such a level of independence, a lot of trust was also needed from their parents, trust that they would come home safely, and not engage in dangerous or illegal activities.

By contrast, being a child today often means being constantly connected to the Internet, to friends, and especially to parents. While many of the past safety issues no longer exist now, and parents can use technology to keep in contact with their children at all times, new risks have also appeared, not just related to online safety. As many of these risks cannot be identified beforehand, digital tracking systems need to have mechanisms that adapt privacy settings *in situ* to the needs and preferences of both children and parents in various specific contexts [12].

Understanding the balance between overprotection and guidance and knowing its potential long-term effects are essential. This study aims to analyze the impact of digital parental control on the long-term development of children, sense of independence, as well as relationships with their parents. Ultimately, we aim to illustrate the delicate balance between parental protection and children's growing need for autonomy in an increasingly digital world, and to propose guidelines for developing more ethical digital tracking systems.

## 2 Literature review

### 2.1 Privacy and ethics

In the era of digital childhood, parents express various concerns about their children's online activity, such as who they interact with, their exposure to inappropriate content, or the effects of sharing personal information online, not only on their safety, but also on their reputation [3].

However, the parents of the current generation, namely the ones born in the 70s-80s, did not grow up with technology, so as good as their intentions might be, it is also important to take into account how well they understand the online world; for instance, they may be unaware of the many ways in which private information may be shared [6].

Naturally, rules differ from family to family, and change based on the age of their children. Some parents consider location tracking, for example, to be a temporary measure until their child grows old enough to need more privacy than surveillance [14].



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. *WebSci Companion '26, Braunschweig, Germany*  
© 2026 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).  
ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-2492-3/26/05  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3795513.3810454>

Social media, however, is a much more complex territory, and requires more careful parental tracking. Part of the reason why children are exposed to online danger is because they do not understand that disclosing personal information may make them become vulnerable to online victimization [4]. However, parental tracking can have plenty of other negative effects. For instance, it has been noted that surveillance can encourage the act of self-censorship in children [9].

Although parents are often well-intended in their use of tracking technologies, and aim towards extending their care and responsibility over distance, it should be noted that such technologies are not innocuous, and could easily lead parents to mistake control for care [4]. Excessive control can raise questions regarding the levels of trust and respect in the parent-child dynamic [9], so one of the most important ethical responsibilities would be establishing a balance between parents ensuring their children are safe, and allowing them personal space.

Research further reveals that digital surveillance practices might also have an effect on how children understand their social environment and might impair their sense of power [2]. Particularly GPS tracking has been shown to negatively affect children's freedom to explore their surroundings and develop 'environmental literacy' [14]

Including children in the defining process of boundaries and limits for parental monitoring aligns with the expanding scholarly emphasis on the importance of child agency in monitoring relationships [5].

## 2.2 Parenting styles

A significant area of study in the child development field is parenting styles. Diana Baumrind's foundational work, which was based on a comprehensive longitudinal study of children between the ages of 3 and 15, was concluded by the identification of three main parenting styles: permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative [1]. Parents who exhibit a permissive or non-directive style often engage with their children in logical reasoning behind parenting related decisions. On the opposite end, authoritarian or directive parents set clear expectations for their children. Finally, authoritative parents are somewhere in the middle, avoiding being overly restrictive, firm in holding their boundaries and expectations.

A more recent concept that has been used to describe parents of college-aged young adults who are overly involved in their children's lives is the phenomenon of 'helicopter parenting' [8]. Due to their persistent involvement, the child might struggle to make choices independently later in life, and concerns have been raised regarding their overall development and autonomy.

With modern technology, parents' ability to monitor and manage their children's lives has amplified, and research has shown that ICTs have become enablers of helicopter parenting, by allowing extensive access into the lives of (pre)teens [5].

In the context of media consumption, researchers have developed the 'parental mediation theory', which was initially designed to address television consumption by children and included three main mediation strategies: restrictive, active, and co-viewing [4]. As technology evolved, these concepts were adapted to online media consumption. Many parents report having difficulties in setting the

right boundaries, especially with technology being so integrated in our daily lives [3]. Moreover, some parents are aware of how important online freedom is for their children, but report struggling with the fear of online dangers that could also translate into offline dangers [9].

## 2.3 Digital self-governance and context-aware surveillance

Helen Nissenbaum presents 'contextual integrity' as an alternative reference point for privacy, aiming to respond to issues arising from modern information technologies. It connects privacy protection to norms of particular contexts and demands the collection and distribution of information to align with the specific expectations and rules of the given context [10]. The evolution of ICTs and fluctuating cultural expectations are impeding the definition of clear boundaries of information flow. Personal life, school life and online social life are constantly overlapping, challenging the limits of how and when personal data should be shared or accessed.

It has been recognized that the balance between benevolent monitoring and surveillance is delicate, with people having the right to "have some control over how your personal information is collected and used". The word 'such' implies that there are limits regarding the level of control over one's own privacy [11]. In line with the use case on ambient assisted living in [12], parents and children may agree that continuous monitoring may not be desirable, but that certain (sudden) situations may call for adaptive, in situ privacy decisions – such as automatically turning on monitoring to ensure timely interventions to prevent (further) damage.

Although extensive research on privacy, ethics, and digital surveillance exists, several significant gaps, concerning children's rights and the digital practices of parents, remain unaddressed. There is a limited understanding about how technology subtly reshapes the parent-child dynamics, often in ways parents do not fully grasp. Also, the effects of the 'quantified otherness' [5] – situations in which tracking practices largely reduce children to data points – on child development, but also on the parent-child relationship, remain unexplored.

Given these gaps in literature, this research will focus on the implications of digital tracking tools, as well as social media platforms designed for communication.

## 3 Methodology

Across generations, parents have used various methods of monitoring, guiding, and supporting their children, including face-to-face communications, establishing rules, and being involved in their lives. However, the dynamic between the two parts has been influenced by the evolution of technology, more specifically by the integration of tracking tools, such as parental control applications and academic monitoring systems.

Hence, the main research question is as follows: *How do digital tracking tools influence the parent-child relationship across generations, and how can this relationship contribute to designing more ethical tracking systems?* We are interested in how these technologies are perceived by different generations of children and parents in relation to their childhoods, in order to find insights that help us in rethinking digital tracking technologies.

The study focuses on the Eastern European region, as it provides a meaningful setting for analyzing the effect of digital tracking on family dynamics, given its unique social, cultural, and technological transitions over the last decades. This focus was also guided by the practical accessibility of participants. The participants were recruited via a combination of targeted and maximum variation sampling in the researcher’s wider circle of family and friends.

The study involved twelve participants, distributed evenly across four generational groups. The first group, with participants in their 20s, consisted of students and recent graduates who reflected on their childhood experiences with parental tracking. The second group, with participants in their 30s, included young adults, who were able to reflect both on the early stages of parenting with the help of digital tracking tools, but also on their own childhoods with limited to no digital tracking. The third group, with participants in their 40s, consisted of middle-aged adults, who also provided a dual perspective, talking about their childhoods without digital tracking, but also their current practices raising teenagers. Finally, the last group, with participants in their 50s, consisted of parents of older children, who mostly provided insights regarding their parenting practices in the pre-digital and early-digital eras.

After a test round, individual interviews were chosen above the initially planned focus groups, as they allowed for deeper personal reflection and the freedom to share personal experiences and opinions without the influence of group dynamics.

Through semi-structured interviews both quantitative and qualitative elements were collected. The quantitative data was obtained through Likert-scale questions that provided measurable insights into the attitudes of the participants. Each interview lasted around 30 minutes and was conducted either in-person or via video conference, ensuring flexibility and accessibility. The qualitative data was obtained through follow-up open-ended questions, tied to each Likert scale question, capturing rich narratives and personal experiences, and allowing participants to expand on their thoughts, ideas, and opinions without limitations.

The data was systematically organized while a clear link to the theoretical framework was maintained. As the coding progressed, additional themes emerged directly from the interviews, emphasizing concepts that were not fully anticipated in the initial code framework.

The research methodology and data collection has been approved via Utrecht University’s compulsory Ethics and Privacy Quick Scan<sup>1</sup>.

## 4 Results

As outlined in the previous section, the thematic analysis was structured around a code framework containing six main codes, and corresponding sub-codes. The main codes and their frequency are summarized in Table 1.

The frequency analysis indicates that ‘Parental approaches’ and ‘Digital tracking practices’ were the central themes in the discussions with the participants. This suggests that the conversation around digital tracking is rooted in the ‘how’ (the practices) and the ‘why’ (the approaches) of parenting with technology. Interestingly,

Main Thematic Code	Frequency
Children’s perspectives	112
Parent-child relationships	107
Parental approaches	350
Digital tracking practices	347
Digital self-governance and surveillance	101
Privacy and ethics	86

**Table 1: Frequency of Main Codes Across All Interviews**

despite being a central academic concern, ‘Privacy and ethics’ was the least frequently coded theme.

This section explores the qualitative findings from the interview in detail, and is divided into six subsections, corresponding with the aforementioned main codes from the code framework

### 4.1 Children’s perspectives

Regarding children’s behavior, the 30s group, representing parents of the youngest children, shows the highest frequency among the generations, with 23 mentions, suggesting that understanding this dynamic is a primary concern for new parents. For instance, a parent from the 30s group anticipates future conflict based on the personality of their child: *“It’s possible with her attitude that we will face problems later. My daughter is quite explosive. And indeed, as I know her now, she may have comments.”* (P10, 30s). In contrast, the lower frequency of mentions among the 20s (6) and 50s (7) groups indicates a more reflective attitude, where this behavioral response loses the central focus.

The term ‘Hide’ is the most co-occurring term with ‘Children’s behavior’ (10 mentions), significantly outnumbering the keywords associated with dialogue. This pattern suggests that when participants describe the observable actions children take in response to digital tracking, the dominant behavior is one of secrecy and resistance. This reactive dishonesty is a recognized pattern, as noted by another parent: *“If you and the child are okay, they tell you everything they do and where they are. But in certain cases I think it helps, because many children lie to their parents.”* (P5, 30s)

The discussion about children’s thoughts peaks for participants in their 30s, who are new parents of young children, with 28 mentions. This concern is often related to the child’s age and their perceived acceptance of monitoring, as one parent from this group mentions: *“At least at her age, because my daughter is still small, she is 7 years old. It doesn’t bother her that we follow her. She knows she has the AirTag in the kindergarten, but for her, it is something normal, natural. So, probably the age and the needs associated with the age didn’t create a pushback in this sense.”* (P10, 30s)

The 40s group, composed of parents of teenagers, also shows a high engagement with the topic of acceptance, with 16 mentions of the theme, indicating that these concerns remain highly relevant during the negotiation stages of adolescence. In contrast, the theme is far less notable for the 20s group (7 mentions), as explained by a participant: *“When I was smaller, I was feeling like I was being controlled, now I feel like it’s better for parents to know where their children are.”* (P3, 20s)

The findings suggest that children’s internal perspectives on digital tracking are primarily framed by their emotional reactions,

<sup>1</sup><https://www.uu.nl/en/research/institute-of-information-and-computing-sciences/ethics-and-privacy>

particularly by the feeling of being controlled. This perception, which only intensifies during the teenage years, can be turned into a sense of trust and support if parents prioritize their children's consent, open dialogue, but also clear boundaries.

## 4.2 Parent-child relationships

Beyond the expected primary terms connected to this topic, such as 'child' or 'parents', the distinction of cognitive verbs like 'know' and 'think' highlights that the parent-child relationship is understood by participants primarily through the lens of perception, awareness, and mutual understanding.

Further, 'Parent-child relationship' is a consistently notable theme across parental generations (the 30s, 40s, and 50s groups), with the highest frequency occurring in the 30s group (31 mentions). This suggests that new parents are most interested in how tracking technologies might shape the foundation of their relationship with their children.

From here, a crucial actionable insight for parents can be extracted: maintain a positive relationship, focusing on open dialogue and collaboration rather than unilateral control. *"I believe in communication and working together with the child to decide what is considered allowed and what not, or what are the limits, rather than an excessive control with which the child does not agree, and which, in the end, doesn't really help the parent either."* (P7, 50s)

## 4.3 Parental approaches

"Parenting styles" is the most referenced concept in this category, with 140 mentions, which indicates that participants conceptualize their monitoring behaviors not as individual actions, but as components of their overall parenting philosophy. 'Communication', with 69 mentions, and 'Safety', with 61, are also highly significant, while 'Control', 'Freedom', and 'Support' are discussed less frequently, suggesting they are viewed as specific components within the broader approaches.

A keyword analysis revealed a shift in the nature of the communication across generations. The 30s group, consisting of new parents, is more focused on the general act of 'Communicating' (13 mentions), while the 40s groups puts more emphasis on 'Talk' (10 mentions), and the 50s towards 'Discuss' (4 mentions) and 'Consent' (2 mentions). This suggests an evolution from a one-way communication style from the parent to the child, to two-way discussions based on engagement and consent from the child. This principle of collaborative communication is seen as the most effective way to implement tracking while avoiding conflict.

Further, we observed a clear evolution in the priorities of the parents. 'Safety' is a dominant and consistent concern for parents in their 30s and 40, but also for the 20s group, while the 'Support' theme is almost absent for the younger groups, but becomes more significant for the 40s and 50s groups. This suggests a shift from a protective mindset while the child is young, to a supportive one when the child is closer to becoming an adult.

## 4.4 Digital tracking practices

Unsurprisingly, 'Tracking tools' as a general idea was the most frequently discussed concept, with 149 mentions. Specific practices such as 'Location tracking', with 98 mentions, and 'Digital catalog',

with 90 mentions, also stand out, indicating that these are the primary methods of tracking used by participants. In contrast, 'Social media tracking' is only mentioned 10 times, showing that it is either a less common or a more sensitive practice.

The keyword frequency also indicated a generational shift in the language used to describe those practices. The 20s group frequently uses verbs such as 'Track' (10 mentions) and nouns like 'Location' (18 mentions), while the parents from the 30s and 40s groups make more use of verbs such as 'Monitor' (25 mentions in total) and nouns like 'Application' (45 mentions in total) or 'Phone' (30 mentions in total). The difference in vocabulary depicts a change of perspective, from being monitored to monitoring.

'Location tracking' is heavily associated with 'Safety' (32 references), confirming this is almost its only purpose from the parental perspective. In contrast, 'Digital catalog' is linked with 'Support' (11 references), reinforcing the idea that parents use it as a tool for academic help. 'Social media tracking' is the only practice with a significant connection to 'Control' (6 references), suggesting its invasive nature.

One participant expressed their concerns regarding social media tracking: *"I think you can't really grow up normally, right? And become a healthy adult if someone is constantly controlling you. I mean, knowing every message on your phone is being read by someone."* (P12, 30s)

## 4.5 Digital self-governance and surveillance

The idea that information sharing must be context-appropriate is most frequently discussed by the 20s group (6 mentions). This implies that the ones who have the most recent experience of being tracked are most aware of how important it is to set boundaries and ensure the monitoring is appropriate to the various scenarios.

Parents also recognize this need, explaining the difference between acceptable (public) and unacceptable (private) contexts for monitoring: *"Morally, as a parent, I think monitoring has to have some limits. You can't film him in his room or what he talks to his friends... I think it is only for traveling or commuting, that's all."* (P11, 40s)

The feeling of constantly being watched is most prominent among the 30s group, with 13 mentions, which indicates that parents of younger children are highly aware of the panoptic dynamic tracking tools can create. They are aware that constant monitoring, even if not ill-intentioned, can feel invasive and make the child hyper-aware that they are being watched.

From the perspective of a child, this feeling can also be triggered by specific features found in tracking applications that create a sense of constant oversight: *"Some apps have like this thing where you can implement notifications so for example if you arrive home your parent immediately gets a notification that you're home and I feel like that can be a little bit way too much like too controlling."* (P1, 20s)

Parents themselves state that a reduction in monitoring is necessary over time as part of a healthy development of the child *"With increasing age, the level of supervision and control theoretically should be inversely proportional. As the child matures, control should decrease."* (P8, 40s)

## 4.6 Privacy and ethics

On the topic of privacy, the language of the 20s group is centered on 'Opinion' and 'Freedom', while the vocabulary of the parents progress from 'Rule' and 'Responsible' for the 30s group to 'Talk', for the 40s group, and finally, to 'Trust', for the 50s group, mapping the changes in priorities over the course of the years.

For the 20s group, 'Autonomy' is the primary concern, with 13 mentions, and it is directly linked to having agency over the tracking tools themselves, since they are the children, and they are the ones being tracked. From the parental point of view, however, autonomy is seen not as an inherent right, but as a developmental goal. One parent explained how using a location tracking application for their child led him to become more independent: *"I see how my son was when he started with this application... he took responsibility, he saw what he had to do, he learned, and he knows where to go, where to look."* (P9, 40s)

On the topic of ethics, across all generations, there is a consensus that monitoring should never be done secretly, as it would mean an immediate breach of trust. Additionally, from the perspective of the child, having the ability to grant consent is an empowering act that reframes the parent-child dynamic from one of control to one of collaboration.

An important tension arises between the child's right to privacy and the parent's desire for the reassurance they get when they know the whereabouts of their children. This struggle can lead parents to justifying tracking practices that are potentially invasive or harmful to the relationship, by deeming them necessary for dangerous or extreme situations. This happens regardless of them being aware that children might perceive them as 'exaggerated controlling': *"I consider this listening part an extremely important function for extreme situations... But also to eavesdrop a little, I mean 5 seconds... Yes, it may sound like exaggerated controlling, I don't know."* (P8, 40s)

## 5 Discussion

When viewed together, the results offer a cohesive overview of the generational tensions created by digital tracking. The personal narratives extracted from the qualitative data reveal a fundamental conflict between the parental drive for safety and control, and the children's developmental needs for privacy and autonomy.

Further, the results suggest that perceptions of tracking technologies are not just different, but evolve with one's role and life stage. There is a clear distinction between the one who is monitored, whose focus is on 'Autonomy' and 'Freedom', and the one monitoring, whose concerns progress from establishing 'Rules' (30s group) to facilitating 'Talk' (40s group) to building 'Trust' (50s group).

In certain cases, the parent, the child, and the tracking technology form a recursive feedback loop, in which the acts of observation and monitoring fundamentally change the dynamics between the different parties. A real-life example of this recursive logic is perfectly captured in a parent's (P9, 40s) testimony, whose daughter responds to being monitored by *"disabling her location sometimes because she doesn't want me to know where she is"*. A parent who leans towards 'helicopter parenting' or a more authoritarian style (as discussed in Section 4.3), may use the resistance of the child as a reason to increase control, therefore intensifying the loop.

The design of modern tracking tools promises constant visibility of the child, therefore allowing parents to permanently monitor their children, and facilitating 'caring dataveillance' [13].

The primary conflict driving the recursive loop of surveillance is based on the disagreement over privacy and the negotiation of its terms. The nature of privacy in the familial context, however, is complex and unique, where power dynamics are influenced by emotional and interpersonal factors, such as love, trust, or authority. Tracking applications provide technical privacy controls, such as settings and permissions that allow users to control the information flow between them and the platforms. However, relying only on those controls has proved insufficient and a lot of the times counterproductive.

## 5.1 Limitations

Despite efforts to ensure variety and accuracy in the study, several limitations of the methodology should be noted. First, the sample size was relatively small, with only twelve participants across four generational groups. Second, the recruitment process included selecting participants who were already familiar with digital tracking tools, which may have introduced a biased perspective. Lastly, the study focused on a specific cultural and geographical context, the Eastern European region, offering meaningful insights into its particular social, cultural and technological transitions, but the findings may not necessarily be transferable to other regions and contexts.

## 6 Conclusions

This research set out to examine how using digital tracking tools shape the relationship between parents and children across multiple generations, with the goal of using these relational insights as a guide for redesigning digital academic tracking systems in an ethical way. The findings indicate that the impact of these technologies is shaped not only by the tools themselves, but largely by the parental approach and by the quality of the communication surrounding tracking, limits, and boundaries.

Rather than relying on a binary model in which parental access can be turned on or off, this study suggests that systems should implement progressive controls that can be changed and adapted to the child's age and maturity level. Further, to mitigate the risks associated with purely restricted mediation, systems should be designed to be adaptive and context-aware, and to intentionally promote active mediation.

As digital tracking technologies become increasingly embedded in our daily lives, the parent-child relationships reach a turning point. The findings of this study suggest that progress does not lie in redefining the mechanisms of surveillance, but in reorienting design towards promoting trust, mediation and communication.

## References

- [1] Diana Baumrind. 1966. Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child development* (1966), 887–907.
- [2] Danah Boyd and Alice E Marwick. 2011. Social privacy in networked publics: Teens' attitudes, practices, and strategies. In *A decade in internet time: Symposium on the dynamics of the internet and society*.
- [3] Marie Danet. 2020. Parental concerns about their school-aged children's use of digital devices. *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 29, 10 (2020), 2890–2904.
- [4] Prakriti Dumar, Hanieh Atashpanjeh, and Mahdi Nasrullah Al-Ameen. 2024. "It's hard for him to make choices sometimes and he needs guidance": Re-orienting

- Parental Control for Children. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 8, CSCW1 (2024), 1–51.
- [5] Katleen Gabriels. 2016. 'I keep a close watch on this child of mine': a moral critique of other-tracking apps. *Ethics and Information Technology* 18, 3 (2016), 175–184.
- [6] Susan A Gelman, Nicole Cuneo, Sanika Kulkarni, Sarah Snay, and Steven O Roberts. 2021. The roles of privacy and trust in children's evaluations and explanations of digital tracking. *Child development* 92, 5 (2021), 1769–1784.
- [7] Peter Gray, David F Lancy, and David F Bjorklund. 2023. Decline in independent activity as a cause of decline in children's mental well-being: summary of the evidence. *The Journal of Pediatrics* 260 (2023).
- [8] Terri LeMoyné and Tom Buchanan. 2011. Does "hovering" matter? Helicopter parenting and its effect on well-being. *Sociological Spectrum* 31, 4 (2011), 399–418.
- [9] Anouk Mols, Jorge Pereira Campos, and Jason Pridmore. 2023. Family surveillance: Understanding parental monitoring, reciprocal practices, and digital resilience. *Surveillance & Society* 21, 4 (2023), 469–484.
- [10] Helen Nissenbaum. 2004. Privacy as contextual integrity. *Wash. L. Rev.* 79 (2004), 119.
- [11] Daniel J Power, Ciara Heavin, and Yvonne O'Connor. 2021. Balancing privacy rights and surveillance analytics: a decision process guide. *Journal of Business Analytics* 4, 2 (2021), 155–170.
- [12] Florian Schaub, Bastian Könings, and Michael Weber. 2015. Context-adaptive privacy: Leveraging context awareness to support privacy decision making. *IEEE Pervasive Computing* 14, 1 (2015), 34–43.
- [13] Marit Sukk and Andra Siibak. 2021. Caring dataveillance and the construction of "good parenting": Estonian parents' and pre-teens' reflections on the use of tracking technologies. *Communications* 46, 3 (2021), 446–467.
- [14] Sarah Widmer and Anders Albrechtslund. 2021. The ambiguities of surveillance as care and control: Struggles in the domestication of location-tracking applications by Danish parents. *Nordicom Review* 42, S4 (2021), 79–93.