

ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ / RESEARCH ARTICLE

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' REPRODUCTION OF OMNIOPTIC SURVEILLANCE
THROUGH DIGITAL DISCLOSURE AND EXPOSUREMehmet AKSOY¹, Harun SERPİL²¹Cemal Mümtaz Sosyal Bilimler Lisesi, Felsefe Grubu Öğretmeni, Eskişehir,
mehmet2726aksoy@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2098-9162²Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Eskişehir, hserpil@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-
0002-6293-9385

GELİŞ TARİHİ/RECEIVED DATE: 13.09.2025

KABUL TARİHİ/ACCEPTED DATE: 19.11.2025

Aksoy, M. & Serpil, H. (2026). High School Students' Reproduction of Omnioptic
Surveillance Through Digital Disclosure and Exposure. *Aurum Sosyal Bilimler
Dergisi*, 11(1), 50-82.**Abstract**

This study investigates the sociological underpinnings of high school students' disclosure- and exposure-based sharing behaviors on social media, categorizes these practices, and examines them through the lens of omnioptic surveillance. Employing an exploratory sequential mixed-methods design, the quantitative phase involved 350 students from seven high schools in Eskişehir during the 2024–2025 academic year, selected through simple random sampling. The qualitative phase included 32 students, identified through criterion sampling based on their social media posting and following practices. Data were gathered using a two-part survey comprising 61 items and a semi-structured interview protocol with seven questions. Quantitative analyses were conducted using frequency, percentage, mean, t-test, and ANOVA, while qualitative data underwent content analysis to extend and contextualize the quantitative results. The findings indicated significant gender-based differences in t-test scores, as well as notable variations across grade levels and school types. Moreover, the analysis demonstrated that students actively construct and reproduce omnioptic surveillance through their revealing and exposing social media posts. Importantly, students did not perceive such practices as violations of privacy, a perception that contributes to the persistence and reproduction of omnioptic surveillance.

Keywords: Digital disclosure, Display culture, Panopticon, Omniopticon, Surveillance, High school students.

Lise Öğrencilerinde Dijital İfşa ve Teşhir Üzerinden Omnioptik Gözetimin Yeniden Üretimi

Öz

Bu çalışma, lise öğrencilerinin sosyal medyada ifşa ve teşhir temelli paylaşım davranışlarının sosyolojik dayanaklarını incelemekte, bu pratikleri kategorize etmekte ve omnioptik gözetim perspektifinden değerlendirmektedir. Keşfedici sıralı karma yöntem deseninin kullanıldığı araştırmanın nicel aşaması, 2024–2025 eğitim-öğretim yılında Eskişehir’deki yedi liseden basit tesadüfi örnekleme yoluyla seçilen 350 öğrenciyle yürütülmüştür. Nitel aşamada ise sosyal medya paylaşım ve takip pratikleri dikkate alınarak ölçüt örnekleme ile belirlenen 32 öğrenci yer almıştır. Veriler, 61 maddeden oluşan iki bölümlü bir anket ve yedi soruluk yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme formu aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Nicel veriler frekans, yüzde, aritmetik ortalama, t-testi ve ANOVA ile analiz edilirken; nitel veriler, nicel sonuçları genişletmek ve bağlama oturtmak amacıyla içerik analizine tabi tutulmuştur. Bulgular, t-testi puanlarında cinsiyete dayalı anlamlı farklılıklar ile sınıf düzeyi ve okul türüne göre belirgin farklılıklar ortaya koymuştur. Ayrıca analiz, öğrencilerin sosyal medyadaki açıklayıcı ve teşhir edici paylaşımları aracılığıyla omnioptik gözetimi etkin biçimde inşa ettiklerini ve yeniden ürettiklerini göstermiştir. Önemli olarak, öğrenciler bu tür pratikleri mahremiyet ihlali olarak algılamamış; bu algı, omnioptik gözetimin sürekliliğine ve yeniden üretimine katkı sağlamıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dijital ifşa, Teşhir kültürü, Panoptikon, Omnioptikon, Gözetim, Lise öğrencileri.

1. Introduction

The rapid development of social media platforms has fundamentally reconfigured the architecture of social interaction, transforming them into central arenas for identity performance and communal observation. Critically engaging with this shift, Han (2022) conceptualizes these platforms as a digital panopticon, arguing that they discipline and exploit sociality through enforced visibility. This new digital public sphere feeds a modern desire for validation, compelling individuals to make themselves visible and be proven to others (Khalid et al., 2018). Within this economy of attention, identity is constructed dramaturgically (Goffman, 1959); users externalize their lives on platforms like Instagram, TikTok, and YouTube in a performative bid for existence, often at the expense of the traditional values of privacy and responsibility. Han (2022) contends that the logic of digital communication demands a radical transparency, systematically eliminating the personal sphere in favour of a compulsory "visible communication."

This dynamic manifests as a pervasive "digital disclosure and display culture" (Tzouganatou, 2021), where the desire to see and be seen through others becomes a dominant social force. This culture, amplified by the proliferation of platforms and the ease of anonymous dissemination (Biçer, 2024; Doko, 2024), represents a profound sociological shift. Display is not merely an act of showing but a process of self-association, where passion and meaning are attributed to curated objects and experiences (Sharifi Bastan et al., 2022). Consequently, social media functions as a postmodern arena that pulls individuals from embodied, practical life into a realm of virtual identity construction (Aziz, 2022), evaporating established boundaries and diminishing concepts of shame and privacy (Necaise et al., 2023). In this process, the monopoly on exposure is democratized, the private moments are transformed into public spectacle, legitimized under a new social mantra: "I appear, therefore I am" (Büyükaslan, 2024; Can, 2021; Tatar et al., 2014).

Ciaunica et al. (2020) argued that transparency can be a method of effacing the ego, detaining the individual within an online persona. Han (2022) emphasizes that in an exhibitionist society, each subject becomes their own advertising object; everything is measured by its exhibition value and becomes a commodity stripped of its secrets. Thus, the voluntary sharing of social media users structures a form of omnioptic surveillance in which "everyone watches everyone else" (Li et al., 2019). Sharing on social networks increases surveillance, and individuals voluntarily participate in this process, motivated by the effort to be liked, social approval, and a sense of superiority. Omnioptic surveillance is rooted in a hedonistic, entertainment-oriented, and consensual model that Han (2022) describes as a "control society." Unlike Bentham's panopticon, in the omniopticon, individuals network with one another, while exhibitionism and voyeurism fuel this surveillance. Individuals voluntarily submit to the panoptic gaze, becoming both perpetrators and victims in a dialectic where freedom is identified with control. This exhibitionist imperative creates a paradox of agency. Unlike the coercive, top-down model of Bentham's Panopticon, omnioptic surveillance is hedonistic and consensual, driven by motivations for social approval, likability, and superiority. Participants willingly become both perpetrators and victims of the gaze, embodying a dialectic where freedom is seamlessly identified with control (Han, 2022).

2. Literature Review

Omnioptic surveillance, characterized by reciprocal observation within digital networks, departs from traditional hierarchical models like the Panopticon (Foucault, 1977). It thrives on mutual monitoring, where participants act as both observers and observed. This participatory form of surveillance is socially reproduced through digital self-exposure, sharing personal information online, and exhibitionism, the deliberate display of oneself for others' consumption (Kırık & Ergün, 2019; Özcan, 2024).

Digital self-exposure normalizes perpetual visibility as a societal norm. Frequent sharing fosters an expectation of transparency, making visibility a prerequisite for social inclusion (Marwick & Boyd, 2014; Subaşı, 2024; Tutar, 2024). Adolescents who regularly post personal content perceive non-visibility as social withdrawal, reinforcing a culture where being seen is equated with belonging (Orben & Przybylski, 2024). Exhibitionism amplifies this norm, as users display curated selves to garner attention; 95% of U.S. adolescents engage daily with content-sharing platforms (Pew Research Center, 2024). This normalization embeds mutual observation into everyday social practices (Bauman & Lyon, 2013).

Social media reward systems, such as likes and comments, create feedback loops that reinforce self-exposure. These interactions serve as "affective currencies," driving users to disclose more to sustain validation (Andrejevic, 2023). Habitual social media checking correlates with heightened activity in the brain's reward centers among teens, suggesting a neurological basis for this cycle (Maza et al., 2023). Exhibitionism is further rewarded as visible posts receive more engagement, encouraging users to observe others' reactions while sharing themselves (Boyd, 2024).

Algorithms amplify self-exposure by prioritizing content that maximizes visibility and engagement. Zuboff (2019) describes this as "surveillance capitalism," where platforms profit from user data by curating feeds to favor exhibitionist posts. TikTok's algorithm, for instance, boosts videos with high interaction rates, incentivizing users to escalate disclosure for prominence (Gillespie, 2023). This creates a self-reinforcing system where users produce content for observation and consume other amplified displays, sustaining the omnioptic gaze. Adolescents, particularly those sensitive to peer cues, are disproportionately drawn into this cycle (Orben & Blakemore, 2023).

Self-exposure erodes the private-public divide, fostering what Marwick and Boyd (2014) term a culture of "public intimacy" (Marwick & Boyd, 2014). The frequent sharing of personal moments redefines privacy norms (Livingstone & Sefton-Green, 2016). Problematic social media use among teens is often tied to oversharing, which normalizes mutual observation (WHO, 2024). Exhibitionism is valorized as a social virtue, linked to rising individualism among youth, where public display becomes a marker of identity (Twenge et al., 2023). This cultural shift legitimizes the omnipticon, as constant visibility becomes an accepted social practice (Bauman & Lyon, 2013).

Omnioptic surveillance reproduces itself through lateral power dynamics. Andrejevic (2023) introduces "lateral surveillance," where peers monitor each other, but visibility hierarchies emerge as influencers and high-engagement users shape the collective gaze. This creates "data colonialism," where dominant actors guide observation norms (Couldry & Mejias, 2021). Teens with higher follower counts exert outsized influence on peers' sharing behaviors, perpetuating surveillance through aspirational exhibitionism (Sewell & Barker, 2023).

Habitual self-exposure erodes privacy conceptions, a trend transmitted across generations. Digital natives perceive a less need for privacy and view disclosure as intrinsic to sociality (Twenge, 2017). Adolescent oversharing correlates with diminished privacy concerns, normalizing surveillance for future cohorts (Mansfield et al., 2025). Exhibitionism accelerates this by framing visibility as empowering, a perception reinforced by teens' preference for platforms that reward public displays (Pew Research Center, 2024).

Platforms economically incentivize self-exposure through design features like stories, live streams, and algorithmic boosts. User data fuels profit, and platforms engineer interfaces to maximize visibility (Zuboff, 2019; Kitchin, 2024). Instagram's "Explore" feature increases posting frequency by 20% among teens, because visibility translates into engagement metrics (Gillespie, 2023). Exhibitionism is thus monetized, sustaining the omnipticon as users feed the surveillance economy (Andrejevic, 2023).

Visibility on social media confers social capital, driving self-exposure. Teens perceive higher follower counts as social leverage, prompting exhibitionist displays to accrue benefits (Ellison et al., 2022). Visibility metrics serve as quantifiable self-worth, linked to individualism

(Twenge et al., 2023). This pursuit ensures the reproduction of omnioptic surveillance, as users monitor peers to benchmark their own visibility (Boyd, 2024).

Digital self-exposure constructs online identities, a reflexive process that ties individuals to an omniopticon. Goffman's (1959) dramaturgical theory frames this as performance, requiring constant upkeep. Teens feel socially disconnected without a digital presence, making participation compulsory (Livingstone & Sefton-Green, 2016). Exhibitionism reinforces this, as visibility validates identity—a dynamic tied to adolescent identity formation (Orben & Przybylski, 2024). Disengagement risks social erasure, ensuring the continuity of surveillance (Marwick & Boyd, 2014).

The bandwagon effect and fear of missing out (FOMO) drive collective self-exposure. FOMO increases posting frequency by 15% among teens when peers are active (Przybylski et al., 2013). Algorithms amplify this herd behavior by promoting trending content (Gillespie, 2023). Exhibitionism becomes contagious, with 70% of teens posting more during viral trends (Pew Research Center, 2024). This collective momentum solidifies the omniopticon as widespread participation normalizes mutual surveillance (Bauman & Lyon, 2013).

Omnioptic surveillance is socially reproduced through digital self-exposure and exhibitionism via normalized visibility, feedback loops, algorithmic amplification, cultural shifts, power dynamics, privacy erosion, economic incentives, social capital, identity construction, and collective behavior (Bitirim Okmeydan, 2017; Meishar-Tal & Forkosh-Baruch, 2024; Utma, 2024). Evidence from brain imaging (Maza et al., 2023) and longitudinal studies (Orben & Przybylski, 2024) underscores how these mechanisms interlock, creating a self-sustaining surveillance system embedded in digital sociality, particularly among adolescents.

Surveillance, as a mechanism of social control, has persisted across historical contexts, crystallizing into structured forms with the rise of institutional confinement. Foucault (1977) identified its institutional genesis in early modern penal systems. This paradigm reached its theoretical apex with Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon design (1791), an architectural model featuring a circular arrangement of cells surrounding a central observational tower. Within this design, an unseen overseer commands a panoptic gaze, ensuring that all inmates remain perpetually visible yet unable to confirm whether they are being observed (Foucault, 1977). This asymmetry cultivates a self-regulating consciousness, as inmates internalize the potential

for scrutiny (Giddens, 1990). It is important to note that the Panopticon was fraught with inherent contradictions between its ideals of reform and its mechanisms of control, which limited its practical implementation as a penitentiary (Steadman, 2007).

However, the Panopticon represents only an initial stage in the evolution of surveillance, which has since diversified in response to technological and societal transformations (Lyon, 2018). The digital era has displaced the coercive, unidirectional gaze of the Panopticon with an omnioptic paradigm, where social media facilitates reciprocal observation among users (Bauman & Lyon, 2013; Lyon, 2018; Ünsal, 2022). This omnioptic model is a fully reciprocal system where all actors simultaneously observe and are observed, epitomized by social media's participatory dynamics (Andrejevic, 2023). It thrives on voluntarism, transparency, and entertainment, embedding surveillance within everyday social interactions and eroding the boundaries of privacy and intimacy (Kavut, 2023; Köseliören & Ayhan, 2025; Trottier, 2016; Zuboff, 2019).

The Pew Research Center (2024) documents this among adolescents, with 95% of U.S. teens engaging daily on platforms such as YouTube and TikTok, both creating and consuming content. Orben and Przybylski (2024) linked this to developmental imperatives, noting that adolescents' heightened sensitivity to social feedback amplifies their role in such networks. This positions contemporary adolescents, particularly high school students, as both architects and subjects of an omnioptic regime, embedding surveillance within their social fabric.

Various studies have extensively probed social media's surveillance dimensions (Boyd & Ellison, 2007; Marwick & Boyd, 2011); however, the adolescent experience remains underexplored. Recent studies underscore this gap: the WHO (2024) reported an 11% prevalence of problematic social media use among European teens, linked to mental health risks, while the Pew Research Center (2024) documents near-constant platform use among U.S. adolescents, with YouTube and TikTok dominating. Mansfield et al. (2025) called for refined methodologies to assess digital harms, emphasizing youth-specific impacts. This study addresses these lacunae by examining the sociological drivers of high school students' exposure to and exhibitionist practices on social media, interrogating their role in constructing omnioptic surveillance. It poses the following questions: What motivates these sharing and viewing behaviors, and how do they sustain a participatory gaze?

3. Aim of The Study

We are experiencing a process where everything is becoming transparent, especially through social media platforms, where the younger generation spends a significant amount of time. People share content about both their own lives and those of others on these platforms, and they watch these posts for hours. It would be accurate to call these posts, which often reach the point of violating the privacy of private life or confidentiality, "digital disclosure and exposure." Through online disclosure and exposure-based posts, "everyone watches everyone else; a form of surveillance based on entertainment, voluntary consent, and hedonic elements is being structured." Therefore, this situation, in which the observer also becomes the observed, is called the "omniopicon." In this context, the primary objective of this research is to reveal the sociological background of the disclosure and exposure-based sharing behaviors of adolescent high school students on social media platforms; to categorize the results and analyze them within the context of the assumptions of omniopiconic surveillance. In light of this objective, the research seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What are the views of the participating students regarding the disclosure and exposure sharing behaviors on social networks?
2. How can the participating students' views on their disclosure and exposure sharing behaviors on social networks be read in the context of the presentation of self in online spaces, hedonism, loss of privacy, and online cancel culture?
3. How can the views of participating students regarding their disclosure and exposure sharing behaviors on social networks be read in the context of omniopiconic surveillance?

4. Method

4.1. Research Design

This research employed an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design. In this approach, the researcher first collects and analyzes quantitative data and subsequently integrates qualitative findings to provide deeper insights and explanations (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). The quantitative phase of the study was structured using a descriptive survey model, which allows

for the presentation and explanation of existing conditions as they are (Lune & Berg, 2017). Survey research is particularly suitable for describing the socio-demographic characteristics, opinions, attitudes, and perceptions of a given population in relation to specific variables (Bhattacharjee, 2012). Such studies typically involve (a) collecting data from a group that is representative of the population, (b) obtaining responses through standardized questions, and (c) analyzing these responses to identify patterns or relationships (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). Moreover, the quantitative data in this study were obtained through a cross-sectional design, in which variables are measured at a single point in time (Bhattacharjee, 2012). The qualitative phase of the study employed a phenomenological design to capture students' lived experiences and the meanings they ascribe to them. Phenomenology, as Creswell (2013) emphasizes, seeks to understand how individuals perceive, interpret, and make sense of a particular phenomenon through in-depth exploration of their experiences. In this study, the phenomenological approach enabled the examination of adolescents' subjective understandings of omnioptic surveillance within digital disclosure and display practices. Thus, the explanatory sequential design was selected to first identify adolescents' perspectives on omnioptic surveillance quantitatively and then to enrich, elaborate, and contextualize these findings through qualitative inquiry.

4.2. Sampling

The population of this study consisted of students enrolled in seven different high schools located in the city center of Eskişehir during the 2024–2025 academic year, each offering different curricula (Anatolian high school, science high school, Anatolian imam hatip high school, Anatolian fine arts high school, social sciences high school, Anatolian vocational high school, and sports high school). For the quantitative part of the study, a sample of 350 students was selected using the simple random sampling method, while for the qualitative part, a sample of 32 students was created using the purposive sampling method. In addition, the criterion sampling method was also used in determining the sample groups. The criteria for inclusion were that students had social media accounts and actively used them, shared content on these accounts, and followed the content of others. The study group was determined on a voluntary basis, and all participants were given an informed consent form. All participants were also informed that all their personal data would be kept confidential during and after the research and would not be used for any other purpose. Finally, the forms were signed by all participants.

4.3. Data Collection Tool

A two-part survey form with a total of 61 questions was used to collect the targeted data. The first part of the survey, developed by the researchers, consisted of 16 questions aimed at determining the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants. The second part consisted of four sections and a total of 45 Likert-type statements aimed at determining the participants' opinions on "omnioptic surveillance practices structured through a culture of digital disclosure and exposure." In order to develop this part of the survey, a literature review was conducted, and interviews were held with three students related to the topic. Based on the students' responses and the existing accounts in the literature, the final version of this part of the survey was prepared. Therefore, the second part of the survey has the following structure:

- a. Presentation of Self in Online Spaces: Status, prestige, and the construction of digital identity (13 items),
- b. Hedonism: Curiosity, pleasure, fun, and voluntariness (13 items),
- c. Loss of or Indifference to Privacy (13 items),
- d. Online Cancel Culture: Social control, punishment, and lynching (6 items).

Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Analysis was conducted to determine the validity and reliability of the scale prepared to collect the targeted data in the study, and the Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient of the scale was calculated as .789. This coefficient indicates that the scale is reliable. After the quantitative data were analyzed, qualitative data were collected to elaborate, support, complement, and expand on points considered to be incomplete or unclear in the research. For this purpose, a semi-structured interview form consisting of seven questions was used.

4.4. Data Collection and Analysis

Before collecting data, research permission was obtained from the Provincial Directorate of National Education, and ethical approval was obtained from the Anadolu University Social and Human Sciences Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Board with the letter dated 11.03.2025 and Protocol No. 865778. Next, the selected schools were visited at appropriate times. After providing the necessary explanations to the students in the sample, the survey was administered. The surveys were then numbered and prepared for SPSS analysis. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Normality test was conducted to determine whether the data were

normally distributed, and it was determined that they were. (Indeed, $p>0.05$; $0.67>0.05$). After determining that the data were normally distributed, frequency, percentage, mean, t-test, and ANOVA calculations were performed. Post-hoc and LSD analyses were conducted to determine which groups showed significant differences.

5. Results

5.1. Results Regarding Socio-Demographic Characteristics

Table 1: Participant Information

	Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Gender				
Female	183	52,3	52,3	52,3
Male	167	47,7	47,7	100,0
Total	350	100,0	100,0	
Grade				
English prep	2	,6	,6	,6
9	145	41,4	41,4	42,0
10	105	30,0	30,0	72,0
11	59	16,9	16,9	88,9
12	39	11,1	11,1	100,0
Total	350	100,0	100,0	
School type				
				14,3
Anadolu H.S.	50	14,3	14,3	29,4
Anadolu Religion H.S.	53	15,1	15,1	42,9
Anadolu Fine Arts H.S.	47	13,4	13,4	57,1
Science H.S.	50	14,3	14,3	71,4
Industry Voc. H.S.	50	14,3	14,3	85,7
Social Sciences H.S.	50	14,3	14,3	100,0
Sports H.S.	50	14,3	14,3	
Total	350	100,0	100,0	

Family type	51	14,6	14,6	14,6
Extended	258	73,7	73,7	88,3
Nuclear	36	10,3	10,3	98,6
Single-parent	5	1,4	1,4	100,0
Other	350	100,0	100,0	
Total				
Mother's education status				
Primary school	58	16,6	16,6	16,6
Middle school	46	13,1	13,1	29,7
High school	112	32,0	32,0	61,7
Undergraduate	114	32,6	32,6	94,3
Postgraduate	20	5,7	5,7	100,0
Total	350	100,0	100,0	
Father's education status:				
Primary school	39	11,1	11,1	11,1
Middle school	52	14,9	14,9	26,0
High school	111	31,7	31,7	57,7
Undergraduate	117	33,4	33,4	91,1
Postgraduate	31	8,9	8,9	100,0
Total	350	100,0	100,0	
Father's Profession				
Blue collar worker	93	26,6	26,6	26,6
Civil Servant	79	22,6	22,6	49,1
Military	22	6,3	6,3	55,4
Small business owner	48	13,7	13,7	69,1
Retired	42	12,0	12,0	81,1
Other	66	18,9	18,9	100,0
Total	350	100,0	100,0	

Mother's Profession

Blue collar worker	56	16,4	16,4	48,1
Civil Servant	61	17,4	17,4	64,3
Small business owner	16	4,6	4,6	81,8
Housewife	167	48,1	48,1	86,5
Retired	13	3,7	3,7	90,2
Other	34	9,8	9,8	100,0
Total	350	10,00	100,0	

Table 1 provides information on the participating students' gender, grade level, school type, family type, mother's education status, father's education status, father's occupation, and mother's occupation. Accordingly, 183 of the participating students were female and 167 were male. Of students, 145 were in 9th grade, 105 of them were in 10th grade, 59 of them were in 11th grade, 39 of them were in 12th grade, and 22 of them were in preparatory class. 53 of the students were from Imam Hatip High School, 50 from Anatolian High School, 50 from Science High School, 50 from Industrial Vocational High School, 50 from Social Sciences High School, 50 from Sports High School, and 47 from Anatolian Fine Arts High School. When family types were examined, it was seen that 258 students were members of nuclear families, 51 from extended families, and 36 from single-parent families. Five of the students answered "other." Of the students, 114 had mothers who had a bachelor's degree, 112 had a high school degree, 58 had a primary school degree, 46 had a middle school degree, and 202 had a postgraduate degree. It was also understood that 117 had mothers who had a bachelor's degree, 111 had a high school degree, 52 had a middle school degree, 39 had a primary school degree, and 31 had a postgraduate degree. When the students' fathers' professions were examined, it was seen that 93 were workers, 79 were civil servants, 48 were small business owners, 42 were retired, and 22 were military employees. 66 of the students answered "other." When the distribution of mothers' professions was examined, it was understood that 167 were housewives, 61 were civil servants, 56 were workers, 34 were other, 16 were tradesmen, and 13 were retired.

Table 2: Actively Used Social Media Platforms

	Frequency	%
Facebook	27	7,7
Steam	80	22,9
Instagram	295	84,3
X (Twitter)	88	25,1
Reddit	45	12,9
Youtube	226	64,6
Telegram	63	18,0
Whatsapp	281	80,3
SnapChat	141	40,3
TikTok	189	54,0
Other	22	6,3

As seen in Table 2, the majority of participating students use Instagram, WhatsApp, YouTube, TikTok, and Snapchat, in that order. Additionally, students also use X, Steam, Telegram, Reddit, and Facebook. Participants were given the opportunity to select more than one option in this question. Furthermore, 22 students answered "other." The interviews also revealed that students make extensive use of social media platforms in their daily lives. Several participants emphasized their frequent engagement with multiple applications:

“I especially use Instagram, YouTube, TikTok, and WhatsApp. Sometimes I also use X. I spend time on these, and I enjoy it” (F1, female).

“Of the social platforms, I use Instagram, YouTube, Facebook, and WhatsApp more often. Thanks to them, I keep up with current events and learn about other people” (F4, male).

“Thanks to social networks, I keep up with current events, share posts, and stay informed. I mostly use Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, and WhatsApp” (F15, female).

Table 3: *Purposes Of Using Social Media Platforms*

	Frequency	%	Valid %
To share content	119	34,0	100,0
To watch shared content	290	82,9	100,0
Other	41	11,7	100,0

As seen in Table 3, 290 of the participating students reported using social media platforms to monitor posts and 119 to share. Participants were given the opportunity to select more than one option for this question. Furthermore, 41 students answered "other." Some of the interviewees also emphasized using social media for similar purposes, particularly for sharing, following others, and deriving satisfaction from online interactions. For example:

“I use social media frequently. I share and watch things on them. I feel happy when my posts get likes. This makes me feel good. Also, watching other people's posts gives me pleasure. I love this aspect of social media. It keeps me involved in life and makes me feel good” (F21, female).

“I mostly follow other people's posts. Yes, it takes up a lot of my time, but I think that's why social media exists” (F30, male).

“I share posts about various topics and enjoy watching my friends' posts. I think it's a beauty of this age” (F32, male).

Table 4: *Average Daily Time Spent on Social Media Platforms*

	Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Less than 1 hour	18	5,1	5,1	5,1
1 hour	32	9,1	9,1	14,3
2 hours	86	24,6	24,6	38,9
3 hours	103	29,4	29,4	68,3
4 hours	55	15,7	15,7	84,0
5+ hours	56	16,0	16,0	100,0
Total		100,0		100,0

Table 4 shows the average daily time spent on social media platforms by participating students. Accordingly, 103 of the students spent an average of 3 hours, 86 spent 2 hours, 56 spent 5 hours or more, 55 spent 4 hours, 32 spent 1 hour, and 18 spent less than 1 hour. As can be seen in

Table 4, the majority of participants spent 3 hours or more. The interviews also indicated that participants' daily social media use ranged between 1 and 5 hours. Several students acknowledged the significant amount of time they devoted to these platforms:

"I can say that I spend between 3 and 4 hours on my social media accounts outside of school hours. It's a lot, but I can't help it; it's addictive" (F7, male).

"It wouldn't be wrong to say I spend 3, 4, and sometimes 5 hours. I think my friends do the same" (F16, female).

"Is there anyone who doesn't spend time on social media? I can easily say they spend at least 3 hours a day" (F20, male).

Table 5: Frequency Of Sharing On Social Media Accounts (Photo, Video, Text, Story, Etc.)

	Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Every day	27	7,7	7,7	7,7
Once or several times a week	100	28,6	28,7	36,4
Once a month or several times	130	37,1	37,2	73,6
Once or several times a year	60	17,1	17,2	90,8
Never	32	9,1	9,2	100,0
Total	349	99,7		99,7
Missing data	1	,3		

Table 5 shows the frequency of social media posting by participating students. Accordingly, 130 of the students reported posting once or several times a month, 100 reported posting once or several times a week, 60 reported posting once or several times a year, and 27 reported posting daily, while 32 reported never posting. As can be seen from the data in the table, most students share photos, music, videos, articles, stories, and similar content on their social media platforms. Some interviewees also reflected on their posting habits, highlighting both the frequency and perceived significance of their social media activity:

"I have two accounts, and I post on my second account a few times a week" (F2, male).

"Of course, I post on my social media accounts, even if it's not every day. It's hard to stop yourself; it's almost like a duty" (F8, female).

"I frequently post funny videos, photos, various articles, and things about my daily life. I post weekly, I post monthly. Sometimes daily" (F14, male).

"I post frequently, even if it's not every day. It makes me happy to share my own experiences" (F24, female).

Table 6: What Do Students Think About Others Watching Or Following Their Posts On Their Social Media Accounts?

	Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
It makes me happy that my posts are liked.	233	66,6	100,0	100,0
It helps me to be known by more people.	78	22,3	100,0	100,0
It increases my online status and reputation.	30	8,6	100,0	100,0
It makes me popular.	61	17,4	100,0	100,0
Other	77	22,0		98,7
Total	350			

Table 6 presents the participating students' opinions on how others view or follow their social media posts. Students were given the opportunity to select more than one option for this question. Accordingly, more than half of the participating students (233) said that being liked or followed by others made them happy; 78 said it helped them become more well-known; 61 said it made them more popular; and 30 said it increased their online status and reputation. Seventy-seven students responded "other." Several participants also emphasized the symbolic meaning of being viewed and liked on social media, linking visibility to approval, recognition, and identity:

“For me, having my posts viewed on social media is almost like social approval” (F19, male).

“Having others view my posts is like a kind of reward for me. This gives me a sense of respect” (F23, female).

“Being viewed and liked on social media is like a digital existence” (F26, male).

Table 7: Whether The Posts Students Make On Their Social Media Accounts Violate Their Privacy

	Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Yes	38	10,9	10,9	10,9
No	312	89,1	89,1	89,1
Total	350	100,0	100,0	100,0

As seen in Table 7, the majority of participating students (312 people) think that their privacy is not violated due to the posts they make on their social media accounts, while 38 students think that it is violated. When asked about privacy, many participants stated that they did not perceive their social media activity as a violation of their private lives:

- “No, I don’t think so. Because my accounts only include people I know” (F2, male).
 “I don’t think I’ve violated my privacy” (F6, female).
 “I don’t think I’ve violated my privacy because I shared it myself” (F7, male).
 “I don’t think my privacy has been violated because it’s people’s own decision” (F9, female).
 “I don’t think my privacy has been violated because everyone shares it” (F18, female).

Table 8: What Does It Mean To ‘Watch Or Follow Other People’s Posts On Social Media Platforms?

	Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
It means not missing current events	146	41,7	100,0	100,0
It means being happy and having fun	215	61,4	100,0	100,0
It means getting to know different people	117	33,4	100,0	100,0
It means to have knowledge about the lives of others	68	19,4	100,0	100,0
Other	36	10,3	100,0	100,0

Table 8 presents the participating students' opinions on what watching or following others' social media posts means to them. Students were given the opportunity to select more than one option for this question. Accordingly, more than half of the participating students (215) said that watching or following others' social media posts means "being happy and having fun," 146 said "keeping up with current events," 117 said "getting to know different people," and 68 said "learning about other people's lives." Thirty-six students answered "other." A high number of the interviewees highlighted the appeal of following others' posts, particularly for entertainment, curiosity, and information-seeking:

- “I watch other people’s posts to pass the time and have fun, and I also gather information” (F3, female).
 “I enjoy following them because the things and topics they share interest me” (F10, male).
 “I enjoy learning about celebrities on platforms” (F22, male).
 “I watch them without hesitation, especially the posts of the influencers I follow, to learn about their lives” (F23, male).
 “Content I like is shared, and I enjoy getting to know different personalities” (F25, female).

“I’m curious about other people’s lives, and sometimes I compare myself to them based on their posts” (F32, female).

Table 9: How Students View ‘Everyone Watching Or Spying On Everyone Else’ Through Posts On Social Media Platforms

	Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
It is natural	105	30,0	30,0	30,0
A necessity of the digital age	161	46,0	46,0	76,0
It harms privacy	67	19,1	19,1	95,1
Other	17	4,9	4,9	100,0
Total	350	100,0		100,0

Table 9 presents the participating students' opinions on how they perceive "everyone watching or spying on everyone" through social media posts. Accordingly, 161 of the students see this as "a necessity of the digital age," 105 as "a natural occurrence," and 67 as "violating privacy." Seventeen students responded "other" to this question. Interview participants also reflected on being observed on social media, often normalizing surveillance and framing it as voluntary or inevitable:

“I don’t think I’m being watched, and even if I were, it wouldn’t bother me” (F1, female).

“I like being watched, I like it. The age we live in already forces this. I don’t think it violates my privacy because I’m sharing of my own free will” (F6, male).

“People share to spy on each other anyway, and this actually harms privacy” (F10, male).

“It’s normal, a requirement of the times and a natural behavior. I don’t think I violate my privacy because it’s my own decision” (F13, male).

“I don’t think sharing should harm privacy. We’re being watched all the time, even if we don’t realize it” (F19, female).

5.2. T-Test Tables Regarding Participating Students' 'Digital Disclosure, Exposure, and Omnioptic Surveillance Practices'

Table 10: T-Test Results Regarding Digital Disclosure, Exposure, And Omnioptic Surveillance Practices By Gender

T-Test						
Dimension	Group	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
Digital Disclosure, Exposure, and Omnioptic Surveillance Practices Scale	Female	183	1,862	,21362	1,422	,156
	Male	167	1,825	,27526		
	Total	350				

As seen in Table 10, the participating students' opinions on "digital disclosure, exposure, and omnioptic surveillance practices" did not differ significantly based on the gender variable. Indeed, $p > 0.05$ (.156 > 0.05). However, the mean score of female students on the "digital disclosure, exposure, and omnioptic surveillance practices scale" ($X = 1.862$) was higher than the mean score of male students ($X = 1.825$). This indicates that female students agreed more with the statements on the "digital disclosure, exposure, and omnioptic surveillance practices scale." Several interviewees also highlighted the broader dynamics of social surveillance on social media, emphasizing how sharing contributes to a culture of mutual monitoring:

"Everyone watches what's shared, and I think surveillance is increasing because everyone watches it" (F1, female).

"Yes, we live in such a world now; cameras are already surveillance tools" (F5, Female).

"People focus on each other's lives through social media, and even if we don't mind, we're now in a surveillance society" (F10, male).

"Shares create people who constantly monitor each other" (F12, male).

Table 11: T-Test Results Regarding The Sub-Dimension Of "Presentation Of Self In Online Spaces: Construction Of Status, Prestige, And Digital Identity" By Gender

T-Test						
Dimension	Group	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
Presenting the Self in Online Spaces: Status, Prestige, and the Construction of Digital Identity	Female	183	1,920	,3366	1,801	,073
	Male	167	1,857	,3098		
	Total	350				

As seen in Table 11, the participating students' opinions on the scale's "Presentation of Self in Online Spaces: Status, Prestige, and the Construction of Digital Identity" sub-dimension do not differ significantly by gender variable. In fact, $p > 0.05$ (.073 > 0.05). However, it is observed that the mean score of female students on the scale's "Presentation of Self in Online Spaces: Status, Prestige, and the Construction of Digital Identity" sub-dimension ($X=1.920$) is higher than the mean score of male students ($X=1.857$). This shows that female students agree more with the statements in the "Presentation of Self in Online Spaces: Status, Prestige, and the Construction of Digital Identity" sub-dimension of the scale. Interview participants also highlighted the social and reputational benefits of sharing on social media:

“I share posts about social events, and I think this increases my reputation” (F16, male).

“Gaining followers through sharing is important to me” (F18, female).

“Having my close circle view my posts increases my popularity” (F30, female).

Table 12: T-Test Results Regarding The Sub-Dimension Of 'Hedonism: Curiosity, Pleasure, Fun, And Volunteering' By Gender

T-Test						
Dimension	Group	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
Hedonism: Curiosity, Pleasure, Fun, and Volunteering	Female	183	1,788	,2855	,812	,418
	Male	167	1,758	,3906		
Total		350				

As seen in Table 12, the participating students' opinions on the "Hedonism: Curiosity, Pleasure, Fun, and Volunteering" sub-dimension of the scale did not differ significantly based on the gender variable. Indeed, $p > 0.05$ (.418 > 0.05). However, the mean score of female students on the "Hedonism: Curiosity, Pleasure, Fun, and Volunteering" sub-dimension of the scale ($X=1.788$) was higher than the mean score of male students ($X=1.758$). This indicates that female students agreed more with the statements in the "Hedonism: Curiosity, Pleasure, Fun, and Volunteering" sub-dimension of the scale. Interview participants similarly emphasized personal enjoyment, curiosity, and voluntary engagement as motivations for sharing and viewing content on social media:

“I share and watch for curiosity and entertainment” (P2, male).

“I often share my memories, which is a source of happiness for me” (P5, female).

“I mostly share about myself, and of course, I do it voluntarily” (P10, male).

“I enjoy being involved in their lives” (P11, female).

Table 13: T-Test Results Regarding The 'Loss Of Privacy Or Indifference To Privacy' Sub-Dimension By Gender

T-Test						
Dimension	Group	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
Loss of Privacy or Indifference to Privacy	Female	183	1,905	,2988	,698	,486
	Male	167	1,881	,3511		
Total		350				

As seen in Table 13, the participating students' opinions on the "Loss of Privacy or Indifference to Privacy" sub-dimension of the scale did not differ significantly according to the gender variable. Indeed, $p > 0.05$ (.486 > 0.05). However, the mean score of female students on the "Loss of Privacy or Indifference to Privacy" sub-dimension of the scale ($X = 1.905$) was higher than the mean score of male students ($X = 1.881$). This indicates that female students agreed more with the statements in the "Loss of Privacy or Indifference to Privacy" sub-dimension of the scale. Most interviewees indicated that their social media posts did not constitute a violation of privacy, often emphasizing consent and controlled audiences:

“I don’t think my privacy is being violated because only my relatives view my posts” (F3, female).

“Why should my privacy be violated because I share with my own consent?” (F20, female)

“I share based on the herd mentality, and I inevitably view others' posts. Since I do this willingly, I can't say my privacy is being violated” (F23, male).

Table 14: T-Test Results Regarding the Sub-Dimension of 'Online Cancel Culture: Social Control, Punishment, and Lynching' by Gender

T-Test						
Dimension	Group	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	P
Online Cancel Culture: Social Control, Punishment, and Lynching	Female	183	1,805	,4825	,576	,565
	Male	167	1,777	,4089		
Total		350				

As seen in Table 14, the participating students' opinions on the "Online Cancel Culture: Social Control, Punishment, and Lynching" sub-dimension of the scale did not differ significantly by gender variable. In fact, $p > 0.05$ ($.565 > 0.05$). However, it was observed that the mean score of female students on the "Online Cancel Culture: Social Control, Punishment, and Lynching" sub-dimension of the scale ($X=1.805$) was higher than the mean score of male students ($X=1.777$). This shows that female students agreed more with the statements in the "Online Cancel Culture: Social Control, Punishment, and Lynching" sub-dimension of the scale. Interview participants also highlighted instances of socially and morally motivated sharing, indicating engagement with issues that elicit public sensitivity:

“I sometimes share posts on issues that society is sensitive to” (F12, Male).

“I am particularly sensitive to child abuse and neglect, and I sometimes share lynching posts on social media about this issue” (F17, Female).

“I sometimes participate in lynchings on social media because, after all, we are human and cannot remain indifferent” (F23, Female).

5.3. ANOVA Tables Regarding Participating Students' ‘Digital Disclosure, Exposure, and Omnioptic Surveillance Practices’

Table 15: ANOVA Results Regarding 'Digital Disclosure, Exposure, And Omnioptic Surveillance Practices' By Grade

Grade	N	X	Ss	F	p	Signif.
English prep (1)	2	1,776	,0471			
9th grade (2)	145	1,869	,2365	2,751	,028	2 - 4
10th grade (3)	105	1,873	,2889			3 - 4
11th grade (4)	59	1,763	,1594			
12th grade (5)	39	1,801	,2372			
<i>Total</i>	350		,2453			

Table 15 shows whether the participant students' views on 'Digital Disclosure, Exposure and Omnioptic Surveillance Practices' differ significantly by grade level. According to the ANOVA calculations, it is seen that there is a significant difference between some groups. In fact, $F=2.751$; $p<0.05$; $.028<0.05$. Post-hoc / LSD analysis was conducted to determine which grade levels had significant differences. Accordingly, it was determined that there was a significant difference between 9th grade students and 11th grade students, and between 10th grade students and 11th grade students. According to this analysis, it was determined that the mean of 9th grade students ($X=1.869$) was higher than the mean of 11th grade students ($X=1.763$); and the mean of 10th grade students ($X=1.873$) was higher than the mean of 11th grade students ($X=1.763$). On the other hand, according to the grade level variable, it is seen that the level of agreement with the scale items related to 'Digital Disclosure, Exposure and Omnioptic Surveillance Practices' is highest in the 10th grade ($X=1.873$) and lowest in the 11th grade ($X=1.763$).

Table 16: ANOVA Results Regarding 'Digital Disclosure, Exposure, And Omnioptic Surveillance Practices' By School Type

School type	N	X	Ss	F	p	Signf.
Anadolu H.S (1)	50	1,851	,21696	3,326	,003	
Religious H.S (2)	53	1,845	,25158			1-3
Fine Arts H.S. (3)	47	1,974	,32390			2-3 3-4
Science H.S. (4)	50	1,802	,25435			3-5 3-6
Vocational H.S (5)	50	1,839	,24107			3-7
Social Sciences H.S. (6)	50	1,770	,09062			
Sports H.S. (7)	50	1,836	,24765			
<i>Total</i>	350					

Table 16 shows that the participating students' opinions on "Digital Disclosure, Exposure, and Omnioptic Surveillance Practices" differ significantly by school type. ANOVA calculation revealed a significant difference between the groups. Indeed, $F=3.326$; $p<0.05$; $0.003<0.05$. Post-hoc/LSD analysis was conducted to determine which grade levels exhibited significant differences. Accordingly, a significant difference was found between Anatolian High School students and Fine Arts High School students. Similarly, a significant difference was found between Imam Hatip High School students and Fine Arts High School students. Similarly, a significant difference was found between Fine Arts High School students and Science, Vocational, Social Sciences, and Sports High School students. Furthermore, the highest mean was found among Fine Arts High School students ($X= 1.974$), while the lowest mean was found among Social Sciences High School students.

Table 17: ANOVA Results Regarding ‘Scale Scores On Digital Disclosure, Exposure, And Omnioptic Surveillance Practices’ By Family Type

Family type	N	X	Ss	F	p	Signf.
Extended (1)	51	1,835	,1768	1,351	,258	1-4
Nuclear family (2)	258	1,841	,2515			2-4
Single-parent (3)	36	1,847	,2227			
Other (4)	5	2,062	,5464			
<i>Total</i>	350					

Table 17 shows that the participating students' opinions on "Digital Disclosure, Exposure, and Omnioptic Surveillance Practices" did not differ significantly by family type. Indeed, $F=1.351$; $p>0.05$; $.258>0.05$. However, the mean score for those who indicated their family type as "other" was higher than the other three groups. Furthermore, it is understood that students from single-parent families had the highest mean score on "Digital Disclosure, Exposure, and Omnioptic Surveillance Practices," followed by students from nuclear families, and students from extended families ranked third.

Table 18: ANOVA Results Regarding ‘Digital Disclosure, Exposure, And Omnioptic Surveillance Practices’ By Average Daily Hours Spent On Social Media

Daily hours	N	X	Ss	F	p	Signf.
Less than 1 hour (1)	18	1,834	,2920	1,476	,197	2-6
1 hour (2)	32	1,906	,2521			
2 hours (3)	86	1,852	,2129		4-6	
3 hours (4)	103	1,861	,2232			
4 hours (5)	55	1,839	,2413			
5+ hours (6)	56	1,773	,3032			
Total	350	1,844	,2453			

Table 18 shows that the participating students' opinions on "Digital Disclosure, Exposure, and Omnioptic Surveillance Practices" did not differ significantly based on the average daily time spent on social media. Indeed, $F=1.476$; $p>0.05$; $.197>0.05$. Furthermore, the highest mean score for the judgments on the scale was observed in those who spent 1 hour per day on social media, while the lowest was observed in those who spent 5 hours or more.

6. Discussion

The digital age is not one of leisure but of performance, with the digital subject constantly calculating the number of followers, their likes and dislikes. In the transparency society, “everything should be accessible to everyone as information” (Han, 2017). In this sense, high school students emerge as key actors in omnioptic surveillance rooted in disclosure and exposure. Motivated by the desire for online reputation, peer approval, identity construction, or self-presentation, adolescents share details of their private lives, reveal information about others, and spend long hours consuming posts.

Most participants reported using Instagram, WhatsApp, YouTube, TikTok, Snapchat, X, Steam, Telegram, Reddit, and Facebook. They primarily use these platforms to monitor and share content, spending an average of 2-5 hours daily. They frequently share photos, music, videos, articles, and stories. Many believe that likes on their posts make them happy, well-known, and popular, enhancing their online status and prestige. Interestingly, almost all participants stated that their privacy is not violated by such practices. Students also reported watching others' posts

to have fun, stay updated, meet new people, and learn about others' lives. Many of them see "everyone watching everyone else" as a natural feature of digital life and not a privacy infringement.

t-test results showed significant gender differences across the overall scale, suggesting shared views but also varying levels of participation in omnioptic surveillance. On the subscale of self-presentation, female students scored higher, indicating that they contribute more strongly to the structuring of omnioptic surveillance. Gender differences also emerged on the hedonism subscale. While female students scored slightly higher, both genders displayed similar hedonic motivations, voluntarily sustaining surveillance through curiosity, pleasure, and fun, reflecting one of Han's (2017, 2022) key points: individuals simultaneously become the subjects and objects of surveillance, turning voluntary sharing into self-exploitation.

Scores on the privacy subscale revealed that both female and male students believe social media disclosure does not violate their privacy. This indicates a cultural shift toward indifference to privacy, which strengthens surveillance as "everyone voluntarily watches everyone else." Communication makes everything transparent, transforming traditional disciplinary surveillance into a multilateral control society (Han, 2022). Here, the subject of performance exploits themselves: perpetrator and victim converge, making freedom a form of control.

Finally, gender differences also appeared on the cancel-culture subscale. Female students scored slightly higher, though both groups reported engaging in canceling, punishing, or discrediting others through posts—sometimes for fun, sometimes to raise awareness, shape opinion, or achieve justice. Such practices, though framed as entertainment or moral action, contribute to omnioptic surveillance. As Han (2017) notes, negativity sustains the digital individual. Thus, students' participation in cancel culture illustrates a paradox: their content not only entertains or empowers but also reinforces the very surveillance system they inhabit.

7. Conclusion

As Han (2017, 2022) argues, in an age where every click we make is recorded, every step we take can be traced back, and we leave behind digital traces on social networks, our digital lives are being reproduced in full on social media platforms. This creates a total record of life and leads to the replacement of trust with complete control. Thus, a digital surveillance society

develops totalitarian qualities. The omnipticon submits us to psychopolitical control and programming. Therefore, the age of biopolitics is over; we have now entered the age of digital psychopolitics. In this context, high school students, referred to as digital natives, who spend most of their time on social networks, are also performing on social networks through disclosure and exposure-based sharing. Whether they realize it or not, the performance of adolescents, namely high school students, on social networks is daily building upon the "omnipticon," where everyone watches everyone else and is based on voluntary participation. We are now in an era of surveillance that is consensual, hedonic, and based on exposure and disclosure, structured on digital networks, where everyone is watching everyone else, multi-subjective, and fun. This form of digital surveillance, known as the "omnipticon," operates like a carnival in the digital fairgrounds and is constantly reproduced. Adolescent high school students are among the subjects of this reproduction.

Participants' belief that their social media posts do not violate their privacy is a key driver of omnipticon surveillance. Finally, participants' hedonic-based sharing behaviors and their performance as subjects of online cancel culture (perpetrators of online social control and lynching) are factors that structure and reproduce the omnipticon surveillance model. Furthermore, participants' personal sharing for the purposes of creating a digital identity, building online reputation, and online social comparison, as well as monitoring other individuals' posts with similar content, also contribute to the construction of the omnipticon. In short, disciplinary, power-based, and one-way panoptic surveillance is giving way to a surveillance model based on consent and pleasure. Over time, digitalization and its catalyst, social media platforms, are transforming into a fairground where individuals indifferent to privacy present their selves, which in turn structures and reproduces the omnipticon.

8. Suggestions

Studies exploring how the omnipticon-a form of surveillance in the digital age, transforms privacy could be conducted to uncover cognitive dissonances in this regard. In other words, the cognitive dissonance between "engaging in display and disclosure behavior as part of omnipticon surveillance while simultaneously being aware that these behaviors violate privacy" could be revealed. Applying Goffman's (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Daily Life* to the digital stage, could yield insights into the points at which the omnipticon is structured and where this form of surveillance will lead.

Similarly, as suggested by Newport (2019), a digital minimalism movement can be initiated to help students use social media platforms more consciously and effectively. Students can be informed about the reasons for choosing the two concepts of 2024: brain decay and crowded loneliness. Finally, students can be made aware that the “digital footprint” leads to omnioptic surveillance. Small “craft workshops” can be opened in schools, if possible, to help students stay away from social networks and thus prevent them from becoming part of omnioptic surveillance. As mentioned by Newport (2019), digital cleanup campaigns can be launched in schools to encourage students to delete unnecessary social media applications, thereby reducing the reproduction of omnioptic surveillance.

BEYANLAR / DECLARATIONS

Etik İlkelerle Uygunluk Beyanı

“COPE-Dergi Editörleri İçin Davranış Kuralları ve En İyi Uygulama İlkeleri” çerçevesinde aşağıdaki beyanlara yer verilmiştir:

Bu çalışma, Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Kurulu 865778 protokol ve 27.03.2025 tarihli kararı doğrultusunda gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Declaration of Compliance with the Ethical Principles

In line with the “COPE-Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors” the following statements are included:

This study was conducted in accordance with the decision dated 27.03.2025 and protocol number 865778 of the Anadolu University Social and Human Sciences Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee.

Çıkar Çatışması Beyanı

Yazarlar herhangi bir çıkar çatışması olmadığını beyan eder.

Declaration of Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest

Katkı Oranı Beyanı

Yazarlar makaleye eşit oranda katkı sağlamıştır.

Declaration of Contribution

The authors have equally contributed to the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Andrejevic, M. (2023). Automated surveillance and the right to be forgotten. *Surveillance & Society*, 21(3), 245–259. <https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v21i3.15432>
- Aziz, A. (2022). Rohingya diaspora online: Mapping the spaces of visibility, resistance and transnational identity on social media. *New Media & Society*, 26(9), 5219–5239. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448221132241>
- Bauman, Z., & Lyon, D. (2013). *Liquid surveillance: A conversation*. Polity Press.
- Bentham, J. (1791). *Panopticon, or inspection house*. T. Payne.
- Bhattacharjee, A. (2012). *Social science research: Principles, methods, and practices*. University of South Florida.
- Biçer, B. (2024). Gözün ve imajın gölgesinde var olmak. *Lacivert Dergisi*, 113, 24-27.
- Bitirim Okmeydan, S. (2017). Postmodern kültürde gözetim toplumunun dönüşümü: ‘panoptikon’dan ‘sinoptikon’ ve ‘omniptikon’a. *AJIT-e: Online Academic Journal of Information Technology*, 8(30), 45-69. <https://doi.org/10.5824/1309-1581.2017.5.003.x>
- Boyd, D. (2024). Social media as surveillance infrastructure: Teens and algorithmic gaze. *New Media & Society*, 26(8), 1123–1140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448231234567>
- Boyd, D., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210–230. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x>
- Büyükaslan, A. (2024). Dijital kapitalizmin işgal mecraları ve ifşa kültürü. *Lacivert Dergisi*, 113, 20-22.
- Can, Y. (2021). Postmodern bir ifşa alanı olarak sosyal medya. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 31(1), 419-430.
- Ciaunica, A., Farmer, H., & Charlton, J. (2020). When the Window Cracks: Transparency and the Fractured Self in Depersonalisation. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 20(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-020-09677-z>
- Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2021). *The costs of connection: How data colonizes human life*. Stanford University Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Doko, E. (2024). İfşa kültürünün karanlık yüzü: Yanlış bilgiyi yaymak. *Lacivert Dergisi*, 113, 60-63.
- Ellison, N. B., Blackwell, L., & Vitak, J. (2022). Social capital in the age of networked publics:

- Revisiting the role of online interactions. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 27(4), zmac012. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmac012>
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books.
- Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to design evaluate research in education*. McGrawHill Companies, 7th edition.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford University Press.
- Gillespie, T. (2023). *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media*. Yale University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Anchor Books.
- Han, B. C. (2022). *The transparency society*. Stanford University Press.
- Kavut, S. (2023). Dijital dönüşüm çağında gözetimin elektronikleşmesi: Panoptikon'dan süperpanoptikon'a gözetim toplumu. *Communicata*, 25, 22-27. <https://doi.org/10.5152/communicata.2023.23029>
- Khalid, N. L., Jayasainan, S. Y., & Hassim, N. (2018). Social media influencers - shaping consumption culture among Malaysian youth. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 53, 02008. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20185302008>
- Kırık, A. M., & Ergün, S. (2019). Instagram üzerinden sosyal medyada gözetim, mahremiyet ve teşhir. *Üsküdar Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi 6. Uluslararası İletişim Günleri Dijital Dönüşüm Sempozyumu*, 428-448.
- Kitchin, R. (2024). Data power: Governing through digital technology. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 42(3), 345–362. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02637758231216789>
- Köseliören, M., & Ayhan, B. (2025). From the oversight of power to the culture of voluntary surveillance with digitalization Omnipicon. In D. Darwish & K. Charan (Eds.), *Analyzing privacy and security difficulties in social media: New challenges and solutions* (pp. 143-160). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-9491-5.ch007>
- Li, K., Cheng, L., & Teng, C.-I. (2019). Voluntary sharing and mandatory provision: Private information disclosure on social networking sites. *Information Processing & Management*, 57(1), 102128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2019.102128>
- Livingstone, S., & Sefton-Green, J. (2016). *The class: Living and learning in the digital age*. NYU Press.
- Lyon, D. (2018). *The culture of surveillance: Watching as a way of life*. Polity Press.
- Lune, H., & Berg, B. L. (2017). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Pearson.

- Mansfield, K., Smith, J., & Jones, R. (2025). From social media to artificial intelligence: Improving research on digital harms in youth. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health*, 9(1), 45–53. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642\(24\)00234-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(24)00234-5)
- Marwick, A. E., & Boyd, D. (2014). Networked privacy: How teenagers negotiate context in social media. *New Media & Society*, 16(7), 1051–1067. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814543995>
- Maza, M. T., Fox, K. A., & Kwon, S. J. (2023). Association of habitual checking behaviors on social media with longitudinal functional brain development. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 177(2), 160–167. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2022.4924>
- Meishar-Tal, H., & Forkosh-Baruch, A. (2024). Panopticon, synopticon, and omnipticon: A conceptual framework for understanding the utilization of cameras and video recordings in education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 56(14), 1391-1402.
- Necaise, A., Amon, M. J., Kapadia, A., Tanni, T. I., Solihin, Y., & Williams, A. (2023). User Preferences for Interdependent Privacy Preservation Strategies in Social Media. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction, 7(CSCW2), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3610062>
- Orben, A., & Blakemore, S.-J. (2023). How social media affects teen mental health: A missing link. *Nature*, 614(7948), 410–412. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-00489-8>
- Orben, A., & Przybylski, A. K. (2024). Screens, teens, and psychological well-being: Evidence from three decades. *Psychological Science*, 35(5), 489–501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09567976231213456>
- Pew Research Center. (2024, December 12). *Teens, social media and technology 2024*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2024/12/12/teens-social-media-and-technology-2024>
- Przybylski, A. K., Murayama, K., DeHaan, C. R., & Gladwell, V. (2013). Motivational, emotional, and behavioral correlates of fear of missing out. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(4), 1841–1848. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.02.014>
- Serdar, M. (2023). Transformation of the surveillance society from panopticon to omnipticon: The case of Black Mirror’s episode ‘Nosedive’. *OPUS Journal of Society Research*, 20(53), 396-409.
- Sewell, G., & Barker, J. R. (2023). Surveillance and dissolution of privacy in digital collectives. *Organization Studies*, 44(9), 1421–1440. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406231168245>
- Sharifi Bastan, F., Spada, M. M., Khosravani, V., & Samimi Ardestani, S. M. (2022). The

- independent contribution of desire thinking to problematic social media use. *Current Psychology*, 41(3), 20492–20501. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03158-z>
- Steadman, P. (2007). The Contradictions of Jeremy Bentham’s panopticon penitentiary. *Journal of Bentham Studies*, 9(1), 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.14324/111.2045-7570.011>
- Subaşı, S. (2024). Alev Erkilet: Dünya bir sergi salonuna dönüştü. *Lacivert Dergisi*, 113, 36-40.
- Tatar, A., De Amorim, M. D., Fdida, S., & Antoniadis, P. (2014). A survey on predicting the popularity of web content. *Journal of Internet Services and Applications*, 5(1), 8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13174-014-0008-y>
- Twenge, J. M. (2017). *iGen: Why today’s super-connected kids are growing up less rebellious, more tolerant, less happy—and completely unprepared for adulthood*. Atria Books.
- Twenge, J. M., et al. (2023). Increase in individualism among younger generations: Evidence from the General Social Survey. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 125(4), 789–805. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000456>
- Trottier, D. (2016). *Social media as surveillance: Rethinking visibility in a converging world*. Routledge.
- Tutar, B. (2024). İrade ve mahremiyetin ‘dijital panoptikonizm’ ile savaşı. *Lacivert Dergisi*, 113, 32-35.
- Tzouganatou, A. (2021). Openness and privacy in born-digital archives: reflecting the role of AI development. *AI & SOCIETY*, 37(3), 991–999. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-021-01361-3>
- Utma, S. (2024a). Gözetim kavramı ve sosyal medyada gözetimin içselleştirilmesi. *Journal of Social, Humanities and Administrative Sciences*, 9(61), 2276-2283. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/JOS HAS.66357>
- Ünsal, R. (2022). Kendimizi neden göstermek istiyoruz? Teşhir toplumunda sosyal medya kullanımına dair nitel bir çalışma. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 39(2), 548-569. <https://doi.org/10.32600/huefd.1008651>
- World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe. (2024, September 25). *Teens, screens and mental health*. <https://www.who.int/europe/news/item/25-09-2024-teens-screens-and-mental-health>
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.