

# PROMISES OF DIGITAL IMAGINARIES AND RE-THINKING IDEALS OF DIGITAL YOUTH

Sari Tuuva-Hongisto and Kristiina Korjonen-Kuusipuro

*Juvenia – Youth Research and Development Centre, South-Eastern Finland University of Applied Sciences (XAMK)  
Patteristonkatu 3 D, 50100 Mikkeli, Finland*

## ABSTRACT

In this article we dismantle the digital imperative of youth and examine the practices and ideals of digital everyday life of Finnish youth, born in 2005-2006 in Finland. Our paper focuses on the different digital engagements in young peoples' everyday lives and what these engagements tell us about the ideals of digital citizenship and agency of young people. We ask, how these ideals shape the understandings of the use? To achieve these objectives, we draw on both qualitative and quantitative data in analyses of their interpretations of the use of digital technologies and their meanings. Our research reveals that it is important to elaborate how digitalisation is accessed, understood, and used, how it is constructed, and how people make sense of it.

## KEYWORDS

Youth, Digital Ideals, Technological Imperatives, Finland

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Digital societies are developed around the ideology of technological imperatives (Talsi & Tuuva-Hongisto, 2009) and socio-technical imaginaries (Jasanoff & Kim, 2009). For example, in Finland, the national-level research of digitalization has followed these rationalities and leaned on a strong belief in them. Digital technologies have been kept apart from social structures and processes and positioned as a neutral good (Halford & Savage, 2010). These logics are visible and evident for example in an unquestioning push towards the digitalization of significant services, education, and political participation. Furthermore, digitalization has also been seen to provide equal opportunities for social and societal participation, especially among young people as “digital natives” and “cyber-children” (Holloway & Valentine, 2003; Prensky, 2001; Tapscott, 2008). Young people today are seen as a generation who find and adopt digital services first, and as such the youth-cultural meaning of digitalization is significant (Ito et al., 2010; Yalçın-İncik & İncik 2022).

As digitalisation strengthens, the use of various technologies and the related literacies are practically essential. Furthermore, variety of cultural and social structures, discourses and practices guide people to use these technologies. Such a necessity can be called a *technological imperative*, by which we mean the social and cultural pressure to exploit key technologies that have become a significant part of society and its ideology. (Talsi & Tuuva-Hongisto 2009.)

One of the key arguments of digitalization in various political debates is attached to the promise of equality of technology (Jasanoff & Kim 2015; boyd 2014). However, in critical reviews, digitalization is one more potential twist in the intersectional skein of a wide range of inequalities (e.g. Helsper 2021). The hope is that by strengthening everyone's digital participation, we will reach a situation where the promises of digitalisation can also be fulfilled and at the same time combat the potential threat of inequality.

The goal of this article is to dismantle the digital imperative of youth. To do this, we examine the practices and ideals of digital everyday life of Finnish youth, born in 2005-2006 in Finland. Our paper focuses on the different digital engagements in young peoples' everyday lives and what these engagements tell us about the ideals of digital citizenship and agency of young people. We ask, how these ideals shape the understandings of the use? To achieve these objectives, we draw on both qualitative and quantitative data in analyses of their interpretations of the use of digital technologies and their meanings. Youths' lives today are imbued with

various kinds of uncertainties. However, everyday experiences and their experiential knowledge can be seen as a resource for coping with these uncertainties (Baillergeau & Duyvendak 2016).

## **2. THE PROMISES OF DIGITAL NATIVES**

The discourse of the “digital generation” is precisely an attempt to construct the object of which it purports to speak. It represents not a description of what children or young people are, but a set of imperatives about what they should be or what they need to become. To some extent, it does describe a minority of young people who are actively using different technologies for social, educational and creative purposes, yet it seems very likely that most of these are already privileged in other areas of their lives and whose use of technology is supported by their access to other forms of social and cultural capital. (Buckingham 2008)

“Digital citizenship” is the ability to participate in society online. The Internet has the potential to benefit society as a whole and facilitate the membership and participation of individuals within society. (Mossberg et al. 2007.) The networked, participatory potential of this new technology has been touted as creating new possibilities both for civic learning and for civic action. It provides a form of “networked citizenship” that is more inclusive and more participatory than the passive, dutiful citizenship of the past. Such arguments are frequently applied to the so-called digital generation of young people, who are apparently developing new forms of global political consciousness and activity as a result of their use of new media (Banaji & Buckingham 2013; Tapscott 2008). Far from dumbing down and disengaging young people, the new media are viewed as politically and personally empowering: they enable young people to become the agents or authors of civic action rather than merely the objects of adult interventions. (Banaji & Buckingham 2013.)

At the same time, if terms such as “digital youth” are taken to an extreme and analyzed in homogenous terms, people may assume that all kids of certain age are equally knowledgeable about and are willing to use all types of digital tools. Yet, studies show that young people engage with technologies in very different ways, ranging from the social to the intensely geeked-out (Ito et al. 2010). In addition, not all young people have the same access to technologized media. Scholars have observed “participation gaps” (Jenkins et al. 2006), which often exhibit familiar socio-cultural inequities based on sex, gender, ethnicity, and class. (Lange 2014.)

Despite the fore mentioned tendencies to universalize and idealize participation, there is increasing acknowledgement that youth’s digital participation is both enabled and constrained by their particular social positions (boyd 2014). There is a broad “access rainbow” that patterns how young people engage with digital culture (Literat et al. 2018). It is partially reflective of their physical access to technological resources but also of the ways in which cultural capital and expectations influence forms of participation.

## **3. METHODS AND RESEARCH MATERIAL**

The analysis is based on data collected in two phases in 2021 and 2022 from different parts of Finland with a target group of young people who are in the last grade of Finnish primary school, that is, about 15 years old. The ninth graders were chosen as a target group, because they are at the start of their transition years for their life-courses concerning education and growing up, approaching emerging adulthood in economically and socio-culturally different environments. We interviewed a total of 28 young people asking them, for instance, what meanings they give to digitalization in their daily lives and what role different digital devices and environments play in it.

A total of 418 young people during 2021 and 2022 quantitative data contextualizes and backgrounds the analysis we present in the article by rendering and structuring the research field and the “digital youth” under review in general. The questions asked in the online survey concerned the use and experiences of young people’s various digital devices and environments. The survey also included some background information questions on, among other things, the respondent’s gender, hobbies, family composition and livelihood, the level of education of parents, their place of residence, the use of public transport and the distance of various services essential to young people from the young person’s home.

The qualitative data consists of 28 thematic individual or pair interviews and two focus group interviews with 6 participants. We have also conducted online observations and written fieldwork diaries of how these young people use digital media in their everyday lives. Our data collection was organized simultaneously to

the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic, and as face-to-face meetings with youth were cancelled due to various restrictions, we utilised digital ethnography and our interviews and observations were conducted online (about digital ethnography, see Korjonen-Kuusipuro, Tuuva-Hongisto & Berg 2022). The qualitative data includes the following themes and contents: young people's digital agencies, digital everyday practices, and meanings of places and contexts both online and offline (and the entanglements of these two).

Our analysis of qualitative data follows reflective thematic content analysis and has been carried out in a dialogic relationship with our research-based understanding of the effects of digitalisation on young people's lives (Braun & Clarke 2022). In our ethnographic study, the analysis phase of the data was entwined with the data collection. At the beginning of the classification of the data, two researchers encoded the transcribed interview data in a data-driven manner in the NVivo programme. We then reflected on the coding together and deepened our analysis by theming the material based on broader common themes and discussed the classification done with the entire research group. The names used in interview citations are pseudonyms to protect the privacy of the interviewees.

The analysis we present in this article is part of the research project Capturing Digital Social Inequality – Young Digi-Native's Asymmetrical Agencies Within Socio-Technical Imperatives and Imaginaries (DEQUAL, 2020–2024), funded by the Academy of Finland. The project is based on the idea of how physical places and environments in which different material structures open up to young people and where socio-cultural and youth cultural opportunities are different and unequal. The analysis of the ideals of digital youth is conducted through analytical frame of digital participation (cf. Literat 2018) and the dimensions of digital engagement: agency, practices, intensities and contexts (see Tuuva-Hongisto et al. 2022). In this article we focus on the restrictions of the use of digitalization that our interlocutors constantly produced in the interviews. They framed their use through the ideas of controlling the screen time, and picturing an ideal type of using digital devices and applications.

#### 4. TECHNO-SOCIAL HIERARCHIES AND SHAME

Young people have a wide range of digital devices and skills at their disposal, and this is also true for the young people who participated in our research: for instance, almost all (96 %) of the youth who responded to the online questionnaire have smartphone at their disposal. The next most common digital devices used by young people are, according to the questionnaire data, a traditional personal computer (66 %) and a game console (47 %). In the questionnaire, we asked youth to take a stand on allegations concerning, for example, the respondent's digital skills. Most young people (90 %) somewhat or completely agreed with the statement 'I have sufficiently good skills to use different digital devices and services'. Only a few respondents (4 %) somewhat or completely disagreed with the statement. (Haverinen et al. 2023)

Based on our quantitative data, it generally appears that young people in general have access to a relatively comprehensive and diverse range of devices and applications that enable digital everyday life and 'hanging out', as well as other communication with friends. The most important online environments according to our online questionnaire were Snapchat (86,6%), TikTok (79,4%), Instagram (79,1%) and YouTube (75,4%), WhatsApp (73%). These results of the questionnaire communicate not only relatively diverse digital competences, skills and habits, but also the wider importance of digital communication and togetherness in the lives of young people. (See also e.g. Ito et al., 2009; Livingstone, 2010.)

Although the digital uses and skills were very mundane, the engagement to online participation varied. The individual differences in the digital participation, in its agencies and diverse roles, practices (playing, hanging, chatting, following), intensities with diversified engagement, screen times, control and online and offline contexts were huge. Despite these differences, most of our participants had the idea of using too much digital devices or spending too much time in different digital environments, even becoming addicted somehow. They were also envious to those who seemed more controlled and disciplined than them:

*Sometimes during the weekend if you take the phone and the just stay on the couch and just watch YouTube videos, you get the feeling that you haven't done or reached anything. On the other hand, if you get out in the morning or go training or do something else useful, you realise that you are more energetic, that you have done something. The feeling that you have done something. (Juhani)*

*Yes, I kind of envy people who can be apart from that phone for a really long time. But I could probably too, but I just have to make that change (laughs). (Helmi)*

*Well, I use my phone quite a lot. I don't want to, but you do become addicted and it's not easy to get rid of.* (Sofia)

Our research revealed that young people did not necessarily feel joy in their everyday use of digital devices, nor did they mention skills learned online. On the contrary, they often seemed to be ashamed and feel guilty for using too many digital devices and digital platforms. A feeling of shame is one of the primary negative affects, and in our analysis, we interpreted that shame was strongly connected to the social ideal of digital youth. Shame is intense and painful, and when we feel shame, we think we have done something that we feel is bad, and that something needs to be hidden. According to our interpretation, young people felt shame in situations where young people felt they had failed to live up to the social ideal. This way shame was strongly connected to the moral developments and reproduction of social norms. (See also Ahmed 2004.)

Hence, our research data do not contain only youth's self-blaming but also efforts to locate oneself on the morally proper side of the line. In the interviews, young people's control over their own screen time and pursuit to keep it within certain limits of undefined normalcy became often justified by comparing how much time other young people or people 'in general' spend on different digital devices (cf. Salasuo, 2021). In this, the data contains many references to 'someone else': someone who uses a smartphone or plays with a computer more than themselves. In this shift, the young participants were also able to position themselves within suitable limits. In their reflections of time use, young people monitor and regulate not only their own but also their peers' use of digital media. (Haverinen et al. 2023.)

It is interesting how young people repeatedly told us that they need and want to do something "useful". Hanging out online did not seem to be useful, but when the interviewer asked what this useful might be, our participants often could not tell what they meant, or they mentioned for example that cleaning your room or wardrobe would be a good option as well as going out. This was encapsulated by one participant who said: "I have a feeling that I use a phone or computer all the time, and my life is being wasted", while another other argued how addictive digital devices were: "They are very addictive and take time from other important stuff".

*And there's going to be shouting, like 'you're on that phone again, all this time, you're always on the phone, that's all you're ever going to do.* (Emilia)

What is notable is the way our qualitative research material emerges the experience of overuse of digital communication devices described by youth themselves. However, they seem to be unable to define the limits of proper use more specifically – or what would be normal use, if such even exists: 'Well, I can't, actually, say what would be a proper time limit [in being on the phone]. But... I feel that I might use the phone a bit too much' (Julia). As a result, the overriding feeling these young people have is that no matter what their actual screen time is – even if it was very minimal – they always spend a little too much time online, especially with their smartphones. Within this pattern we can recognize excuses for breaking something that is defined and recognized as morally wanted and demanding. In this, the discursive attitude climate obtrudes into the accounts around digitalization of the young ones' time use – showing that they are aware of the moral concern around their digital life contents. The blames are toned with expectations of more conventional everyday activities and with references where 'being on the phone' is seen as an irritative practice of doing nothing. (Haverinen et al. 2023; about doing nothing see Ehn & Löfgren 2010)

The ninth grades had a very clear idea of what kind of use of digital devices and applications were appropriate. They constantly referred to the time used on smart phones, they controlled, or wanted to control the used time with digital devices, especially on the phone. Especially those who had very limited screen time, had also very goal-oriented hobbies and their leisure time consisted of workout and their own special interests. They used digital media for school tasks, to read news and to follow current affairs. They said they did not post on social media, they were strict with their privacy; they did not have online friends and they were not actively communicating on any other channels. They used Youtube only to follow their own special tubers (usually connected to their hobbies) and they were following these mainly for learning purposes. They were heading to elite high schools, and they lived in a big city. This seems to illustrate a kind of ideal of today's digital youth: scarce, disciplined, controlled.

Matias is an example of what we call an "ideal digital youth", a disciplined, goal oriented and a media literate person. For him digital technologies are mostly for useful and educational purposes, he also follows news and current affairs, and his screen time is very limited.

*And then at school. No. Not that much at the network. Of course, messaging and for this, but [...] Not really that much. I am one of the less using. I'm not that active there. The whole screen time is about an hour and a half. A while ago I kept a diary an my weekly training activities: amounts and such. In addition to soccer training, I spent about 30 hours a week in body maintenance and other sports.* (Matias)

Matias wants to focus on school, and he is heading to an elite high school after the ninth grade. His hobbies are very goal-oriented: he plays football, and his plans include studying medicine or economics – or being a professional football player. His digital agency is controlled, passive and conscious, mostly for educational and targeted purposes. His digital practices are connected for studying, following news and current affairs and his hobbies: Matias uses social media platforms in order to look videos connected to football or other activities he wants to learn more about. The intensity of his use is very limited: in the interview he stresses that he doesn't have time to be on the phone or hang out online. He estimates his screen time is around one hour and half. The contexts of his digital participation are mostly Youtube and Instagram. Matias lives in the growing city centre, where he thinks he has all the possible opportunities for his future. The ideal of digital youth seems to be in motion: it is no longer connected to the potential of digitalization, its uses and skills. Thus, the discourse has shifted towards overuse, addictive and problematic use of digital devices, especially smart phones. The ninth graders commented on controlling their use; the idea of the freedom of mobile devices places new burdens and responsibilities on people as well as greater emotional stress. (Livingstone 2010.) We can also see how the "ethos of excellence" increasingly guides the content and practices of many children's and young people's leisure activities (Berg & Salasuo 2017).

The ethos of excellence is connected to the promise of a good life model that hard work, diligence and doing your best will be rewarded, at least at some point. Lauren Berlant (2011), a scholar of culture and politics, described this phenomenon by using the concept of cruel optimism. Cruel optimism requires citizens who focus on middle-class well-life goals that are not in the least possible or realistic for them.

## **5. CONCLUSIONS: SHIFTING IDEALS OF DIGITAL YOUTH**

Today, self-control has become a sign of a good citizen; we must wage an endless battle to achieve the seemingly natural ideal norms of the elite and the stars. A failed and bad person is presented as not being able to take care of himself and fulfill these expectations of an ideal life dictated by no-one but shared by everyone. It is interesting that in a society that emphasizes freedom, we live amid so many silent but compelling norms and rules. (Jakonen 2020, 233-4.)

In our study we interpreted shame over the everyday use of digital devices, especially smartphones. When looking deeper into these tensions of controlling the use, we were able to interpret that shame and guilt young people felt for using too much digital devices and digital platforms were very visible. Even though, these feelings were "produced" in the context of the interviews, it was still surprising for us researchers how much shame was connected to the digital everyday.

The feelings of shame and guilt also echoes moral panic (Cohen 1972; Buckingham, 2008), where young people's ways to use digital devices are considered as a threat for a disciplined society. Furthermore, there seems to be evidence of demonizing talk around digitalisation: if you are not aware, controlled and disciplined, you will most probably be addicted, spend your time idly and learn nothing. We are not denying that disadvantages such as addictive behavior exist, but our data illustrates how young people seem to think that online activities are a waste of time. However, these ideas and feelings were "produced" in the context of the interviews, and those who participated in our study may have talked to the researchers in a way they think adults want to hear about their digital everyday life. We also noted how shame was not connected to a lack of skills or trendy devices, but clearly to a lack of control over their usage of digital devices and services.

Idealistic statements about digital culture stood in stark contrast to the ways that young people's digital lives are being pathologized in mainstream media, where parents are being taught to fear what young people might encounter if they spent too much time online. Medical authorities were urging parents to move the computer out of the teen's bedrooms and into publicly visible spaces to see if greater parental oversight might diminish their likelihood for mischief, cyberbullying, illegal downloads, violent gaming, or porn consumption. At the time, it was as if there were only two ways to perceive the Web— as a space of personal freedom and enlightenment or as a space of darkness and risk. (James 2014.)

These debates typically attribute an extraordinary power to technology and account for its role in highly deterministic terms: technology is seen to produce social change, irrespective of how and by whom it is used. Young people as emblems of the future are predictably invoked on both sides of this debate: they are at the same time "digital natives," whose facility with technology is creating new forms of social and cultural participation (Prensky 2001), and the "dumbest generation," stupefied and terminally distracted by the

flickering screen (Bauerlein 2009). Such arguments tend merely to replay the binary logic that has historically characterized responses to all new technologies: either technology will liberate us, or it will enslave us; either it will expand our potential, or it will reduce us; either it will revitalize our social and cultural life, or it will take us all to hell. (Banaji & Buckingham 2013.)

Danah boyd (2014, 15.) states that a great deal of the fear and anxiety that surrounds young people's use of digital media stems from understanding or dashed hopes. Often, what emerges out of people's confusion takes the form of utopian and dystopian rhetoric. Sometimes misunderstandings result in moral panic. In other cases, such as the dystopian notion that teens are addicted to social media or the utopian idea that technology will solve inequality, the focus on technology simply obscures other dynamics at play. Both extremes depend on a form of technological determinism. Utopian and dystopian views assume that technologies possess intrinsic powers that affect all people in all situations in the same way.

Our research reveals that it is important to elaborate how digitalisation is accessed, understood and used, and how it is constructed. Furthermore, the dynamics of everyday lives – how people make sense of it and navigate its socio-technical contours are important (Webster et al., 2020). Feelings, emotions and affects can be analysed as hotspots showing us socially and culturally meaningful issues that need our attention (MacLure 2013; Ahmed 2004). Methodologically, understanding the everyday experiences and reading emotions and affects from research material is demanding. Therefore, diverse ways of exploring affect all need to be discussed further, particularly with reference to digitalisation, shame, and youth cultures. We hope the avenues opened in this paper will lead to additional research on the topic.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We want to thank all young people who participated in our research. DEQUAL project is funded by the Academy of Finland (330574).

## REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S., 2004. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Baillergeau, E. and Duyvendak, J.W., 2016. Experiential knowledge as a resource for coping with uncertainty: evidence and examples from the Netherlands. *Health, Risk & Society*, Vol. 18, No. 7–8, pp. 407–426. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698575.2016.1269878>
- Banaji, S. and Buckingham, D., 2013. *The Civic Web: Young People, the Internet, and Civic Participation*. MIT Press, Cambridge (MA) and London.
- Bauerlein, T., 2009. *The Dumbest Generation*. New York: Penguin.
- Berg, P. and Salasuo, M., 2017. Liikkuva luokka Liikunnan harrastaminen kunnon kansalaisuutena. *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka* 82 (2017) 3, 251–261.
- Berlant, L., 2011. *Cruel optimism*. Duke University Press, Durham (NC).
- Boyd, danah (2014) *It's complicated. The social lives of networked teens*. Yale University Press, New Haven & London.
- Buckingham, D., 2008. Introducing Identity. In Buckingham, D. (Ed.) *Youth, Identity, and Digital Media*. MIT Press, Cambridge (MA) and London, 1–24. doi:10.1162/dmal.9780262524834.00
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V., 2022. *Thematic Analysis. Practical guide*. Sage Publications.
- Cohen, S., 1972. *Folk devils and moral panics: The creation of the mods and rockers*. MacGibbon & Kee, London.
- Ehn, B. and Löfgren, O., 2010. *The secret world of doing nothing*. University of California Press Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.
- Halford, S. & Savage, M., 2010. Reconceptualizing Digital Social Inequality. *Information, Communication & Society*, Vol. 13, No. 7, pp. 937–955.
- Haverinen, V-S. et al. Forthcoming. Fear of missing out real life: from parental regulation to moral hierarchies of youth's screen time. Manuscript under review.
- Helsper, E. J., 2021. *The Digital Disconnect. The social causes and consequences of digital inequalities*. Sage, London & Thousand Oaks (CA).
- Holloway, S.L. and Valentine, G. (2003). *Cyberkids. Children in the Information Age*. Routledge/Falmer, London & New York.

- Ito, M. et al., 2010. *Hanging out, Messing around and Geeking out: Kids Living and Learning with New Media*. MIT Press, Cambridge (MA) and London
- Jakonen, M., 2020. *Konflikti. Talous ja politiikka*. Into, Helsinki.
- James, C., 2014. *Disconnected: Youth, New Media, and the Ethics Gap*. MIT Press, Cambridge (MA) and London.
- Jasanoff, S. and Kim, S-H. 2009. Containing the Atom: Sociotechnical Imaginaries and Nuclear Power in the United States and South Korea. *Minerva*, Vol. 47, No. 2, pp. 119–146. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-009-9124-4>
- Jasanoff, S. and Kim, S-H. 2015. *Dreamscapes of Modernity. Sociotechnical Imaginaries and the Fabrication of Power*. Chicago & London: Chicago University Press.
- Jenkins, H. et al., 2006. *Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century*. The MacArthur Foundation, Chicago.
- Korjonen-Kuusipuro, K., Tuuva-Hongisto, S. and Berg, P., 2022. Reflections on Digital Ethnography and Digital Realms of Young People. In Jantunen, J.H. et al. (Eds.) *Diversity of Methods and Materials in Digital Human Sciences. Proceedings of the Digital Research Data and Human Sciences DRDHum Conference 2022, December 1-3, Jyväskylä, Finland*, 83-94.
- Lange, P. G., 2014. *Kids on YouTube: Technical Identities and Digital Literacies*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Literat, I. et al., 2018. Analyzing youth digital participation: aims, actors, contexts and intensities. *Information Society*, Vol. 34, No. 4. pp. 261-273.
- Livingstone, S., 2010. Digital learning and participation among youth: critical reflections on future research priorities. *International journal of learning and media*, Vol. 2, No. 2-3. pp. 1-13.
- MacLure, M., 2013. Researching without representation: language and materiality in post-qualitative methodology. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, Vol. 26, No. 2, 658–667. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2013.788755>
- Mossberger, K., et al. 2007. *Digital Citizenship: The Internet, Society, and Participation*. MIT Press, Cambridge (MA) and London.
- Prensky, M., 2001. Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants. *On the Horizon*, Vol. 9 No. 5. pp. 1-6.
- Salasuo, M., 2021. (ed.). *Harrastamisen äärellä. Lasten ja nuorten vapaa-aikatutkimus 2020*. Nuorisotutkimusseura & Nuorisotutkimusverkosto, Helsinki.
- Talsi, N. and Tuuva-Hongisto, S., 2009. ”Ei vietetty sinä jouluna tekniikan riemujuhlaa” Teknologinen imperatiivi teknologiaelämäkerroissa. *Kulttuurintutkimus*, Vol. 26, pp. 71–82. <http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:ELE-1551839>
- Tuuva-Hongisto, S., Kuusipuro-Korjonen, K. and Berg, P., 2022. *Tracing the digital landscapes of young people*. Presentation at NYRIS Conference 2022, Oslo.
- Tapscott, D., 2008. *Grown up Digital! How the Net Generation is Changing your World*. The McGraw-Hill Companies, New York.
- Webster, A., Svalastog, A. and Allgaier, J., 2020. Mapping digital landscapes. *Information, Communication & Society*, Vol. 23, No. 8, pp. 1100-1105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2020.1784507>
- Yalçın-İncik, E., & İncik, T. 2022. Generation Z students' views on technology in education: What they want what they get. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 10(2), 109-124. <http://dx.doi.org/10.52380/mojet.2022.10.2.275>