International Journal of Sociology and Humanities

Merve Sefa YILMAZ
Psychology, Kahramanmaraş
Sütçü İmam University,
Kahramanmaraş, Türkiye

Ayşe MERMUTLU
Sociology, Fırat University,
Elazığ, Türkiye

Quantified self and subjectivity: Evaluation of digital self-tracking practices in the context of subjectification processes

Merve Sefa YILMAZ and Ayşe MERMUTLU

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33545/26648679.2023.v5.i1a.44

Abstract
Parallel to the widespread use of digitalization in all areas of life, monitoring and evaluation of various bodily functions and practices through digital technologies has also taken its place among daily life routines. With wearable/portable devices and smart phone applications, many bodily parameters and practices such as steps counts, calorie consumption, sleep tracking, stress level, habits and personal finance management, etc. are tracked, converted into quantitative data, analyzed, and those bodily functions and practices are re-structured on the basis of these data. Expressed in the description of the "Quantified Self", this contemporary trend corresponds to the new forms of regulation of bodily practices in the digital society and is discussed in the relevant literature within the framework of various forms of subjectivity. The Foucauldian theoretical line considers self-tracking as a self-practice in the context of biopower as a normalization, control and surveillance activity that structures bodily practices around certain norms regarding health and aesthetics. Self-tracking practices are also discussed in the context of new-individualism culture, where self-transformation through self-knowledge and self-updating is the distinguishing feature, and performance subject as a "self-designer", a success-oriented "self-entrepreneur" who transforms herself into a project. In this paper, firstly, these subjectivities will be evaluated in the context of self-tracking practices and current approaches as to what kind of subjectivity to which the "quantified self" corresponds will be discussed. Then, the thesis that the subject of the self-tracking practice can be understood in a more comprehensive way in the context of the notion of "neoliberal subjectivity", which includes certain aspects of the subjectivities in question, will be discussed.

Keywords: Self-tracking, biopolitics, performance subject, neoliberal subjectivity

Introduction

Quantified Self, both refers to the expression of the self through numbers and serves as a reference to a social movement. Quantified Self provides individuals with a framework that allows them to understand themselves through measurable metrics in both senses. Within this framework, it enables the proactive collection of information related to behavior and environment, particularly focusing on physical/mental health, and creates opportunities for individuals to better understand themselves, ultimately facilitating improvement in all these areas over time (Davis, 2022) [1].

The voluntary entry of individuals into the process of self-surveillance, based on specific discourses and information (such as health, beauty, aesthetic lifestyle, etc.), with the aim of self-improvement, has brought self-management to the forefront. This self-management cannot be thought of independently from power, and it operates not through external, coercive pressure, but rather through individuals voluntarily constructing themselves as subjects. In this study, while evaluating the impact of self-tracking practices on the individual's self-construction as a subject, a Foucauldian approach is adopted. The Foucauldian theoretical tendency considers self-tracking as a self-practice within the framework of biopower, which structures bodily practices around certain norms related to health and aesthetics, involving normalization, control, and surveillance activities. According to Foucault (2018: 100) [2], biopower is an indispensable element of capitalism. This new form of power plays a critical role in capitalism's treatment of bodies as a production apparatus, transforming individuals into labor power, and aligning the population with

Corresponding Author:
Merve Sefa YILMAZ
Psychology, Kahramanmaraş
Sütçü İmam University,
Kahramanmaraş, Türkiye

economic processes in a "totalizing" manner. In this context, the need arises for the physical power of the human body to be converted into labor power and utilized as productive power, while the population is made suitable and "efficient" for economic processes. Thus, the human body becomes valuable, and human life becomes something that needs to be preserved. So, how does the individual accomplish the notion of valuing and preserving this body and self, and how does the process of subjectification operate within this context? Here, the relationship between knowledge and power comes into play, and the role of digital self-tracking in these processes of subjectification is evaluated.

Digital Self-Tracking
Lupton (2013: 25) [3] states that the concept of self-tracking emerged in discussions on how individuals can optimize their lives, and she defines self-tracking practice as a form of personal knowledge production (Lupton, 2018: 1) [4]. In the present era, self-tracking technologies have become an integral part of daily life experiences for many people. For example, checking the number of steps taken, stairs climbed, or kilometers run through the screen of a smartphone, various applications, or wearable devices; monitoring stress levels, happiness and depression states when needed; tracking calorie and water intake; or occasionally measuring heart rate has become a routine activity for most individuals. All of these activities are generally referred to as self-tracking practices (Lupton, 2016: 2) [5].
To record or track any activity or physical movement, various tools have been needed from the past to the present, such as memory, paper, pen, mobile phones, or sensors. In short, this type of action called "tracking" requires a kind of "system". If it is acknowledged that the culture of measurement, i.e., digitization, has existed since ancient times and has been done through various methods, it can be clearly stated that one of the new developments regarding tracking activities is technological advancements (Neff and Nafus, 2016: 11-18) [6]. Therefore, the primary reason behind the emergence of self-tracking and encouraging individuals to engage in self-tracking is the advent of digital technologies, which facilitate the collection, measurement, calculation, and visualization of the data resulting from self-tracking practices, providing a supportive system. Individuals having internet-connected mobile and wearable digital devices have facilitated the real-time, detailed measurement, monitoring, analysis, presentation, and sharing of bodily and daily life data (Lupton, 2014: 1) [7]. In this context, the widespread use of smartphones, various digital applications, sensors, and garments, fabrics, and accessories that integrate information and communication technologies namely, wearable devices due to digital transformation, along with easy access to such devices, has also supported the development and proliferation of self-tracking practices.
With the development and diversification of these technological tools, the control and surveillance of the body have become easier, and various fields, ranging from health to cosmetics, involve control and intervention in the body. Many aspects, such as heart rate, calorie consumption, body fat percentage, step count, and blood sugar level, can be easily determined. This situation indicates that the digital society has made many aspects of life calculable and predictable. In this context, individuals in the digital society

can measure their performance and efficiency through devices and applications that can record their own bodies (Han, 2017: 67) [8]. Therefore, it can be said that digital technologies have gained significant importance in the construction process of the body. One of the most significant examples of the communication between body construction and digitalization is the self-tracking practice carried out through portable/wearable devices and mobile applications. According to Lupton, these various digital technologies that enable self-tracking practice offer new ways to enable "surveillance", which has significant effects on subjectivity and embodiment. With mobile digital technologies that can be used for surveillance, which have become a part of daily social life today, there are increasing opportunities to be both the target and initiator of surveillance. The self-monitoring possibilities provided by wearable and other digital technologies allow for much more detailed and continuous self-regulation than in previous times (Lupton, 2014a: 445-446) [9]. In this context, self-tracking practices, along with evolving digital technologies, contribute to the reconstruction of the body by enabling the measurement and analysis of many aspects of life that were previously unmeasurable. This contemporary trend, embodied in the description of "Quantified Self", corresponds to new forms of organizing bodily practices in the digital society and is discussed within the framework of various forms of subjectivity. In this study, self-tracking practice is evaluated in the context of processes of subjectification, elaborating on how "quantified self" corresponds to a form of subjectivity.

Evaluation of Subjectivation Process within the Scope of Self-Practices
Subjectivity can be defined as a "set of subjective experiences" that corresponds to the meanings of "identity" or "individuation". Individuals are positioned as subjects of these subjective experiences in connection with historical processes. According to Foucault, subjectivity is the "relationship of consciousness we establish with ourselves", in other words, it is the way we represent ourselves with our own consciousness. For example, if we represent ourselves in our consciousness through concepts that are fundamental in defining certain experiences, and if we establish a conscious relationship with ourselves through those concepts, then we pass as subjects of those subjective experiences and within ourselves, we embrace the limitations imposed by those identities. This situation implies, according to Foucault, how modern power demonstrates, in a subtle and cunning manner, how it makes people subject to itself without resorting to any social contract game to obtain consent. In this context, the term used for both is the same: to be a subject and to be a subject to power. Power, in order to subject people to itself, engages in subjectification (Keskin, 2017: 14) [10].
Foucault focuses on the questions of "How can we transform ourselves into normal subjects?" and "How can we work on our ethical essence?" By doing so, he draws attention to the practices of "self-care" and "asceticism" (Foucault, 2014: 206) [11]. Subjectification corresponds to the process of establishing/constructing a subject, and according to Foucault, the establishment of this subject or subjective experience is closely related to the historical process of experience formation. The ability of a person to become a subject is realized through assuming the position

of the subject of that experience. Foucault explains his approach to the process of establishing subjective experience through three axes within the historical process. The first axis is discursive practices (knowledge production), the second is non-discursive practices (systems of power), and the final axis encompasses self-techniques and self-practices related to the problem of the self (Ovacık Çoruh and Uluoğlu, 2018: 166-167) [12]. Foucault describes the final axis as "subjectivity" and states that fundamentally, it is related to the individual's thinking about their own existence and behavior. Therefore, these three axes correspond to knowledge, power, and subjectivity processes, and the convergence of these three axes gives rise to subjective experience. This subjective experience is constructed based on a certain form of behavior and existence. In a conversation titled "Subject and Power" in 2017, Keskin elaborates on the process of establishing subjective experience through sexuality. Sexuality is a subjective experience constructed around and based on the problematization of the body and the pleasure derived from it. There is a very clear truth in what Foucault says. Until recently, the term "sexuality" did not exist in Western languages, but the absence of such a term does not mean that the behavior you refer to with that term did not exist. People have always engaged in relationships with other bodies, derived pleasure from them, and sought to enhance that pleasure. Some of them labeled it as "sin". However, according to Foucault's claim, from the 18th century onwards, that form of behavior began to be seen as a problem due to certain requirements brought about by capitalism, and information about that form of behavior started to emerge. These correspond to discursive practices. At the same time, they turned to normative systems, i.e., rules imposed by power, to determine how that behavior should be performed, and they conceptualized their behaviors, bodies, and the pleasure derived from bodies in a completely new way in their minds. They have now assigned meanings and values to that behavior. Thus, an experience called "sexuality" emerged. This experience is normative. It contains knowledge domains that define what is normal and what is pathological. There are normative norms that state that the pathological should not be done. These are rules and laws. A person who embraces this knowledge, believes in its truth, and adopts the normative system created based on that truth will perceive themselves as a subject of a specific sexuality and behave accordingly. However, their behavior will always be self-limited within the framework of that conceptualization. This situation corresponds to the manipulative system that comes with the establishment of subjective experience and our position as subjects within that experience (Keskin, 2017) [10].

From this perspective, it is stated that the individual emerges as a possible object of knowledge within the framework of truth games. The question that needs to be explained at this point is: How does the individual become involved in truth games as a subject? Foucault, in his search for an answer to this question, approaches the relationship between the subject and truth games in two ways. Firstly, by starting from coercive practices (such as psychiatry and the prison system), and secondly, by including theoretical or scientific games as seen in the analysis of wealth, language, and living beings. Foucault attempts to explain this situation through the concept of "practices of the self" in his lectures at the Collège de France. In this case, it is possible to assert a "shift" and "transition" in truth games. Truth games have now moved from coercive practices to practices focused on self-formation of the subject. Foucault refers to this as "ascetic practice". The term asceticism, in this context, does not imply moral asceticism but rather refers to the individual working on oneself with the concern of self-improvement, complete transformation, and attaining a certain mode of existence. (Foucault, 2014: 222) [11].

The main focus of Foucault's analysis is the practices of selfhood (subjectivity) considered as the final axis. Selfhood practices are the ways in which individuals can transform themselves into ethical subjects, the efforts of self-improvement for ethical behavior. In other words, selfhood practice is the method of working on one's ethical essence. Foucault states that the fundamental principle of this culture of selfhood ethics/culture, which is a kind of art of existence, is "care of the self". At the core of the necessity of this culture is the principle of "knowing oneself" that emerges within the context of the individual's relationship with oneself. Foucault enriches this moral principle with concepts such as self-technologies, self-culture, and self-formation (Işık, 2014: 106) [13]. Foucault's concept of self-technologies emphasizes that individuals are not only controlled or directed externally but also highlights the dimensions of self-subjugation that they themselves provide. In the context of self-technologies, it can be said that the subjects in modern society are constituted by "discourses and discursive practices" led not only by the state but also by civil society. Self-technologies also indicate the automation of control. Individuals now participate in this process of control by exhibiting their own behaviors. Modern self-technologies convince individuals to become healthy, successful, or desirable through practices that promise happiness, perfection, wisdom, or ultimately immortality. In his early works, Foucault explored power beyond individuals, while in his later works, he developed the concept of self-technologies within the framework of "aesthetics and ethics of existence". According to Foucault, the degree of autonomy in shaping one's own life is a problematic situation. Despite focusing on the formation of subjectivity, even in his later works, Foucault shows clear signs of not willing to provide any definitive determination of the true self to the subject. Individuals are subjected to control and shaping both internally and externally through games of truth and discursive practices (Westwood, 2002; Coors, 2003; Freundlieb, 1998; cited in Hülür, 2009: 459) [14]. "Self-technologies", which encourage individuals to turn inward and have a significant impact on the process of subjectification, are defined by Foucault as follows (Mills, 2021: 47) [15].

"Techniques that enable individuals to perform a certain set of operations on their own bodies, souls, thoughts, and behaviors, using their own capabilities, in order to transform, change, and attain a certain excellence, happiness, purity, supernatural power, or similar state"

Self-technologies, in short, refer to the practices and tools through which individuals subject themselves as ethical subjects, shaping their modes of existence according to normative codes or aesthetic and ethical criteria. Foucault analyzes the practices in which individuals engage in relation to normative or moral regulations and values, resulting in their self-constitution as subjects of ethical codes, that is, ethical subjects (Mills, 2021: 47) [15].

The principle of "care of the self" being dominant in an individual is also conceptualized as "culture of the self". At the core of this culture lies the principle of "self-concern", which directs and regulates the development and practice of the culture. The principle of self-concern has a broad and extensive impact. It is a command that carries the necessity of an individual's self-care, appearing in various teachings. This principle has taken the form of an attitude, a mode of behavior, and has left its mark on lifestyles. It has developed as methods, practices, and prescriptions that are contemplated, cultivated, matured, and taught. In this way, it has formed a social practice that shapes interpersonal relationships, exchanges, communications, and even institutions at times. Furthermore, it has led to the development of a particular mode of knowledge and the cultivation of specific knowledge (Foucault, 2018: 330-332) [2].

Subjectification is considered the most important technology of governance. Foucault, particularly in his analysis in 1978, discusses the existence of a third model that emerged alongside the sovereign model and the disciplinary society, which continues to exist today. This third model is conceptualized as the "governmentality model". It is a model that does not restrict freedom like discipline or sovereignty, but rather delivers and governs freedom. This model is constructed around the principles of liberalism and neoliberalism, as these forms of capitalism require the notion of "freedom". Free market freedom, freedom of circulation, the circulation of labor and capital, and similar freedoms are crucial for these types of capitalism. However, what is truly important is securing this circulation. This is where Foucault's notion of the society of security comes into play. The primary focus is now on creating a governance model that can ensure security and subjectifying individuals within this model to make them liberal or neoliberal subjects (Keskin, 2017) [10]. Thus, the most striking aspect of neoliberal governmentality is the reconfiguration of the subject. The individual now regulates and transforms themselves according to the market model, and in doing so, they must envision themselves as a company. As a result, the individual becomes a self-managing economic unit like a company, making themselves responsible for their success and failure. In this case, the classical definition of the state undergoes a transformation, and the state's responsibility over individuals disappears invisibly. Everyone becomes a self-responsible subject, and this situation corresponds to a desired order (Brown, 2018: 65) [16]. Taking this into account, it is possible to argue that self-surveillance practices serve as a means for individuals to manage themselves in the manner of a company, to assume responsibility for their success and failures. Through self-surveillance practices, individuals establish self-control, or self-governance, to conform to the accepted norms. Therefore, self-surveillance practices can be considered as one of the aspects to be included in processes of subjectification.

Digital Subjects of Self-Tracking: Reconstruction of the Self in the Grip of Self-Governance

Foucault begins his lecture on February 14, 1979, titled "The Birth of Biopolitics" with the question "what is neoliberalism?" He emphasizes the essence of neoliberalism as the adaptation of the general exercise of political power to market economic relations (Foucault, 2019: 111) [17]. Foucault attempts to explain the principles of neoliberal governance and its difference from traditional liberalism.

According to Foucault, the main theme of this difference is "the shaping of all state powers and the organization of society based on the market economy" and "the ability of the market to shape both the state and society". One transformation carried out by neoliberals involves the "shift of exchange within the market principle towards competition" (Foucault, 2019: 103-104) [17]. Based on this transformation, Foucault also analyzes social policies. In traditional social politics, the norm is to aim for a certain equality of access to consumer goods. However, according to neoliberals, if it can be called social policy, the purpose of social politics is not the socialization of consumption and income, but rather their privatization. Each individual in society will now be responsible for protecting and insuring their own health against potential risks. Therefore, health will be reduced to an individual responsibility. Foucault refers to this as "individual social policy", which signifies the individualization of social politics (Foucault, 2019: 124-125) [17]. In this context, the main concern of neoliberalism is not to create a free and empty space according to the principle of laissez-faire, but rather to extend the rules of the market economy to all areas and establish the art of governance accordingly. This has been one of the fundamental turning points that affect all of our lives. The question of "the limits of governance" has shifted from which areas governance should touch and not touch to how this touch should occur (Coşkun, 2019: 85) [18]. The boundaries of governance have expanded so much that with the values and transformations brought by neoliberalism, a new subjectivity has emerged, and as a result, concepts such as personality, self, and identity have begun to be restructured (Sugarman, 2015: cited in Sarıçalı, 2021: 32) [19]. In terms of research, it is crucial to examine the effects of self-surveillance in constructing and developing the self. With the neoliberal transformations, individuals taking responsibility for potential risks and dangers have necessitated self-governance. The realization of self-governance, however, varies according to the conditions of the society in which one lives. In a society where neoliberal policies prevail, the foregrounding of a "subject" who will self-discipline according to ethical norms becomes prominent. This is precisely where neoliberalism diverges from classical capitalism. The internalization of norms produced within these policies and thus self-disciplining oneself has become a necessity. The self, striving to develop itself in the position of the neoliberal subject, is presented as being in contact with one's "true" values, while the non-neoliberal self is presented as "deceived" or "disconnected from reality". Within this framework, the belief that hard work, perseverance, and making the right choices lead to a successful life predominates in the cultural environment (LaMarre et al., 2019: 246) [20]. The individual's attempt to reconstruct their self by holding themselves accountable and assuming the responsibility imposed by neoliberal subjectivity is an important issue to consider, including how and with which tools this is accomplished. In this context, the notions of "bio power" and the omnipresence of "surveillance" made possible by digital devices come to the forefront.

Due to the advancements in information and communication technologies today, individuals can be monitored not only in their work lives but also in their private lives, including their daily routines. Through the data banks provided by surveillance, every aspect of individuals' lives is now recorded, enabling easy control and supervision over their lives. With the increasing possibilities, the power's desire to "know", or in other words, the desire to "see everything without being seen", can be constantly fulfilled. Surveillance, in connection with the emerging technologies, has found its place in almost every sphere of social life, making individual's part of the power structure. Consequently, power and knowledge are perpetually intertwined, with power gaining access to information and knowledge aligning with power (Çaycı, 2016; cited in Okmeydan, 2017: 58-59) [21]. This situation reveals that power has attempted various methods throughout history to control and disseminate visibility according to different conditions and philosophies of different periods. Each power establishes its control over social life through the "gaze" within the framework of its contemporary technologies. Historically, the "gaze" is one of the fundamental determinants of power. Virtually all aspects of society are under the surveillance of power's gaze. Therefore, the fundamental form of control used by power to legitimize itself is "surveillance," and one of its essential organs is the "gaze". The gaze represents the intersection of both producing and consuming culture under the dominance of power (Çoban, 2009: 1) [22]. The gaze mentioned here refers to self-tracking devices that enable individuals to monitor themselves.

When evaluating contemporary society, it can be said that we are now living in a society that is focused on success and performance. "What sets the individual who bases their life on performance and productivity apart from the masses is their self-rule, their role as their own marketer and entrepreneur, their freedom". When referring to modern societies, it is appropriate to characterize them as performance societies rather than disciplinary societies. In line with the changing structure of society, the obedient subject has also undergone a transformation and has reached the dimension of the performance subject (Han, 2019: 17) [23].

In the era of late modernity, the subject focused on success and performance is no longer a servant to anyone and is not subjected to any external force. It emancipates itself, transforming into a self-affirming project. The transformation of the individual from subject to project does not eliminate the violence exerted upon the individual but merely changes the structure of that violence. Instead of the external, alien "force" imposed on the individual in the past, there now exists a self-directed force manifested as freedom. This transition is directly related to capitalist production relations. Once a certain level of production is reached, the individual reaches a point of self-exploitation, progressing in connection with the sense of freedom. The situation of self-exploitation, being concurrent with freedom and encompassing the sense of freedom within it, is more efficient and successful than exploiting others. Therefore, it can be said that the society of success and performance is also described as a "self-exploitation" society (Han, 2016: 19-20) [24]. In such a society, the exploiter and the exploited coincide in the same person, and the perpetuation of exploitation occurs without hegemony. The individual

focused on work and performance, due to its paradoxical freedom, now exists in the positions of both perpetrator and victim, master and servant (Han, 2016: 131) [24].

In contemporary society, it is observed that almost nothing remains stable and consistent, and individuals are directly or Indirectly affected by this instability. In the past, when faced with a situation or problem, or in the process of self-development, individuals would largely act according to societal rules and shape their identities accordingly, considering the prevailing values of society. However, the speed of change experienced in today's world leads to the dissolution of societal values and the gradual disappearance of the "path" that individuals used to follow. In this context, in order to adapt to development and change and sustain their existence, individuals find themselves dealing with the problems posed by innovations, being open to new ideas, and thus having to struggle on their own. This has given rise to a new understanding of individuality. The individual now becomes someone who takes care of themselves, recognizes their own shortcomings, intervenes in their own lives, and takes responsibility for the consequences of those interventions. In a society where individuals are individually responsible for themselves, the constant advancement of technology and its increasing accessibility have led individuals to seek control, discipline, and self-management through self-monitoring activities.

Giddens argues that in a world of intense and disorienting technological changes, individuals constantly reassess the established patterns of their relationships and question the certainties of their private or public lives. This situation arises from the fact that no one can be certain about what the future holds for an extended period of time. The future has become uncertain, and this uncertainty affects all societies to varying degrees. The uncertainty and open-endedness of the future also lead to the openness and fluidity of identities (Elliot and Lemert, 2011: 144) [25].

Therefore, today the self is deprived of pre-given meanings, traditional structures, rules, and processes, and it becomes a survival expert through a kind of "do-it-yourself" technique in self-realization. In this era dominated by individualism, traditional ways of doing things become blurred, and the individual incorporates self-design and self-construction techniques into all stages of life, becoming responsible for themselves and their own development (Elliot and Lemert, 2011: 92) [25].

In the context of an uncertain and fluid world, individuals strive to find new certainties, facilitated by the convenience offered by technological possibilities. In this regard, portable/wearable devices and applications, referred to as self-tracking practices, enable individuals to attain a quantitative form of their own selves and open doors for them to adapt and persist in the face of uncertainty. According to Lupton (2016: 68) [5], this self-tracking practice represents the elevation of the "neoliberal entrepreneurial citizen ideal". This figure, characterized as an entrepreneurial citizen, actively engages in self-improvement strategies and is often concerned with strategies that involve the consumption of information, objects, technology, and experiences, which strengthen their self-development endeavors as previously mentioned.

With the practice of self-tracking, individuals are confronted with a quantitative depiction of their selves and continuously reassess their body and self-based on the acquired information. This situation suggests that

individuals strive to remain in an ideal citizen position at all times. While this subject may not be characterized as an obedient subject, they seem to experience the qualities of obedience down to their very core. In fact, what this subject is presented with under the guise of "freedom" is the suggestion that they are a free subject, in contrast to the obedient subject.

When considered in the context of freedom, individuals in today's society, where everything is digitized and measured, gain significant power, but at the same time, they are surrounded by some negative consequences without even realizing it. Although individuals may feel more free with the opportunities provided by communication technologies, they are increasingly being monitored, controlled, and their freedom is being restricted in the name of creating a secure society rather than prioritizing freedom. In this situation, it is possible to say that individuals are in a state of false consciousness. While developed technologies facilitate daily life, on the other hand, even the most intimate aspects of people's everyday lives are now under surveillance. Individuals are included in vast databases through the information (data) they provide to communication technologies. As a result, everyday life practices are regulated in a way that does not provide a basis for behaviors that can be considered as crimes, aiming to create a "utopia of a crime-free society" (Avcı, 2015: 255-256) [26]. In this context, individuals become the primary center of control in order to create such a society. The everyday practices of individuals are being reconstructed, with control becoming the central aspect, according to the requirements of this utopia. One of the most significant practices utilized in this reconstruction is the practice of self-tracking, carried out through wearable/portable devices and smartphone applications. Through self-tracking, individuals ensure their control through self-governance and engage in it not under the coercion of obedience but with pleasure.

According to Han (2016: 36) [24] the obedient subject is characterized by a sense of duty, making it more of a subject of duty rather than a subject of pleasure. However, the performance-oriented subject of late modernity is not focused on fulfilling any particular duty. It lives not based on obedience, law, and a sense of duty, but rather based on freedom, pleasure, and individual inclinations. Instead of acting under someone else's command, it listens to itself and thus liberates itself from the negativity of an authoritarian other, becoming the master of itself alone. The liberation of the individual from the negativity of the other also brings about new obligations. Because in the dialectic of freedom, it lies in the creation of new obligations. Therefore, getting rid of the other entails a narcissistic self-focus that will be responsible for many psychological disorders of the success-driven subject, as it brings along a self-centeredness.

When considered within the context of self-tracking practices, it is possible to perceive self-trackers as individuals who embody the entrepreneurial subjects of the age of individualism and performance focus. In order to establish a solid ground for oneself in the fluidity of today's world and to be accepted as normal within the norms of society, individuals need to focus on themselves and keep themselves updated in the context of system standardization. If an individual does not possess this entrepreneurial spirit, they are at risk of being marginalized and potentially excluded from the system, leading to their disappearance or being cast aside.

Conclusion

With the integration of digital technologies into everyday life and easy access to these digital devices (such as smartphones, smart watches, wearable devices, etc.), various bodily functions and practices can now be tracked and measured through digital technologies. A person using any smartphone or wearable device can record, analyze, and reconstruct numerous functions and practices based on quantitative data, ranging from daily step counts and calorie intake/expenditure to water consumption, heart rate, sleep cycles, and personal financial management. This prevalent trend in contemporary society finds its counterparts in the descriptions of "quantified self" or "self-tracking". In this context, self-tracking practices generally provide the opportunity to monitor a wide range of activities and practices through digital devices and applications. Self-tracking practices also intersect with discussions on the culture of new individualism, which is characterized by the understanding of self-transformation and self-updating through self-knowledge. It portrays the self as a self-designed project and emphasizes a performance-oriented "self-entrepreneur" mindset. This article draws on Foucauldian theory as a theoretical tool to consider self-tracking as a self-practice. In the evaluation of self-tracking and subjectivity processes, the article examines the concept of self-tracking through a Foucauldian lens, considering it as a self-practice within the context of bio power, which normalizes, controls, and surveils bodily practices around certain norms related to health and aesthetics. Furthermore, the article evaluates the function of self-practices within the processes of subjectivation and analyzes the digital subjects that emerge alongside self-tracking within the contexts of performance and neoliberal subjectivity, considering notions of "self-development", "self-responsibility" and "self-entrepreneurship".

Acknowledgments

References

1. Davis M. What Is Quantified Self? The Complete Guide to Lifelogging [Internet]. c2022 [cited 2022]. Available from: https://rize.io/blog/quantified-self.
2. Foucault M. Cinselliğin tarihi. (Çev. H. U. Tanrıöver). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları; c2018.
3. Lupton D. Understanding the human machine [Commentary]. IEEE Technology and Society Magazine. 2013;32(4):25-30.
4. Lupton D. Dijital siborg asamblajı: Donna Haraway`in siborg kuramı ve yeni dijital sağlık teknolojileri. Doğu-Batı Düşünce Dergisi. 2018;86(21).
5. Lupton D. The Quantified Self: A Sociology of Self-Tracking. Cambridge: Polity Press; c2016.
6. Neff G, Nafus D. Self-Tracking. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; c2016.
7. Lupton D. Self-tracking modes: Reflexive self-monitoring and data practices. SSRN 2483549; c2014. p. 1-19.

8. Han BC. Şeffaflık toplumu. (Çev. H. Barışcan). Metis Yayınları; c2017.
9. Lupton D. Quantified sex: a critical analysis of sexual and reproductive self-tracking using apps. Culture, Health & Sexuality. 2014;17(4):440-453.
10. Keskin F. (Mayıs, 2017). Foucault: Özne ve iktidar. (Basın Bülteni) [Internet]. c2017 [cited 2017]. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AbmKP08bySo
11. Foucault M. Özne ve iktidar. (Çev. I. Ergüden, O.Akınhay.) İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları; c2014.
12. Ovacık Çoruh D, Uluoğlu B. Bir karşı-özneleşme [yeniden özneleşme] pratiği olarak tasarım. Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 2018;32(44):163-193.
13. Işık S. Foucault'da kendilik etiği ve sanat yapıtı olarak yaşam. Felsefe ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (FLSF). 2014;17:101-116.
14. Hülür H. Faşist olmayan varolma biçimlerinin olanakları üzerine: Michel Foucault'da normalleşme, benlik ve etik. EKEV Akademi Dergisi. 2009;13(40):447-470.
15. Mills C. Biyopoltika-Düşünürler ve Temalar. (Çev. M. Karbay). İstanbul: Notabene Yayınları; 2021.
16. Brown W. Halkın Çözülüşü: Neoliberalizmin Sinsi Devrimi. (Çev. B. E. Aksoy). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları; c2018.
17. Foucault M. Biyopolitikanın doğuşu. (Çev. A. Tayla). İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları; c2019.
18. Coşkun B. Neoliberal iktidar ve özne: Foucault'nun izinde güncel bir inceleme. Notabene Yayınları; c2019.
19. Sarıçalı M. Benliğin neoliberal öyküsü ve psikolojik danışma. Anadolu University Journal of Education Faculty. 2021;6(1):31-38.
20. LaMarre A, Smoliak O, Cool C, Kinavey H, Hardt L. The normal, improving, and productive self: Unpacking neoliberal governmentality in therapeutic interactions. Journal of Constructivist Psychology. 2019;32(3):236-253.
21. Bitirim Okmeydan S. Postmodern Kültürde Gözetim Toplumunun Dönüşümü: 'Panoptikon'dan 'Sinoptikon' ve 'Omniptikon'a. AJIT-E: Academic Journal of Information Technology. 2017;8(30):45-69.
22. Çoban B. Yeni panoptikon gözün iktidarı ve Facebook. Yeditepe Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi. 2009;10:1-18.
23. Han BC. Yorgunluk toplumu. (Çev. S. Yalçın). İstanbul: Açılım Kitap; c2019.
24. Han BC. Şiddetin topolojisi. (Çev. D. Zaptçıoğlu). Metis Yayınları; c2016.
25. Elliott A, Lemert C. Yeni bireycilik küreselleşmenin duygusal bedelleri. (Çev. B. Kıcır). Sel Yayıncılık; c2011.
26. Avcı Ö. Dijital yaşamın dijital özne (l) leri: Herkes ya da hiç kimse. Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. 2015;8(1):249-266.