

## Abstract

From its conceptual birth in 2007, *the Quantified Self (QS)* has become a topic of many scholarly reflections. Denoting the practice of tracking various self-related factors (i.e., psychological, physiological, environmental), the QS has found both its ardent critics and its optimistic supporters. Numerous scholars emphasize various oppressive aspects of self-tracking: promotion of neoliberal perfectionism, responsabilization (Moore and Robinson, 2015; Sanders, 2017; Lupton 2014; Till, 2014), forms of normalization (Zheng, 2021; Whitson, 2015; Ruckenstein and Schüll, 2017), gendered oppression (Moore and Robinson, 2015; Sanders 2017), and objectivist ideology (Oxlund, 2012). Its conduciveness to technologies of power (Foucault, 1988) is often contrasted with the potentially liberating and empowering effects of self-quantification. Most ethnographic studies show that instead of conforming to prevailing power-structures, self-tracking practices are used to resist them (Pantzar and Ruckenstein, 2017; Nafus and Sherman, 2014; Sharon and Zandbergen, 2016). As Foucauldian technologies of the self (Foucault, 1988), QS practices enable individuals to act upon themselves and autonomously pursue goals of happiness, perfection, and the like (Heyes, 2006; Whitson, 2015). Thus, while the QS remains an ambiguous practice, most scholars indicate its empowering effects.

While digital technologies are crucial for self-quantification (Swan, 2013; Nafus and Sherman, 2014), they have much more profound effects on higher-level processes, reshaping political, economic, and cultural spheres. One such development is described by Shoshana Zuboff's (2019) *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. The author provides a diagnosis of an emerging capitalist logic that creates value by transforming human experience into behavioral predictions sold for commercial purposes (Zuboff, 2019: 8). Surveillance capitalism also uses *instrumentarian power* that actively modifies behavior to align with commercial goals (Zuboff, 2019: 341). The end goal is the utopia of certainty where "all behavior [converges with] preestablished parameters that align with social norms and objectives" (Zuboff, 2019: 387).

Escaping surveillance capitalism's dystopian vision requires conceiving alternative ways of organizing the digital sphere (Zuboff, 2019: 449). However, recent attempts at restricting the functioning of surveillance capitalism were unsuccessful, reflected by the growth of most surveillance capitalist corporations. (Zuboff, 2019: 449-457) Transcending surveillance capitalism might fail and the frictionless future life might be inevitable. What are the possibilities

of resistance that would preserve the need for making decisions with their frictions, fears, risks, and ambiguity? (Weiskopf, 2020: 7-8)

This paper explores self-quantification as an ambiguous possibility for resistance against surveillance capitalism. Resistance is ambiguous because the QS practices facilitate the expansion of surveillance capitalism. QS practices provide data for surveillance capitalist companies and promote 'numerical ontology' (Oxlund, 2012) that might provide ideological support for surveillance capitalism. Nonetheless, I argue that most of QS's contributions to surveillance capitalism are relatively inconsequential. Instead, self-quantification provides crucial tools for obtaining self-knowledge and facilitates several forms of resistance against surveillance capitalism. Self-knowledge is crucial for challenging algorithmic behavioral modification and directing one's behavior. Moreover, self-quantification also educates people about the use and power of data, making people question the power that surveillance capitalist companies possess. Therefore, I argue that self-quantification provides crucial tools to challenge surveillance capitalism. (498)

## References

- Foucault M (1988) Technologies of the Self. In: LH Martin, H Gutman and PH Hutton (eds) *Technologies of the Self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, pp: 16-50.
- Heyes J (2006) Foucault Goes to Weight Watchers. *Hypatia* 21(2): 126-149. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2006.tb01097.x>.
- Lupton D (2014) Self-tracking Cultures: Towards a Sociology of Personal Informatics. In L Loke, G Wadley, T Leong, K O'Hara and T Robertson (eds) *26th Australian Computer-Human Interaction Conference, Sydney, Australia*, February 12, 2014, pp. 77-86. New York: Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2686612.2686623>
- Moore P and Robinson A (2016) The quantified self: What counts in the neoliberal workplace. *New Media & Society* 18(11): pp. 2774–2792. [doi: 10.1177/1461444815604328](https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444815604328).
- Nafus D and Sherman J (2014) This One Does Not Go Up To 11: The Quantified Self Movement as an Alternative Big Data Practice. *International Journal of Communication* 8: 1784-1794.
- Oxlund B (2012) Living by numbers: The dynamic interplay of asymptomatic conditions and low cost measurement technologies in the cases of two women in the Danish provinces. *Suomen Antropologi* 37(3): pp. 42-56.
- Pantzar M and Ruckenstein M (2017) Living the metrics: Self-tracking and situated objectivity *Digital Health* 3: 1-10. doi: [10.1177/2055207617712590](https://doi.org/10.1177/2055207617712590).

- Ruckenstein M and Schüll ND (2017) The Datafication of Health. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 46(1): 261-278. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-102116-041244>
- Sanders R (2017) Self-tracking in the Digital Era: Biopower, Patriarchy, and the New Biometric Body Projects. *Body & Society* 23(1):36–63. [doi: 10.1177/1357034X16660366](https://doi.org/10.1177/1357034X16660366).
- Sharon T and Zandbergen D (2017) From data fetishism to quantifying selves: Self-tracking practices and the other values of data. *New Media & Society* 19(11): 1695–1709. [doi: 10.1177/1461444816636090](https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816636090).
- Swan M (2013) The Quantified Self: Fundamental Disruption in Big Data Science and Biological Discovery. *Big Data* 1(2): 85-99. <http://doi.org/10.1089/big.2012.0002>.
- Till C (2014) Exercise as Labour: Quantified Self and the Transformation of Exercise into Labour. *Societies* 4(3): 446-462. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc4030446>
- Weiskopf R (2020). Algorithmic Decision-Making, Spectrogenic Profiling, and Hyper-Facticity in the Age of Post-Truth. *Le Foucauldien*, 6(1), 1-37. <http://doi.org/10.16995/lefou.62>.
- Whitson J (2015) Foucault's Fitbit: Governance and Gamification. In: SP Walz and S Deterding *Gameful Worlds: Approaches, Issues, Applications*, Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 339–58.
- Zheng EL (2021) Interpreting fitness: self-tracking with fitness apps through a postphenomenology lens. *AI & Society*: 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-021-01146-8>
- Zuboff S (2019) *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. New York: Public Affairs.

First of all, the epistemic resources that self-tracking provides is crucial for tackling surveillance capitalism.

- What epistemic resources? Situated objectivity. Relatively stable and reliable information about various factors that influence one's feelings and behavior. self-tracking shows how changing internal and external factors influence one's behavior.