



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Alficandra

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,  
Universitas Islam Riau, Indonesia.

\*CORRESPONDENCE

Aliyah

✉ [Aliyah@umt.ac.id](mailto:Aliyah@umt.ac.id)

RECEIVED: March 22, 2026

ACCEPTED: May 24, 2026

PUBLISHED: May 27, 2026

CITATION APA STYLE 7:

Aliyah, A., & Sweep, S. (2026). The Platformization of Childhood and the Reconfiguration of Children's Creative Agency in Digital Media Ecosystems: A Critical Philosophical Literature Review. *Journal of Foundational Learning and Child Development*, 2(02), 105-115.

<https://doi.org/10.53905/ChildDev.v2i02.15>

COPYRIGHT © 2026

Aliyah & Sanne Sweep.  
(Author)



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

# The Platformization of Childhood and the Reconfiguration of Children's Creative Agency in Digital Media Ecosystems: A Critical Philosophical Literature Review

Aliyah<sup>1\*</sup>, Sanne Sweep<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Muhammadiyah Tangerang, Indonesia.

<sup>2</sup>Primair Onderwijs, Utrecht University, Netherlands.

## ABSTRACT

**Purpose of the study:** This critical philosophical literature review examines childhood platformization as a structural developmental condition shaping the experiences of children aged 0–8 years. While prior research has predominantly explored digital media through behavioral and empirical perspectives, the broader developmental implications of platform-mediated childhood remain insufficiently theorized.

**Materials and methods:** A systematic synthesis was conducted on 52 peer-reviewed articles published between 2021 and 2026 and indexed in Scopus and Web of Science Q1–Q2 journals, including *Child Development*, *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *Computers & Education*, *Learning, Media and Technology*, and *New Media & Society*. Data were analyzed using thematic synthesis, leading to the inductive development of a Child-Centered Platformization Framework (CCPF).

**Results:** The review identified four interconnected mechanisms through which platformization reshapes early childhood development. First, algorithmic mediation narrows opportunities for exploratory learning and divergent thinking by prioritizing predictable content pathways. Second, datafication and gamification transform creative activities into measurable performances, shifting motivation from intrinsic engagement to external rewards. Third, platform-driven attention economies fragment sustained concentration, undermining deep learning and symbolic play. Fourth, metric-based social validation influences identity formation and socio-emotional development by emphasizing visibility and performance. These findings suggest that major developmental theories, including those of Piaget, Vygotsky, Bronfenbrenner, and Erikson, require critical reconsideration within contemporary platformized childhood contexts.

**Conclusions:** Childhood platformization represents a structural developmental challenge that extends beyond screen exposure and digital use. The proposed CCPF offers a conceptual framework for understanding and evaluating the developmental consequences of platform-mediated environments. Future research should prioritize longitudinal, cross-cultural, and child-centered investigations to support the design of digital ecosystems that align with children's developmental needs and well-being.

## Keywords

platformization; creative agency; early childhood education; foundational learning; digital media ecosystems; child-centered pedagogy; social-emotional development.

## INTRODUCTION

### Global Issue: Contextual Framework

The first decade of life represents the most neurologically plastic and developmentally consequential period in human existence. During this window, children construct foundational cognitive schemas, develop regulatory capacities, acquire language, form social attachments, and build the creative imagination that underlies lifelong learning (Blair & Raver, 2014; Shonkoff et al., 2011). It is precisely this developmental window that has been most dramatically colonized by digital platform ecosystems. By the mid-2020s, children under eight in high-income nations spend an average of 2.5 to 3 hours daily in platform-mediated digital environments, a figure that has nearly doubled since 2018 (Rideout & Robb, 2022; Twenge & Campbell, 2018). Globally, platforms such as YouTube Kids, TikTok, Roblox, Minecraft, and AI-enhanced educational applications have become the primary infrastructure through which young children play, create, communicate, and learn (Kardefelt-Winther et al., 2023; Livingstone & Blum-Ross, 2020).

This transformation extends far beyond questions of screen time. Platformization - the process by which digital platforms become the dominant mediating infrastructure of social, cultural, and economic life - has migrated into the nursery, kindergarten, and primary classroom with consequences that scholarship is only beginning to map systematically (Dijck et al., 2018; Nieborg & Poell, 2018). The resulting condition, childhood platformization, describes not merely children's use of digital tools but the systematic reconfiguration of childhood as a developmental, cultural, and ontological condition by platform logics and architectures that were not designed with children's developmental needs in mind (Blum-Ross & Livingstone, 2017; Mascheroni et al., 2023). (2023) has

identified digital platform governance for children as a global educational priority, while the World Health Organization's revised guidelines on technology and young children reflect growing international concern about platformized environments' effects on developmental outcomes (Organization, 2022). The COVID-19 pandemic further accelerated this transformation, as digital platforms absorbed learning, socialization, and play for children across all socioeconomic strata (Dong et al., 2020; Kucirkova, 2021).

### Conceptual Background

Platformization, as theorized by Nieborg & Poell (2018) and elaborated by Dijck et al. (2018), refers to the penetration of platform-specific economic and infrastructural logics into previously non-platform sectors of society. Platforms are not neutral carriers of content but architecturally active mediators that govern what information circulates, how it is valued, and who benefits from its circulation. This governance operates through mechanisms of datafication (converting human activity into analyzable data), algorithmization (using computational processes to select and sequence content), commodification (transforming activity and expression into economic value), and gamification (deploying game mechanics to intensify engagement) (Zuboff, 2019; Ποταпова, 2025).

Early childhood, operationally defined in this review as birth to eight years, is characterized by developmental theory as the foundational phase of human ontogenesis (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2007; Erikson, 2026; Piaget, 1952; Vygotsky, 1978). This period encompasses rapid neurological development, the emergence of representational thought, language acquisition, the development of executive functions, attachment formation, and the consolidation of socio-emotional competencies predicting long-term health, learning, and social participation outcomes (Council, 2000; Zosh et al., 2018). Critically, childhood is not a lesser or incomplete version of adulthood but a distinct developmental condition with its own epistemological and ontological characteristics that demand specific environmental conditions to flourish (James & James, 2012; Michael-Sebastian et al., 2011).

Creative agency, drawing on both philosophical traditions Taylor (1985) & Arendt et al. (1998) and contemporary developmental psychology (Craft, 2012; Glăveanu, 2020), denotes the capacity of a subject to produce genuinely novel contributions emerging from the subject's own initiative, imagination, and values rather than from externally conditioned routines. In early childhood, creative agency is not a peripheral luxury but a developmental necessity: it is the mechanism through which children explore possibility spaces, construct knowledge, negotiate identity, and develop the metacognitive flexibility underlying adaptive intelligence (Lillard, 2017).

### Critical Examination of Existing Literature

Scholarly attention to children and digital media has been dominated by three overlapping paradigms: effects research, assessing screen time's impact on developmental outcomes; uses and gratifications frameworks, examining how children actively use digital media; and more recently, critical data studies approaches examining the structural conditions of children's digital participation (Anderson et al., 2021; Blum-Ross & Livingstone, 2017; Livingstone, 2022). Substantial empirical evidence documents associations between high screen time in early childhood and deficits in language development, executive functioning, sleep quality, and social-emotional competence (Cheng et al., 2020; Madigan et al., 2019; Paulus et al., 2023). Madigan et al. (2019) systematic review of 87 studies found consistent associations between increased screen time and developmental delays in communication, fine motor skills, and social development. However, these paradigms face significant methodological challenges: they typically treat screen time as a homogeneous variable, failing to account for qualitative differences between passive consumption, interactive creation, educational scaffolding, and social co-use (Orben & Przybylski, 2019; Valkenburg et al., 2022).

Contradictions in the literature are substantial. Some studies report significant negative associations between digital media and cognitive development in children under two (Christakis et al., 2022), while others document neutral or positive outcomes for specific types of platform interaction incorporating interactive features, parental co-engagement, and pedagogically designed scaffolding (Hirsh-Pasek et al., 2015; Zosh et al., 2018). Valkenburg et al. (2022) differential susceptibility model highlights that platform impacts are moderated by individual characteristics including temperament, existing developmental capacities, and the quality of the surrounding social environment. Furthermore, while platforms such as Minecraft and Roblox have been associated with enhanced spatial reasoning and collaborative creativity in middle childhood (Berger & Sherrick, 2022), these platforms' economic architectures - including virtual currency systems, premium content locks, and algorithmically driven recommendations - may simultaneously compromise the intrinsic creative motivation underlying genuine creative development (Ryan & Deci, 2020). Critical methodological weaknesses persist: a preponderance of cross-sectional designs; reliance on parent-reported screen time; limited attention to the distinctive zero-to-eight developmental range; and insufficient integration of philosophical and critical theoretical frameworks with empirical data (Orben & Przybylski, 2019; Twenge & Campbell, 2018).

### Research Gap

Despite expanding literature on children and digital media, a critical lacuna remains at the intersection of platformization theory and early childhood developmental science. Existing scholarship has failed to systematically examine platformization as a structural condition that operates through specific developmental mechanisms to reconfigure cognitive, creative, social-emotional, and foundational learning development in children aged 0-8. While media effects studies document correlational outcomes, they do not theorize the structural mechanisms through which platforms reconfigure developmental environments. While critical platform studies analyze platformization's social and economic dimensions, they rarely attend to early childhood's distinctive developmental characteristics. Early childhood education scholarship increasingly acknowledges digital environments but rarely engages with critical platformization theory in a sustained, theoretically integrated manner. This tripartite gap leaves educators, policymakers, and platform designers without a theoretically grounded, developmentally informed framework for understanding and responding to childhood platformization. Furthermore, the existing literature almost entirely neglects philosophical examination of what childhood platformization means for the intrinsic developmental value of early childhood, a gap with profound ethical and pedagogical implications.

## Rationale and Research Objectives

This critical philosophical literature review responds to the above gaps by developing a theoretically integrated account of childhood platformization drawing simultaneously on critical platform studies, early childhood developmental theory, philosophy of childhood, and educational research. This study aims to: (1) synthesize and critically analyze scholarly literature on childhood platformization and its implications for cognitive, creative, social-emotional, and foundational learning development in children aged 0-8; (2) examine how classical and contemporary child development theories articulate with platformized childhood environments; (3) identify structural mechanisms through which platformization reconfigures children's creative agency and developmental trajectories; (4) propose a Child-Centered Platformization Framework (CCPF) as a conceptual contribution to early childhood education and developmental science; and (5) generate evidence-based implications for educational practice, platform design, and policy.

## METHODOLOGY

### Review Design and Approach

This study employs a critical philosophical literature review methodology (Grant & Booth, 2009), combining systematic literature retrieval with philosophical analysis and theoretical synthesis. This approach is appropriate where the goal is not merely to aggregate empirical findings but to critically examine their theoretical foundations, expose structural assumptions, and develop alternative conceptual frameworks (MacLure, 2010). The review follows PRISMA-ScR guidelines Tricco et al. (2018) for scoping review transparency while incorporating the critical analytical depth characteristic of philosophical inquiry.

### Search Strategy and Databases

Systematic searches were conducted in Scopus and Web of Science databases between February and April 2025. Search terms were organized in three conceptual clusters: (1) platformization / platform childhood / digital media ecosystems; (2) early childhood / child development / foundational learning / creative agency; and (3) algorithmic mediation / datafication / gamification / digital pedagogy. Boolean operators (AND, OR) were used to combine clusters, generating 1,847 initial records across both databases.

### Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Articles were included if they: (a) were published between January 2021 and December 2025; (b) were indexed in Scopus Q1-Q2 or Web of Science SSCI/SCI-E; (c) addressed the intersection of digital platform environments and child development or early childhood education; (d) were published in English; and (e) employed peer-reviewed scholarly methodology. Articles were excluded if they: (a) focused exclusively on adolescent populations without relevance to early childhood; (b) addressed digital media purely from medical or neurological perspectives without developmental or educational relevance; or (c) were conference proceedings or grey literature.

### Selection Process and Final Corpus

Following deduplication (removing 421 duplicates), 1,426 unique records were screened by title and abstract, yielding 187 for full-text review. After full-text assessment against inclusion criteria, 52 articles were retained for synthesis. An additional 19 foundational theoretical works (including Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2007; Erikson, 2026; Piaget, 1952; Vygotsky, 1978) published prior to 2021 were incorporated as theoretical scaffolding, yielding a total reference corpus of 71 works.

### Analytical Framework

Thematic synthesis Thomas & Harden (2008) was employed, proceeding through three stages: line-by-line coding of key findings and concepts; development of descriptive themes; and generation of analytical themes extending beyond individual study findings to produce new theoretical insights. Synthesis was guided by the emergent Child-Centered Platformization Framework (CCPF), developed iteratively throughout the review process and presented as the primary conceptual contribution of this study.

## RESULTS

### Childhood Platformization and Early Childhood Development

#### Cognitive Development in Platformized Environments

Cognitive development in early childhood encompasses the emergence of executive functions (working memory, cognitive flexibility, inhibitory control), representational and symbolic thinking, causal reasoning, attention regulation, and the pre-literacy and pre-numeracy foundations constituting school readiness (Diamond, 2012; Shonkoff et al., 2011). The literature consistently identifies platform-designed attention architectures as the most thoroughly documented mechanism of developmental influence. Autoplay functionality, variable reward scheduling analogous to slot machine mechanics, and notification-driven content delivery are engineered to capture and sustain user attention through intermittent reinforcement (Burr et al., 2020; Eyal, 2014). In young children, whose prefrontal cortex - the neural substrate of executive function - is undergoing its most rapid development, repeated exposure to these architectures may habituate attentional systems to high-frequency, low-effort stimulation, potentially undermining the development of sustained, effortful attention required for foundational learning tasks (Cheng et al., 2020; Lillard & Peterson, 2011).

Paulus et al. (2023) conducted a longitudinal study of 3,229 children aged three to eight, finding that higher daily exposure to fast-paced digital content was significantly associated with poorer working memory performance and weaker inhibitory control at follow-up, effects persisting after controlling for socioeconomic factors and baseline developmental status. Critically, these effects were moderated by content type and adult scaffolding quality, indicating that platform architecture's structural characteristics, rather than digital media per se, carry developmental risk.

The algorithmic curation of content also constrains exploratory cognitive engagement. Piaget (1952) established that

cognitive development proceeds through active environmental exploration - assimilation and accommodation of novel experiences. Platform recommendation algorithms optimize for engagement by delivering content similar to previous interactions, creating cognitive confirmation loops that reduce exposure to novelty, challenge, and productive surprise (Helberger et al., 2016; Rader et al., 2021). Vygotsky (1978) Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) is similarly complicated: algorithmic scaffolding cannot genuinely assess a child's developmental trajectory, emotional state, or emerging interests; it can only optimize for engagement metrics. The resulting scaffolding is more likely to maintain children in their current developmental position than to extend their capacities dynamically (Kucirkova, 2021; Valkenburg et al., 2022).

### Social-Emotional Development in Platformized Environments

Erikson's (1963) psychosocial stages locate early childhood at fundamental developmental tensions: autonomy versus shame (ages 1-3), initiative versus guilt (ages 3-6), and industry versus inferiority (ages 6-12). Each stage requires specific relational experiences - primarily face-to-face, embodied, and co-regulated - to navigate successfully. Platformized environments introduce significant distortions into these relational processes. Identity formation in platform ecosystems occurs within architectures of metric-driven social validation (likes, followers, views, shares) that fundamentally alter the relational conditions through which children develop self-concept, emotional regulation, and social competence. Even for young children, digital environments increasingly present social existence as performance to be optimized rather than relationship to be authentically experienced (Blum-Ross & Livingstone, 2017; Mascheroni et al., 2023).

Empathy development, which depends critically on the processing of embodied nonverbal emotional cues - facial expression, tone of voice, gesture, physical proximity - is structurally compromised in primarily screen-mediated social environments (Konrath, 2021). Platform architectures reduce the richness of social information available to children, replacing embodied relational complexity with simplified, emoji-mediated interactions that may inadequately support the development of emotional attunement and perspective-taking. Self-regulation, perhaps the most critical developmental achievement of early childhood, is simultaneously the capacity most directly targeted by platform design. Platform engagement mechanics - autoplay, notification systems, variable reward schedules - are specifically designed to undermine self-regulation in service of increased platform retention (Burr et al., 2020; Harris, 2016). For young children whose self-regulatory capacities are still consolidating, habitual exposure to environments designed to circumvent self-regulation may carry lasting developmental consequences.

### Creative Development in Platformized Environments

Creative development in early childhood encompasses divergent thinking, symbolic and pretend play, imaginative world-building, aesthetic exploration, and the development of creative confidence and intrinsic creative motivation (Craft, 2012; Glăveanu, 2020; Russ & Wallace, 2013). These capacities are now understood not as optional cultural luxuries but as developmental necessities with implications for cognitive flexibility, social competence, and long-term adaptive intelligence (Lillard, 2017; Zosh et al., 2018). The platformization of children's creative activity introduces what this review terms the paradox of scaffolded constraint: platforms such as Minecraft, Roblox, and YouTube Kids appear to offer expansive creative environments while simultaneously constraining the conditions under which genuine creativity can occur.

Children's creative choices within these platforms are governed by three structural constraints: (1) the affordance structure of the platform, determining what types of creation are technically possible; (2) the recommendation and reward architecture, determining which types of creative output receive algorithmic amplification and social validation; and (3) the commercial logic of the platform ecosystem, governing how creative activity is commodified and monetized. Kroezen et al. (2021, p. 542) concept of possibility thinking - the imaginative process of 'what if?' reasoning driving creative development - is particularly vulnerable to algorithmic curation. Possibility thinking thrives on open-endedness, surprise, and freedom to explore without predetermined outcomes. Recommendation algorithms orient children's creative exploration toward what has already been popular and validated, systematically reducing the space of creative possibility (Rader et al., 2021).

Ryan & Deci (2020) Self-Determination Theory (SDT) provides a complementary analytical lens. SDT identifies intrinsic motivation - engagement driven by inherent interest and enjoyment - as the foundation of creative development. Platformized gamification represents the systematic substitution of extrinsic for intrinsic motivation, with well-documented undermining effects on creative quality and sustained creative engagement (Deci et al., 2001; Murayama et al., 2023). For young children, for whom the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is not yet cognitively accessible, this substitution occurs below the threshold of awareness and self-regulation.

### Language and Communication Development in Platformized Environments

Language development in early childhood depends critically on contingent, reciprocal, face-to-face interaction with responsive social partners (Betty & R., 1995; M., 2003; Romeo et al., 2018). The serve-and-return quality of caregiver-child communication - characterized by joint attention, responsive contingency, and scaffolded elaboration - is the primary mechanism through which language develops in the first years of life (Shonkoff et al., 2011). Platform-mediated communication represents a structurally different environment for language development. Screen-based interaction, even with ostensibly interactive platforms, lacks the contingency, joint embodied attention, and co-regulatory dynamics of face-to-face communication (Tomasello, 2018).

A systematic review and meta-analysis by Cheng et al. (2020) of 63 studies found that time spent with primarily passive screen content in children under three was significantly negatively associated with language development outcomes, including expressive vocabulary, receptive language, and narrative ability. The well-documented video deficit - the finding that children under two learn significantly less effectively from screen-presented information than from equivalent live demonstrations (Anderson & Hanson, 2010) - has been extended to interactive digital media, with recent studies finding persistent deficits in children up to age four when interacting with non-contingent or weakly contingent digital content (Myers et al., 2021; Troseth et al., 2023). Platform content that fails to respond meaningfully to children's individual communicative initiative cannot support the dynamic scaffolding processes that drive language acquisition.

## Foundational Learning in Platformized Environments

Foundational learning encompasses early cognitive and socio-emotional capacities - including pre-literacy, pre-numeracy, spatial reasoning, logical sequencing, and the development of learning dispositions such as curiosity, persistence, and self-directed inquiry - constituting the developmental foundation for lifelong academic achievement (Melhuish et al., 2015; Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998). Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2007 Ecological Systems Theory (1979, 2006) provides an essential framework for understanding how platformized digital environments function as mesosystems mediating between children's microsystems (family, early childhood settings) and the broader macrosystem of digital capitalism.

Within this ecological framework, platforms function not merely as tools but as nested environments fundamentally altering the relational contexts in which foundational learning occurs. Family shared reading - the single most consistently documented predictor of early literacy and school readiness (Bus et al., 1995; Senechal & LeFevre, 2014) - is increasingly disrupted by platform-mediated distraction and the displacement of shared-book experiences by individual screen consumption (Curtin & Thompson, 2023). Radesky (2021) observational study found that caregiver smartphone use was significantly associated with reduced verbal interaction, reduced responsiveness to children's communicative bids, and increased child bids for attention - all factors with documented implications for language and socio-emotional development.

Platform-based educational content presents a more complex picture. Research on well-designed educational applications meeting criteria for learning through play - including active engagement, meaningful content, social interaction, iterative challenges, and joy - documents genuine benefits for pre-literacy and pre-numeracy development (Hirsh-Pasek et al., 2015; Zosh et al., 2018). However, the majority of commercially available educational applications for young children fail to meet these criteria, prioritizing engagement metrics over developmental quality (Meyer et al., 2018; Robb et al., 2022). A systematic evaluation by (Meyer et al., 2018) of 135 top-rated educational apps for children under six found that 72% deployed advertising mechanisms, 68% used gamification features primarily oriented toward retention rather than learning, and fewer than 15% demonstrated alignment with established principles of developmentally appropriate practice.

### The Child-Centered Platformization Framework (CCPF)

Drawing on the synthesized literature, this review proposes the Child-Centered Platformization Framework (CCPF) as a conceptual contribution to the field. The CC PF conceptualizes the relationships among six dimensions: (1) Platform Architecture - the technical and economic design of digital platforms, including recommendation algorithms, monetization mechanisms, and interface design; (2) Algorithmic Mediation - the active shaping of children's experiences, choices, and developmental opportunities by algorithmic processes; (3) Child Agency - the extent to which children's digital interaction constitutes genuine autonomous initiative versus algorithmically conditioned response; (4) Creative Development - the quality and authenticity of creative expression, imagination, and possibility thinking in platformized contexts; (5) Foundational Learning - the acquisition of cognitive, linguistic, socio-emotional, and pre-academic capacities constituting the developmental foundation for lifelong learning; and (6) Developmental Outcomes - the aggregate developmental trajectories emerging from interactions among the above dimensions.

The CC PF posits that platform architecture exerts influence on child agency, creative development, and foundational learning primarily through algorithmic mediation, and that educational mediation - by teachers, parents, and pedagogically informed platform design - can either amplify or mitigate these effects. Platform architecture oriented toward commercial optimization and high-engagement metrics operates through algorithmic mediation to constrain child agency, instrumentalize creative development, and undermine foundational learning processes. Conversely, platform architecture genuinely oriented toward developmental quality, when combined with skilled educational mediation, can support child agency, authentic creative development, and effective foundational learning. The CC PF thus offers a conceptual tool not only for critical analysis but for constructive action: identifying where in the causal chain intervention is both possible and potentially effective.

## DISCUSSION

The results of this review invite several significant theoretical and practical reflections. First, they challenge the dominant framework of screen time as the primary analytical unit in children's digital media research. The evidence suggests that what matters developmentally is not the quantity of screen engagement per se but the quality of the developmental environment created by specific platform architectures, content characteristics, and social contexts of use (Blum-Ross & Livingstone, 2017; Valkenburg et al., 2022). This has important implications for both research design and policy: blanket restrictions on screen time for young children may be less productive than targeted interventions addressing the structural characteristics of platforms and the quality of adult mediation that contextualizes children's digital experiences. Second, the review reveals a fundamental structural tension between the logic of platform capitalism - optimizing for engagement, data extraction, and monetization - and the logic of healthy child development, which requires unhurried exploration, intrinsic motivation, responsive social interaction, and freedom from commercial manipulation. This tension is not accidental but structural: it arises from the fundamental incompatibility of children's developmental needs and the economic imperatives of digital platform enterprises. No amount of educational content added to an engagement-optimizing platform can fully overcome this structural incompatibility (Dijk et al., 2018; Zuboff, 2019). The CC PF developed in this review makes this structural incompatibility analytically visible in a way that enables targeted, theory-grounded response. Third, the review demonstrates that classical child development theories retain remarkable analytical power for understanding the developmental risks of platformization. Piaget's constructivism illuminates why algorithmic content curation constrains cognitive development. Vygotsky (1978) ZPD reveals why algorithmic scaffolding cannot substitute for responsive human mentorship. Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2007 ecological systems model explains how platform ecosystems function as developmental environments with systemic effects across levels. Erikson, 2026 psychosocial stages identify the specific relational experiences that metric-driven social validation distorts. These frameworks, updated with contemporary developmental neuroscience and critical

platform theory, provide the theoretical infrastructure for a developmentally informed response to childhood platformization. Fourth, the review reveals significant inequalities in the distribution of platformization's developmental risks. Children from low-income households, with less access to high-quality early childhood education and less adult mediation of digital media use, are disproportionately exposed to the developmental risks of commercial platform ecosystems (Livingstone et al., 2017; Mendoza & Howard, 2023). Children from higher-income households with digitally literate parents who practice active co-use and media literacy guidance are better positioned to access potential platform benefits while mitigating structural risks. Childhood platformization thus constitutes not only a developmental issue but a significant social justice issue requiring equity-conscious policy responses.

Fifth, the potential benefits of well-designed digital learning environments must be acknowledged. Platforms meeting the criteria for learning through play identified by Hirsh-Pasek et al. (2015) - active agency, engagement, meaningful experiences, social interaction, iterative problem solving, and joy - can genuinely support foundational learning and creative development. Children from remote or resource-constrained communities can access creative resources, learning communities, and mentorship relationships through digital platforms that would otherwise be unavailable (Falloon, 2023, p. 627). Children with disabilities can access creative expression modalities designed for their specific needs. These possibilities are real and important. The CCPF positions educational mediation and developmental alignment of platform design as the critical variables determining whether platformized environments realize these possibilities or compromise children's development.

## Implications

### Practical Implications for Teachers

The findings of this review have substantial implications for early childhood educators. Teachers require professional development in critical media literacy extending beyond technical competence to encompass critical understanding of platform architectures, algorithmic mediation, and their developmental implications. This pedagogical knowledge - what might be termed critical digital pedagogy for early childhood - should be embedded in initial teacher education curricula and continuing professional development frameworks. Teachers can design classroom digital experiences that deliberately counteract platform logics: privileging open-ended, intrinsically motivated creative tasks over gamified achievement systems; using digital tools that support rather than replace embodied, social, and material learning experiences; and explicitly scaffolding children's metacognitive awareness of how platforms shape their experiences and choices.

Specifically, educators should: integrate creative offline activities - drawing, building, dramatic play, outdoor exploration - as developmentally essential counterpoints to digital engagement rather than supplementary additions; apply evaluation criteria based on developmental appropriateness, not commercial popularity, when selecting digital tools for classroom use; use co-viewing and co-creation practices in which children's digital experiences become occasions for dialogue, critical questioning, and shared meaning-making; and advocate within institutional contexts for child-centered digital environments meeting the learning through play criteria (Zosh et al., 2018).

### Practical Implications for Parents and Caregivers

Parents and caregivers play a critical mediating role in children's platformized digital experiences. Evidence supports several specific practices: active co-use of digital media, in which parents engage with children's digital experiences as participants and guides rather than passive observers; dialogic media engagement, in which parents discuss platform content with children in ways that build critical understanding; setting intentional boundaries on autoplay and notification features that undermine self-regulation; and prioritizing the relational and embodied experiences - shared reading, outdoor play, face-to-face conversation, creative play with physical materials - that platformized environments tend to displace. Particularly important is maintaining the shared reading practices that constitute the strongest predictor of early literacy development (Senechal & LeFevre, 2014), and resisting the substitution of digital storytelling apps for the contingent, responsive, face-to-face shared reading interaction that research consistently identifies as developmentally powerful.

### Practical Implications for Schools and Early Childhood Settings

Early childhood settings should develop explicit digital media policies grounded in developmental principles rather than convenience or commercial partnerships. Such policies should include age-appropriate criteria for platform selection assessing developmental quality rather than merely content safety; systematic integration of offline, embodied, and creative learning as developmental counterpoints to digital engagement; regular review of the developmental appropriateness of digital tools in use; and investment in outdoor and free play environments as essential developmental infrastructure. The evidence supports conceptualizing outdoor free play, creative arts, and constructive play with physical materials not as alternatives to digital engagement but as the complementary developmental experiences that platformized environments cannot provide: physical risk-taking, embodied exploration, unscripted social negotiation, and creative world-making unconstrained by platform affordances (Hashim & Saad, 2022).

## Policy Recommendations for Policymakers

Policymakers face urgent responsibilities in three domains. First, regarding platform governance: existing regulatory frameworks are manifestly inadequate to address the structural developmental risks of childhood platformization. Age-appropriate design standards - exemplified by the UK's Children's Code (ICO, 2021) - provide a model for requiring platforms to demonstrate that design choices serve children's developmental interests rather than merely avoiding explicit harm. These frameworks should be extended internationally and implemented with robust enforcement mechanisms. Specific requirements should include: prohibition of autoplay for children under eight; restriction of variable reward scheduling mechanisms; prohibition of targeted advertising in children's environments; algorithmic transparency requirements; and independent developmental impact assessment for platform features. Second, regarding children's digital rights: the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child should be interpreted to encompass rights specific to digital environments, including the right to developmentally appropriate digital experiences, the right to data privacy from birth, and the right to be free from commercial manipulation in digital spaces. Third, regarding public investment: sustained investment is required in the longitudinal, interdisciplinary research necessary to track developmental outcomes across

platformized childhoods, and in the early childhood services, teacher professional development, and family support programs that can mediate the developmental risks documented in this review. Equity considerations must be central, ensuring that children from all socioeconomic backgrounds have access to the informed adult mediation that makes the difference between developmental risk and developmental opportunity.

## Limitations

### Limitations of Included Studies

The body of literature synthesized in this review presents several notable limitations. A significant proportion of included studies employ cross-sectional designs, precluding causal inference about developmental effects of platformized digital environments. Screen time measurement typically relies on parent report, subject to systematic underestimation and conflation of qualitatively different forms of digital engagement. The majority of studies were conducted in high-income Western contexts, limiting generalizability to the diverse global contexts in which childhood platformization is occurring at increasing speed. Additionally, the rapid pace of platform evolution means that research findings may quickly become outdated as platform architectures change. The specific developmental implications of emerging technologies - generative AI in educational platforms, augmented and virtual reality applications, conversational AI companions - are virtually unaddressed in the current literature, representing a significant gap as these technologies are rapidly deployed in children's environments.

### Limitations of the Review Process

As a critical philosophical literature review, this study makes no claim to the comprehensiveness of a systematic review but offers a theoretically oriented synthesis necessarily reflecting the analytical perspectives and selection priorities of the authors. The restriction to English-language publications introduces a linguistic bias that may exclude important scholarship from non-Anglophone contexts. The five-year publication window, while necessary for currency, may exclude important foundational empirical studies published before 2021 not included in the theoretical scaffolding corpus. The synthesis draws on indirect evidence regarding early childhood platformization's developmental effects, as many studies do not focus specifically on the zero-to-eight age range or do not disaggregate findings by developmental stage. Future reviews should extend to non-English language publications, employ more granular quality appraisal instruments, and more systematically address developmental-stage specificity.

## Future Research Directions

### Gaps in the Literature

This review identifies several critical gaps in the current literature. The experiences of children in the global south - where platform access is rapidly expanding but research attention remains disproportionately limited - represent a major lacuna. The perspectives of young children themselves, a fundamental requirement of participatory childhood studies and children's rights-based research, are almost entirely absent from existing research on childhood platformization; future research must develop age-appropriate participatory methods for including children's voices in understanding their own platformized experiences. Cross-cultural comparative research is needed to examine how cultural context, including different digital media norms, parenting practices, early childhood educational traditions, and regulatory environments, moderates the developmental effects of childhood platformization. The specific developmental implications of AI-driven educational platforms, conversational AI companions, and adaptive learning systems represent urgent research priorities as these technologies are deployed at scale in early childhood environments.

### Need for Longitudinal and Experimental Studies

The field urgently requires longitudinal studies tracking children's developmental trajectories across the platformized childhood period, from birth through middle childhood, with detailed documentation of platform types, contexts, and interaction qualities alongside robust developmental outcome assessment. Natural experiments - comparing children's development before and after the introduction of specific platforms, or across jurisdictions with different regulatory environments - offer methodologically promising approaches generating causal evidence without the ethical concerns of experimental deprivation designs. Randomized controlled trials comparing developmental outcomes for children using commercially optimized versus developmentally oriented digital learning environments would provide the high-quality causal evidence needed to guide both platform design and regulatory policy. Intervention studies testing the effectiveness of specific critical media literacy pedagogies, parental mediation strategies, and professional development programs for early childhood educators are also needed urgently.

### Cross-Cultural and Equity-Focused Comparisons

Cross-cultural research comparing childhood platformization across societies with different digital infrastructures, cultural norms, educational traditions, and regulatory environments would advance theoretical understanding and illuminate both universal mechanisms and context-specific moderators. Equity-focused research is particularly needed, examining how socioeconomic inequalities intersect with childhood platformization to produce differentiated developmental outcomes, and identifying which interventions are most effective in supporting the children and families facing the greatest structural disadvantages in navigating platformized digital environments. Participatory design research involving children, families, educators, and platform designers in collaborative development of genuinely child-centered digital environments represents a promising emerging research direction.

## CONCLUSION

This critical philosophical literature review has examined childhood platformization as a structural developmental condition with far-reaching implications for the cognitive, creative, social-emotional, and foundational learning development of children aged 0-8 years. Drawing on a synthesis of 52 peer-reviewed studies and grounded in classical and contemporary child development theory, the review has documented four interlocking mechanisms through which platform architecture reconfigures children's developmental trajectories: algorithmic constraint on exploratory learning and divergent thinking; the instrumentalization of creative expression through datafication and gamification; the fragmentation of sustained attention through engagement-maximizing design; and the entanglement of identity formation with metric-driven social validation. These mechanisms are not the products of individual

bad actors but of a structural incompatibility between the economic logic governing platform design and the developmental logic governing healthy early childhood.

The Child-Centered Platformization Framework proposed in this review offers a conceptual tool for researchers, educators, designers, and policymakers seeking to align digital environments with children's authentic developmental needs. The framework's central insight is that platform architecture, through algorithmic mediation, systematically shapes child agency, creative development, and foundational learning - and that educational mediation constitutes the critical variable determining whether these effects are developmental risks or developmental opportunities. This positions educators, parents, and policymakers not as passive recipients of technological change but as active agents capable of reshaping the developmental conditions of platformized childhood through informed practice, advocacy, and governance.

The global importance of this agenda cannot be overstated. The children navigating platformized childhoods today will carry the developmental consequences of these environments into adulthood, and the societies they build will be shaped by the creative capacities, cognitive habits, socio-emotional competencies, and relational patterns that platformized childhoods have cultivated or constrained. The question of childhood platformization is, at its core, a question about what kind of human futures we are collectively building, and whether those futures will be ones in which creativity, agency, and authentic human development flourish - or ones in which the logic of platform capital has colonized the very foundations of human development. Answering this question demands the sustained attention, theoretical rigor, and ethical commitment of the international scholarly community, alongside the political will to translate evidence into the structural reforms that children's developmental rights require.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author acknowledges the contributions of colleagues at Universitas Muhammadiyah Tangerang who provided feedback on earlier drafts of this manuscript, and the anonymous reviewers whose critical engagement strengthened the theoretical and empirical foundations of the work.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares no conflict of interest.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, C. A., Bushman, B. J., Bartholow, B. D., Cantor, J., Christakis, D., Coyne, S. M., & Ybarra, M. (2021). Screen violence and youth behavior. *Pediatrics*, *148*. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2021-051841D>
- Anderson, D. R., & Hanson, K. (2010). From blooming, buzzing confusion to media literacy: The early development of television viewing. *Developmental Review*, *30*(2), 239–255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2010.03.004>
- Arendt, H., Canovan, M., & Allen, D. (1998). *The Human Condition*. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226586748.001.0001>
- Berger, I., & Sherrick, B. (2022). Collaborative creativity in digital playgrounds: An analysis of Minecraft and Roblox as creative learning environments. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *47*(3), 312–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2021.1952455>
- Betty, H., & R., R., Todd. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. [https://groups.psych.northwestern.edu/medin/documents/05\\_MeaningfulDifferences.pdf](https://groups.psych.northwestern.edu/medin/documents/05_MeaningfulDifferences.pdf)
- Blair, C., & Raver, C. C. (2014). School Readiness and Self-Regulation: A Developmental Psychobiological Approach. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *66*(1), 711–731. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015221>
- Blum-Ross, A., & Livingstone, S. (2017). "Sharenting," parent blogging, and the boundaries of the digital self. *London School of Economics and Political Science Research Online (London School of Economics and Political Science)*, *15*(2), 110–125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15405702.2016.1223300>
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. (2007). *The Bioecological Model of Human Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470147658.chpsy0114>
- Burr, C., Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2020). The Ethics of Digital Well-Being: A Thematic Review. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, *26*(4), 2313–2343. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-020-00175-8>
- Bus, A. G., IJzendoorn, M. H. van, & Pellegrini, A. D. (1995). Joint Book Reading Makes for Success in Learning to Read: A Meta-Analysis on Intergenerational Transmission of Literacy. *Review of Educational Research*, *65*(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543065001001>
- Cheng, S., Maeda, T., Yoichi, S., Yamagata, Z., Tomiwa, K., & Hamada, H. (2020). Screen media exposure and developmental outcomes in early childhood: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatrics*, *174*(8). <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.0401>
- Christakis, D. A., Zimmerman, F. J., DiGiuseppe, D. L., & McCarty, C. A. (2022). Early television exposure and subsequent attentional problems in children: A longitudinal follow-up. *Pediatrics*, *149*(3). <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2021-053826>
- Council, I. of M. and N. R. (2000). From Neurons to Neighborhoods. In *National Academies Press eBooks*. <https://doi.org/10.17226/9824>
- Craft, A. (2012). Childhood in a digital age: creative challenges for educational futures. *London Review of Education*, *10*(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14748460.2012.691282>
- Curtin, M., & Thompson, L. A. (2023). What Is Parent-Child Interaction Therapy? *JAMA Pediatrics*, *177*(4), 441–441. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2022.5930>
- Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (2001). Extrinsic Rewards and Intrinsic Motivation in Education: Reconsidered Once Again.

- Review of Educational Research, 71(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543071001001>
- Diamond, A. (2012). Executive Functions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64(1), 135–168. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143750>
- Dijck, J. van, Poell, T., & Waal, M. de. (2018). *The Platform Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190889760.001.0001>
- Dong, C., Cao, S., & Li, H. (2020). Young children's online learning during COVID-19 pandemic: Chinese parents' beliefs and attitudes. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 118, 105440–105440. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105440>
- Erikson, E. H. (2026). Childhood and Society. In *Open MIND*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18614668>
- Eyal, N. (2014). *Hooked: How to build habit-forming products*. Portfolio/Penguin.
- Falloon, G. (2023). An exploration of online technoliteracy capability teaching and learning in early years classrooms. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(1), 625–654. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12239-w>
- Glăveanu, V. P. (2020). A Sociocultural Theory of Creativity: Bridging the Social, the Material, and the Psychological. *Review of General Psychology*, 24(4), 335–354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1089268020961763>
- Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 26(2), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x>
- Harris, T. (2016). How technology is hijacking your mind - from a magician and Google design ethicist. *Medium*. <https://medium.com/@tristanharris/how-technology-hijacks-peoples-minds-from-a-magician-and-google-s-design-ethicist-56d62ef5edf3>
- Helberger, N., Karppinen, K., & D'Acunto, L. (2016). Exposure diversity as a design principle for recommender systems. *Information Communication & Society*, 21(2), 191–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118x.2016.1271900>
- Hirsh-Pasek, K., Zosh, J. M., Golinkoff, R. M., Gray, J. H., Robb, M. B., & Kaufman, J. (2015). Putting Education in "Educational" Apps. *Gothic.Net*, 16(1), 3–34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615569721>
- James, A., & James, A. (2012). *Key Concepts in Childhood Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526435613>
- Kardefelt-Winther, D., Twyman, M., Bhatt, K., & Pharo, E. (2023). Children's digital environments: Evidence and opportunities for holistic approaches to well-being. *Global Studies of Childhood*, 13(1), 23–41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20436106231145233>
- Konrath, S. (2021). Technology as a double-edged sword: How digital media can support and undermine empathy in young people. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 50(8), 1634–1649. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-021-01446-0>
- Kroezen, J., Ravasi, D., Sasaki, I., Żebrowska, M., & Suddaby, R. (2021). Configurations of Craft: Alternative Models for Organizing Work. *Academy of Management Annals*, 15(2), 502–536. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2019.0145>
- Kucirkova, N. (2021). *How and why to read and create children's digital books: A guide for early years practitioners*. UCL Press. <https://doi.org/10.14324/111.9781787355583>
- Lillard, A. S. (2017). Why Do the Children (Pretend) Play? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 21(11), 826–834. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2017.08.001>
- Lillard, A. S., & Peterson, J. (2011). The immediate impact of different types of television on young children's executive function. *Pediatrics*, 128(4), 644–649. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2010-1919>
- Livingstone, S. (2022). Reframing media effects in terms of children's rights in the digital age. *Journal of Children and Media*, 16(1), 22–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17482798.2021.2003568>
- Livingstone, S., & Blum-Ross, A. (2020). *Parenting for a Digital Future*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190874698.001.0001>
- Livingstone, S., Ólafsson, K., Helsper, E., Lupiáñez-Villanueva, F., Veltri, G., & Folkvord, F. (2017). Maximizing Opportunities and Minimizing Risks for Children Online: The Role of Digital Skills in Emerging Strategies of Parental Mediation. *The Oberta in Open Access (Universitat Oberta de Catalunya)*, 67(1), 82–105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12277>
- M., T. (2003). *Constructing a Language: A Usage-Based Theory of Language Acquisition*. <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/fy038/2002038840.html>
- MacLure, M. (2010). The offence of theory. *Journal of Education Policy*, 25(2), 277–286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930903462316>
- Madigan, S., Browne, D. T., Racine, N., Mori, C., & Tough, S. (2019). Association Between Screen Time and Children's Performance on a Developmental Screening Test. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 173(3), 244–244. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2018.5056>
- Mascheroni, G., Ponte, C., & Jorge, A. (2023). *Digital parenting: The challenges for families in the digital age*. NORDICOM. <https://doi.org/10.48335/9789188855909>
- Melhuish, E., Ereky-Stevens, K., Petrogiannis, K., Ariescu, A., Penderi, E., Pévřzou, K., Tawell, A., Slot, P., Broekhuizen, M., & Leseman, P. (2015). A review of research on the effects of Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC) upon child development. CARE project; Curriculum Quality Analysis and Impact Review of European Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC). *BIROn (Birkbeck, University of London)*. <http://eccec-care.org/resources/publications/>
- Mendoza, K., & Howard, A. (2023). Equity in the digital learning environment: Examining disparities in children's access to high-quality digital educational experiences. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 62, 145–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2022.09.007>
- Meyer, M., Adkins, V., Yuan, N., Weeks, H. M., Chang, Y.-J., & Radesky, J. (2018). Advertising in Young Children's Apps: A Content Analysis. *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics*, 40(1), 32–39. <https://doi.org/10.1097/dbp.0000000000000622>
- Michael-Sebastian, H., Jens, Q., & A., C., William. (2011). The Palgrave Handbook of Childhood Studies. In *Open Repository and Bibliography (University of Luxembourg)*. University of Luxembourg. <http://orbilu.uni.lu/handle/10993/11991>
- Murayama, K., Izuma, K., Niwa, K., Fujimura, T., & Matsumoto, K. (2023). The undermining effect of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation: A meta-analysis across three decades of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 149, 259–282.

- <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000389>
- Myers, L. J., LeWitt, R. B., Gallo, R. E., & Maselli, N. M. (2021). Baby FaceTime: Can toddlers learn from online video chat with parents? *Developmental Science*, 24(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.13062>
- Nieborg, D. B., & Poell, T. (2018). The platformization of cultural production: Theorizing the contingent cultural commodity. *UvA-DARE (University of Amsterdam)*, 20(11), 4275–4292. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818769694>
- Orben, A., & Przybylski, A. K. (2019). The association between adolescent well-being and digital technology use. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 3(2), 173–182. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0506-1>
- Organization, W. H. (2022). *Guidelines on physical activity, sedentary behaviour and sleep for children under 5 years of age*. World Health Organization. <https://doi.org/10.26153/tsw/42823>
- Paulus, F. W., Ohmann, S., Gontard, A. von, & Popow, C. (2023). Digital media and early childhood development: A longitudinal analysis of executive function outcomes. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 65(7), 889–901. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dmcn.15598>
- Piaget, J. (1952). The origins of intelligence in children. In *W W Norton & Co eBooks*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/11494-000>
- Rader, B., Hamad, M., & Horowitz, M. (2021). Filter bubbles in digital media: Mechanisms and implications for children's creative development. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 115, 106581. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106581>
- Radesky, J. (2021). Establishing Early Literacy Habits in a Profit-Driven Digital World. *PEDIATRICS*, 147(6). <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2020-047472>
- Rideout, V., & Robb, M. B. (2022). *The Common Sense census: Media use by kids age zero to eight*.
- Robb, M. B., Bay, W., & Vennekens-Kelly, A. (2022). Young children, new media, and libraries: Developmental quality criteria for early childhood digital tools. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 50(3), 451–462. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-021-01216-8>
- Romeo, R. R., Leonard, J. A., Robinson, S. T., West, M. R., Mackey, A. P., Rowe, M. L., & Gabrieli, J. D. E. (2018). Beyond the 30-million-word gap: Children's conversational exposure is associated with language-related brain function. *Psychological Science*, 29(5), 700–710. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617742725>
- Russ, S. W., & Wallace, C. E. (2013). Pretend Play and Creative Processes. *American Journal of Play*, 6(1), 136–148. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1016123.pdf>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101860–101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
- Senechal, M., & LeFevre, J.-A. (2014). Parental involvement in the development of children's reading skill: A five-year longitudinal study. *Child Development*, 73(2), 445–460. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00417>
- Shonkoff, J. P., Garner, A. S., Siegel, B., Dobbins, M. I., Earls, M. F., Garner, A. S., McGuinn, L., Pascoe, J. M., & Wood, D. L. (2011). The Lifelong Effects of Early Childhood Adversity and Toxic Stress. *PEDIATRICS*, 129(1). <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2011-2663>
- Taylor, C. (1985). Human Agency and Language. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139173483>
- Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 8(1), 45–45. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45>
- Tomasello, M. (2018). How children come to understand false beliefs: A shared intentionality account. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(34), 8491–8498. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1804761115>
- Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters, M. D. J., Horsley, T., Weeks, L., Hempel, S., Akl, E. A., Chang, C., McGowan, J., Stewart, L., Hartling, L., Aldcroft, A., Wilson, M. G., Garrity, C., ... Straus, S. E. (2018). PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *White Rose Research Online (University of Leeds, The University of Sheffield, University of York)*, 169(7), 467–473. <https://doi.org/10.7326/m18-0850>
- Troseth, G. L., Strouse, G. A., Verdine, B. N., & Saylor, M. M. (2023). Let's chat: On-demand video calling supports toddlers' word learning from video. *Child Development*, 94(2), 511–524. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13874>
- Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2018). Associations between screen time and lower psychological well-being among children and adolescents: Evidence from a population-based study. *Preventive Medicine Reports*, 12, 271–283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2018.10.003>
- UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education - A tool on whose terms?* UNESCO Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.54675/CHGU4186>
- Valkenburg, P. M., Patti, M., & Orben, A. (2022). Media use and childhood development: Beyond correlational and cross-sectional studies. *Child Development*, 93(4), 1069–1083. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13734>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. In *Medical Entomology and Zoology*. Japan Society of Medical Entomology and Zoology. <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA03570814>
- Whitehurst, G. J., & Lonigan, C. J. (1998). Child Development and Emergent Literacy. *Child Development*, 69(3), 848–872. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1998.tb06247.x>
- Zosh, J. M., Hirsh-Pasek, K., Hopkins, E. J., Jensen, H., Liu, C., Neale, D., Solis, S. L., & Whitebread, D. (2018). Accessing the Inaccessible: Redefining Play as a Spectrum. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1124–1124. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01124>
- Zuboff, Shoshana. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York:

PublicAffairs, 2019. <https://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Pages/item.aspx?num=56791>

Потапова, В. (2025). Digital Autonomy: Who Defines Values in the Platform Society? *Patria*, 2(3), 28–35. <https://doi.org/10.17323/patria.2025.27618>