

Discussion Paper

DIGITAL CHANGE AND ITS IMPACT ON FAMILIES

November 2019



CONTENTS

1. Digital change and its consequences for families	1
2. Principles for shaping digital change from a family perspective	3
3. Children and young people: a mix of measures for greater participation and safety on the net.....	4
4. Digitalization and Middle Age: Parenthood, Reconciling Family and Work Life.....	9
5. Families with elderly family members in need of help – digitalization and care	12

Background

This discussion paper reflects on questions regarding digitalization for different areas of life from the point of view of families. It takes a lifecycle perspective to discuss the consequences of digitalization for children, adolescents, parents and the grandparent generation and its impact on their relationships. The paper focuses on the promotion of participation on the one hand and the protection of vulnerable family members on the other, as well as balancing the responsibility for these tasks between public and private actors as well as families and their individual members.

In view of the rapid developments in the digitalization of all areas of life, we have deliberately chosen the form of a discussion paper, which formulates positions and open questions and thus represents a snapshot of the discussions taking place within and outside the Association of German Family Organizations (AGF).

1. DIGITAL CHANGE AND ITS CONSEQUENCES FOR FAMILIES

The spread of digital media, communication and work tools has massively changed everyday life, communication and family relationships in recent years. This is currently particularly visible in intra-family conflicts over media use. Most families with children and adolescents are familiar with disputes about "screen time". On the other hand, many families also appreciate the new, extended possibilities of communication and exchange between family members living far apart and the feeling of security they gain from the high accessibility of family members.

In families, children come into contact with digital media at a very early age. Their parents and siblings show them how they use mobile phones and computers in their everyday lives and how this influences their family's communication culture. This gives them an idea of the importance of digital media and techniques even before *conscious* educational decisions are made in the family as to which media can be used by children in which situations and to what extent.

Working life, which has a particularly strong influence on the life situation of the middle generation of families,¹ has for some years undergone change that has been significantly influenced by digitalization. The discussion about industry 4.0 leads us to expect further radical restructuring of the world of work. Family life can be influenced both by trends in the intensity of work and by new freedoms in work organization, with more flexible working hours and homeworking opportunities.

Digitalization has an impact not only on the relationship between parents and young children / adolescents but also on relationships between adult children and their increasingly dependent elderly parents and between grandparents

¹ This refers to the generation of parents who are of working age and are between the generation of their younger children and their own older (grand) parents.

and grandchildren. At the same time, the digitalization of care and the dissemination of technical support and monitoring opportunities for older members raise new ethical questions for families.

Even a casual look at how we obtain information reveals the role changes within families and the devaluations of old knowledge stores associated with them. If parents have problems with their children, do they prefer to ask their own mother/father or an Internet group for advice? Would younger children rather have a video tutorial or their own parents explain to them how to fry an egg or solve a maths problem?

Digitalization is a development that should and can be shaped by society. Nevertheless, it should not be underestimated that some families unquestionably feel overwhelmed by digitalization when, for example, conflicts with children over media use escalate. One of the reasons why people feel overburdened is that it is so difficult to weigh up the benefits and risks of certain digital media and that the information and assessments in the private sphere and among experts are so contradictory. The pressure is increased by the fact that our lives are already heavily influenced by digitalization: there is no turning back, and families will have to deal with it, whether they wish to or not.

1.1. General opportunities of digital change for families

From the AGF's point of view, the opportunities of digital change exist on several levels. Communication and cohesion in families can be strengthened by digital means of communication. On the one hand, it can integrate members living away from the family home more continuously into family communication. On the other hand, the technical possibilities of family chats and groups make it possible to quickly share information, photos and videos multilaterally, far more easily than analogue, bi-directional techniques. Digital media also facilitate the practical organization of family life and arrangements.

Moreover, digital technology can help older family members to live longer independently in their own home environment. Sensor technology that monitors the vital signs of elderly family members with impaired health or their activities in the home and activates help in emergencies can increase the sense of security of both those affected and their relatives.

Digitalization in general has the potential to improve the participation of families in social, political, cultural and educational processes by facilitating access. It can help to reduce the urban–rural divide in cultural and educational opportunities by providing access that otherwise exists only in larger cities. For example, it is possible to exchange information on highly specialized educational issues, illnesses or conflict solutions via the Internet in chats and web forums, even if no groups physically meet in the vicinity of one's home. Digital counselling services can be used by families regardless of where they live. The Internet enables families and family organizations to formulate, organize and publicly present and promote their interests.

Digitalization offers further great potential in reconciling family and career through new opportunities to make working hours more flexible and to facilitate homeworking and mobile working.

1.2. General risks of digital change

In addition to opportunities, digitalization also entails risks. There is a danger that digital media and means of communication do not contribute to a deepening of family exchanges, but rather promote an individualization of family members and their retreat into an isolated preoccupation with the media. In contrast to watching television together as family, the most common form of media consumption among children and adolescents today is more strongly online and individualized in their own room or on the move.

Health risks are associated with long use of digital media. Paediatricians, for example, point to the possible deterioration of emotional, cognitive and coordinative physical abilities from excessive use. The World Health Organization therefore recommends very limited use of digital media by under-five-year-olds (World Health Organization (WHO) 2019).

In the case of children and young people, potential risks lie in the consumption of youth-endangering content from media providers, in phenomena such as cyberbullying or cybergrooming, which occur in communication between users.

In addition, for families and for middle and higher age groups, there are classic problems of consumer protection and data security or the restriction of the right of informational self-determination, as well as the confrontation with politically radical disinformation and influence. These are also relevant for the middle and higher age groups.

Furthermore, the use of digital technologies to satisfy the security needs of the middle generation of adults often raises ethical questions. For example, what degree of digital control of children and adolescents is permissible, in the sense of a legitimate need for security on the part of parents? When, on the other hand, do parents cross the threshold of excessive control, thereby compromising the development and independence of the children? When are digital security measures legitimate for cognitively impaired elderly family members? When is it no longer legitimate to monitor older people and step over into interfering too deeply with their personal rights?

In the everyday life of families, the question also arises as to how great the individual pressure is to maintain accessibility and rapid reaction in communication and when there is a right to "switch off" in personal and professional everyday life.

2. PRINCIPLES FOR SHAPING DIGITAL CHANGE FROM A FAMILY PERSPECTIVE

Balancing the opportunities and risks of digital media or technologies is not always easy. For the AGF, the evaluation focuses on the following fundamental aspects and questions.

Participation: Do digital media/techniques open up or restrict new scope for action and exchange for families and their members? Does technology help families to carry out their tasks of educating and supporting family members? Does it give family members new access to social, cultural or political participation?

Participatory justice: Do digital media/techniques increase participatory justice in society or do they reproduce and exacerbate existing social inequalities? Do all family forms benefit equally from new opportunities to participate in educational processes, culture, working life or social activities? Are the offers barrier-free? Does technology assist equal gender access and participation?

Perspective of competence: Do families and their members possess the competences to use digital media/techniques profitably and to avoid dangers? What measures to increase competence should accompany the use of digital media/technologies? Which institutions are responsible for this? What further training and education in educational and care institutions are needed to teach people about digital media? What are the consequences for families if media skills are inadequate?

Protection perspective: Are families and their members age-appropriately and sufficiently informed about the risks of digital media/technologies and protected against them? How should protective measures be designed for the different age groups? Whose responsibility is the implementation of such measures?

Share of responsibility: Is there a balanced share of responsibility between individuals, families, politics, administrations and providers for the dangers that can be associated with digital media/techniques? What should be done to make their use safe for the vulnerable, as well as for able and supposedly competent family members?

Transparency/openness of development/democratic control: Is there transparency for users about the short- and long-term implications of their acceptance of general terms and conditions (GTCs) and their use of digital media and technologies? Does digitalization lead to monopolistic structures for certain services or is it a genuine open development with alternative providers and technical solutions? How can data protection, consumer protection and other rights of families and their members be effectively enforced against international monopolistic service providers?

3. CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE: A MIX OF MEASURES FOR GREATER PARTICIPATION AND SAFETY ON THE NET

3.1. The situation in families

Die Kindheit und Jugend ist wesentlich von digitalen Medien und Techniken geprägt. Dies beginnt mit der Beobachtung des Medienkonsums der Eltern und älteren Geschwister. Aber auch die eigene Mediennutzung beginnt bereits in sehr jungem Alter. Dies betrifft auch die „klassischen“ Medien wie Radio und Fernsehen.

Childhood and adolescence are essentially characterized today by digital media and techniques. This begins with observing the media consumption of parents and older siblings. But even one's own media use begins at a very young age. This also applies to the "classical" media such as radio and television.

Children and young people grow up with and actively use a wide range of digital media. More than 50% of 6- to 13-year-olds already own a mobile phone (KIM study 2018). In the juvenile phase access to mobile phones is already almost universally widespread: about 99% of all girls and 97% of all boys aged 12 and over own a mobile phone (JIM study 2018). According to the JIM study (2018), smartphones (99%), computers with Internet access (98%) and television and radio sets (95% and 85%, respectively) are present in practically every household with 12- to 19-year-old children, and there are game consoles in many households (71%).

The development of children and adolescents still takes place predominantly in the analogue field, but no longer exclusively. Today, digital space also establishes meeting points and venues in which meaningful communication takes place, in which they live relationships and experience education and life. Smartphones can be used almost anywhere and at any time. Children and adolescents therefore integrate mobile media very quickly into their everyday lives and lifestyles (Tillmann and Hugger 2014).

Against this background, it is all the more important that the use of media by children and young people is appropriate to their age and development. In this sense, parents usually initially try to have access to the media jointly and controlled. However, as children grow older, the use of digital media becomes increasingly autonomous. "This applies [for example] to the use of the Internet ("I usually use it alone": 6-7 years: 8%, 12-13 years: 72%), online research for schools (6-7 years: 2%, 12-13 years: 63%) and the use of mobile games (6-7 years: 13%, 12-13 years: 64%)" (Medienpädagogischer Forschungsverbund Südwest (mpfs) 2019, p. 15).

In particular, the functional range of modern smartphones means that a large number of digital media, information and communication services can be accessed by children and young people. At the same time, media use is subject to constant change as a result of technological progress, making it difficult for parents to keep track of the digital offerings to children and the quality of such offerings.

Parents face various dilemmas in their efforts to regulate the use of digital media. On the one hand, the media are now an integral part of children's lives. Media literacy and computer skills are accepted as prerequisites for coping with everyday life and as an essential foundation for most careers. On the other hand, parents are aware of the risks of using digital media respectively are uncertain about media coverage on media-related risks and negative effects, as they lack the knowledge and skills to properly assess the truthfulness and relevance for their own children (Wagner et al. 2013). Families need to balance the different rights of children and young people in shaping their digital lives. These include the right to digital participation, the right to erect barriers against digital dangers, the right to privacy and the right to have their own experiences and make their own mistakes.

Thus, parents must keep an eye on the risks inherent in the use of digital media. In the discussion here, the prime contents that pose a risk to children are pornographic images and representations of violence. The participation of children and adolescents in chat rooms, groups and other social media creates dangers that emanate not from media providers but from other users. Phenomena such as cyberbullying, cyber-mobbing, cyber-stalking and cyber-grooming are attacks on personal integrity and dignity. Economic risks can arise from the costs of buying hardware and software, entering into contracts and in-app and in-game purchases, as well as from advertising, which can lead to overstretching their financial resources. Other risks that also affect adults are data protection risks and the risk of political manipulation on the Internet.

There must be analogue and digital living spaces in which children and young people can develop freely and in which they are, at the same time, protected from negative influences. The aim must be to avoid allowing children to be subject to influences from the adult world that are not appropriate to their age and development, but without unduly restricting their freedom to operate in the digital world.

The responsibility for protection against digital risks must not be unilaterally assigned to families. Instead, a policy mix of three elements is necessary:

- Promotion of skills, sensitization and media education for children and parents
- Establishment of a national and international regulatory protection framework
- Corporate responsibility and self-regulation by providers of digital media and technologies

3.2. Skills development

The promotion of skills, the perception of digital participation opportunities and risk limitation are closely linked. In addition to appropriate access to infrastructure and content, the prerequisites for digital participation are appropriate skills and abilities, both for technical use and for dealing with digital offerings. This also includes critical questioning and classification of content, recognition of advertising and fake messages intended to deceive, responsible behaviour and knowledge of the extensive use of data by providers.

Not every digital risk necessarily results in an actual danger. What tips the balance are the skills and resources that children and young people possess to deal and to cope with the threats and risks of digital media and addiction to it. Experts (see AGF 2017, p. 7) point out that, although greater media literacy increases contacts with Internet risks, it also reduces the risk of these contacts becoming negative experiences and harming children and young people. Media education that seeks to constrain users reduces exposure to risk but also decreases their competence. Important environments for the provision of digital education include families themselves, daycare centres, schools and places of extracurricular education for children and young people. The first three environments are considered below.

Parents' media literacy and digital family culture as protective influences

Parents' low media literacy and a lack of support for the use of digital media and technologies are risk factors for children and young people. In contrast, a good family culture of using digital media and technologies acts as a protective factor against digital risks. Parents should be aware that they are role models for their children and therefore use smartphones, PCs, televisions, etc., with care. The Paediatric Recommendations for Parents on Careful Screen Media Use (2018) advocate, for example, that parents should also use technical devices only in a goal-oriented way and not out of boredom, that mealtimes should take place without screen media, that enjoyment of the sensory perception of the real world should be encouraged and that parents should accompany their children into the media world in an age-appropriate manner and remain in dialogue with them about it. Furthermore, screen media should not be used for reward, punishment or reassurance.

Part of a strategy to promote skills must also be to expand advisory and complaints services and make them better known to families. From the point of view of families, a central point of contact would be desirable, which could network advisory services on "good use of digital media and technology", Internet dangers and addiction issues and at the same time signpost to institutions with expertise in prosecuting infringements of child and youth protection laws by providers of digital content as well as by users who engage in cyberbullying, cyber-grooming and other antisocial and harmful behaviours.

The role of parents is also discussed in the chapter "Digitalization and middle age" on page 9.

School as a digital learning space

From a family perspective, schools have a complex educational mandate. They are intended not only to impart general knowledge and lay the foundations for vocational training, but also to promote the development of social skills, the ability to cooperate, tolerance and a sense of democratic values. Within this, digital media education is an important building block. Parents, however, rate the current state of digitalization of schools and daycare centres as predominantly negative (see, for example, Vodafone Foundation Germany 2019).

Schools should integrate digital media and techniques into school life in three ways. First, schools must provide "media skills" in the use of digital tools for acquiring and presenting knowledge, for artistic expression and for digital knowledge related to the world of work. Second, digital media and techniques in schools should of course be used as a didactic tool among many educational methods in order to achieve defined educational goals. Third, the school must teach a reflective approach to media-mediated content, which includes the processing of information as well as source criticism and the understanding of interest-driven communication and manipulation. There are many overlaps with the learning objectives when dealing with classical media. However, schools must also convey the specifics of the new social and digital media.

Achieving these objectives will require better technical equipment in schools, as is now being aimed at with the Digital Pact. At the same time, technical support structures need to be strengthened to help schools set up and maintain hardware and software. However, the technical equipment is only one component. In addition, long-term strategies to qualify teachers, educators and school social workers in training, further education and further education are needed, so that they can meet the demands of a comprehensive media education at school. In this context, the methods of teaching and possibly the learning culture as a whole are likely to change. Proponents of digitalization hope, among other things, to encourage individualized and self-directed learning, as well as cooperative forms of teaching. In the field of technical media literacy, the division of roles between teachers and learners may become blurred, for example when teachers learn from students how to use smartphones, PCs or interactive whiteboards to the best effect. At this time, however, schools do not seem to take digitalization seriously

enough. According to the "Monitor Digital Education", only 8% of school principals attach strategic importance to the topic (Schmid et al. 2017).

Overall, from the point of view of the AGF, more involvement of schools and the state in the digitalization of education is desirable.

Child Day Care Centers and digitalization

The use of digital techniques in daycare centres is much more controversial than in schools. Many parents take a critical view of the use of digital media in daycare centres. Some fear that digitalized technology could be used as a substitute for human care. Some parents expect a greater focus at daycare centres on analogous forms of teaching about and appreciation of the world while others would like these centres to be explicitly understood as a space in which children are protected from encountering digital media. This also happens partly because of the parents' own problems in regulating their children's media consumption in accordance with their own convictions and in their highly pressured everyday lives. They refer to arguments put forward by medical experts linking high media use by young children with higher levels of physical inactivity, reduced physical and functional ability and greater health risks, such as nearsightedness and concentration problems, and more recent phenomena such as gaming disorder, compared with previous generations of children.

On the other hand, advocates of early digital media education in daycare centres argue that children would come into contact with these techniques in their family environments anyway. Early encounters with digital media in the kindergarten are able to offer children active, creative uses and to prevent or correct the appropriation of dangerous or purely passive patterns of use. The "GRÜNBUCH Förderliche und Obstruliche Faktoren für eine Erfolgende Medienerziehung in frühkindlichen Bildungseinrichtungen" (Green Paper on Factors that Promote and Obstruct a Successful Media Education in Early Childhood Educational Institutions) states that daycare centres that integrate media educational content into their work are still rare in Germany. "According to a survey conducted by the 'House of Little Researchers' Foundation in 2017, 78.2% of daycare centres do not have a media concept that specifies the use and handling of digital media in their facilities" (Lienau and van Roessel 2019, p. 8). Thus, in practice, there are great challenges to implementing concepts of digital media use throughout the entire childcare sector.

Against this background, the AGF advocates that the use of digital media in daycare centres should take place only for specific pedagogical objectives and concepts, for a limited time and only under the guidance of personnel qualified in media pedagogy. The AGF is critical of the use of digital media by children under the age of three. There are important educational goals competing for time and resources with digital media learning goals (which can also involve the teaching of media itself and art). The AGF sees a need to evaluate the effects of early digital media education on both the long-term success of media literacy and the reduction of hazardous or purely passive use in children's lives. To this end, whether and how the early use of digital media affects cognitive, psychological, social and physical development should be explored.

Irrespective of the controversial question of the earliest age at which digital media should be used in daycare centres, its use needs better framework conditions and support. This applies to the necessary infrastructure and also to the corresponding competences of teachers and educators. Media pedagogy should therefore be more firmly anchored in teacher training and be an integral part of school curricula. Participation in media education training courses should be increased. Appropriate financial and conceptual support for daycare centres and schools to implement more in-depth digital and media education services can make sense.

3.3. Regulatory protection framework

There is a broad consensus that policy makers have a high degree of responsibility to protect children and young people when using digital media and technologies. At the same time, the rapid development of new technologies, social networks and the convergence of formerly separate media have created a need to further develop tried and tested structures and instruments.

From the perspective of everyday family life, it is incomprehensible that in some circumstances, in Germany the same potentially dangerous media content is subject to different controls and rules depending on whether it is distributed via television, a streaming portal or a DVD. In a convergent media world, the classic separation of the content and responsibilities of the Youth Protection Act on the one hand and the protection of minors in the media on the other only partially meets the need for protection of children and young people. The AGF contends that these two areas of regulation should be merged in an integrated law, as was already proposed in 2016 by the "Bund-Länder Commission" on Media Convergence.

In addition, the protection of minors should be systematically extended to include child- and youth-specific consumer and data protection rules for digital media and technologies. Within families, consumer protection problems, for example economic risks to children through in-app purchases, free games with the possibility of additional purchases/loot boxes, advertising offences or advertising that cannot be identified for children also pose a strong threat.

Data protection problems can have long-term negative consequences for the lives of children and young people. Data protection can be individually controlled only to a very limited extent by families, children and adolescents. The task of policymakers here is to ensure that control over privacy and data lies with users and that general terms and conditions are truly transparent for children, young people and their parents in real-life usage situations. Actions at different levels can contribute to this, such as the Recommendation of the Council of Consumer Advisers (SVRV) (2017) that companies must, prior to the conclusion of a contract, set out on one page (500 words) the relevant data protection implications, as well as the GTCs. Furthermore, legislators could put pressure on digital media and technology providers to develop a clear and comprehensible traffic light system that makes it easier for parents, children and adolescents to understand the scope of their consent and agree to the processing of their data. In the medium term, the GDPR should be evaluated for its real effectiveness in protecting children and young people and, if necessary, further refined. Legislators should also exert a stronger influence on providers of digital media and technologies to implement data-saving and security-oriented pre-settings in the sense of strategies such as "privacy/security by design" and "privacy/security by default".

Children and adolescents and to some extent parents also have problems recognizing new forms of advertising as such and thus evaluating them appropriately. The more similar the forms of advertising are to those in the classical media, television, radio or print media, the easier it is to identify them. However, advertising strategies are increasingly focusing on circumventing this clear recognition for children and adolescents, for example in the case of influenza advertising. In the view of the AGF, the responsibility for dealing with the rapidly changing framework conditions of advertising must not be individualized and shifted solely to the media competence of children and young people, but requires political action.

3.4. Corporate responsibility, self-regulation by providers of digital media and technologies

Digital media and technology providers have a crucial responsibility to better protect children and young people. Many of their business models are geared towards a high level of use of their offerings by these target groups, while at the same time evading responsibility for the dangers of such offerings. Without the collaboration of companies, however, it will not be possible to achieve significant protection. From the point of view of parents, self-

regulation and self-control measures appear to have had only limited effectiveness so far. For example, they cover only those service providers that have voluntarily joined a self-regulatory body; international monopolistic providers cannot be put under pressure to submit to national regulations. In addition, providers hide behind the statement that it is almost impossible to control certain offers because the danger may emanate from the content created or shared by other users. These would not be editorial offers by service providers and would be neither adopted as their own nor controlled by them.

From the point of view of family associations, however, digital media and technology providers must be held more responsible than in the past for controlling and avoiding risks to children and young people. This applies to classic child and youth protection issues as well as addiction risks and economic risks that may arise from the use of a particular site.

On the other hand, however, there are instances of self-regulation that are already being successfully implemented and should be further developed. One example is the concretization of abstract legal norms, which can be implemented and adapted better and faster by institutions of voluntary self-regulation on the basis of existing competences. An example of this is the further development of appropriate age-group labels for digital media content, apps and programs. Age rating marks are a good guide for parents, even though children of the same age are not necessarily at the same stage of development.

These age assessments must be sufficiently differentiated, reliable and transparent. The reasons for age classification must be made clear to parents, children and adolescents and should be published for each case. This should be done in the form of easy-to-understand icons that indicate, for example, dangerous content, violence, self-harm or data protection. Such a system already exists in some countries. This can increase the legitimacy and acceptance of age classifications.

Bottom line

Families need support in the process of shaping digital change and especially in protecting vulnerable family members from the associated risks. The different circumstances and capabilities of families for coping with these risks must be taken into account. It is not a solution to demand more and more digital skills from families and consumers. Shaping digital change is a common task for families, educational and care institutions, business, politics and administration. Policy must be made more responsible for improving the legal framework conditions for safe use, and the manufacturers for implementing the technical and content requirements.

4. DIGITALIZATION AND MIDDLE AGE: PARENTHOOD, RECONCILING FAMILY AND WORK LIFE

Middle-aged family members are affected by digitalization in various functions, including their roles as parents, as employees or self-employed and as carers. Digitalization and care will be dealt with in greater depth from page 12 of this document onwards. Here, some aspects from the section on children and young people are briefly taken up again from the perspective of the parents. Subsequently, some issues and arguments on the digitalization of the world of work from the perspective of families will be discussed.

4.1. Parenthood and digitalization

As already outlined in Chapter 3, parents have an exemplary role to play and are responsible for creating a positive family culture of mindful use of digital media and technologies.

The middle (parent) generation is generally considered to have the highest digital competence within families. They set the time and content framework for the children's media use. However, they often do not feel sufficiently prepared for this responsibility and are uncertain about their assessments. The sometimes huge conflicts they experience about assessing risks, about suitable or "wrong" content and about the amount of time children spend on digital media can be a heavy burden. If this group has its own care-dependent parents, they suffer additional pressure to decide on the use of digital support and monitoring techniques for them.

In order for the middle generation to be able to fulfil this responsibility competently, their media competence needs even more support. Families need low-threshold access to independent information, education and counselling to increase their media literacy. Parents with younger children express a high need for information on risks and protection on the Internet and age- and child-appropriate use of the Internet. They also need information on the use of social networks and the suitability of technical equipment for children and young people, as well as clear guidance on age-appropriateness for websites, games and apps.

Tailor-made offers for this generation of parents characteristically impart digital media skills combined with education and assistance. Parents should be supported in reflecting on their positions and in constructively shaping the practical negotiation for digital media and technology use in the family. Inevitably, the preferred forms of information and counselling differ according to the parent group. For example, parents with lower educational attainment tend on average to prefer direct oral forms of further education or counselling over purely written offers. For these groups, parent-teacher evenings, for example, offer opportunities for discussion and are points of contact for referrals to advice centres and courses on digital education. Discussions on the fly when picking up the children are not an adequate substitute.

Parents are also the targets of digital offers designed to make life easier for them in their contacts with authorities, administrations and social organizations. Digitalization offers good opportunities for this, for example facilitating applications for benefits. In addition, existing analogue services for families can be digitally advertised and made more accessible. Authorities and providers of family benefits should expand digital possibilities with the user uppermost in mind. Digitalization services also outside the world of work can help to accommodate families' wishes in terms of reconciling family and professional work. If more and more transactions can also be carried out online, the importance of opening hours of physical premises as the "external clock generators" for example, is reduced.

4.2. Digitalization of the world of work

The chances of digitalizing the world of work are often seen at the level of achieving a better work-life balance and the potential for making it easier for mothers to integrate into or re-enter professional work. The example of mobile work and home office is often used to demonstrate how flexible working hours can make it easier to reconcile the demands of home and care work. Through mobile forms of work and more capacity to determine their own working hours and place of work, disadvantages for women shall be reduced and opportunities for men to integrate domestic (caring) work and flexible gainful employment shall be improved. Moreover, if fathers and mothers have more options for organizing their working time, more room will be created for partnership-based negotiation processes. In addition, the digitalization of the world of work is seen as an opportunity to close the gap between men's and women's working hours and to replace the common culture that requires a worker's physical presence at the workplace, which puts people with family care responsibilities at a disadvantage in their career advancement (Klenner und Lott 2018). However, these developments will not occur as automatic consequences of digitalization, but must be accompanied by a corresponding cultural shift in partnerships, in companies and in the social evaluation of gainful employment and domestic work.

The changing employment opportunities of individual groups of employees and the devaluation of vocational qualifications are seen as risks of digital change for family life or for individual family members. Even if there is

unlikely to be a mass loss of jobs, significant shifts between sectors and within occupations can be expected. Further likely consequences of the digitalization of work are changes in the organization of work and an increasing de-employment, i.e. the division of work into fragmented and partly individualized organizational and employment structures. The possible accompanying increase in the demand for round-the-clock availability and an indirect extension of working hours through unrealistic targets may further increase the time pressure under which family life already labours..

New digital competences and employability

Families are directly affected by the employment opportunities of their working-age members. The importance of gainful employment goes far beyond the material security of families. It can also contribute to social integration and life satisfaction. If the employability of family members is to be maintained or increased under the conditions of digitalization of the world of work, education is the key. The role of schools in digital education is discussed in Chapter 3. In order to prepare employees for the ongoing digitalization of their working lives, greater efforts are needed in initial and continuing vocational education and training, in addition to the changes in schools described there.

The digitalization of the world of work therefore means investing not only in technology but also in individual employability. In order to maintain this over the entire life course, a new culture is needed that promotes readiness for lifelong learning but also establishes an explicit right to further education and training. Offers should be expanded both quantitatively and qualitatively and with a strategic focus on digital development. Further education and training must not represent an additional burden for families and hence should take place mainly during working hours. Parents, especially mothers, often experience a chronic lack of time anyway, so it can hardly be expected that they will find sufficient time for further education in addition to their professional and family tasks. This requires appropriate solutions that involve all groups. In particular, part-time employees must be actively involved in further training planning.

Particular importance is attached to continuing education and training opportunities in the phases of family-related career transitions and especially when returning to work after time off for family leave. Family members who have given up professional work for a longer period of time to devote themselves to caring tasks often need support in order to get back up to date with digital technologies and digital workflows.

Digitalization, reconciliation of family and work and gender justice

In order to improve the reconciliation of family and professional work life satisfactorily, the family associations believe there is a need to expand the opportunities for parents and caregiving relatives to have a say in the timing of their work and, if possible, also in the place of work. This expansion of available options is intended to benefit all employees and not just those working in typical office jobs. Even if mobile working is not equally feasible in all occupations, the opportunities for flexible working hours should be open to as many employees as possible. If there is a high need for presence and direct contact with people, it should be possible for at least some activities to be carried out virtually or in the home office.

Indeed, the home office example is a good example of how the combination of working at home and working at the work place can improve the compatibility of family and career. The elimination of travel times brings significant relief. For this solution to work well, certain conditions are required, such as sufficient information on operational compatibility. In addition to politics, internal company structures such as corporate management and works councils are also needed to implement this.

However, there are also indications that the digitalization of the world of work may maintain gender roles rather than break them down. Women and men with children seem to make different use of new flexible working models, such as the home office or trust-based working hours. While fathers work more overtime in these models, mothers do so only to a limited extent. When they have access to flexible working, however, mothers spend considerably more time on childcare (Lott 2019). Thus, flexible working appears to help reconcile family and career, but it remains to be seen whether this will change the classic distribution of roles between women and men.

In order to prevent isolation in homeworking and associated health, including mental health, problems, various regulatory instruments should be combined into an appropriate legal and operational framework. At the same time, as digitalization progresses, working people need to upskill to better manage their work-life balance. A new management, work and corporate culture is needed, accompanied by clear rules between employers and employees that do not weaken existing occupational health and safety regulations but adapt them to changing conditions. This also applies to the protection of employee data and the manner in which employees choose to obtain and use information.

5. FAMILIES WITH ELDERLY FAMILY MEMBERS IN NEED OF HELP – DIGITALIZATION AND CARE

5.1. The Family-Perspective on Digitalisation of Care

The situation of families with older family members in need of care is very heterogeneous due to the diversity of family models as well as a great variety of social and cultural backgrounds. However, despite such heterogeneity there are also similarities: care providing families usually show a high degree of commitment when looking after family members in need of care, and at the same time they experience high burdens.

Of the 3.41 million people in Germany that are in need of care defined by the Care Insurance Law (SGB XI) more than three quarters (2.6 million) are looked after at home. In 2017, of those 2.6 million people 1.7 million were exclusively looked after by family members. Looking at families with a migration background the share of people in need of care, who are exclusively cared for at home by family members, is significantly higher: for example, about 98 percent of people, who are of Turkish origin and in need of care, are exclusively cared for by their family (Tezcan-Güntekin and Breckenkamp 2017).

The Robert Koch-Institute has called families being “Germany’s greatest care service”. A study titled “Contemporary Health in Germany” (2012) shows that nine out of ten individuals, who look after people in need of care, do so to family members (Robert Koch-Institute (RKI) 2015). The German Centre for Gerontology underlines the extreme importance of family members: According to data from the German Ageing Survey more than 16 percent of 40- to 85-year-olds regularly support at least one person. Care in the stricter sense is provided by a third of them. Especially high is the provision of care to partners in the group of 80- to 85-year-olds as well as the support and care for older family members by young seniors (60 to 64 years). It is predominantly women, who provide care and support. However, the gap between men and women of working age is bigger than in the life phase after employment (Tesch-Roemer and Hagen 2018).

In the following, we refer to familial care of older people in their homes. When talking about the support of older family members in inpatient facilities, we will point out so.

Families’ internal view on the topic of “Care and Digitalisation” is characterized by a double ambivalence:

Ambivalences in familial care

Taking on caring responsibilities within the family is on the one hand a reflection of good and close emotional relations in families and partnerships. Hereby, an expression of that familial responsibility can be both supporting an older family member in their home environment as well as in an inpatient facility. The willingness to support each other emotionally, instrumentally or financially is usually very strong.

On the other hand, care is also accompanied by burden of physical and psychological kind. There exist deficits in the service landscape to relieve care-providing relatives. Bad quality professional care, inadequate services and social pressure of expectations can lead relatives, against their actual preferences, to look after older family members at home.

Furthermore, looking after relatives when of working age often comes with (currently particularly for women) career-related disadvantages and material losses on income and pension. Also, the emotional closeness between family carers and the people in need of care can under certain constellations turn from a resource into a burden. Conflicts of interests can occur between family carer and the cared-for but also between the generation of grandparents, parents and children. Those conflicts are a part of this family phase. The various interests within families must be interrelated to and weighed against each other.

Ambivalences of Digitalisation and Mechanisation in Family Life

Families also experience the digitalisation and mechanisation of family life, which also includes care, ambivalently. For many families, digital technologies and media are an integral part of daily life and they are used among other things to help with communication, to organize daily life and for entertainment. On the other side, digitalisation has also created new problems and conflicts or increased old ones, respectively, within families. This often has to do with children's and adolescents' user behaviour of digital media. The competition among children and adolescents for the very best/newest generation of technical gadgets/mobile phones can also lead to conflicts within families. Therefore, parents for example have to deal with partly difficult to meet consumer wishes of their children.

Conflict-ridden concerns of the middle and older generations have more to do with questions of data protection and the tension between relatives' desire for safety and the fears of older people in need of care to be under surveillance. On the one hand, differing technical competence between the generations offer positive occasions for familial (supportive) exchange. However, they also hold a potential for conflict if one-sided help is permanently demanded or when, conversely, unwanted digital technologies are imposed on older people.

5.2. Families and Care Provision: Analogue Services are the Basis

In regards to caring for older family members, families usually express rather rarely the need for a greater digitalisation of such care relations. Instead, it is the deficits of "analogue" services for care-providing relatives that impede families taking on care responsibilities. This includes the lack of specific services or regional undersupply, for example, in short term care units or services for dementia patients. This is increasingly true also to outpatient care services and inpatient care units. The key issue here are non-suitable services, which do not sufficiently take into account the specific needs of families, like for example, care services that are inflexible when it comes to time. In addition, there are also unnecessary financial or bureaucratic entry barriers for the use of services, as is often the case with day- and night-time care or ambulatory and mobile geriatric rehabilitation.

Taking on care responsibilities poses a risk especially for women to build an independent pension because of, among other things, the still insufficient recognition of care-giving periods in the pension insurance. For example, this affects women, who after the end of their child-care phase have just started again to firmly set foot into work

life. In addition, families get impeded in their efforts to reconcile care for relatives and work by a lack of cooperation from many employers.

Increasingly, older people in densely populated areas have more and more justified fears to lose their apartments for financial reasons because of rising rents and because of higher private expenses for health and care services.

Families primarily wish classical care infrastructure and analogue services for care-providing families to be improved and further developed. From the point of view of family associations, the role digitalisation of care can play in solving the problems of care-providing families is somewhat overestimated by the current highly euphoric discourse on digitalisation.

5.3. Potentials of Digitalisation of Care to Relieve Families

In the following, when talking about the digitalisation of care, we mainly refer to technical or digital aids in the following areas (derived and extended from Daum 2017):

- **Planning- and Documentation Technologies**
Electronic patient records, electronic route planning, electronic service documentation
- **Information-, Communication- and Entertainment Technologies**
Using digital devices to communicate, entertain, coordinate and synchronise supply networks, for teleconsultation by personal computer, smartphone and others
- **Intelligent and Networked Robotics and Technology**
Service- and transport robotics, care sector robotics, emotion robotics, rehabilitation robotics, eating-aid robotics
- **Networked Aid- and Monitoring Systems**
Ambient Assisted Living (AAL)², assistance systems, aid- and monitoring systems, sensor technology for the monitoring of vital parameters, presence control, fall control.

In the list above there are digital applications, which either take on assisting functions for professional care-givers or, which are to directly support the autonomy of the people in need of care or their relatives. A certain amount of digital aids has already reached market maturity and is being used in practice, like for instance, electronic patient records and electronic service documentation, general digital information and communication means (for example messenger services), home emergency-call systems and AAL solutions. Moreover, there are applications that are in an advanced developmental stage and just before their extensive technical implementation, such as teleconsultation solutions, feeding robots and others. Some digital aids are only in their early testing stage, such as for example, autonomous care robots that can independently carry out body-related care tasks like washing and moving patients. Even though it is likely that in regards to these latter applications there might still be a longer period of development work necessary, it is exactly these applications that generate much attention and constitute an important point of reference in the discussion.

Despite the above-mentioned primary importance of “analogue” human support services the family associations recognise the potential that new technologies bring to familial care.

² AAL includes various forms of technologically based solutions to increase living comfort, support health and physical relief as well as means of communication (Compare for examples Hilbert et al. 2018).

- In multi-local family constellations, digital technology can not only serve to improve communication within families and with friends and neighbours but also to coordinate help structures that are a mix of familial, informal and professional support protagonists (Renyi et al.).
- Digital offers by the public administration and the social insurance agency can relieve families with relatives in need of care when obtaining information and making an application. For example, online-services serve hereby as digital simplifications of application procedures and prevent unnecessary trips and waiting times. Digitalisation offers possibilities to make locally existing support services transparent and accessible to families.
- Also, telemedical offers can reduce trips and waiting times and open up access to medical advice and, if applicable, diagnosis in rural areas, too.
- Digital and technical aids can support communication and contact within the family and with friends and neighbours. The participation of family members in need of care can be strengthened by digital applications, which support active and passive involvement in family, culture and society. Digital and technical aids that help coping with everyday life, have the potential to maintain the autonomy of people in need of care. Positive effects can be achieved on the health of care-providing relatives through further development of technical aids that reduce physical stress. Not least, the need for safety of people in need of care and of their relatives can benefit from monitoring and surveillance systems. However, sensory monitoring of older family members without a reliable human intervention offer, which in case of an emergency can be mobilised quickly, leads to rather greater insecurity in families than to more safety.
- Information about good care made available in digital form through care-tutorials, videos and so on, can contribute to improve familial care, provided it meets quality standards. The exchange with other care-providing relatives in chats and discussion groups can lead to relief if data protection is maintained and quality criteria are met, as they are formulated for example by NAKOS (National point of contact and information on promoting and supporting self-help groups) in the admission criteria for their "Green List".

5.4. The Current Discourse on Digitalisation of Care

In Germany care takes place mainly at home and is mostly provided by families, which show a high level of diversity when it comes to their structural, social and cultural characteristics. However, this is only insufficiently reflected in the discussion about the digitalisation of care.

In the developmental field of digitalised care many legitimate interests are articulated. For example, representatives of the care professions, among other things, hope for physical and psychological relief for professional care-givers as well as more effectively organised work. Providers of ambulatory and inpatient care services expect rationalisation and cost saving effects. Technology suppliers and consulting firms would like to market innovative products. The housing industry has long relied on keeping older renters in their portfolio by digital and technical retrofitting of apartments.

In each case, there are overlaps between the interests of the above mentioned exemplary groups and the interests of people in need of care and care-providing relatives. However, there is no aligning of interests. Looking at the public expert discussion about the topic of digitalisation of care gives the impression:

- that in digitalisation projects benefits for families are taken too much for granted and possible (long-term) negative aspects are too rarely evaluated.
- that despite the considerably higher number of people in need of help cared for at home, a very high share of projects of digitalisation is located in the inpatient sector. Here the focus very often lies on objectives of rationalisation and efficiency.

- that the practice of project promotion is aimed at professional care institutions and care services. Often institution-related “digital island solutions” are created. Changing the professional care supply automatically changes the digital environment, including corresponding conversion problems for the people in need of care. Digital solutions to support care arrangements should accompany the life course of people in need of care and adjust to their changing needs and requirements. Instead, not the institutions but the people in need of care and their families should stand in the centre of digital solutions. From the beginning, diversity and equal access should be taken into consideration.

5.5. Objectives of Digitalisation of Care from the Perspective of Families

The digitalisation of care needs a framework of values that is relevant from the perspective of people in need of care, care-providing relatives and professional actors, and which is reflected in the digital and technological solutions. These care-related values can differ individually and potentially there are conflicts of interests between the three mentioned groups. Therefore, any home care arrangement – including usual concrete care routines – can only be the result of a negotiation process between the involved persons. In general, digital and technological solutions have to be designed in a way they take account the openness of these negotiation processes. They have to flexibly support individual arrangements and be able to learn.

Creating room for familial negotiation processes and adaptable care arrangements

There is a central requirement taking into consideration the potentially conflict-ridden constellation between people in need of care, care-giver relatives, professional carers and the operational logic of digital solutions as well as individually varying ideas of a good life with health restrictions: The digitalisation of care should serve to create new room for respectful relationship and negotiation processes in families and where applicable with the wider informal support network (neighbours, friends). Conversely, existing room for negotiations must not be restricted.

Supporting participation

Usually the need for care is accompanied by losing possibilities to social, cultural and familial participation. This often is also true for the family carers, especially in cases of high stress. The career related disadvantages that family carers sometimes face are currently being looked at by an Advisory Board of the German family ministry (BMFSFJ) for the “Reconciliation of Care and Professional Work”. The goal of care policy measures has to be that a person remains to be able to actively or passively participate in social and familial life, despite the need for care or a care-providing relation. Therefore, the primary objective of digitalisation efforts in the care sector should be the promotion of participation chances of people in need of care and family carers.

Promoting self-determination

As in all families, also in care-giving families self-determination is only conceivable in terms of relationship categories. “Autonomous and free decision making by a person is always integrated into the existing net of social relations and has therefore inevitable consequences for others, who’s entitlements on free decision making have to be taken into consideration and to be respected just the same” (Deutscher Ethikrat 2018, p. 15). Because of the vulnerable situation of people in need of care their right to self-determination is, however, an especially high good, also against the interests of other family members.

The primary objective of support by professional care-givers, by family carers as well as by digital and technical aids has to be to maintain the self-determination of people in need of care and to lead a “life according to one’s own standards”. Living daily life, social relations, hygiene and so on according to one’s own ideas, is often hard to achieve for people in need of care because of sometimes rigid professional and familial images of the “correct, active, dignified lifestyle under need of care”.

For example, implicit rigid values about the meaning of a “good lifestyle in old age”, healthy behaviour, hygienic standards as well as inner-familial divisions of labour and so on must not be “inscribed” or deposited as standard, neither into digital and technical solutions nor into artificial intelligence that operates them. Because, even when it comes to seemingly neutral technological solutions, such as electronic documentation systems, it appears “that the standardising effects of such systems do not leave relational behaviour untouched either, but subordinate it to an extent under a ‘machine logic’” (Kehl 2018).

Therefore, technology’s or software’s inherent values must be transparent and individually adaptable. They are to support self-determination of people in need of care and individual negotiation processes within families. The collection of values and preferences of people in need of care and the resulting initial individual adaptation of digital aids as well as readjustments of such adaptations have to be taken into consideration in regards to the financing, as well as typical tasks such as maintenance and the import of updates.

Enabling mixed help structures

In order to strengthen familial care and at the same time to avoid excessive demands on single family members digital and technical aids should support the cooperation of heterogeneous mixed help structures made of professional, familial, friendship and neighbourhood actors. Under no circumstances are digital solutions to limit the right of people in need of care to choose, for example, by predetermining one particular form of follow-up-care or one particular service provider in case of care arrangement changes or during transits between forms of care, such as, hospital discharge, (geriatric) rehab, short-term-care and so on.

Relieving care

Enabling mixed help structures also includes the improvement of working conditions of professional care-providers in order to increase the attractiveness of the care profession. The simplification of documentation and planning tasks as well as supporting professional care-providers with digital information about complex care problems and the reduction of physical stress through assisting technology can contribute to bring more people into care profession and to increase the times spent in it. When it comes to the substitution of human care-providers in certain task areas by robotics, it has to be monitored very carefully whether it serves to increase the attractiveness or whether it is perceived as undermining the essence of the care profession.

Guaranteeing access equality

Digitalisation is also a question of social and economic equity. Because digitalisation occupies an increasingly central role in daily life, all families and social groups must be granted equal access to the digital world. Today, the costs for procurement and operation of systems of Ambient Assisted Living (AAL) are still relatively high and constitute a factor in combination with approval practices of nursing care insurance funds, which has a negative influence on the acceptance of such technologies. In order, not to deepen the digital social inequality in old age even further, financing of AAL systems should be made easier.

In addition to proper access to infrastructure and content, respective competences and abilities that enable technical use as well as handling digital services are necessary. This also includes critical questioning, responsible behaviour and awareness for data protection and privacy.

Another aspect of access equality is the usability as well as the usefulness of digital technology for older people in need of care. In order to guarantee these aspects, all users should be involved in the development following the approach of User-Centered Design (UCD). This is currently happening, however, apparently still too often as “alibi practice”. But, User-Centered Design will only turn into a “cooperative practice – transparent, participative, equal – when older users are involved in the development at an early stage and seriously” (Endter 2018).

“Technical assistance systems must not stigmatise”. On the one hand, they should not exclude older people from use, for example, because of too high requirements for fine-motor skills. On the other hand, according to Universal Designs, neither should they be aimed at elders alone but also at younger people and children to avoid an association of the technology with simple deficit balancing (Meyer 2016, p. 20).

Persons, who do not have or do not wish access to digital services, must however continue to be able to fall back on non-digital services.

Enabling consultation on digitalisation

The various consultation services in the care sector need competences in the field of digitalisation and care. Consultation in cases of care must, however, continue its focus on shaping stable care arrangements that take into consideration the interests of people in need of care and their care-providing relatives. Here, questions of personal resources of the involved, their values and preferences as well as the possibilities of the professional care support are central. Digital and technical aids can be a further topic in the consultation process and a building block in the care arrangement. Therefore, in the context of being in need of care, it seems to us that a separate consultation about technology is not useful because the consultation landscape is already unnecessarily fragmented and the implementation of technology only contributes to the stability of care arrangements in the context of concrete situations of need.

However, consultants in care support centres, social services and other consultation centres have to be very much qualified to be able to understand technical innovations and to assess their effects on specific situations of need and familial cultural contexts. As any consultation of older people in need of support they have to be culturally and diversity sensitive in order to increase the probability of reaching disadvantaged target groups at all and then to achieve an appropriate consultation success.

Ensuring data protection and privacy of all family and network members

Data gained in the care process can contain sensitive health data as well as information about familial and social support networks and their quality. When it comes to children, families are on the one side usually very sensitised in regards to the consequences of using digital tools and media, and on the other side at the same time there is a great amount of helplessness in dealing with digital media/tools. The middle generation, who supposedly has the competences to protect and to school the more vulnerable parts of the family such as children, young people and the old, are often overstrained themselves. In regards to data protection they themselves often exhibit a “dangerous use” of digital technology (Kutscher and Bouillon 2018).

In contrast to children, when it comes to older people in need of care data protection still plays too small a role in internal family discussions. The expert community’s image of the importance of data protection for older people in need of care appears to be inconsistent. Some discussions give the impression that data protection and privacy for older people were less urgent concerns than for the young. There must not be a reduced standard of data protection for people in need of care.

Avoiding a hierarchical structure of care activities

The digitalisation and mechanisation of documentation and administration tasks can lead to more time for professional care. However, for two reasons we do not share the view that the replacement of body-related care treatments by robotics would also lead to more time for “human affection”: It is not clear why an opposition is constructed between body-related help with eating, washing, bowel movements etc. and human (communicational,

emotional) affection. These activities come with intense verbal and non-verbal communication and give both sides involved an extended picture of the other person.³ In our society feeding and eating together with children counts as central means to convey culture and the ability to enjoy. Why in regards to older people offering food is called in parts of the discussion on digitalisation “dead time” that could rather be used for “human affection”, cannot be understood by the family organisations. And, since great technological progress is being made especially in the development of technologically-based serving meals (feeding robotics), the family organisations fear that for reasons of rationalisation technology-driven practices could move into professional care, that do not serve the people in need of care and their families.

On the other hand, the AGF sees the risk that under the given economic pressure in the care sector, resources freed-up through the substitution of human care activities by robotics may not flow into a surplus of attention but may be saved..

5.5. Designing digitalization and care

The Association of German Family Organisations (AGF) welcomes a broad social debate about guidelines and limits of digitalisation in an ageing society. In contrast to the very much technology and professionally-driven debate, it is needed to focus in on the perspective of people in need of care and their families. From the perspective of family organisations, a central initial question should be how digitalisation affects daily life, communication and relationships of the structurally, socially, materially and culturally very diverse family forms with older family members.

We suggest that the “German Charta of rights for people in need of help and care” is concretised in regards to requirements on digitalisation of care. So far, questions of digitalisation such as privacy, data protection and access equality play only a minor role in the Charta. From our view, further development is necessary at least in regards to Article 1 “Self-determination and help for self-help”, Article 3 “Privacy”, Article 5 “Information, consultation and education”, Article 6 “Communication, appreciation and participation in society”, Article 7 “Religion, culture and world view”.

Weighing usefulness and risks of digitalisation of care is difficult because of the high dynamic on the side of technological development as well as on the side of threats to privacy and data protection. Often, no general assessment can be given but instead just for concrete measures and in the face of diverse family forms and life phases just in the context of a specific family situation. However, in general the following aspects should be taken into consideration:

- he Association of German Family Organisations (AGF) welcomes a broad social debate about guidelines and limits of digitalisation in an ageing society. In contrast to the very much technology and professionally-driven debate, it is needed to focus in on the perspective of people in need of care and their families. From the perspective of family organisations, a central initial question should be how digitalisation affects daily life, communication and relationships of the structurally, socially, materially and culturally very diverse family forms with older family members.
- We suggest that the “German Charta of rights for people in need of help and care” is concretised in regards to requirements on digitalisation of care. So far, questions of digitalisation such as privacy, data protection and access equality play only a minor role in the Charta. From our view, further development is necessary at least in regards to Article 1 “Self-determination and help for self-help”, Article 3 “Privacy”, Article 5 “Information,

³ The discussion among care experts also points to the diagnostic potential of body-related care treatments and feeding.

consultation and education”, Article 6 “Communication, appreciation and participation in society”, Article 7 “Religion, culture and world view”.

- Weighing usefulness and risks of digitalisation of care is difficult because of the high dynamic on the side of technological development as well as on the side of threats to privacy and data protection. Often, no general assessment can be given but instead just for concrete measures and in the face of diverse family forms and life phases just in the context of a specific family situation. However, in general the following aspects should be taken into consideration:
 - Does a digitalisation measure lead to more or less self-determination for the person in need of care and the family carer?
 - Is the room for negotiations over support arrangements widened or minimised?
 - Does a digitalisation measure improve communication within families, with friends, the neighbourhood and, if applicable, with professional care providers?
 - Does a digitalisation measure promote direct human contact or does it substitute direct contacts?
 - Does a digitalisation measure / mechanisation lead to physical or psychological relief for care-providing relatives?
 - Does a digitalisation measure improve reconciliation of care and work for relatives?
 - Does a digitalisation measure lead to further personnel / machine fragmentation as well as segmentation of support services and personnel change of carers or does it support continuity of care relations?
 - Does a digitalisation measure contribute to avoid the overburdening of (single) familial carers or does it concentrate responsibility onto single helpers?
 - Does a digitalisation measure support mixed care arrangements of family members, neighbours, friends, professional services?
 - Do all (forms of) families have equal access to the advantages of the digitalisation measure? Are possible disadvantages distributed evenly?

Literature at the AGF.

AGF

 **Arbeitsgemeinschaft**
 **der deutschen**
 **Familienorganisationen e.V.**

 Deutscher Familienverband e.V. (DFV)

 evangelische arbeitsgemeinschaft familie e.V. (eaf)

 Familienbund der Katholiken e.V. (FDK)

 Verband alleinerziehender Mütter und Väter e.V. (VAMV)

 Verband binationaler Familien und Partnerschaften e.V. (iaf)