

## Towards a Typology of Sexting

The following typology is drawn from focus group participants' descriptions of various kinds of 'naked or semi-naked' photographs. This typology differs from Wolak and Finkelhor's typology of sexting which is based on US case-law, rather than young people's accounts of their own media production practices (2011).

### Different Kinds of 'Naked or Semi-Naked' Images

- *Private selfies or self-portraits.* These are the digital equivalent of images in a mirror, and are intended for self-reflection rather than sharing. The subjects of these pictures may be clothed or unclothed, and some 'private' selfies may include genital close-ups.
- *Public selfies.* These self-portraits are posted on social media platforms such as Facebook, and are intended to be shown to friends and strangers. They include images produced to show a new hair-cut, or new item of clothing to close friends. These pictures may include self-portraits of subjects dressed in underwear or swimwear.
- *Contextual images.* Pictures where undress is 'to be expected', such as images taken at the beach or swimming pool, featuring one or more young people in swimwear.
- *Joke images.* These are the photographic equivalent of nudey runs, and are intended as displays of shared bravado or humour. 'Sneaky hat' pictures fall into this category.
- *Inoffensive sexual pictures.* Flirtatious semi-naked or naked images, produced and shared consensually between peers/intimate partners.
- *Offensive and unethical sexual pictures.* These include:
  - Flirtatious semi-naked or naked images produced consensually, but shared by ex-friend or ex-partner for revenge.
  - Images produced or shared without consent. (e.g. a shower intrusion photo).
  - Images produced consensually but distributed/consumed outside of an appropriate peer/friendship context. (e.g. by a 40 year old rather than a 17 year old).

This typology outlines the range of images that might be perceived by adults as sexting. However, it was clear from our focus group discussions that young people did not define all these types of image as sexual, or suggestive. Although one group alluded to instances where young men pressured young women into producing or sharing photos, the majority of focus-group discussions focused on non-coercive image exchanges.

Gender differences were emphasised in discussions of the reception of naked images, but less so in the context of their production. One group put forward a proposal that young men were more likely to produce and share naked images online because they had more 'confidence' about their bodies. This suggests that popular discourses of 'body confidence' and 'self esteem' (that occur in both formal and informal education targeting young people) might reasonably influence the ways that young people think about nudity and self-representation. Naked or semi-naked pictures may represent 'self confidence' rather than 'provocativeness' for young people in some contexts. This suggests that adults seeking to develop educational and policy responses to 'the problem of sexting' must acknowledge young people's diverse perspectives on nudity or semi-nudity as significant and context-dependent. To do otherwise is to risk being dismissed as irrelevant.

## 6. Recommendations

These recommendations are presented in two major categories, (1) strategies and (2) new approaches to understanding sexting:

### Strategies:

- 6.1 We recommend that educators, policy makers and legislators consider context-specific and age-appropriate legal/educational approaches for young people in different age-groups. Educators and legislators should particularly address the specific needs of those under 18, yet over the age of consent (i.e. young people aged 16-17).
- 6.2 We recommend the inclusion of young people on committees, review boards and other policy-making groups, so that their experiences can inform future frameworks for understanding and responding to sexting.
- 6.3 We recommend that both educational and legal responses to sexting reflect 'harm reduction' principles rather than promoting abstinence from the production and exchange of digital photos between peers or from using social media.
- 6.4 We recommend that sexting education be more focused on fostering ethical, respectful practices between intimate partners and within friendship networks.
- 6.5 We recommend legislative reform to clarify the application of existing laws relating to child pornography and child exploitation material (as they are applied to sexting), and to clarify the parameters of lawful conduct by and between consenting children and young people.

### New Approaches:

- 6.6 We recommend that educational strategies that address sexting, including information resources for adults, seek to problematise and challenge gendered double-standards in relation to concepts such as 'provocativeness', 'self-confidence', 'responsibility', 'consequences' and 'reputation'.
- 6.7 We recommend that educational strategies that address sexting, including information resources for adults, acknowledge young people's rights and responsibilities with regard to self-representation and sexual expression.
- 6.8 We recommend that educational strategies that address sexting, including information resources for adults, distinguish between non-consensual production and distribution of sexting images and consensual image sharing.
- 6.9 These educational strategies should emphasise ethical frameworks, and recognise that sexting can be an expression of intimacy, rather than shaming young people for sexting. Framing sexual expression only as a risk does little to alleviate anxieties or feelings of shame that young people may experience in relation to their sexualities.

## 7. Appendices

### 7.1 Literature Review

Sexting studies commonly point to rates of teen sexting that are drawn from one of three large-scale US studies. The National Campaign to Prevent Teen & Unplanned Pregnancy reported that 20% of teen participants (aged 13-19) had “sent/posted nude or seminude pictures or video of themselves” (National Campaign to Prevent Teen & Unplanned Pregnancy 2008, 1). The *Digital Abuse Study* found that one in three participants (aged 14-24) “had engaged in some form of sexting”, which included sending or receiving sexual images and/or words (Associated Press & MTV 2009). Pew Internet’s *Teens and Sexting* study found that 4% of teens with mobile phones (aged 12-17) reported sending “sexually suggestive nude or nearly nude images of themselves to someone else via text messaging”, and 15% said they had received such messages (Lenhart 2009, 3). The only comparable Australia data comes from the *AU Kids Online* study which found that 15% of 11-16 year old respondents had “received sexual messages” via the internet, and 4% had sent such messages (Green et al. 2011, 9). This is comparable to the *EU Kids Online* figures of 15% and 3% respectively (Livingstone et al. 2011), yet this data does not include sexting via mobile phones. Prevalence data to date has been inconsistent due to different study designs and different understandings of sexting (Lounsbury et al. 2011), as evident in the above differences of age-groups, media (online and/or mobile phones) and ‘sext’ content (images and/or words).

The *New Voices / New Laws* report was published in November 2012 (Tallon et al. 2012). *New Voices / New Laws* offers quantitative and qualitative data on young people’s concerns, and is a suitable companion to this report, which demonstrates similar findings in relation to young people’s concerns around the legal aspects of sexting. In each of the studies, young people expressed dissatisfaction with current laws designed to protect them, as well as confusion over their rights and responsibilities. Participants from each study expressed ethical considerations around sexting that could be useful in reforming current sexting laws, policy and education.

#### 7.1.1 Approaches and Disciplines

Sexting research crosses several disciplines, given its social, cultural, legal, and technological aspects. Much of the sexting literature focuses on its legal aspects including criminology (see for e.g. Jaishankar 2009, Comartin et al. 2012), media and communications law (see for e.g. Calvert 2009, Eraker 2010, Nunziato 2012), and privacy rights (see for e.g. Leary 2011, Slane 2010). More recently it has been researched in relation to health (Diliberto and Matthey 2009, Brown et al. 2009), education (Manzo 2009, May 2011), social policy (Schmitz and Siry 2011, Stone 2011), youth studies (Chalfen 2010, Draper 2011), psychology (King 2012, Sirianni and Vishwanath 2012), pediatrics (Katzman 2010, O’Keeffe and Clarke-Pearson 2011), psychiatry (Sadhu 2012), and business (Mainiero and Jones 2012).

Recent studies have linked sexting to ‘high risk’ sex practices (Rice et al. 2012, Temple et al. 2012), though these links have been questioned elsewhere (Gordon-Messer et al. 2013, Levine 2013). Unlike many of these approaches, a ‘media culture’ framework accepts that “young people are media-makers, not just media-consumers” (Chalfen 2009, 260).

#### 7.1.2 Terminology and Debates

According to Karaian, sexting is a media-coined phrase that is used in media and adult discussions, and not by those who practice it (Karaian 2012). Drawing on data from the *Young, Mobile, Networked* study, Albury and Crawford observed that for 18-30 year olds, “the word ‘sexting’ was not commonly preferred, with some interviewees describing it as a journalistic term rather than something used within peer groups” (2012, 3). Sexting has also been referred to as ‘revenge porn’ (Willard 2010), ‘self-exploitation’ (Leary 2007), or ‘self-produced child pornography’ (Goldstein 2009). As Goldstein notes, such terms further a particular idealised agenda, focussing on

harm that demands legislation.

According to Hasinoff, “sexting is typically seen as a technological, sexual, and moral crisis” (2012, 2), and Chalfen notes that public concern has focused on “what adults believe to be the inappropriate behaviour of young people” (2009, 260). These media discourses have been highlighted elsewhere (Hasinoff in press, Karaian 2012, Bond 2011). According to Lunceford, the core public concern around sexting is the risk of harm (2011). It is noted that harm is not only faced by individuals involved in sexting, but a broader social harm is evoked through materials that paedophiles may use for arousal and grooming (Lunceford 2011, Leary 2007). Elsewhere, Powell aligns the unauthorised dissemination of sexual images with sexual assault, arguing that any distinction made between these “fails to recognise the full impact... on those pictured” (2010, 121). Framing sexting as an ‘emergent’ practice, Chalfen states that “relevant codes of laws, rules, standards and even etiquette have yet to be established and formalised” (Chalfen 2009, 265); thus much public and media discussion to date has been trying to regulate a practice that is not fully understood.

### 7.1.3 Technology, Young People and Risk

Crawford and Goggin trace a history of ‘moral panics’ involving young people and technology (2008). Within this history, much media attention is given to the question of how technologies connect with ‘the nature’ of young people (Goggin 2010, 125). Media reports on sexting tend to foreground the role of technology (Goldstein 2009), and thus, “societal concerns and anxieties over mobile media can quickly turn into panics, triggering gravely serious policing of behaviours” (Goggin 2010, 128). According to Goldstein, the media and legal discourses involved in such panics construct a belief in children’s innocence by presenting two villains; the ‘ubiquitous paedophile’, and the technology that enables sexting (2009). Hasinoff notes the special ‘problematization’ of young people and their behaviours, observing the contrast that lifestyle magazines for adults often represent sexting not as a risk, but as a tool for greater intimacy (2012, 9). Media researchers elsewhere note that new technology always brings social advantages and disadvantages, and to only focus on one or the other misrepresents these technologies (Höflich and Linke 2011, Pertierra 2005).

Höflich and Linke warn against a technological determinist understanding of media, highlighting the ways that human relationships influence the use of communication technologies (2011). Bond argues that mobile phones offer much to young people who are “developing sexuality and intimate relationships” and constructing a “sexual self-identity” (Bond 2011, 587). Cupples and Thompson argue that “gender and other social identities are worked out and performed in interaction with things as well as people” (2010, 14); this includes mobile phones. In a study of the use of mobile phones in couple relationships, Höflich and Linke suggest that this technology allows couples to regulate proximity and distance (2011). This could be tested in relation to young people’s sexting which has been suggested as a way of delaying sex, and offering “a chance to simultaneously engage the body and keep it at a distance” (Cupples and Thompson 2010, 10). Similarly, Lenhart notes that some teens “view sexting as a safer alternative to real life sexual activity” (2009, 13).

### 7.1.4 Media Production and Sexual Cultures

Hasinoff argues that researchers, educators, and policymakers could respond more effectively to the *practice* of sexting by viewing sexters as media producers (2012). Lunceford also argues for a need to consider teen sexting “within the larger media landscape in which these teens reside” (2011, 110). Thus, sexting could be considered an amalgam of new technologies and new intimacies; a dynamic media practice that is as social as it is technological. Chalfen notes a history of sexual image taking and sharing which includes the polaroid camera, and asks if sexting could “merely be a new iteration of previous practices” (2009, 259). Media scholars often note the co-constitution of social and technological shifts, demonstrating how mobile phones do not create but expand sociotechnical ‘networks of intimacy’ (Pertierra 2005).

Attwood and Smith approach young people’s sexuality through a focus on ‘sexual cultures’ which do not assume

youth sexuality to be always dangerous and problematic (2011). They argue that despite researchers' concerns for young people's safety, "young people's engagements with sexual issues remains a relatively unexplored area" (Attwood and Smith 2011). Thus, research into young people's engagement with sexting could generate a grounded understanding of sexting. In a legal framework, any discussion of sexting practice could be considered self-incriminating (see Appendix for Confidentiality Statement issued in the focus groups). Current Australian laws prevent researchers from asking people under 18 years about their personal sexting practices. This extends the bias of current research that focuses on 'expert views' (Walker et al. 2011), is top-down, and uses terminology that does not connect to young people's experiences and concerns.

#### 7.1.5 Harm Reduction

Lunceford argues for an ethical approach to sexting education, suggesting that ethical awareness can never prevent harm but is useful in reducing it (2011). He states that education should not focus on telling young people what is appropriate so much as "teaching them how to minimise the harm to themselves, as well as others, as they perform their sexuality" (Lunceford 111). Much education around sexting focuses on presenting child pornography laws as a disincentive to sext (Goggin 2010). Rather than questioning whether sexting constitutes child pornography, many experts "suggest that youth need to be educated so that they understand this is what they are indeed producing" (Goggin 2010, 127). Young people are rarely afforded the opportunity to differentiate their self-representations from representations of child pornography. Hasinoff argues that the focus of sexting education "should clearly be to reduce unauthorised distribution" (2012, 10).

#### 7.1.6 Rights, Context and Sexual Citizenship

When falling under child pornography laws, minors involved in sexting are simultaneously considered perpetrators and victims (Goldstein 2009). Willard argues that different practices warrant different responses, and thus it matters whether image-sending is self-initiated or pressured, as does the nature of the relationship between sender and receiver (2010). Lenhart addresses some of this complexity by looking at three common sexting scenarios; sending images as a prelude to sex, image swapping between sexual partners, and image sending amongst friends (2009, 10-13). Hasinoff argues that 'typically obscured' aspects of consent are important in resolving sexting issues, and that to recognise non-consensual and malicious sexting "it is a prerequisite to understand that sexting can be consensual" (2012, 11).

Albury et al. note that current laws de-legitimise young people's right to sexual self-expression (2010). Albury et al. note that young people's sexual citizenship must be acknowledged in these debates, and ask "what meaning are we ascribing to young people's sexuality if they are deemed *outside* of legitimate representation?" (2010). According to Lunceford, "adolescents view digital technologies as modes of expression, and a key facet of such expression is sexual in nature" (Lunceford 2010, 242). Further to this Goldstein states that "by criminalising self-produced child pornography, our government has effectively censored minors' right to record their sexualities or erotic identities" (Goldstein 2009, n.p.). Thus, current media and legal discourses ensure erasure of teens sexual self-representations, even though such self-representations can be "an important way to respond to the objectifying media portrayals of women" (Hasinoff 2012, 11). Accordingly, Lunceford says "we must examine sexting from a different standpoint, one that acknowledges the complicity and agency of the adolescents themselves" (2011, 107).

#### 7.1.7 Gender and Representation

In media and public discourse, potential victims are predominantly figured as female and many scholars note there is greater social fall-out for girls (Ringrose et al. 2012, Powell 2010). Media and public discourses of female victims often hinges upon broader moral concerns about the sexualisation of girls (Hasinoff 2012, Karaian 2012, Egan and Hawkes 2008). As Karaian argues, a discourse of protecting young girls from sexualisation paradoxically

positions girls as objects, not subject to speak themselves into discourses of sexting that position them as victims (never agents) of sexuality (2012). Karaian seeks to centre girls' voices in sexting debates, because thus far dominant sexting discourse "reifies teenage girls as sexual objects, to be seen and not heard" (2012, 3), once again denying a space for self-representation.

It is often said that the law is trailing cultural and social norms, and that while "popular culture functions to normalise adolescent sexuality... our legal system seeks to demonise and sanction it" (Lunceford 2010, 242). Elsewhere Lunceford notes how "laws concerning adolescent sexuality can reveal underlying ethical stances" (2011, 104). Smith notes that current laws are "simply too blunt an instrument to deal with consensual teenage sex" (2008, 539), which is commonplace. Legal approaches to sexting, according to Lunceford, often ignore that "these adolescents are *choosing* to create erotic images of themselves" (2011, 106), and that participants do not always consider sexting exploitative.

#### **7.1.8 Privacy**

Research on the legal aspects of sexting is often concerned with rights to privacy, featuring discussion on how mediated cultures continue to challenge these rights (Leary 2011, Slane 2010, Marwick et al. 2010), although most of this literature relates to North American laws. Hasinoff argues that teens should have the right to consensually sext, but also the right to have their images kept private (in press). Elsewhere, Hasinoff argues that a media production perspective of sexting would bring young people's privacy rights to the fore (2012). Livingstone argues that privacy is very important to young people in digital media environments, but that hard distinctions between public and private are less relevant because privacy is carefully managed based on the nature of different friendships (2008). Thus, legal discourses of privacy may not always fit with young people's views of privacy and disclosure.

#### **7.1.9 Sexual Images and Pornographic Framing**

Child pornography laws prohibit the possibility of shared and agreed upon visual representations of the 'sexual image'. Thus, there is no systematic, shared, method for determining sexts as child pornography. As Chalfen notes, "most of our knowledge of sext content comes from written descriptions" (2009, 262). Thus, the determination of 'sexual imagery' is vague, broad, and rarely part of public discussion. Lunceford notes that young people producing these images are also challenging the ways we consider child pornography, as they are clearly not considering the images in these terms (2011, 110). Thus, greater consideration of young people as producers of self-representations, and as sexual agents, is needed. As Egan and Hawkes note, current logic suggests that "any display of tween aged bodies in bikinis or tight clothing could fall prey to the charge of sexualisation" (2008, 307).

#### **7.1.10 Friendship and Intimacy**

The sending of naked images also occurs outside sexual contexts (Chalfen 2009, Lenhart 2009). As Albury and Crawford state, "image exchanges can be embedded in wider systems of friendship, courtship and social bonding" (2012). Similarly, Bond argues that sexual images on young people's phones "appeared to play a role in their everyday lives in relieving boredom, generating humour and gaining popularity" (2011, 598). That these aspects of sexting are not part of public debates which consistently approach its negative aspects/potential, ensures that public debates often "overlook the meaningful, playful, and creative nature of young people's communicative practices" (Bond 2011, 598).

Recent research has argued for a need to theorise pleasure as well as dangers for girls who sext (Thurlow and Bell 2009, 1039, Hasinoff 2012). In his analysis of social networking and mobile phone use amongst gay men, Dowsett notes "a remarkable shift in *inciting* desire rather than merely *representing* it" (2010, 269). A discourse of incitement is mostly absent in sexting research, except through the figure of the "ubiquitous, (adult) paedophile audience

that might somehow access these images” (Goldstein 2009, n.p.). Further research is needed to understand young people’s own frameworks for understanding the risks and pleasures of sexting.

## 7.2 Focus Group Schedule

### WELCOME

Collect consent forms

Hand out confidentiality statements

### INTRODUCTION

Voluntary discussion; free to leave at any time; no impact on any current or future relationships with UNSW; referral info located at the door.

### DISCUSSION

#### What is sexting?

- When are you likely to hear the term ‘sexting’?
- What does ‘sexting’ mean to you?
- How do you think adults define it? [parents, teachers, media...]
- How do these definitions differ?

How we’re defining sexting - [http://www.lawstuff.org.au/nsw\\_law/topics/Sexting](http://www.lawstuff.org.au/nsw_law/topics/Sexting)

- Why do you think there’s a lot of attention given to ‘young people’ and sexting?

#### Sexting Context

- Do you think that sexting is a problem? Why/why not?
- Who’s usually involved?
- Are there times when sexting is okay?
- When is it not okay?
- How might good sexting go bad? How might this be prevented?

#### Educational Resources

- Have you seen much educational material on sexting? If so, what?

### TAGGED PREVIEW

Discussion: What’s happening here?

### MEGAN’S STORY

Discussion: What’s the message? Does it work? How could it be improved?

### PHOTOGRAPH (trailer)

Discussion: What does this say about sexting? Does this format work?

### Media

- Can you name some examples of sexting storylines on TV, or in other media you’ve seen?
- How is sexting portrayed in those stories? What happens to those characters?

### NEIGHBOURS CLIPS

Discussion: What do you think of this? Why is sexting a problem here?

[Note emotional responses? Are characters defended/derided?]  
[Compare *Neighbours* storyline to other TV examples mentioned]

### Law

- Are you aware of the legal penalties for underage sexting?

PHOTOGRAPH: Sergeant Gildea (clip 1)

- Do you think these laws are appropriate? Why/why not?

### Concluding

- What do you think would be the best message about sexting for someone your age?
- What about for people younger than you?
- Any other thoughts?

## 7.3 Focus Group Confidentiality Statement

### Confidentiality

Confidentiality is keeping the information shared during the workshop to yourself.

Everyone at the workshop should feel free to talk openly about things they have done or seen. This might include telling a story about an event that made the person feel embarrassed or upset.

### Your Rights

Everyone who joins in the 'Young People, Sexting and the Law' focus group has a right to confidentiality. This means the information you share is private and has limits on how it can be shared and recorded.

All information will be shared and recorded anonymously. This means your identity is kept secret. Your name will be deleted from our records as soon as the workshop is completed. No names or suburbs will be mentioned in any of our reports.

### Your Responsibilities

You have a responsibility to make sure the confidentiality, privacy and anonymity of others is respected. The personal things you hear in the workshops and the identity of who says what MUST be kept secret.

When you sign this confidentiality statement you agree:

- Not to tell anyone outside the workshop the facts of events talked about in the workshop;
- Not to try and get more information about events shared in the workshop; and
- Not to share any of the participants' personal details or identifying information outside the workshop.

Signature:

Date:

## 7.4 Focus Group Media

Video clips were shown in the focus group from five media sources. The first clip shown was *Megan's Story*, a two-minute video from a ThinkUKnow campaign, 2010. The film begins with Megan exiting a school bathroom smiling, buttoning her shirt and holding her phone. Her smile fades in the classroom as one by one classmates receive images of her via their phones and look at her suggestively or with disgust. When her teacher receives the image and looks at her with disapproval, she breaks down and leaves the room.

The next clip was a one-minute trailer for *Tagged*, a short film made by the Australian Communications and Media Authority about cyberbullying, in 2011. The trailer features a montage of clips over a musical score, suggesting the gravity of bullying, sexting, and digital media misuse; people are seen photographing, being photographed, and using social media and mobile phones. As per other education campaigns, *Tagged* suggests that sexting is a form of cyberbullying.

Two clips from a *Neighbours* sexting storyline were shown (the first of seven scenes collected from this particular storyline). The first scene shows school-aged Tash in a café with her friends and father (who is also the school principal). Her female friend pulls her aside and holds her phone up. Tash is shocked and says 'this is private', but her friend tells her it has been forwarded to 'half the kids at school'. The second clip features the same friend consoling Tash in the café, but Tash says it's no big deal, and that she's 'not the only girl with a few racy photos out there'. She mentions Paris Hilton and Kim Kardashian becoming famous through this. Her friend insists that she's being 'exploited' and 'violated' but Tash says she's the one with the power because people will see that she looks 'awesome' and 'hot'. Her friend tells her 'that's not what they're thinking'. Tash's dad enters the scene and she delays him from checking his email.

A clip was shown from extra footage on the *Photograph* DVD – a short film made in Bendigo, Victoria in 2010. *Photograph* tells the story of Holly who sends a naked image to her boyfriend Dylan, who shares the image with a friend who forwards it further. In this clip Sergeant Matt Gildea explains the legal ramifications of sexting via the characters of the film, and the criminal charges likely to happen. He gives a definition of 'child pornography' and explains how the offence lies not just in possession, but also the transmission of these images.

## 7.5 Adult Stakeholders – Organisations

The following is a list of organisations whose members attended the workshop in December 2012, or provided detailed commentary on the working paper.

Australian Federal Police

Australian Research Centre in Sex, Health and Society, La Trobe University

Australian Youth Affairs Coalition

BoysTown (Kids Helpline)

Children's Legal Service, Legal Aid NSW

Criminology, Monash University

Criminology, UNSW

Family Planning NSW

National Centre Against Bullying, The Alannah and Madeline Foundation

National Centre in HIV Social Research, UNSW

National Children's and Youth Law Centre, UNSW

NSW Police Force

NSW Rape Crisis Centre

School of Communications and Arts, Edith Cowan University

Sydney Institute of Criminology, The University of Sydney

Western Sydney Area Health Service (Youth Health Promotion)

Young and Well Cooperative Research Centre

## 7.6 Adult Stakeholders – Workshop Agenda

### **‘Young People, Sexting and the Law’: Consultation and Workshop**

Date: December 14

Time: 1.30-4.30pm

Venue: Room 256, Robert Webster Building, UNSW Kensington Campus

Purpose:

- Participants will be introduced to the ‘Young People, Sexting and the Law’ project.
- Participants will then discuss the project’s working paper, including recommendations, from the research findings to date
- Discussion and relevant advice from this workshop will be used to inform the remainder of the project.

Groups:

#### 1) Sexting and The Law

How might our recommendations about different legal frameworks for young people aged 16-17 be applied in practice across the areas of law, law enforcement and legislation? Is this recommendation realistic in practice? Why, or why not?

#### 2) Sexting Education and Harm Reduction

How might current programs or other information resources addressing sexting draw on the notion of harm reduction, rather than promoting abstinence? Is this already being done in your professional context? How does it work? If it can’t (or shouldn’t) be done in your context, why not?

#### 3) Sexting and Ethics

How might the notion of ‘ethical sexting’ apply in your professional context? What would constitute ethical or unethical practices within your professional or disciplinary frameworks? Is this a useful concept for your thinking around sexting? Why/why not?

#### 4) New Approaches to Sexting

The working paper suggests a ‘typology’ of sexting. Is this useful within your professional or disciplinary context? Why/why not? How do our recommendations in regard to ‘gender’ and ‘intimacy’ fit into your current understandings of sexting? How well do they fit with your preferred educational or legal responses to sexting? If they don’t fit, why not? How would you re-frame them?

## 8. References

- Albury, K. & Crawford, K. 2012. Sexting, consent and young people's ethics: Beyond Megan's Story. *Continuum*, 26(3), 463-473.
- Albury, K., Funnell, N. & Noonan, E. 2010. The politics of sexting: young people, self-representation and citizenship. Australian and New Zealand Communication Association Conference: Media, Democracy and Change, 7-9 July 2010, Canberra, <http://www.anzca.net/conferences/conference-papers.html>.
- Associated Press & MTV 2009. *A Thin Line: Associated Press & MTV Digital Abuse Study*. [http://www.athinline.org/MTV-AP\\_Digital\\_Abuse\\_Study\\_Executive\\_Summary.pdf](http://www.athinline.org/MTV-AP_Digital_Abuse_Study_Executive_Summary.pdf).
- Attwood, F. & Smith, C. 2011. Investigating young people's sexual cultures: an introduction. *Sex Education*, 11(3), 235-242.
- Bond, E. 2011. The mobile phone = bike shed? Children, sex and mobile phones. *New Media & Society*, 13(4), 587.
- Brooks, K. 2011. Twits like Weiner a lesson for us all. *Brisbane Courier Mail*, 15 June, 2011.
- Brown, J.D., Keller, S. & Stern, S. 2009. Sex, Sexuality, Sexting, and SexEd: Adolescents and the Media. *Prevention Researcher*, 16(4), 5.
- Calvert, C. 2009. Sex, Cell Phones, Privacy, and the First Amendment: When Children Become Child Pornographers and the Lolita Effect Undermines the Law. *CommLaw Conspectus*, 18, 1-517.
- Carmody, M. 2009. *Sex and Ethics: Young people and ethical sex*, Palgrave Macmillan, Melbourne.
- Chalfen, R. 2009. 'It's only a picture': sexting, 'smutty' snapshots and felony charges. *Visual Studies*, 24(3), 258-268.
- Chalfen, R. 2010. Sexting as Adolescent Social Communication. *Journal of Children and Media*, 4(3), 350-354.
- Comartin, E., Kernsmith, R. & Kernsmith, P. 2012. "Sexting" and Sex Offender Registration: Do Age, Gender, and Sexual Orientation Matter? *Deviant Behavior*, 34(1), 33-52.
- Cox Communications 2009. *Teen Online and Wireless Safety survey: Cyberbullying, sexting, and parental controls*. May 2009. Cox Communications with The National Center for Missing & Exploited Children (NCMEC).
- Crawford, K. & Goggin, G. 2008. Handsome Devils: mobile imaginings of youth culture. *Global Media Journal: Australian Edition*, 1(2).
- Cupples, J. & Thompson, L. 2010. Heterotextuality and Digital Foreplay: Cell phones and the culture of teenage romance. *Feminist Media Studies*, 10(1), 1-17.
- Curnutt, H. 2012. Flashing Your Phone: Sexting and the Remediation of Teen Sexuality. *Communication Quarterly*, 60(3), 353-369.
- Diliberto, G.M. & Matthey, E.E. 2009. Sexting: Just how much of a danger is it and what can school nurses do about it? *NASN school nurse*, 24(6), 262-267.
- Dobson, A.S., Rasmussen, M.L. & Tyson, D. 2012. *Submission to the Victorian Law Reform Committee Inquiry into Sexting*, [http://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/images/stories/committees/lawreform/isexting/subs/S34\\_-\\_Dobson\\_Rasmussen\\_Tyson\\_Monash\\_Uni.pdf](http://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/images/stories/committees/lawreform/isexting/subs/S34_-_Dobson_Rasmussen_Tyson_Monash_Uni.pdf).
- Dowsett, G.W. 2010. Dancing with daemons. In Aggleton, P. & Parker, R. (eds.) *Routledge handbook of sexuality, health and rights*. Routledge, London & NY.
- Draper, N.R.A. 2011. Is your teen at risk? Discourses of adolescent sexting in United States television news. *Journal of Children and Media*, 6(2), 221-236.

- Egan, R. & Hawkes, G. 2008. Endangered Girls and Incendiary Objects: Unpacking the Discourse on Sexualization. *Sexuality & Culture*, 12(4), 291-311.
- Ellwood-Clayton, B. 2012. Bring Sexy Back. *Sun Herald*, 28 October 2012.
- Eraker, E.C. 2010. Stemming Sexting: Sensible Legal Approaches to Teenagers' Exchange of Self-Produced Pornography. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, 25, 555-671.
- Goggin, G. 2010. Official and unofficial mobile media in Australia: youth, panics, innovation. In Donald, S., Anderson, T. D. & Spry, D. (eds.) *Youth, Society, and Mobile Media in Asia*. Routledge, London.
- Goggin, G. & Crawford, K. 2011. Generation Disconnections: Youth Culture and Mobile Communication. In Ling, R. & Campbell, S. (eds.) *Mobile Communication: Bringing Us Together and Tearing Us Apart*. Transaction Publishing, New Brunswick, NJ.
- Goldstein, L. 2009. Documenting and denial: discourses of sexual self-exploitation. *Jump Cut*, 51, retrieved from <http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/jc51.2009/goldstein/index.html>.
- Gordon-Messer, D., Bauermeister, J.A., Grodzinski, A. & Zimmerman, M. 2013. Sexting Among Young Adults. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 52.
- Green, L., Brady, D., Ólafsson, K., Hartley, J. & Lumby, C. 2011. *Risks and Safety for Australian Children on the Internet: Full findings from the AU Kids Online survey of 9-16 year olds and their parents*. ARC Centre of Excellence for Creative Industries and Innovation, Brisbane.
- Hasinoff, A. 2012. Sexting as media production: Rethinking social media and sexuality. *New Media & Society*.
- Hasinoff, A. in press. Should teens have the right to sext? Privacy, consent, and social media. In Greenberg, J. & Elliott, C. (eds.) *Communication in Question: Competing Perspectives on Controversial Issues in Communication Studies*. Thomson Nelson, Toronto.
- Hinduja, S. & Patchin, J. 2011. *Sexting: a brief guide for educators and parents*. Cyberbullying Research Center.
- Höflich, J.R. & Linke, C. 2011. Mobile Communication in Intimate Relationships: Relationship Development and the Multiple Dialectics of Couples' Media Usage and Communication. In Ling, R. & Campbell, S. (eds.) *Mobile Communication: Bringing Us Together or Tearing Us Apart*. Transaction Publishing New Brunswick, NJ.
- Jaishankar, K. 2009. Sexting: A new form of Victimless Crime? *International Journal of Cyber Criminology*, 3(1), 21-25.
- Karaiian, L. 2012. Lolita speaks: 'Sexting' teenage girls and the law. *Crime, Media, Culture*, 8(1), 57-73.
- Katzman, D. 2010. Sexting: Keeping teens safe and responsible in a technologically savvy world. *Paediatrics & child health*, 15(1), 41-45.
- King, B. 2012. How Much is Too Much? Limit Setting and Sexual Acting Out in a Digital Era. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 68(11).
- Kitt, K.E. 2012. *Sexting: Hot Sex Text Tips*, Lil Black Dress Press.
- Leary, M.G. 2007. Self-produced child pornography: The appropriate societal response to juvenile self-sexual exploitation. *Virginia Journal of Social Policy and the Law*, 15.
- Leary, M.G. 2011. Reasonable Expectations of Privacy for Youth in a Digital Age. *Mississippi Law Journal*, 80, 1033-1129.
- Lenhart, A. 2009. *Teens and Sexting: How and why minor teens are sending sexually suggestive nude or nearly nude images via text messaging*. December 2009. Pew Internet & American Life Project, Washington.

- Levine, D. 2013. Sexting: A Terrifying Health Risk... or the New Normal for Young Adults? *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 52(3), 257-258.
- Livingstone, S. 2008. Taking risky opportunities in youthful content creation: teenagers' use of social networking sites for intimacy, privacy and self-expression. *New Media & Society*, 10(3), 393.
- Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Görzig, A. & Ólafsson, K. 2011. *Risks and safety on the internet: The perspective of European children*. 13 January, 2011. European Union and The London School of Economics and Political Science, London.
- Lounsbury, K., Mitchell, K.J. & Finkelhor, D. 2011. *The true prevalence of sexting*. Crimes Against Children Research Centre, University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire.
- Lunceford, B. 2010. Sex in the Digital Age: Media Ecology and Megan's Law. *Explorations in Media Ecology*, 9(4), 239-44.
- Lunceford, B. 2011. The New Pornographers: Legal and Ethical Considerations of Sexting. In Drushel, B. E. & German, K. (eds.) *The Ethics of Emerging Media: Information, Social Norms, and New Media Technology*. Continuum, New York.
- Mainiero, L. & Jones, K. 2012. Workplace Romance 2.0: Developing a Communication Ethics Model to Address Potential Sexual Harassment from Inappropriate Social Media Contacts Between Coworkers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 29 May.
- Manzo, K.K. 2009. Administrators Confront Student "Sexting": Schools urged to develop policies and programs to curb the practice. *Education Week*, 28(8), 13-16.
- Marwick, A.E., Diaz, D.M. & Palfrey, J. 2010. *Youth, Privacy, and Reputation*. The Berkman Center for Internet & Society, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- May, D. 2011. *Sexting in Kansas Schools*. Doctorate of Education, University of Kansas.
- Mitchell, K.J., Finkelhor, D., Jones, L.M. & Wolak, J. 2012. Prevalence and Characteristics of Youth Sexting: A National Study. *Pediatrics*, 129(1), 13-20.
- National Campaign to Prevent Teen & Unplanned Pregnancy 2008. *Sex and Tech: Results from a Survey of Teens and Young Adults*. National Campaign to Prevent Teen & Unplanned Pregnancy & CosmoGirl.com, Washington DC.
- Nunziato, D.C. 2012. Romeo and Juliet Online and in Trouble: Criminalizing Depictions of Teen Sexuality (cu l8r: g2g 2 jail). *Northwestern Journal of Technology and Intellectual Property*, 10(3), 57.
- O'Keeffe, G.S. & Clarke-Pearson, K. 2011. The Impact of Social Media on Children, Adolescents, and Families. *Pediatrics*, 127(4), 800-804.
- Pertierra, R. 2005. Mobile phones, identity and discursive intimacy. *Human Technology: An Interdisciplinary journal on Humans in ICT Environments*, 1(1), 23.
- Powell, A. 2010. *Sex, Power and Consent: Youth Culture and the Unwritten Rules*, Cambridge University Press.
- Rice, E., Rhoades, H., Winetrobe, H., Sanchez, M., Montoya, J., Plant, A. & Kordic, T. 2012. Sexually Explicit Cell Phone Messaging Associated With Sexual Risk Among Adolescents. *Pediatrics*, 130(4).
- Ringrose, J., Gill, R., Livingstone, S. & Harvey, L. 2012. *A Qualitative Study of Children, Young People and 'Sexting'*. NSPCC (National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children), London.
- Sadhu, J. 2012. Sexting: The Impact of a Cultural Phenomenon on Psychiatric Practice. *Academic psychiatry: the journal of the American Association of Directors of Psychiatric Residency Training and the Association for Academic Psychiatry*, 36(1), 76.

- Schmitz, S. & Siry, L. 2011. Teenage Folly or Child Abuse? State Responses to "Sexting" by Minors in the US and Germany. *Policy & Internet*, 3(2).
- Sirianni, J.M. & Vishwanath, A. 2012. Sexually Explicit User-Generated Content: Understanding Motivations and Behaviors using Social Cognitive Theory. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace*, 6(1).
- Slane, A. 2010. From Scanning to Sexting: The Scope of Protection of Dignity-Based Privacy in Canadian Child Pornography Law. *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*, 48(3).
- Stone, N. 2011. The 'Sexting' Quagmire: Criminal Justice Responses to Adolescents' Electronic Transmission of Indecent Images in the UK and the USA. *Youth Justice*, 11(3), 266-281.
- Sweet, L. 2012. *Dirty Talking & Texting Tips...!!*, Carlton Books, London.
- Tallon, K., Choi, A., Keeley, M., Elliott, J. & Maher, D. 2012. *New Voices / New Laws: School-age young people in New South Wales speak out about the criminal laws that apply to their online behaviour*. November 2012. National Children's and Youth Law Centre and Legal Aid NSW, Sydney.
- Temple, J.R., Paul, J.A., van den Berg, P., Le, V.D., McElhany, A. & Temple, B.W. 2012. Teen Sexting and Its Association With Sexual Behaviors. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 166(9), 828-833.
- Thurlow, C. & Bell, K. 2009. Against technologization: Young people's new media discourse as creative cultural practice. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14(4), 1038-1049.
- Walker, S., Sanci, L. & Temple-Smith, M. 2011. Sexting and young people: experts' views. *Youth Studies Australia*, 30(4), 8-16.
- Watson, C. 2010. The naked truth about sexting. *The Adelaide Advertiser*, 3 March 2010.
- Willard, N.E. 2010. Sexting and Youth: Achieving a Rational Response. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(4), 542-562.
- Wolak, J. & Finkelhor, D. 2011. *Sexting: a typology*. March 2011. Crimes Against Children Research Centre, University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire.





**KEYES, Liz**

---

**From:** O'CONNOR, Brett  
**Sent:** Friday, 1 November 2013 11:50 AM  
**To:** SMITH, Jean; MCKAIN, Kathleen; WILSON, Susan  
**Subject:** FW: discussion about on going issues of CEM being reported at schools  
**Attachments:** CyberbullyingGuidelinesForPrincipals.pdf; IncidentManagementResponseFlowChart.jpg

FYI

**Brett O'Connor** | Director – Child Safety  
T+617 323 70919 | F +617 3235 4379 | E [brett.oconnor@dete.qld.gov.au](mailto:brett.oconnor@dete.qld.gov.au)

---

**From:** PRIDDEY, Rob  
**Sent:** Friday, 1 November 2013 10:09 AM  
**To:** O'CONNOR, Brett  
**Subject:** RE: discussion about on going issues of CEM being reported at schools

Hi Brett,

The document 'Cyberbullying and reputation management – incident management guidelines for principals' is what we provide school Principals and DP's. I have attached the guide for your reference together with a flowchart for incident management. The document provides advice in regards to the handling of child exploitation material (CEM) and other crimes police may have involvement with. We are about to update this guide for 2014 are intending to add further content in relation to the dealing of CEM and naked selfies of students.

In addition to the handling of incidents of when the student is under 16 years there is the Commonwealth offence of distribution and accessing child pornography material where the person in the image is under 18 years of age.

Happy to discuss and clarify this with the police officer or David Ebhorn.

Regards

Rob

**Rob Priddey** Manager | Cyber Safety + Reputation Management + Web Filtering  
Jobs + Digital Delivery | Information and Technology Services  
Department of Education, Training and Employment  
447 Old Cleveland Road | Mount Cootey QLD 4153  
P: 07 3034 5035 | M: s.47(3)(b) - Cont F: 07 3034 5111  
E: [rob.priddey@dete.qld.gov.au](mailto:rob.priddey@dete.qld.gov.au)

Our Vision | Engaging minds. Empowering futures.

This e-mail (including any attached files) is intended only for the addressee and may contain confidential information. If you are not the addressee, you are notified that any transmission, distribution, printing or photocopying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me. Unless explicitly attributed, the opinions expressed do not necessarily represent the official position of the Queensland Department of Education, Training and Employment.

**From:** O'CONNOR, Brett  
**Sent:** Friday, 1 November 2013 9:52 AM

**To:** PRIDDEY, Rob

**Subject:** FW: discussion about on going issues of CEM being reported at schools

Hi Rob

Do you have any info/guidelines re DETE's response to the issues raised below?

Thanks

Brett

**Brett O'Connor** | Director – Child Safety

T+617 323 70919 | F +617 3235 4379 | E [brett.oconnor@dete.qld.gov.au](mailto:brett.oconnor@dete.qld.gov.au)

---

**From:** EBORN, David

**Sent:** Thursday, 31 October 2013 8:33 AM

**To:** LEGAL, advice request

**Subject:** FW: discussion about on going issues of CEM being reported at schools

Good Morning,

In regards to the email from CPIU below.

I am seeking some advice before I speak with local CPIU and provide guidance to schools.

There have been a number of incidents lately where students have been forwarding naked photos of themselves to other students.

Naked photos of students under the age of 16 could be considered child pornography and would be reported to the police.

In these situations should the phones be held by the school for the police to be informed?

Should the school interview students about this or should they just inform the police and allow them to investigate?

At what stage should the parents be informed?

If a naked photo is of a student who is over the age of 16, would the school deal with this without police involvement? (enact responsible behaviour plan)

Regards

David

David Eborn

Principal Advisor Education Services

Central Queensland Region

Gladstone Office

Department of Education, Training and Employment

Phone - 49713614

This message (including attachments) is intended for the addressee named above. It may also be confidential, privileged and/or subject to copyright. If you wish to forward this message to others, you must first obtain the permission of the author.

If you are not the addressee named above, you must not disseminate, copy, communicate or otherwise use or take any action in reliance on this message. You understand that any privilege or confidentiality attached to this message is not waived, lost or destroyed because you have received this message in error. If you have received this message in error please notify the sender and delete from any computer.

Unless explicitly attributed, the opinions expressed in this message do not necessarily represent the official position or opinions of the State of Queensland or the Department of Education, Training and Employment.

Whilst all care has been taken, the Department of Education, Training and Employment disclaims all liability for loss or damage to person or property arising from this message being infected by computer virus or other contamination.

---

**From:** [Smith.DamienR@police.qld.gov.au](mailto:Smith.DamienR@police.qld.gov.au) [mailto:[Smith.DamienR@police.qld.gov.au](mailto:Smith.DamienR@police.qld.gov.au)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 30 October 2013 4:22 PM  
**To:** EBORN, David  
**Subject:** discussion about on going issues of CEM being reported at schools

Hi David,

I was hoping that when you had a spare moment we could have a quick discussion about the ever increasing issue of students being in possession naked photos of other students. I just want to clarify what Education Queensland's stance on this issue is and see if we can ensure there is a consistent approach across all schools with the handling of these matters.

Regards

Damien

*Damien SMITH  
Detective Sergeant 11764  
Officer in Charge  
Gladstone CPIU  
Tel: (07) 49713244  
Mob. s.47(3)(b) - C  
Fax: (07) 49713279  
E-mail: [Smith.DamienR@police.qld.gov.au](mailto:Smith.DamienR@police.qld.gov.au)*

\*\*\*\*\*  
CONFIDENTIALITY: The information contained in this electronic mail message and any electronic files attached to it may be confidential information, and may also be the subject of legal professional privilege and/or public interest immunity. If you are not the intended recipient you are required to delete it. Any use, disclosure or copying of this message and any attachments is unauthorised. If you have received this electronic message in error, please inform the sender or contact [securityscanner@police.qld.gov.au](mailto:securityscanner@police.qld.gov.au). This footnote also confirms that this email message has been checked for the presence of computer viruses.  
\*\*\*\*\*

# Cyberbullying

## and reputation management

---

Incident management guidelines for principals



# Contents



Overview	3
A school's approach to cyberbullying and reputation management	3
Incident management response	4
Incident management response flowchart	7
How to preserve evidence	8
Removal of content	10
Reporting	11
Relevant policy and procedures	12
Queensland Government contacts	13
Appendices	14
Appendix 1 –Types of mobile phone and electronic communication technology incidents	14
Appendix 2 - Criminal offences	15
Appendix 3 - Contacts for reporting abuse	17
Appendix 4 - Further resources	18

Released under RTI Act 2009

