

## **YOUNG PEOPLE AND SEXTING IN AUSTRALIA:**

### **ETHICS, REPRESENTATION AND THE LAW**



**UNSW**  
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES



arc centre of excellence  
for creative industries  
and innovation

Kath Albury (UNSW)

Kate Crawford (Microsoft Research/MIT Center for Civic Media/UNSW)

Paul Byron (UNSW) and Ben Mathews (QUT)

This project is funded by the ARC Centre of Excellence in Creative Industries and Innovation at the University of New South Wales, Australia

## AUTHOR DETAILS

Kath Albury is a Senior Lecturer at the Journalism and Media Research Centre, UNSW, and an Associate Researcher at Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence in Creative Industries and Innovation. Kath's research focuses on sexuality, gender, education and sexual ethics in contemporary media. She is currently a Chief Investigator on the Australian Research Council Discovery Project, 'Young People, Sex, Love and the Media'.

Kate Crawford is a Principal Researcher at Microsoft Research New England, a Visiting Professor at MIT Center for Civic Media, a Senior Fellow at the Information Law Institute of NYU and an Associate Professor at UNSW. She is an internationally recognised researcher of the political, cultural and ethical contexts of networked technologies. Her current work focuses on a range of data practices, including the big data industry, crisis communication, and the everyday uses of mobile and social media.

Paul Byron is a Research Assistant and PhD candidate at the Journalism and Media Research Centre, UNSW. His doctoral research looks at how young people's everyday practices of sex, intimacy, and friendship challenge and/or incorporate formal understandings of sexual health.

Ben Mathews is an Associate Professor in the School of Law at Queensland University of Technology. He is Director of Research in the School of Law, and is a member of the Health Law Research Centre: <http://www.hlrc.qut.edu.au/>. Ben's current major research areas involve law and children, focussing on law and child maltreatment, civil liability for child abuse, children and medical law, children's rights, children's health, cultural violence (including female genital mutilation) and law in school contexts.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is part of the ARC Centre of Excellence for Creative Industries and Innovation (CCI)'s Risk and Representation project.

We would like to thank danah boyd, Senior Researcher at Microsoft Research, and Research Assistant Professor at NYU, for her input and understanding on young people and social media practices. Jackie Ruddock, Research Associate (UNSW), working alongside Research Assistant Paul Byron, has provided vital support in the research process and preparation of this report and we thank her for her detailed work.

We would also like to acknowledge Lelia Green, Jean Burgess, and everyone in the Social Media Collective at Microsoft Research for their expert advice. Matthew Keeley from the National Children's and Youth Law Centre and Karen Willis from Rape Crisis Centre NSW provided invaluable advice and support for the initial stage of research. Thanks also to Dan O'Reilly-Rowe, Feona Attwood, Clarissa Smith, Clare Bale, Catharine Lumby and Alan McKee for their support for this project.

Finally, and most importantly, we are grateful to all the young people and adults who generously contributed to focus groups and stakeholder consultations.

**Suggested citation:** Albury, K., Crawford, K., Byron, P. & Mathews, B. 2013. *Young People and Sexting in Australia: ethics, representation and the law*. April 2013. ARC Centre for Creative Industries and Innovation/ Journalism and Media Research Centre, The University of New South Wales, Australia.

ISBN: 978-0-7334-3280-4

For more information contact:

Kath Albury  
Senior Lecturer  
Journalism and Media Research Centre  
[k.albury@unsw.edu.au](mailto:k.albury@unsw.edu.au)

Kate Crawford  
Principal Researcher  
Microsoft Research New England (USA)  
[kate@katecrawford.net](mailto:kate@katecrawford.net)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.</b>	<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Methodology and Context</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Focus Groups	4
3.2	Adult Stakeholder Workshop	5
3.3	Legal Context of Sexting	6
<b>4.</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1	Focus Groups With Young People	8
4.1.1	Sexting Definitions	8
4.1.2	Nudity: A Matter of Context and Confidence	9
4.1.3	Gender	10
4.1.4	Consent and Intention	11
4.1.5	Sexting and The Law	12
4.1.6	Privacy, Law Enforcement and Police Powers of Search	13
4.1.7	Responses To Existing Educational Material	13
4.2	Adult Stakeholder Workshop	15
4.1.8	The Relationship Between The Age of Consent and Sexting	15
4.1.9	Education and Resources	16
<b>5.</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>17</b>
	Towards a Typology of Sexting	18
<b>6.</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>19</b>

<b>7.</b>	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>20</b>
7.1	Literature Review	20
7.1.1	Approaches and Disciplines	20
7.1.2	Terminology and Debates	20
7.1.3	Technology, Young People and Risk	21
7.1.4	Media Production and Sexual Cultures	21
7.1.5	Harm Reduction	22
7.1.6	Rights, Context and Sexual Citizenship	22
7.1.7	Gender and Representation	22
7.1.8	Privacy	23
7.1.9	Sexual Images and Pornographic Framing	23
7.1.10	Friendship and Intimacy	23
7.2	Focus Group Schedule	24
7.3	Focus Group Confidentiality Statement	25
7.4	Focus Group Media	26
7.5	Adult Stakeholders – Organisations	26
7.6	Adult Stakeholders – Workshop Agenda	27
<b>8.</b>	<b>References</b>	<b>28</b>
	<b>Notes</b>	<b>32-33</b>

# 1. Executive Summary

The *Young People and Sexting in Australia* report presents the findings of a qualitative study of young people's understandings of, and responses to, current Australian laws, media and educational resources that address sexting. While there are many definitions of sexting, for the purposes of this report we are referring to the production and distribution of naked or semi-naked photographs via mobile phones and social media.

The project involved a review of both international local and academic research as well as popular media addressing sexting, and a review of educational resources for young people. Three focus groups were conducted with young people aged 16 and 17 in 2012, and a working paper based on those findings was then distributed to adult stakeholders in the fields of law enforcement, youth and children's legal support, education, criminology, media and communications, youth work, youth health care, counseling and youth health promotion. This report therefore draws on both the focus group discussions, and a workshop consultation with the adult stakeholder group.

## Key Findings:

- While focus group participants were familiar with the practice of sending naked or semi-naked pictures, the term sexting was understood as an adult or media-generated concept that did not adequately reflect young people's everyday practices and experiences of creating and sharing digital images.
- Young people observed that gendered double-standards were applied to discussions of sexting, and digital self-representation in general. For example one group of young women were particularly offended that their self-portraits or selfies were viewed by both peers and adults as 'provocative' while young men's naked or semi-naked pictures were understood as 'jokes'.
- Sample media campaigns and public education materials viewed by focus groups were rejected by some participants for failing to acknowledge young women's capacity for consensual production and exchange of images. These participants also felt that current sexting education fails to emphasise young people's responsibility to not share images without consent.
- Both young people and adult stakeholders agreed that current legal frameworks relating to sexting (particularly those that conflate sexting with child pornography) are not widely understood by either young people or adults, and that this lack of education and awareness places young people at risk of unreasonable criminal charges.

The *Young People and Sexting in Australia* report recommendations follow. These recommendations are presented in two major categories, (1) strategies and (2) new approaches to understanding sexting:

## Strategies:

- 1.1 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).
- 1.2 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.

- 1.3 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.
- 1.4 We recommend that sexting education be more focused on fostering ethical, respectful practices between intimate partners and within friendship networks.
- 1.5 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:**

- 1.6 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’.
- 1.7 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.
- 1.8 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.
- 1.9 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.

## 2. Background

Though there are many definitions, sexting can be generally described as “the practice of using a camera cell phone to take and send nude (including semi-nude) photographs to other cell phones or Internet sites” (Chalfen 2009, 258). In recent media coverage, policy development, legal discussion, and academic research, sexting is predominantly considered to be a young people’s problem (Mitchell et al. 2012, Ringrose et al. 2012, Walker et al. 2011), although it is also an adult practice, as seen through the 2011 sexting scandal of Anthony Weiner (Brooks 2011) and other public figures and celebrities (Curnutt 2012, Watson 2010). Sexting now also features in sexual self-help narratives for adults (Ellwood-Clayton 2012, Kitt 2012, Sweet 2012), where it is not typically framed as a risky practice. But through publicised legal cases where young people who are caught sexting face criminal charges for the possession and distribution of child pornography, much attention has focused on sexting as involving a serious risk of criminalisation, as well as a risk of exploitation.

Having established comprehensive databases of international sexting literature and Australian media coverage, we found that few discussions on sexting adequately engage with young people’s concerns around this practice. It is rare for young people’s opinions to be voiced in media coverage. Nor is there much said about where sexting fits into ongoing, everyday media practices. Dominant media and educational debates often conflate sexting with cyberbullying (see for e.g. Hinduja and Patchin 2011, Cox Communications 2009). This project offers an understanding of the contexts of sexting, which is often outside the context of abuse, victimisation and harassment, and one which reflects young people’s perspectives on their everyday practices and cultures.

This report is designed to inform Australian legal, educational and policy responses to sexting. We approach sexting from a media and cultural research perspective, extending upon formative work into young people’s use and production of media via mobile phones and other digital media. Further discussion on young people’s reflections on legal aspects of sexting can be found in the *New Voices / New Laws* report, released in November 2012 by the National Children’s and Youth Law Centre in partnership with the Children’s Legal Service, Legal Aid NSW (Tallon et al. 2012).

### 3. Methodology and Context

We catalogued an archive of Australian news media relating to sexting since 2008, when the term first developed a public currency. Key media themes were noted and compared to our literature database of published research on sexting. Empirical research took place in two settings; the first involved three focus groups with young people aged 16-17 years, and the second involved a workshop with relevant adult stakeholders.

To date, over 400 news stories about sexting have been published in Australian newspapers. These predominantly focus on sexting as a crime, or an aspect of cyberbullying, often suggesting that young people are unable to safely navigate sex and technology. Most reports of sexting rely on statements from experts including legal commentators, child psychologists, educators and police, and sexting is deemed a matter for parents, schools, and police to manage. Scant attention is given to young people's concerns on the matter, or why they choose to engage in sexting.

The term 'consequences' features in almost one third of print media stories, referring to legal and social consequences of sexting. Although it could be argued that 'consequences' is a neutral term, the potential consequences of sexting are never represented as neutral or positive – particularly for young women. Instead, the term seems to stand in as a euphemism for 'punishment', and it is strongly implied that young people are naïve, unaware of the impact of their actions, and that this ignorance must be corrected by adults who know better. Our project takes a different approach.

This research is informed by several sexting studies such as the recently published National Society for the Protection of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC) report on sexting (Ringrose et al. 2012), the *AU Kids Online* project (Green et al. 2011), and the Australian *Young, Mobile, Networked* study (Goggin and Crawford 2011). This project differs from these studies in its attention to young people aged 16-17 years, that is, people who are over the age of sexual consent, but not considered legal adults. The NSPCC report focuses on a younger group for whom the repercussions of sexting are quite different, and the *Young, Mobile, Networked* study interviewed young adults (aged 18-30), who do not face legal penalties for sexting with other adults. The *AU Kids Online* study addresses online sexting, but not sexting via mobile phones.

Australians aged 16 and 17 are permitted to have consensual sex, but not to make any photographic or video recordings in ways considered to be pornographic by law (see 'Legal Context of Sexting' section on page 6 for more detail). As a result, 16-17 year olds must navigate sexual practices that can be both consensual and legal, but illegal to visually record. In this context, educational and media messages suggest that the legal responses override one's ethical engagements, and thus young people are not asked to reflect on the ethics of sexual conduct as much as they are asked to obey current laws. We recognise that young people are consequently vulnerable when they discuss sexting with adults. For this reason, we are especially grateful for the support of the National Children's and Youth Law Centre, and the NSW Rape Crisis Centre, who assisted us in developing a Confidentiality Statement, and a protocol for responding to any young person who might be distressed as a result of participation in our research.

Recruitment and data collection processes for the focus groups with young people, the adult stakeholder workshop, were approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at The University of New South Wales (Reference: JC12050).

#### 3.1 Focus Groups

Data on young people's attitudes and concerns about sexting were collected from three focus groups held in Sydney in June 2012. These involved a total of 16 young people aged 16-17 years from three geographical areas in Sydney. Participant recruitment took place through an arms-length approach, with a notice sent via email through peer and professional networks, as well as to youth services (government and non-government), and independent schools. Information was also posted to various Facebook pages including pages for youth centres, sporting groups, and entertainment venues. Consent was obtained from all participants and their guardians, and participants were given \$50 shopping vouchers for their input.

The first focus group (G1) featured self-nominated participants responding to our callout (Eastern and Western suburbs); the second (G2) was made up of peers involved in a youth group (South-East suburbs); and the third (G3) took place at an independent school for 'at risk' young people (Western suburbs). Participants in G1 and G2 attended both government and independent schools.

Focus groups were semi-structured as per a schedule approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee (see Appendix). During discussion, each participant was given a sheet of paper with the following definition of sexting, taken from the National Children's and Youth Law Centre's *LawStuff* website:

*Sexting usually refers to:*

- Taking naked or partly naked photos or videos of yourself (posing in a sexual way) and sending the photos either via the internet or mobile phones; and
- Receiving or forwarding such photos or videos through mobile phones, internet and social networking sites such as Facebook or MySpace.

Several videos on sexting were shown to participants to generate discussion, including public service films and excerpts from a sexting-related subplot in the TV show *Neighbours* (see Appendix for full details of materials shown).

### 3.2 Adult Stakeholder Workshop

In December 2012, a workshop was conducted at UNSW involving 17 adult stakeholders from various organisations that engage with young people and the legal structures around sexting. These include police, criminologists, youth workers, health workers, researchers, and young people's advocates (see Appendix for a full list of organisations involved). Consent was confirmed with all participants, and for confidentiality reasons we requested permission to name organisations rather than participants involved. All participants consented to this.

Participants were invited from either existing professional networks, or by approaching other key organisations that have been involved in national discussions around sexting, including many who made submissions to the Victorian Law Reform Committee Inquiry into Sexting in 2012. As there are overlapping concerns among stakeholders from different domains, we sought to assemble a range of expertise in which sexting could be discussed in a holistic sense, beyond the roles of each individual present. This provided an opportunity to workshop potential legal, educational, and policy responses to sexting, and for many participants was the first time they had the opportunity to discuss the responses across sectors and institutions.

Prior to the workshop, participants were sent a working paper that reported on findings from the focus groups with young people. The 3-hour workshop involved a brief introduction and analysis of focus group findings, an overview and discussion of the findings of *New Voices / New Laws* report (Tallon et al. 2012), and workshop discussions on the draft recommendations included in the working paper (see Appendix for workshop agenda).

The workshop discussion involved participants assembling into four groups to discuss one of the following: sexting and the law; sexting education and harm reduction; sexting and ethics; and new approaches to sexting (see Appendix for the issues discussed in each group).

Workshop participants were invited to send further comments on the working paper and workshop discussion in the month following the workshop. Interested parties unable to attend the workshop were also emailed the working paper and invited to comment. This report includes revised discussion and recommendations informed by the stakeholder discussion.

### 3.3 Legal Context of Sexting

In Australia, Commonwealth and State laws regulate and respond to child pornography and child exploitation material, and the use of new technological means to store, create and distribute it. These laws have enabled responses to a growing and egregious phenomenon. In 2005, federal legislation commenced which made illegal the use of mobile phones to create, transmit, or possess material defined as ‘child pornography material’ or ‘child abuse material’.<sup>1</sup> The provisions make it an offence to:

- Use a carriage service for child pornography material (s 474.19) or for child abuse material (474.22);
- Possess, control, produce, supply or obtain child pornography material (s 474.20) or child abuse material (474.23) for use through a carriage service;

Section 474.19 states, for example, that a person is guilty of an offence if the person accesses ‘child pornography material’ using a carriage service. Section 474.22 is identical and applies to ‘child abuse material’.

However, these laws were created to respond to child pornography. They were not developed to regulate consensual behaviour between children (or adults), including sexting. The extrinsic materials (explanatory memorandum) to the Act which inserted these provisions in 2004 demonstrate that these laws were not intended to apply to children and adolescents engaging in self-regarding sexual activity or genuinely consensual peer-to-peer sexual activity.

One difficulty that has become apparent in the sexting context is that laws created to prohibit and respond to ‘genuine’ child pornography have not been updated to clearly exclude consensual sexting behaviour. This type of behaviour, which was not a part of mobile phone culture at the time the laws were created, has since become far more common as mobile phone technology has developed. The law does not clearly accommodate what many people would justifiably feel is either merely self-regarding material created by young people (e.g. taking a photo/video of yourself and not distributing it) or is consensual private material created by and for young people involved in romantic relationships (e.g. images of yourself and a genuinely consenting partner). There are not good grounds for criminalising these behaviours, although it is a separate question whether unauthorised dealings with such images without consent should be regulated (e.g. forwarding an image or posting it on social media services).

Alongside the federal child pornography laws, there are provisions in State and Territory criminal laws which, if they are interpreted broadly, apply to sexting activity. These laws, depending on the jurisdiction, prohibit the possession, making of, and distribution of, ‘child exploitation material’, or ‘child pornography’, or ‘child abuse material’.<sup>2</sup> There are reports of prosecutions for sexting having been brought under these provisions. However, if by ‘sexting’ we mean consensual sexual activity between youth, these provisions were clearly not intended by Parliament to apply to these situations. This is again demonstrated by the extrinsic materials which accompany the introduction of the legislation (speeches in Parliamentary debates, and the statements by relevant Ministers in the explanatory memoranda to the bills).<sup>3</sup>

Prosecutions brought under these provisions for sexting, at least in most cases where the activity is clearly innocuous, are therefore an unsound response. Police have extensive powers and discretion about methods of proceeding in response to a complaint. Factors relevant to prosecution decisions include the availability of evidence, the public interest, and the fact that the person is under 18 years old will weigh against a prosecution and will favour less intrusive responses such as warnings and cautions.

---

1 Criminal Code Act 1995 (Cth) Chapter 10—National infrastructure; Part 10.6 Telecommunications Services: Division 474—Telecommunications offences - Subdivision D—Offences relating to use of carriage service for child pornography material or child abuse material.

2 Crimes Act 1900 (ACT) ss 64-65; Crimes Act 1900 (NSW) s 91H, 91FA-FB; Criminal Code (NT) s 125B; Criminal Code 1899 (Qld) ss228A-E; Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 (SA) ss 62-63; Criminal Code 1924 (Tas) s 1A; ss130-130G; Crimes Act 1958 (Vic) ss 67A, 68-70; Criminal Code Act 1913 (WA) ss 217-221A.

3 In Qld, the relevant provisions regarding child exploitation material were inserted into the Criminal Code by the Criminal Code (Child Pornography and Abuse) Amendment Act 2005, which commenced on 4 April 2005. In the explanatory notes to the bill, Rod Welford stated clearly that the policy objective of the bill was ‘to respond to the growing incidence of child pornography’: <http://www.legislation.qld.gov.au/Bills/51PDF/2004/CrimCdCPAAmB04Exp.pdf>. This policy objective was also the impetus behind the amendments to Victoria’s Crimes Act 1958 which inserted ss67A-70, via the Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) (Enforcement) Act 1995, No. 90/1995.

Responses by law enforcement agencies should emphasise education and awareness, and should be undertaken in cooperation with educational and health institutions. If complaints are made about sexting activity, in many cases the most reasonable response from police should be simply to caution the person involved about what kind of conduct is unlawful. Prosecutions should not be commenced without adequate grounds, especially given the potentially severe consequences for breaches of the law, which often include placement on a sex offender register.

The National Children's and Youth Law Centre's *New Voices / New Laws* report (Tallon et al 2012) offers an extensive children's rights-based review and analysis of the Australian State and Federal laws that currently apply to sexting, and compares these laws and law reform proposals in other jurisdictions, such as the United States of America. The authors make a range of detailed recommendations with respect to law, law enforcement, education and policy reforms, including recommendations to "continue to consult with and listen to children and young people in the development of laws, policies, best practices and resources on sexting and cyberbullying" and "initiate a national conversation about amending Commonwealth child pornography laws as they apply to sexting" (Tallon et al 2012, 8.)

## 4. Findings

This study deliberately engages a specific age group of young people – those who are over age of consent, but are still children according to Australian law. All focus group participants were aged 16-17 years, and all but one were senior high school students, in years 10, 11 or 12.

While this project relied on a small sample set, it raises some questions in relation to some of the implied assumptions in current sexting education. The educational videos surveyed for this project (*Megan's Story*, *Tagged*, and *Photograph*) all depict school as the primary site where sexting may have 'consequences' for young people. The primary consequence for young women in these films is represented as sexual shaming by peers, and subsequent damage to 'reputation'. However, the young people in our groups seemed dismissive of shaming by their fellow students. It was agreed that the exposure of naked or semi-naked photos among classmates would be embarrassing, but potential exposure of these images to teachers or parents was of much greater concern.

Group participants perceived younger people (particularly 12 and 13 year olds) to be more 'at risk' than 16 and 17 year olds. The age of consent was mentioned in all three focus groups, and the implication was that 'consent' should apply to all sexual acts, including the exchange of naked pictures.

### 4.1 Focus Groups With Young People

#### 4.1.1 Sexting Definitions

Interviewees in all groups were familiar with the concept of sending semi-clothed, naked or sexually suggestive images and text messages and there was agreement that the term 'sexting' was not part of their everyday lexicon. While all participants were familiar with the term, it was seen as having been generated by adults and/or journalists. Some participants used humour or sarcasm when discussing adults' use of term.

Focus group participants did not use a specific term to define the practices known as sexting, preferring general terms like 'pictures'. This suggests that education or awareness campaigns focused on sexting are inherently read by young people as 'adult-generated' or 'media-generated', and may be implicitly associated with adult anxieties, rather than their own experiences and practices.

Well, I find with older generations, they want to name it, want to find out what it is and determine what it is and giving it the brand name, 'sexting'... I don't know - they just made a name for it.

(G1, F)

Facilitator: Where have you heard people using the term sexting?

Male 1: The news. That's about it.

Facilitator: Would people your age use the word?

Male 2: I've never used it in - apart from when I'm saying oh, did you watch that article on sexting on the news?

(G3)

The term sexting was viewed as inherently negative and even sinister, in contrast to the more neutral terminology of 'pictures'. Some participants suggested that 'pictures' only become 'sexting' "when a person gets offended" by an image.

#### 4.1.2 Nudity: A Matter of Context and Confidence

Participants were both puzzled and offended by the tendency for adults in general (and educators in particular) to bundle all naked or partially naked user-generated pictures into the category of sexting. Participants used terms like “taboo”, “dirty”, “wrong” and “disgusting” to describe adult reactions to young people’s practices of producing and sharing images.

Facilitator: How do you think adults would define the term sexting; whether that’s teachers or journalists or someone else?

Male 1: They would think it’s irresponsible because people could send it around.

Facilitator: Anything else?

Male 1: They’d probably - even the slightest thing sexual - even like teenagers joke around a lot; but the moment you mention anything sexual they’ll probably be like - jump on it straight away and say sexting.

Male 2: Yes, overreact.  
(G3)

Both young men and young women challenged this one-size-fits-all definition, emphasising the variety of cultural contexts that define ‘decency’ in dress and undress. Additionally, they argued that there are many contexts where these pictures are not intended as a sexual communication. Participants offered a number of examples of semi-clothed images, including pictures of people on the beach in swimwear, and people in their underwear in a non-sexual context.

Going back to the definition, ‘taking naked or partly naked photos’, how does a girl or boy being in their underwear have any difference to their being in their swimwear? How is that any different? ... I know there is obviously a difference, but...  
(G1, F)

I think everybody has a very different perspective over what’s decent, what’s indecent and usually it’s a moral sort of thing, because, obviously you can’t please everybody. But who determines what is decent and what is indecent?  
(G1, F)

The majority of participants did not seem to view naked or semi-naked pictures as inherently shameful or shaming for their subject (though they were considered embarrassing, particularly if viewed by parents or teachers). Only one participant (a 16 year old female) used moral frameworks to discuss ‘sexters’. For some others the choice to participate (or not participate) in taking or distributing naked or semi-naked self-portraits was primarily seen as an outcome of bodily autonomy and ‘self-confidence’ rather than sexual shamelessness.

I think it also raises issues about... are you allowed to do what you want with your body? I mean, if you are that confident that you want to post a naked picture on Facebook, should you be allowed to do that? I mean, if it’s yours, if you’re autonomous.  
(G1, F)

Consequently, gendered differences in self-representation were seen by some participants as reflecting different levels of body confidence:

Female 1: Guys go do nudey runs and all stupid type of things.

Female 2: Yeah, they do all stupid things.

Female 1: Where[as] a girl's more - there's more problems with girls' self confidence than there is [with] boys' self confidence.

(G2)

Participants described different genres of semi-naked or naked pictures that they did not define as sexting. These included 'selfies', or digital self-portraits (which might be intended for private self-regard, or for sharing among friends); and 'sneaky hat' images, which were primarily produced by boys as comedy/prank pictures. (The subjects of sneaky hat pictures are naked or semi-naked, but cover their genitals or breasts with a baseball cap or hat).

### 4.1.3 Gender

Despite the framing of gendered approaches to nudity as primarily informed by individual self-confidence, a number of young women emphasised what they saw as a gendered double-standard in relation to self-representation. They claimed that adults were overly focused on young women's appearance, which resulted in an uncomfortable sense that they were constantly being monitored for signs of sexualisation or 'provocativeness', even in the playground of their single-sex school.

All groups noted broader double-standards in relation to male and female self-representation, with one group describing an event where a mutual friend posted naked pictures on Facebook and "no one cared", because it was interpreted as humorous rather than sexual.

Female 1: That's the whole thing with the gender...

Female 2: Yes, definitely

Female 1: ...it's like if a girl does anything in her underwear, it's immediately she's trying to get someone. She's trying to look provocative and sexy and stuff.

Female 2: That's a gender equality issue.

Female 1: Yeah. But if a guy does it it's hilarious and it's so funny.

Male 1: Yeah, I'm sure if there was a girl in that photo, people [i.e. parents and teachers] would have been called up and stuff, but because it's just a guy...

Male 2: A guy, like no one cares, they're just...

Male 1: No one cared.

(G1)

Gender also impacted on participants' accounts of the ways that sexual images were produced and shared. One group discussed the ways that male and females might interpret shared images differently:

Male 1: This isn't my personal view, but it's - the moment a female sends - some guys see it as the moment she's - they send her - him a text - it's theirs. It's their photo. They can do what they want with it. She voided all rights to that photo, so - and they can - yes, they do whatever they want with it.

Male 2: It could be their photo, but it still counts as - they only gave them their photo as trust. That's why they did it.

Male 1: Yes, but that's not a lawful, binding agreement.

Male 2: Yes, not lawful, but...

Male 1: Yes, so it's based on morals.

(G3)

Another group of young people debated the likelihood of young men sharing images that had been sent to them in the context of an intimate friendship, flirtation or romantic relationship:

Male 1: There's no guy who's been sent a naked photo of a girl who's, like, not shown their mates...

Male 2: They're not... no one's gonna ask... Unless it's like, just - no, but if you ask for it - if someone asks you for it, they're definitely going to show their friends.

Male 1: They might not send to anyone, but it's... they definitely would show...

Female 1: I think that's a bit of a generalisation though.  
(G1)

The young men in this group began with a universal statement about their peers' behaviour, but following a heated challenge from the young women in the group, sought to distinguish between young men who 'asked' for pictures (who were presumably more likely to share them without permission) and those who did not. In the context of this conversation, it was not clear whether the young men were clarifying their statement, or changing it in response to the young women's strong negative reaction. This suggests that future research of this kind should involve both mixed and same-sex groups, in order to learn more about young people's gendered responses to sexting.

#### 4.1.4 Consent and Intention

Participants in all three focus groups explored the context of intention and consent in relation to sexting. For one group, it was "offensiveness" that defined sexting in relation to ordinary digital pictures. In this discussion, it was not nudity in a picture that made it offensive, but the absence of consent in its production or distribution.

Male: ...no one's going to really mind unless it's offensive, right?

Facilitator: Yeah. So what contexts would sexting be offensive in, do you think?

Female: Like, photos and then they're getting shared...

Multiple Participants: Yeah.

Female: ...and they're not kept between, like when they're shared for everyone.  
(G1)

In another discussion, images were only considered sexting if they were produced with mutual consent:

Male: Sexting's more of a willing action. If someone - if you don't know that someone's taken a picture of you in that way, would that still be classified as sexting?

Female: No, it's invasion of privacy.

Male: Exactly.  
(G2)

The majority of participants considered the exchange of user-generated sexual images to be acceptable in the context of a relationship, however some were very wary of the potential for images to be shared non-consensually following the breakdown of a romantic relationship or friendship.

When asked to describe circumstances where sexting was or was not okay, consent was a deciding factor for all groups:

Facilitator: When is sexting not ok?

During school [*Laughter*]. To family members [*Much laughter*]. I think just any time when there's not consent.

(G1, F)

I think sending explicit text or photos to someone who doesn't want them sent to them is probably a problem, because usually, when I think about it, I think of both parties being consensual and both taking part in it.

(G1, F)

If it stays between the two consensual partners, yes, it's fine, because they both - they can trust each other. That's fine because it's their choice.

(G3, M)

#### 4.1.5 Sexting and The Law

Participants were uniformly surprised by the legal penalties applied to sexting, and used terms like 'excessive', 'hype' and 'overdone' to describe the application of child pornography laws to young people who produce or share naked pictures.

Female 1: They're technically saying, if you're under 18.

Female 2: I really do not get it.

Female 1: Because it's child pornography.

Male 1: So...

Female 2: Yeah, but then why are you allowed to have sex at 16?

Male 1: I thought it was 18.

Male 2: Sixteen.

Female 2: Because the difference is...

Female 1: Sixteen's the legal age.

Female 2: ...at 16 you can consent to sex but not until 18 you can consent to sharing your friggling photo to the world.

(G2)

All groups referred to discrepancies between the age of consent for sexual activity, and the legal impossibility of consent when producing and sharing images. Participants were very familiar with the concept of consent, and used the term in a nuanced manner, providing a range of examples of consensual and non-consensual scenarios for sexting. As the following quote indicates, some participants were also aware that the law frames them as 'children'.

Male: Yes, because they're both over the age of consent, so it shouldn't be as much of a problem compared to the...

Female: But they're still children.

Male: Yes, I know that, but it's still, they consent. It's like, why can you see it in your own eyes but not send it in a photo - if you're still of the age of consent - because it's not like you're looking at other people or something. It's between two consenting parties.

(G3)

All participants stated that child pornography laws should be applied differently to those under and over the age of 18:

I think there's a difference between a 17-year-old male having a photo of his girlfriend or something naked than a 40-year-old man having a photo of a young kid. Yeah. There's quite a big difference. I don't think it should be the same sort of punishment.

(G1, M)

Participants were unsure as to whether consensual production and sharing of images by those over the age of 18 also counted as pornography, and were unclear of its legality. There was also some confusion regarding the correct action to take if a young person received an unsolicited sexual image from a peer:

Male: What if you delete it straight away? Would you still get charged?

Male: What about if it's not your choice of receiving it?

(G3)

#### 4.1.6 Privacy, Law Enforcement and Police Powers of Search

The theme of 'privacy' emerged in all three groups, in different ways. Focus group participants discussed privacy in relation to their own images, and those shared by peers. There was an extended discussion of the extent of police powers, and the tension between 'private' and 'public' images within police investigations:

Female: Why are police going to look through someone's phone or computer?

Male: They've done it before.

Female: But that's the law. That's what [the facilitator] just said.

Male: Yeah, if we take - yeah, they go through our phones?

Female: Are they allowed to touch us?

Male: Yes, they are allowed to, if they've got the right permission for it.

Female: They need a warrant don't they?

Male: Yeah, basically, yeah.

Male: No, if they suspect you they can do whatever they want. They see you [unclear]...

Female: Not really.

Male: ...check your undies, man.

Male: They can't go that far.

Female: No.

Male: But they can do the basics. They can ask if they can check over your text messages and things like that. But they can't go straight out, give me your phone now. We're taking you to the station. You have to sit there while we go through all your stuff.

(G2)

#### 4.1.7 Responses To Existing Educational Material

When asked, most participants could not recall any school-based education on sexting, though one group from a state girls' school specifically recalled watching a short film on sexting as part of the *Crossroads* Personal Development, Health, and Physical Education (PDHPE) program in Year 10. These young women were offended by what they saw as sexist assumptions in the film, which they believed depicted girls as inherently unwilling

participants in sexual interactions. This group was also skeptical of what might be termed ‘abstinence’ messages around sexting:

Female: That’s the message that got conveyed to us is ‘Don’t do it’, you know, ‘you’re going to get yourself into trouble’. Everything like that. But I think at the end of the day, people are going to do it anyway. Like, it’s going to happen.

Female: Tell teenagers not to do something...

Female: Yeah, exactly. They’re just going to do it even more.  
(G1)

Focus group participants were then invited to comment on existing Australian educational material. Media and educational content screened for each group included *Megan’s Story* (in full), and extracts from *Tagged*, *Photograph* and the sexting subplot from *Neighbours*. Two out of three groups were extremely skeptical of these clips. The following discussion took place after screening *Megan’s Story*:

Male: It’s just an example really. It’s not really teaching you... It’s just saying what could happen. I think anything - anyone would still laugh. A group of us would still laugh at that if we were made to watch it at school.

Female: Well, we all just laughed at it then.

Female: It’s a generic educational tool that teachers think [will] affect us.

Male: Yeah, I don’t think videos would ever work.  
(G1)

Discussions of the media clips seemed to favour a ‘harm reduction’ approach to sexting:

It’s just such a hard topic to sort of - because there’s always going to be those few unfortunate instances. It’s like teen sex, or something. A lot of the time it’s okay. There’s consent, protection, all that, but then you get those cases - unwanted child teenage pregnancy, date rape and all that. So it’s just - you’re never going to be able to define it and you’re never going to be able to completely police it and I think people need to accept that and they just need to work more on prevention and protection.  
(G1, F)

There was some debate about the best approach to sexting education. Some participants favoured ‘scare campaigns’, while others called for a nuanced unpacking of legal penalties and possible consequences post school:

Facilitator: ...what do you think would be an appropriate message for people your age? How would you talk about it?

Female: It’s mainly about it getting out of the intended audience. Instead of saying “don’t do it”, because obviously, we’re going to do it anyway - not personally, but you tell someone not to do something, they’re so much more inclined to do it then. I - with an example at our school - I don’t know - I’d use the whole of [a boys’ school] finding out about this one photo. That’d kill someone. But - and also trust issues and you need to know the boundaries of your trust issues and the person that you’re sending these photos to.

Male: I’ll also say that - yeah, just that I sort of - you have to sort of show how if it gets into the wrong hands, you know, you wouldn’t want your parents to find it, you wouldn’t want your sister or someone seeing it.

Female: I think, even then, how likely the consequences are, because I’m sure that everybody is aware of the consequences, but they do it anyway, because they think, “oh they’ll never send it. No. They love me”. No.

Female: No.

Female: Not in two weeks. [Laughter]  
(G1)

## 4.2 Adult Stakeholder Workshop

This workshop invited adult stakeholders to reflect on draft project findings and recommendations in an interdisciplinary context. Participants, including representatives from law enforcement agencies; youth medical and health promotion services and youth support agencies; sexual assault services; and researchers in the areas of criminology, media and communication, and education, received a draft research report one week prior to the workshop. The half-day consultation involved short presentations by the Lead Researchers on the *Young People and Sexting in Australia*, and the *New Voices / New Laws* projects. Following a whole-of-group discussion, breakaway groups focused on specific draft recommendations.

Topics addressed included: adults' and young people's awareness of current laws relating to sexting, and proposals for law reform. There was also an extended discussion of the different needs of adults and young people for age-appropriate educational resources and support in relation to sexting, and other forms of mediated intimacy. While diverse views were presented in the group discussion, there was a broad consensus regarding the need for sexting to be approached via an ethical framework (drawing on Carmody 2009) that allowed for a consideration of the context in which images were produced and circulated. The majority of adult participants were strongly opposed to an abstinence model for sexting education, with one clear dissenter from this position.

### 4.1.8 The Relationship Between The Age of Consent and Sexting

Given that the 16 and 17 year-old focus group participants expressed confusion and surprise at the difference between the age of consent for sexual activity (16), and that age at which young people can consent to sexting (18), one draft recommendation to the adult participants suggested that legal, educational and policy responses to sexting should take the age of consent into account. We proposed that any response targeting young people aged 16 and 17 should acknowledge that non-abusive sexual interaction between peers was legal in Australia.

One adult participant suggested that as sexting was not usually the depiction of an actual sex act, but more often involved a depiction of a naked or semi-clothed body, sexual consent laws may not be relevant. Several adult participants suggested that future research *and* legal, educational and policy responses should consequently allow more recognition of individual and cultural context in which the production and distribution of images occurred. Some of these participants suggested that given that young people in NSW are able to legally seek independent medical treatment (without parental consent) from the age of 14, this might be an appropriate age at which to introduce a more 'adult' framework for responding to sexting:

While we see the point of making it 16-18, we'd like to see the study go younger.

We need to be including youth under the age of consent in these types of studies and in material for parents, teachers and so on.

There was also a caution against assuming that all sexting activity between young people who are close in age is intrinsically unproblematic. As one participant observed:

[In] the work we do with juvenile sex offenders, [we find relationships where] age congruence can [still] be very abusive – it's something to keep in mind.

One small group discussion specifically considered sexting as part of a process of sexual learning. This group observed that the process of learning to trust, and learning how to be sexual, are part of a trajectory of learning experiences, and do not necessarily correspond with a single event. Consequently, young people should not be

understood as ‘becoming sexual’ at age of first intercourse, as implied by the concept of ‘age of consent’. This group noted that first experiences of oral sex or intercourse often follow a number of cautious attempts at sexual experimentation in younger teen years, and that sexting could be understood by young people as a lesser risk in this context. This reflects Wolak and Finkelhor’s typology of sexting, which broadly categorises sexting scenarios as either ‘aggravated’ or ‘experimental’ (2011).

#### 4.1.9 Education and Resources

Adult participants were very engaged with the question of how best to provide both young people and adults with relevant education and resources in relation to sexting. The breakaway discussion focused on the topic of education attracted the greatest number of workshop participants, and also attracted follow-up comments via email from an interested organisation that was unable to send a representative.

Participants in this discussion observed that adults, as much as young people, were under-resourced by current education and policy responses to sexting. For example:

The Commonwealth Safe Schools framework has great concepts, but there is not enough focus on the ‘how’. A lot of it seems focused on prevention, rather than treating what has already happened.

One participant observed that adults in the law enforcement field were better resourced than other adults likely to be impacted by sexting:

Police who don’t know how to deal with this do have a space to go and find out. Parents need it too. There needs to be well developed online resources that are made available to teachers too.

This group also argued that a ‘risk’ model was not appropriate when addressing sexting:

There needs to be a focus on language – risk is an insufficient term.

The group also considered whether current school sex education provided adequate frameworks for understanding sexting, arguing that sexting was about technologies, relationships and bodies:

...a holistic view of healthy relationships and sexual diversity is needed, and [a picture of] where sexting ties into that. In the UK this has gone too far the other way, and education is all about relationships and not about the body.

The workshop participants favoured harm reduction as a strategy for addressing sexting. However the stakeholder who was unable to attend the workshop, but responded via email, was strongly opposed to this approach, arguing that the potential harms of sexting were too great. This stakeholder argued that “the impacts of sexting are multifaceted, and in some cases extreme”. The stakeholder’s submission concluded that ‘risk’ was indeed an appropriate framework from which to approach sexting, and educational strategies should focus on prevention and abstinence.

## 5. Discussion

As indicated previously in the focus group findings, a small but vocal group of young women drew pointed attention to the gendered nature of current Australian sexting education. These young women noted that the educational material they had viewed framed sexting as a ‘problem’ for girls, and de-emphasised young men’s responsibility. They also criticised what they perceived as an excessive attention by teachers and parents to young women’s bodies and choices in relation to sexual expression and self-representation. This group of young women was also critical of ‘abstinence’ approaches to sexting education.

As Dobson, Rasmussen and Tyson (2012) and Albury and Crawford (2012) observe, the Australian educational response to sexting has tended to reinscribe individualised notions of ‘risk’ and ‘shame’ and reinforce dominant gendered assumptions about sexual behaviour, without being responsive to the social values within young people’s peer groups. As Dobson and colleagues put it,

if government and educational campaigns continue to frame the issue for youth as one of personal responsibility and awareness of the ‘risks’ involved in sexting, *without making explicit the gendered and socially-constructed nature of such risks*, they risk intensifying the harms experienced by young people who engage in sexting practices. (2012, 4; original emphasis)

This issue is not unique to young people. The mediated circulation of celebrity sex tapes, and the recent debates around the publication of paparazzi ‘creep shots’ of Kate Middleton indicate that adult culture also supports sexual shaming, and the non-consensual production and circulation of images.

We suggest that the challenge for future education regarding sexting issues is to resist the association of images of female nudity, in particular, with inevitable ‘shaming’ and ‘loss of reputation’. Education addressing sexting also needs to question the assumption that sexual pressure or manipulation (in respect to both ‘real life’ and digital sexual activities) is a ‘normal’ part of adolescent male sexuality. Sexting is not a purely technological event, and is not simply an outcome of ‘bad choices’ made by individuals. The production and sharing of sexual images takes place in relationships, among intimates, friends and strangers, and needs to be understood in a broader cultural context. When images are shared without consent, it is a very significant breach of trust, and should be considered as a serious invasion of privacy rather than an inevitable outcome of recording a sexually suggestive image.

All focus group participants opposed non-consensual production and sharing of sexual images, and indicated a general acceptance of legal penalties in these circumstances. While consensual production and exchange of pictures between young people of the same age was generally agreed to be unproblematic, there was agreement among participants that relationships between peers of the same age could be abusive, violent or exploitative; and that those under-18s who shared photographs (or threatened to share them) in this context should face penalties. It was agreed that strong legal protection should be maintained for young victims of abuse, violence or exploitation, whether it was perpetrated by adults or by peers. However, the application of ‘child pornography’ laws to under 18s was strongly rejected and considered unreasonable and unfair.

The 16 and 17 year old focus group participants were unclear about laws relating to the digital production and consumption of images in general. All groups used terms like ‘privacy’ and ‘consent’, and engaged in discussions around the meaning of these terms. Young people expressed a strong desire for factual information on relevant laws, including clear guidelines regarding both their *rights* – e.g. opportunities for redress in exploitative/non-consensual circumstances - and their *responsibilities* – e.g. behaving ethically and legally with regard to digital images. Participants in the adult workshop expressed concern that many professionals working with young people were themselves uncertain of the laws pertaining to young people’s use of online and mobile media, and did not know where they could find appropriate information and advice. Some were also uncertain of their obligations under mandatory reporting laws.

## 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 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 mediatised 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), 38-52.
- 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.
- Karaian, 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. & Finkehor, 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.





