6 Swimming in the Fishbowl
Young People, Identity, and Surveillance in Networked Spaces

Valerie Steeves

This chapter draws on the findings of Media Smart's Young Canadians in a Wired World research project in order to examine young people's experiences with identity and surveillance in networked spaces.[1] Canada is an interesting example to examine, because the Canadian government was the first in the world to connect all its schools to the Internet in 1999 and, within a decade, home access to networked technologies approached universality (CRTC, 2010). Since that time, Canadian youth have continued to be early adopters of various networked communications technologies, the most recent example being social media. The statistics on Facebook use are illustrative of this trend; Canada has the largest *per capita* participation on Facebook in the world (Oliveira, 2012) and 95% of 17-year-old Canadians have a Facebook account (Steeves, 2014). As such, Canadian youth are among the most wired in the world and have fully integrated networked technologies into their schooling and social lives.

From as early as 2000, the young Canadians we spoke with were using the technologies of the day—primarily chat rooms and instant messaging—to try on new identities and connect with friends. Our research participants also celebrated the privacy they found online; they believed themselves to be outside the gaze of their parents and teachers and accordingly embraced the Internet as a safe place to explore and experiment (Media Awareness Network, 2001). As new technologies emerged over the next 10 years, other researchers reported similar findings. Chat rooms (Mendoza, 2007), instant messaging (Steeves, 2005), personal home pages and blogs (Stern, 2004), cell phones (Ito, 2005), and social networking sites (boyd, 2007; Livingstone, 2008; Shade, 2008) were each, in turn, appropriated by children and reconstituted as socio-technical spaces; children used these spaces to connect with peers and engage in a reflexive project of constructing the self, away from the watchful eyes of adults.

When we returned to the field in 2012 to 2013, the children we interviewed reported that they continue to use the latest networked technologies, including social media, smartphones, networked MP3 players, tablets, and gaming platforms to experiment with their identities and connect with their friends. However, the online spaces they now frequent are structured

by pervasive monitoring, particularly from peers, parents, family members, teachers, and school administrators, and the various forms of surveillance they encounter online pose challenges for them when it comes to using the technology for identity play.

This chapter discusses the ramifications of our findings, in three sections. First, I explore the types of visibility and lateral surveillance our participants experienced with peers and the kinds of strategies they relied on to manage their online personas. Second, I examine the dual face of parental surveillance as care and control and the complex negotiations that the children and parents we talked to undertook with respect to both access to and use of online media. Third, I turn to the panoptic surveillance our participants experienced at school and explore their perceptions of the impact of this surveillance on their ability to use networked technologies to enhance their learning.

PEERS, LATERAL SURVEILLANCE, AND IDENTITY-MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

As noted, our participants in 2012 to 2013[2] enjoyed the ways in which networked communications enable a playful engagement and experimentation with different ways of being online. For example, our 11- and 12-year-old participants searched for information to learn more about things they would encounter in the future, like high school and jobs, and saw this as a safe way to 'rehearse' the roles they would play as teens and adults. Our teenaged participants relied heavily on various media to express themselves, communicate with friends, explore their interests, keep in touch with family, and generally figure out who they wanted to be when they grew up.

A large part of the appeal of networked technologies for all age groups was the visibility they provide. A number of researchers (Peter, Valkenburg and Fluckiger, 2009; Phillips, 2009; Shade, 2011; Draper, 2012) suggest that, by monitoring how others respond to their online personas, young people are able to evaluate their various identity performances. This allows them to co-produce their subjectivity through their interaction with others who mirror back their performances for them to see (Mead, 1934; Goffman, 1959). From this perspective, their online identities are fluid (Giddens, 1991) and tied to an ongoing project of "writing the self into being" (boyd, 2007).

The concept of lateral surveillance (Andrejevic, 2005), in which peers monitor peers and are monitored in turn, is a particularly important element of this kind of reflexive identity construction and performance, especially for our teenaged participants. Ninety-five percent of the 17-year-olds we surveyed had a Facebook account, and 72% read or posted on friends' social network sites at least once a day or once a week. Thirty-nine percent of all survey respondents indicated that they slept with their cell phone next to them in case they received messages during the night. The teenagers

we interviewed saw this as a way to monitor the 'drama' that unfolded when they were not at school, and indicated that they used their networked devices to keep an eye on peers throughout the day and night.

Much of this lateral surveillance was playful in nature. Our participants knowingly slipped in and out of the online gaze to play jokes on each other and enjoy themselves. Pranking—setting online traps for someone or misdirecting them to a joke site—was a common activity,[3] especially among boys. Although pranking was "just for fun" (Steeves, 2012a, 28), it was also a way of acquiring and demonstrating the skills they needed to distinguish between 'real' and 'fake' online representations. Another form of playing with the gaze was to impersonate a friend by using his or her login and then posting comments under his or her name.[4] Our interview participants indicated that this typically involved in-jokes or poking fun at each other and was a regular—though sometimes trying—part of their online interactions with their friends.

However, lateral surveillance also exacerbated the consequences of a failed performance (e.g. a picture in which they appeared foolish or did not look their best, or a sext—a sexually explicit text message—that was forwarded to others within the teen's peer network) because failed performances could be seen, copied, and forwarded across a range of technological platforms used by their peer group. In other words, although being seen online was part of the fun, being seen badly was a significant risk. Our participants accordingly developed a number of strategies in order to minimize this risk.

In this regard, decisions about what photographs of themselves to post were particularly important. Our qualitative participants told us that they put a great deal of care and attention into selecting these images—as one 15- to 17-year-old girl put it,

> I just don't take stupid pictures that I know could ruin my reputation, or something.
>
> <div align="right">(ibid., 33)</div>

And 91% of our survey respondents reported that they used privacy settings to block someone from seeing the photos they post, and most of the persons blocked were known to the respondents. Of the people being blocked, 31% were friends, 20% were people they had stopped being friends with, and 20% were people they knew but with whom they were not friends.

They also closely monitored their peers' sites to see how they were being portrayed by them. Forty-five percent of our survey respondents indicated that they had asked someone to delete something that person had posted about them because they did not want someone else—especially friends (21%)—to see it. The young people we interviewed told us they routinely 'de-tagged' photos of themselves so they could retain control over the distribution of their image. Accordingly, this lateral surveillance enabled them

to see how they were being portrayed and to take proactive steps to protect their online image. As one 15- to 17-year-old boy said,

> I don't want . . . myself to be in someone else's phone or computer . . . Or, like, other people showing other people, being like, "look at this!'"
>
> (ibid., 32)

Our interview participants also relied on friends to help them manage their online personas. It was generally understood that friends do not post embarrassing or compromising photos of friends online. Moreover, if someone did post an embarrassing photo or say something mean about someone, that person's friends were expected to go online and restore his or her reputation. For example, 11- to 12-year-old Emma told us that an acquaintance had posted an unflattering picture of her on Facebook, and people were making mean comments about her appearance. She texted her friends, who immediately went to the site and posted comments like, "'no, Emma looks cool, she's awesome, she's so brave' and stuff, and [Emma] was like, 'I love you guys'" (ibid., 32). Although lateral surveillance exacerbated the impact of the mean comments because they were seen by so many people, it also alerted Emma to the attack and enabled Emma's friends to repair her online reputation by visibly coming to her defence.

Interestingly, our participants proactively purged particularly candid or bad photographs of themselves before they could be posted online in order to keep these images away from the lateral surveillance of their peers. Although they routinely allowed friends to take photos of them when they were goofing around, they would later go into their friends' phones or cameras to delete them. As Emma and Taylor explain:

> EMMA: Cause . . . if there's a picture of my goofing off, like making a funny face, you don't want everyone to see that, it's between you and your friends.
> TAYLOR: Yeah, other people, other people probably all make fun of you, and then that'll stay around for a while because that's happened before.
> EMMA: Yeah, only your friends understand why you're doing it . . .
> TAYLOR: Yeah, and then everyone else, like, sees it and then they're kind of like, "oh, why are you doing this?"
>
> (ibid., 32)

Failure to allow someone access to a device so he or she could delete a photo placed a strain on the friendship. A number of our participants told us that, in those circumstances, it was acceptable to break into the person's phone or social media account without his or her permission to delete the photo. If they were unsuccessful and the person posted the photo or made negative comments about them online, the friendship was at an end.

In this sense, lateral surveillance was a form of self-protection; by routinely monitoring what photos of them were held by others, they were able to intervene when necessary to prevent the distribution of unwanted images. On the other hand, possession and non-distribution of a potentially embarrassing photo was seen as a sign of close friendship. For example, during one 15- to 17-year-old qualitative group session, Bridget started teasing her best friend Maddy about a particularly embarrassing photo of Maddy she had on her phone:

> BRIDGET: [Giggling] Look at the picture that I have of you. [Laughter from everyone even though Bridget only showed it to Maddy]
> ALICIA: But it's not like something I wouldn't send to somebody, I wouldn't post pictures that I have of people . . .
> MADDY: Oh, it's nothing dirty. [Laughter] It's just a lot of makeup with . . . facial hair . . .
> BRIDGET: I wouldn't post it on Facebook, I'm not like that.
> FACILITATOR: By keeping it on your phone you've got it, but it's not as public as Facebook?
> MADDY: Yeah.
>
> (ibid., 33)

Keeping something off social network sites and away from the lateral surveillance of peers was therefore a way of signalling closeness and trustworthiness.

Lateral surveillance among peers accordingly played a variety of functions. It provided access to an audience for the purposes of identity construction, in the Meadian sense, and opened up spaces for fun and playful teasing. Although it magnified the potential consequences of a failed performance, it also enabled our participants to monitor how they were represented by others and respond in ways that allowed them to publicly repair their reputations. It further served to demarcate intimacy when images shared with trusted friends were kept out of the surveillant gaze and stored 'privately' on media such as mobile phones.

PARENTS AND THE COMPLICATIONS OF SURVEILLANCE AS CARE AND CONTROL

Parental monitoring was one of the most common forms of surveillance our participants discussed. However, both the parents and young people we talked to were ambivalent about it and entered into complex negotiations around access to and use of online services, social media accounts, and cell phones.

From the parents' perspective, online monitoring was a form of care. Almost all of them expressed concerns over the possibility that their child

could be hurt online,[5] and most required full password access to their child's various accounts so they could keep an eye on him or her to keep him or her safe. Although the nature of online risks was ill defined and parents could not point to specific harms, they felt that they were forced to monitor their children to protect them from stalkers and other ill-intentioned strangers.

However, the parents who did this also worried that it would negatively affect their relationship with their child, because monitoring could potentially signal that they did not trust their child to act appropriately. As Rooney notes, a child learns how to enter into trusting relationships with others by relying on "the good will of others . . . such as parents, caregivers, friends and strangers in a variety of ways to care for and protect them" (Rooney, 2010, 346). Having opportunities "to trust and be trusted" are an integral part of learning "how to be with others in a way that supports [children's] capacity to live and live in a meaningful way." Accordingly, children need to learn to "trust with good judgment," actively negotiating situations in which they can rely on others and situations in which distrust may be an appropriate response to some potential harm (Steeves, 2012a, 347). She concludes:

> Where there is a climate of fear about public spaces, it is possible to see how parental fears might lead to a tendency to use tighter mechanisms of control . . . However, such an approach, particularly where it is an overreaction to the risks involved, makes it difficult for children to negotiate an appropriate, realistic and constructive balance between trust and risk . . . and as a result the opportunities for a child to negotiate terms of freedom or to subvert the controls that are placed on them rapidly diminish.
>
> (ibid., 350)

Interestingly, our 11- to 12-year-old survey respondents were much more comfortable with parental monitoring than were their older counterparts and accepted it as a form of care. However our qualitative participants told us that much of this comfort was rooted in the fact that they found posting personal information on social media sites or talking with strangers 'boring.' As one girl summarized,

> Wilhelmina: *Ben normalement nous, à notre âge, on a pas vraiment besoin de . . . ben y'a des filles au secondaire qui ils ont besoin mais comme moi admettons j'ai comme cinq amis*—Well normally, us, at our age, we don't really need to [use social media] . . . there are high school girls who need to but me, I admit, I have like five friends.
>
> (ibid., 16)

This is consistent with Livingstone's (2009) observation that younger children construct their online identities through display, as opposed to adolescents, who construct their identities through their social connectedness to

others. Surveillance was accordingly more acceptable to our younger participants[6] because they were not yet predisposed to break away from their identity within the family and begin to explore who they were in connection to peers.

Nonetheless, all our participants indicated that they took steps (e.g. using privacy settings to limit what parents could see or clearing histories on shared computers) to avoid parental monitoring. Our teenaged participants were highly adept at using technical controls to evade 'lectures.' One 15- to 17-year-old girl's comment that, "My mom keeps on [posting] me, 'You're on Facebook! Get off! Do your homework!' And I'm like . . . de-friend" (17), was met with both commiseration and a flurry of stories about evading the parental gaze online. Even many of our youngest survey respondents felt that parents should not force their children to friend them on social media sites (56%) or read their texts (44%)[7] and took steps to avoid being watched. Sharing their passwords was one thing; having their parents constantly looking over their shoulders was another. This is in keeping with Valentine's (2004) observation that young people make their own decisions about risk and disrupt the kinds of controls parents put in place to protect them from risk.

But concerns about online privacy from parents were particularly acute for our teenaged participants. Communication with friends was a central part of their lives, and they enjoyed the way networked tools gave them a deep sense of connection with their friends (Licoppe, 2004; Shade, 2011). They also articulated a strong need for autonomy from parents so they could better explore the "public–private boundaries of the self" (Peter, Valkenburg and Fluckiger, 2009, 85) and be free to experiment in ways that were difficult in offline contexts (Livingstone, 2009, 91). They felt that constant connection to parents also made it difficult for them to accomplish the central tasks of adolescence to

> renegotiate their familial relationships . . . seek to define themselves within a peer group . . . [and] venture out into the world without parental supervision.
>
> (Draper, 2012, 223)

As one 13- to 14-year-old in Toronto put it,

> There should be a point where parents will just like, leave you alone and not have to know every single thing about you. Like I get, the protection side, but they don't need to know every single thing about you.
>
> (Steeves, 2012a, 18)

Because of this, our teenaged participants were much more likely to seek out private online spaces in which to interact with their peers. They articulated a clear need for privacy and explicitly linked it to their need for

autonomy and independence, drawing on Samarajiva's notion of privacy as "the capacity to implicitly or explicitly negotiate boundary conditions of social relations" (Samarajiva, quoted in Livingstone, 2009, 110). However, many parents of teens told us they had to increase their level of vigilance as their child entered adolescence because this age group was more likely to do or say something inappropriate online. Moreover, they worried that the impact of such a misstep would be magnified because so many people would be able to see it. They therefore recruited other family members, such as older siblings or cousins, to monitor their child online and report back to them, creating a hybrid form of surveillance that was both hierarchical and lateral.

Although all our parent participants were uncomfortable with this level of scrutiny, almost all of them felt they had little choice because surveillance was perceived to be a necessary tool to protect their children from their own poor judgment. This exchange was typical:

> Who was it that said you had spies out there? I have nieces [who] will write to [my daughter], even call me to say, "uh, tell her to change . . . her wall, her status, or whatever," so that's good.
>
> (Steeves, 2012a, 14)

Others spoke of the need to read every text, every social media posting, and every email to make sure their child was not in a position to make a mistake. Accordingly, just when teenagers were asking for more freedom from the parental gaze—precisely so they could make their own mistakes—many parents were increasing the level of online monitoring in order to shut down any possibility of their child behaving poorly. Parental surveillance accordingly moved from monitoring for protective care of a child at risk of harm from ill-intentioned others to monitoring for behavioural control of a child that was a source of risk himself or herself.

From our teenaged participants' perspective, this kind of surveillance created a great deal of conflict and interfered with their family relationships. As one 15- to 17-year-old said,

> "I blocked my little brother, he's like a little spy for my mother" (18). And, after cousins of one of our 13 to 14-year-old participants 'snitched' on her, she told us, "the same night I go and delete them . . . then [my mom] gets mad, she's like 'don't delete your family members.' I'm like, well, tell them to stop stalking me."
>
> (18)

Interestingly, it was also not in keeping with the kinds of monitoring they experienced in offline situations. Whereas parents were comfortable with their child's judgment in general, they were much more concerned about their child's actions when networked technologies were involved. The

teenagers we interviewed found this confusing, because online (and surveilled) actions were perceived by parents to be more dangerous than offline (and unsurveilled) actions. One 13- to 14-year-old girl summarized:

> My mom trusts me enough to, like, actually bring a guy home, like one of my guy-friends home? But she doesn't trust me enough to like, have him up on Facebook, which kind of makes me depressed.
>
> (19)

They told us that this kind of surveillance made it more difficult for them to express themselves online and explore their various roles as friend, romantic partner, and emerging adult because online performances for their peer audience would often unintentionally become visible to their family audience. This meant they were often held to account for comments that were taken out of context or seen as more dangerous because they were made online or by text. This in turn disrupted their "ability to disclose private information in appropriate ways and settings" (Peter, Valkenburg and Fluckiger, 2009, 83), both with their peers and with their family members.

Rooney's work on trust is particularly relevant here. She argues that young people must not only learn to trust others; they must also learn how to be

> "trusted *by* others to be responsible, to take control and do things in ways that extend their skills and competencies" so they can develop into "competent, confident and active human agent[s]."
>
> (2010, 344, emphasis added)

From this perspective, surveillance as control teaches children the wrong lessons: Family members who monitor you for your own protection do not trust you to make the right decisions and are not to be trusted because they exaggerate risks and interpret actions out of context.

At the same time, our participants were empathetic to their parents' concerns and acknowledged that parents were only trying to protect them from harm. Moreover, all age groups of survey respondents indicated that parents were a helpful resource for solving problems. Younger children tended to see parents as a first response—three quarters of 10-year-olds indicated they would ask their parents for help first if someone was mean or cruel to them online— but more than one quarter (27%) of 15- to 17-year-olds continued to rely on parents if self-help strategies (including ignoring the problem, confronting the person who said it face to face, and asking friends for help) were unsuccessful. The presence of parental rules about online activities (as opposed to parental monitoring) also appears to have a protective effect for all age groups; survey respondents who reported that they had house rules against risky online behaviour were statistically less likely to participate in that behaviour.

Interestingly, our teen participants who were not monitored were also the ones who were the most likely to willingly share aspects of their online lives

with their parents and to go to them for help. Trust for them was mutual—their parents trusted them to behave appropriately, and they trusted their parents not to over-react (Steeves, 2012a, 19).

Kerr, Stattin, and Trost (1999) report that this kind of voluntary disclosure increases trust for parents as well as for children. The more a child is able to express feelings and talk about problems with a parent, the more the child trusts the parent. Conversely, the more a child spontaneously reveals about his or her daily life to a parent, the more the parent trusts the child. Surveillance as control, on the other hand, diminishes measures of trust and, interestingly, also correlates with higher, not lower, rates of anti-social behaviour (Stattin and Kerr, 2002). So although parental surveillance may be well intentioned, it does not provide a "realistic form of protection" (Rooney, 2010, 351) for the child. It also may reduce the opportunities for the child to explore other independent identities with a sense of competence and confidence (Steeves, 2012a, 351).

One story in particular illustrates the importance of adult support as a child begins to explore the world outside the home and competently navigate new identities. A 13- to 14-year-old boy told us that he was being 'stalked' online by a 13-year-old girl who wanted to be his girlfriend. After she posted a comment on his Facebook wall that "btw, I'm not a virgin," he was subjected to cruel comments and uncomfortable teasing from his friends. He did not know what to do, so he showed the posts to his mother. His fear was that she would take the matter out of his hands and, in fact, she immediately wanted to intervene. However, he articulated his concerns about exacerbating an already uncomfortable situation, and they negotiated an appropriate strategy that met his need for protection in a way that also respected his need for independence. He removed the comments from his wall, and the teasing stopped (ibid., 20).

This boy's problem was not resolved by parental surveillance—in fact, the mother only knew of the situation because the boy told her about it. It was resolved by dialogue structured by mutual trust and a willingness on the part of the parent to provide the child the opportunity to solve his own problem, with her guidance. This illustrates that the negotiations between parents and children around technologies are complex and multifaceted and implicate broader concerns about the competing needs to allow a child freedom and exert control over the child.

SCHOOLS, PANOPTIC SURVEILLANCE, AND A LOSS OF PRIVACY

Monitoring at school was pervasive and often posed problems for the young people we interviewed as they sought to complete their schoolwork. Not only was certain content blocked, but their online communications with peers were closely scrutinized, and they were held to account for interactions they interpreted among themselves as harmless. Moreover, they were given

little to no opportunity to explain themselves if one of the technical controls indicated they had done something they were not allowed to do.

Our participants were most vituperative about this kind of panoptic control. They both actively resisted it (e.g. sharing technical fixes to get around filters) and questioned the school's need to police their every word, to make sure they did not 'swear' or say something 'inappropriate.' From their perspective, the school should give them access to networked technologies without placing them under surveillance and, instead, rely on teachers to help them learn how to use them. One 13- to 14-year-old explained:

> But then, again, we're supposed to write every day everywhere else, except for school. What's the big deal if we do exactly what we do at home, at school? . . . Teachers should be allowed to read what we write, and if it's inappropriate, they can make us take it down, but they shouldn't just block us out from it, that is our own right.
>
> (Steeves, 2012a, 21)

Interestingly, the key informant teachers we spoke to agreed. From their perspective, school filters, acceptable use policies, and keystroke loggers made it incredibly difficult to productively use networked technologies in the classroom because they decreased learning opportunities and restricted the teachers' ability to teach. As one teacher from Ontario noted,

> For me it would be so much easier if it were just unblocked and the Board trusted the teachers to show the kids how to actually use this material. That's how I'd prefer to teach.
>
> (Steeves, 2012b, 12)

This form of panoptic surveillance also took away the teachable moments in which teachers could help students learn to act as good digital citizens. A teacher from Western Canada put it this way:

> It's not like all of a sudden you hit 18, and now you can have autonomy. I mean, children do not learn to make good choices by being told what to do and follow instructions. And, unfortunately, they have to be given the opportunity to make bad choices as often as good choices. And they need adults to be the saving, caring allies that we need to be to help them make [good choices], to learn from their mistakes.
>
> (12)

A teacher from Eastern Canada suggested that surveillance can interfere with the privacy of the classroom and make it more difficult to create a safe, confidential learning environment:

> When the conversation was intended to provoke intellectual curiosity and you're expected to take intellectual risks and really share and

expose your thoughts about a particular text or event, to have that trust, that collaboration, that safe learning environment sort of ruined from access to technology or a recording device or posting online, I don't know if you could overcome that to build [the] kind of classroom [where students feel safe to experiment].

A teacher from Northern Canada agreed. He told us students

need to trust you in order to take risks . . . being able to answer questions and know that if I get a wrong answer, that's okay, they won't laugh or make fun of me. That's risk taking for some students. That's a big risk.

Interestingly, both the young people and the teachers we talked to indicated that the panoptic surveillance they both experienced in school was the most difficult to negotiate, because they had very little control over the gaze or input into how their actions were interpreted by the school administrators that monitored the use of the system.

CONCLUSION

Our research findings suggest that the young people and adults we talked to have a complex relationship with networked technologies and continually negotiate the degree of monitoring young people are subjected to in the socio-technical spaces they inhabit. Young people are attracted to networked spaces because of the visibility they provide, but the monitoring they experience in these spaces makes it difficult for them to draw lines between their various audiences and attain the level of privacy they desire. That lack of privacy also detracts from their ability to enter into relationships of trust—particularly with parents, teachers, and other family members but also with friends—which in turn complicates their attempts to meet the developmental objective of individuating and 'growing up.'

Moreover, young people's experiences of monitoring involve different kinds of surveillant relationships, each of which offers different opportunities for freedom and control. Lateral surveillance among peers is highly nuanced, both opening up opportunities to reflexively perform a variety of social roles and potentially magnifying the consequences of failed performances. Self-representations are accordingly carefully crafted on and through social networks, and young people rely upon friendships within these networks to help them manage how they are perceived and understood, particularly in these contexts.

Negotiations between young people and parents are particularly complex, as parents seek to balance surveillance as care with surveillance

as control. This balance becomes more challenging when children enter adolescence—when young people seek a greater degree of privacy from parents so they can explore their identity outside the family. However, this is also when many parents feel they should increase the level of monitoring to ensure that their children do not engage in relationships or practices that they see as inappropriate or dangerous. Again, failed performances are seen as more problematic because they take place on networked media and can be reproduced and distributed widely. In addition, the ubiquity of being watched through social networks by a variety of audiences makes it more difficult for a teen to craft a specific persona for peers within that social network without disrupting the expectations of family members. This difficulty is magnified when parents see these behaviours on social networks as particularly risky.

Monitoring in school most closely aligns to the panoptic conception of surveillance, and young people participate in a number of strategies to resist this kind of watching. Interestingly, both the young people and the teachers we spoke to lament the ways in which panoptic surveillance invades the privacy of the classroom and detracts from the relationships of trust that are at the heart of learning.

NOTES

1. The Young Canadians in a Wired World project began in 2000–2001 when we interviewed parents and children and surveyed approximately 5,500 Canadian students aged 10 to 17 to examine children's use and perceptions of the Internet. In 2004 to 2005, we conducted a similar study, broadening the technology to other forms of networked communications, including cell phones and gaming platforms. In 2012 to 2013, we again returned to the field but added a series of interviews with teachers to get a better understanding of the impact of the full range of networked technologies in the classroom. This chapter draws on the most recent data from 2012 to 2013, which includes the results of interviews with 10 key informant teachers and 12 qualitative group sessions (four each in Calgary, Toronto, and Ottawa) with a total of 66 young people aged 11 to 17 and 21 parents of children and youth aged 11 to 17, and a quantitative survey of 5,436 children and youth aged 10 to 17 from across the country. For a full report of each phase of YCWW, see http://mediasmarts.ca/research-policy.
2. All information about and quotes from our 2012 to 2013 qualitative research are taken from Steeves, 2012a. The survey results are taken from Steeves, 2014.
3. Twenty percent of our survey respondents reported pranking online at least once a day or once a week, and 28% reported pranking over a cell phone (Tables 8, 9).
4. Although only 20% of 11-year-old survey respondents reported that they did this, the proportion rose to 50% by age 17.
5. Vandoninck, d'Haenens, and Roe (2013) report similar concerns among European parents, independent of socio-economic status.

Proof

6. Seventy-nine percent of children aged 10 agreed with the statement that parents should keep track of their children online all the time, compared to only 23% of 17-year-old respondents.
7. The percentages increase with age, to 77% of 17-year-olds and 83% of 17-year-olds respectively.

REFERENCES

ANDREJEVIC, M. (2005) The Work of Watching One Another: Lateral Surveillance, Risk and Governance. *Surveillance & Society, 2*(4). p. 479–497.
BOYD, D. (2007) Why Youth (Heart) Social Network Sites: The Role of Networked Publics in Teenage Social Life. In Buckingham, D. (Ed.), *Youth, Identity, and Digital Media*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 119–142.
CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION. (2010) Communications Monitoring Report, July 2010. www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/publications/reports/policymonitoring/2010/cmr2010.pdf, accessed 22–09–2013.
DRAPER, N. (2012) Is Your Teen At Risk? Discourses of Adolescent Sexting in the United States. *Journal of Children and Media, 6*(2). p. 221–236.
GIDDENS, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
GOFFMAN, E. (1959) *The Presentation of the Self*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
ITO, M. (2005) Mobile Phones, Japanese Youth, and the Re-placement of Social Contact. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work, 31*. p. 131–148.
KERR, M., STATTIN, H. & TROST, K. (1999) To Know You Is to Trust You: Parents' Trust Is Rooted in Child Disclosure of Information. *Journal of Adolescence, 22*. p. 737–752.
LICOPPE, C. (2004) 'Connected' Presence: The Emergence of a New Repertoire for Managing Social Relationships in a Changing Communication Technoscape. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 22*. p. 135–156.
LIVINGSTONE, S. (2009) *Children and the Internet*. Cambridge (UK): Polity Press.
———. (2008) Taking Risky Opportunities in Youthful Content Creation: Teenagers' Use of Social Networking Sites for Intimacy, Privacy and Self-expression. *New Media and Society*, 10(3). p. 393–411.
MEAD, G.H. (1934) *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. C.W. Morris (Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
MEDIA AWARENESS NETWORK. (2001) *Young Canadians in a Wired World: The Students' View*. Ottawa: Media Awareness Network. http://mediasmarts.ca/research-policy. Accessed 22–08–2013.
MENDOZA, K. (2007) *"WATZ UR NAM?": Adolescent Girls, Chat Rooms, and Interpersonal Authenticity*. Media Education Lab. www.mediaeducationlab. Accessed 22–08–2013.
OLIVEIRA, M. (2012, Feb 29). Canada's 'Most Socially Networked' Title Slipping Away. *Globe and Mail*. www.theglobeandmail.com/technology/digital-culture/social-web/canadas-most-socially-networked-title-slipping-away/article550205/. Accessed 29–02–2012
PETER, J., VALKENBURG, P. & FLUCKIGER, C. (2009) Adolescents and Social Network Sites: Identity, Friendships and Privacy. In Livingstone, S. & Haddon, L. (Eds.), *<Kids Online>: Opportunities and Risks for Children*. Bristol: The Policy Press, 83–94.
PHILLIPS, D. (2009) Ubiquitous Computing, Spatiaility, and the Construction of Identity: Directions for Policy Reponses. In Kerr, I., Steeves, V. & Lucock, C.

Proof

(Eds.), *Lessons from the Identity Trail: Anonymity, Privacy and Identity in a Networked Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, 303–318.

ROONEY, T. (2010) Trusting Children: How Do Surveillance Technologies Alter a Child's Experience of Trust, Risk and Responsibility? *Surveillance and Society*, 7(4). p. 344–355.

SHADE, L. R. (2008) Internet Social Networking in Young Women's Everyday Lives: Some Insights from Focus Groups. *Our Schools, Our Selves*. p. 65–73.

———. (2011) Surveilling the Girl via the Third and Networked Screen. In Kearney, M. C. (Ed.), *Mediated Girlhoods: New Explorations of Girls' Media Culture*. New York: Peter Lang, 261–276.

STATTIN, H. & KERR, M. (2002) Parental Monitoring: A Reinterpretation. *Child Development*, 71(4). p. 1072–1085.

STEEVES, V. (2005) *Young Canadians in a Wired World—Phase II Trends and Recommendations*. Ottawa: Media Awareness Network. http://mediasmarts.ca/research-policy. Accessed 19–08–2013.

———. (2012a) *Young Canadians in a Wired World, Phase III: Talking to Youth and Parents about Life Online*. Ottawa: Media Smarts. http://mediasmarts.ca/research-policy. Accessed 19–08–2013.

———. (2012b) *Young Canadians in a Wired World—Phase III Teachers' Perspectives*. Ottawa: Media Smarts. http://mediasmarts.ca/research-policy. Accessed 19–08–2013.

———. (2014) *Young Canadians in a Wired World, Phase III: Student Survey*. Ottawa: Media Smarts. http://mediasmarts.ca/research-policy. Accessed 19–08–2013.

STERN, S. R. (2004) Expressions of Identity Online: Prominent Features and Gender Differences in Adolescents' World Wide Web Pages. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 48(2). p. 218–243.

VANDONINCK, S., D'HAENENS, L. & ROE, K. (2013) Online Risks. *Journal of Children and Media*, 7(1). p. 60–78.