Northumbria Research Link

Northumbria
University
NEWCASTLE

University**Library**

'A Sneaky Bit of Stalking': Young People, Social Network Sites, and Practices of Online Surveillance

Sanja Milivojevic[*]
Thomas Crofts
Murray Lee
Alyce McGovern

*T*his article maps the important albeit under-researched relationship between young people, social network sites, and surveillance practices they encounter or engage with in their digital lives. Based on original empirical research, this article unpacks the complexities of young people's digital identities, and explores strategies of surveillance, covert and overt, that young people are subjected to and perform on a daily basis. Often justified through risk-based crime prevention narratives, such intrusive strategies scrutinise young people in order to anticipate crime and victimisation on social network sites that has not yet, and might never occur. As such, these strategies are arguably underpinned by pre-crime logics of anticipating and targeting impending crime and victimisation. Importantly, they are increasingly normalised as they are imposed for young people's "own good". Yet, as this article demonstrates, young people are aware of such strategies and simultaneously engage in, experience being subject to, and resist surveillance practices.

Key words: young people, social network sites, surveillance, digital identity.

[*]   Dr Sanja Milivojevic is a Senior Lecturer at La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia.
      E-mail: s.milivojevic@latrobe.edu.au.
      Dr Thomas Crofts is a Full Professor at University of Sydney, Australia.
      E-mail: thomas.crofts@sydney.edu.au.
      Dr Murray Lee is a Full Professor at University of Sydney, Australia.
      E-mail: murray.lee@sydney.edu.au.
      Dr Alyce McGovern is an Associate Professor at University New South Wales, Sydney,
      Australia. E-mail: a.mcgovern@unsw.edu.au.

Introduction

The Internet and social network sites provide 'a global forum for surveillance performances' (Koskela, 2012: 54) by a range of actors, and for a variety of purposes. Surveillance is perceived as necessary to mitigate the uncertainty of late modernity, especially when it comes to the most vulnerable of population groups – children and young people. The panic about young people's use of the Internet and other information and communication technologies is well documented in the literature (see Kelly, 2000; Shade, 2007; Slane, 2010; Barnard-Wills, 2012). Indeed, the 'youth-at-risk' narrative appears to be particularly potent in the virtual world. Surveillance is, thus, "promoted … as a way to protect children from online dangers, and parents are often co-opted into a joint surveillance project of care and control" (Steeves, 2012: 352; also Kelly, 2000). Often, surveillance in the digital age is covert, with objects of such interventions unaware of the practice itself, nor that their information is stored, let alone where (Hope, 2005). Importantly, both 'lateral' surveillance (Andrejevic, 2005), performed by family members, potential employers, acquaintances, colleagues, and surveillance by agents of institutions – private or public – are on the rise. As such, while much is made of the ungovernability of cyberspace, young people are in effect often subject to increasing levels of surveillance as they navigate their digital lives. As Lyon (2007: 13) argues, "ours is the first generation that has deliberately sought techniques used by the military or the police in order to monitor [children's] activities".

The information and communication technologies that we focus on in this paper are just one, albeit important, segment of security technologies (Ceyhan, 2008). The implementation of security technologies is largely based on three sets of logic: a security logic of identification of risks; a logic of management flows of goods, people and transportation; and a logic of ambient intelligence that seeks to improve the quality and comfort of our daily lives (Ceyhan, 2008). The first set of logics, as we analyse in this paper, underpin the development of surveillance interventions on social network sites that aim to mitigate the perceived vulnerability of young people in a globalised, network society. In this context risk logics play an increasingly important role in regulating a whole spectrum of human interactions (Mythen, 2014).

Surveillance, according to Lyon (2001: 4), has the capacity to "reinforce social and economic divisions, to channel choices and to direct desires, and even at

its sharp end to constrain and control." It presumes monitoring of the observed population for specific purposes (Clarke, 1998). In the risk society (Beck, 1992) surveillance as "collection and processing of personal data, whether identifiable or not, for the purposes of influencing or managing those whose data have been garnered" (Lyon, 2001: 2), is embedded into information technology. The consolidation of Web 2.0 platforms, in which consumers are creators of the content, has arguably increased surveillance opportunities and practices. Social network sites – web-based services that allow individuals to construct a public or semi-public profile, create a list of users with whom they share a connection and information, and view and negotiate that list and connections made by others within the system (Boyd, Ellison, 2007: 211) – are spaces where surveillance strategies arguably flourish. Indeed, most of us accept terms of use that create an ability to be surveilled, giving little thought to the implications of agreeing to the various 'terms and conditions' caveats that gate keep the various social network sites that we access, often on a daily basis. Surveillance, thus, becomes embedded into our various online lives and is somewhat multimodal and directional – a liquid surveillance as Bauman and Lyon (2013) put it.

Surveillance of young people's online behaviour is becoming mainstream (Stoddart, 2015). Schools, for example, have always been sites for surveillance (Taylor, 2012). As Ahrens (2012: 1697-1698) argues, "[i]n their quest to get tough on cyberbullying, an increasing number of schools have begun to confiscate and inspect students' electronic communication devices and, more generally, to monitor and police their electronic communications." This surveillance also often extends to after-hours, post-school practices (Ahrens, 2012). Parents, government agencies, potential employers and other interested parties engage in practices of surveillance and monitoring of young people's online activities. As Ahrens (2012: 1713) notes, "[p]erhaps one of the most surprising facts about the recent trend towards more punitive and surveillance-oriented policies in the public schools is the degree to which parents have supported and embraced such policies." Often, parents lobby schools to impose strict punishments in cases of sexting and cyberbullying, or bring the matter to the school authorities themselves. Presented as crime/victimisation prevention strategies, these practices, whether impromptu or well planned, are increasingly problematic as "each new surveillance or discipline technique normalizes a certain amount of state intrusion and paves way for the next program that goes a step further" (Ahrens, 2012: 1704).

Attempts to regulate and moderate young people's online engagement quickly transform into policy. The panic about cyberbullying and sexting – two examples of activities facilitated by new technologies involving young people – has resulted in knee-jerk interventions that aim to 'get tough' on perpetrators and eliminate such practices altogether (Crofts et al., 2015). Nevertheless, young people increasingly use social network sites for self-expression, entertainment, to experiment with their identities, and to belong (Davies, 2007; Evers et al., 2013; Gabriel, 2014). Social network sites are crucial tools through which they negotiate and develop their intimate relationships and encounters (Pascoe, 2011). While living their digital lives, young people experience, and resist, various surveillance intrusions on a daily basis. They also proactively use social network sites to find information about a range of actors: their peers, potential love interests, family, even teachers.

This article offers an analysis of young people's perceptions, experiences, resistance and engagement with practices of online surveillance, in particular in the context of social network sites, within a broader theoretical context of pre-crime. We argue that strategies of surveillance have been imposed on young people and justified by the need to anticipate and target impending crime and victimisation that might never occur. As such, they are questioned, and resisted by the object of surveillance. Importantly, however, young people also conceptualise online surveillance as a reality that is, and can be, practiced and justified.

Method

This article draws on data collected as part of a larger research project that explored the perceptions, practices and policies of sexting by young people. The project consisted of four methods of data collection, including a quantitative survey of young people between the ages of 13 and 18 on their perceptions and practices of sexting; focus groups with young people aged 18 – 20 years regarding their views and experiences of sexting; an analysis of media reporting of sexting to capture the tenure of public discourse around sexting; and, an analysis of existing laws and sanctions that apply to sexting at state and federal levels across Australia. The data in this article is drawn predominantly from the focus group research component of the project that, while focusing on sex-

ting, also allowed participants to consider a broad range of their online activities and their perceptions in relation to these online activities (such as building and maintaining their online identity; the use of social media; responding to risk and surveillance, and how they conceptualise online privacy).

Eight focus groups were conducted with 54 young adults (34 females and 20 males) between the ages of 18 and 20. Respondents were drawn from the first year student body of the University of Sydney, University of Western Sydney,[1] and a Technical and Further Education (TAFE) New South Wales Institute. These institutions represent a broad cross section of educational establishments across New South Wales (NSW) and as such the sample included a range of backgrounds in relation to gender, class, ethnicity and geography. All participants signed a written consent form indicating the voluntary and confidential basis for their participation in the project. The form also stipulated that participants could withdraw from the focus groups at any time, and that the conversations in the focus groups would be audio recorded. Participants were asked to comment on several key topics, including their use of information technologies and the negotiation of their online identity, as well as how they conceptualise sexting and what underpins their knowledge on the topic. Focus groups also sought to capture opinion on criminal justice, regulatory, and informal responses to sexting. In the context of these themes, much of the discussion focused on surveillance and the monitoring of young people's online lives by various agents and/or agencies. Young people also commented on their use of information technologies to gather information about others (current or future partners, school mates, and the like). The participants were asked to reflect on these issues in their current lives, but also recalled experiences that occurred in their late childhoods.

This research deployed a grounded theory approach (see Strauss, Corbin, 1998). Data collection, transcription and analysis occurred in alternating sequences. Data was analysed even as it was gathered, which in turn impacted upon subsequent data collection, leading to the refinement of the analysis, which fed back into data collection and so on. Interviews were transcribed and anonymised before being imported into the qualitative analysis program, nVivo, which allowed codes to be assigned to specific lines or segments of text. This approach is defined by Strauss and Corbin (1998) as the breaking down, naming, comparing and categorising of data, a process

---

[1]   Renamed in 2015 to Western Sydney University.

in which hypotheses or theories are generated directly from the data, rather than through a priori assumptions or existing theoretical frameworks. A coding matrix was developed from the initial interview data that was then used to inform and refine the structure of subsequent interviews in order to maximise the quality of the data gathered. We ensured interrater reliability by running a coding comparison query at the beginning of the project.

While there are possible limitations in terms of sample size, geographical location of the project, and potential bias of focus group moderators, through these processes of analysis a number of themes emerged in relation to young people, their identity on social network sites, and experiences of/resistance to surveillance[2]. The remainder of the article explores and explains these themes through the voices of our participants.

Digital natives or 'careless zombies'?[3]: Living a (precarious?) virtual life

It is not surprising that young people consider information technologies an important part of their everyday lives. According to a Newspoll report prepared for the Australian Communications and Media Authority (2013: 6) that surveyed 1,511 children and young people between 8 and 17 years of age, 95% of 11 year olds and 100% of 16-17 year olds had accessed the Internet in the four weeks prior to the survey. Furthermore, 87% of 14-15 year olds and 94% of 16-17 year olds owned a mobile phone. Over two thirds of 12 year olds surveyed and 92% of 16-17 year olds surveyed use the Internet for social networking purposes (Newspoll, 2013: 7). According to the report, the majority of young people indicate that using the Internet is a positive experience, with only 6-7% of teenagers reporting bad experiences every time or most times they are online. The majority of social network site users also reported positive outcomes when it came to social network activity, such as feeling good about themselves, and feeling closer to another person (Newspoll, 2013: 8).

---

[2] Limitations, comprehensive overview of literature and research on the topic in Australia and elsewhere, broader themes that emerge from focus groups, analysis of Australian media and legal responses to sexting, as well as analysis of surveys completed by young people as a part of our broader research project on sexting in Australia has been detailed in Crofts et al., 2015.

[3] Absorption of social network sites is perceived to create a generation of 'careless zombies' that are ultimately ethically degenerate (Stanley, 2013).

Around 20% of 8-13 year olds and around a quarter of 14-17 year olds, however, had seen something on the Internet that bothered them in the year before the survey (Newspoll, 2013: 7).

While young people of today are considered 'digital natives' (Thomas, 2011; Bruno, 2012) that are comfortable and competent in virtual spaces, online safety of their children is a key concern for parents (Newspoll, 2013: 8). Parents, along with schools, government agencies and non-governmental organisations, spend a lot of time (and money) trying to teach young people e-safety,[4] in order to mitigate perceived online risks. The naivety with which young people supposedly use technology as well as their ignorance of risks often underpin such interventions (Betts, Spenser, 2015: 20; see also Cranmer, 2013). As Barnard-Wills (2012: 240) notes, discourses of e-safety "provide a particular representation of the online environment and information technology," one that prioritises certain threats and actors over others, in particular child sexual abuse. At the same time, children and young people are constructed as both potential victims and potential offenders (Barnard-Wills, 2012; Stoddart, 2015), at risk and in the need of protection (e.g. child sexual abuse) and/or in the wrong and in the need of punishment (e.g. cyberbullying).

Pre-crime society, as Zedner (2007: 262) notes, "shifts the temporal perspective to anticipate and forestall that which has not yet occurred and may never do so." Within pre-crime logic, rescue and punishment narratives require and/or legitimise the surveillance of young people's behaviour online. As a result, a whole range of cyber moral entrepreneurs have cemented themselves into the school system, providing moral training thinly disguised as cyber-safety education. Young people, however, are more tech-savvy than their parents, or teachers (Pascoe, 2011). Our research suggests that Millennials[5] often find it humorous when adults try to teach them about risks and how to mitigate them when online:

> "[S]ome researcher has said [recently] that schools should ban all electronic things until students get a licence, so that they're taught that you have to be good with your phone and you know the consequences of doing certain things and they have to sign some agreement and they get a

---

[4] E-safety refers to "the way that young people are taught about risks online, how they can protect themselves, and to whom they should report worrying activity" (Barnard-Wills, 2012: 239).

[5] The demographic population following Generation X, born between early 1980s and late 1990s.

licence. And there's a little cartoon next to it that showed this adult saying you know 'you have to get a licence to get your phone', and then it says 'and then you can teach us how to use it'. So it's like the chicken and the egg." (Female, USyd FG 4)

Similar to findings by Cranmer (2013) in the UK, our research suggests that messages about online threats communicated by e-educators, the media and law enforcement resonated with the young people that participated in our focus groups. In the pre-crime logic, the crime threat is not identified, and is non-imminent (McCulloch, Wilson, 2016: 9). Nevertheless, the permanency of online behaviour and the loosely defined threat of online predators are key issues young people have in mind when engaging on social network sites:

"I think the other scary thing about Facebook as well is once you put up that pic it never really disappears. You go in and finish your Facebook … it gets deactivated until you decide to sign in and then it's just… it's like you can never fully delete your Facebook. I mean it might dissolve over time I don't really know how that works, but I know it will never really be gone because you're just deactivating it temporarily. So you have to be really careful about it." (Female, USyd FG4)

"When I was in high school they had those seminars … this guy told us this story – I don't know if it was real or not – but this girl put a status [on Facebook] and it said – it was 10 o'clock at night – going to go walk my dog on so and so beach or something by myself. So this man – I don't know this stalker or whatever he knew she was going to be alone at 10 o'clock at night walking her dog on some beach, so he went. So I'm just really careful." (Female, UWS FG3)

Underpinning these concerns is the notion of technological determinism (Selwyn, 2012), in which engagement with social network sites will inevitably, at some point, lead to victimisation, exploitation, or some other negative consequence for the young people in question. Such outcomes are deemed unavoidable, regardless of individual circumstances or contexts. And while many young people in our focus groups echo these narratives, others question the permanency of digital imprints that have the potential to harm them. Importantly, they consider proactive strategies to mitigate such risks:

"I know there's certain companies where you actually hire them to get all the information they can about you on the internet, put it on a disk and then – well they sort of trace stuff on the internet and somehow you can get rid of it. … I know when I graduate and I'm looking for a job I would consider doing that, having someone professional to show me exactly how much information about me [is out there], and I don't know really why, I don't know what I'm trying to hide, but I would probably still do it anyway to be honest." (Female, USyd FG4)

While young people are aware of risks associated with their use of technology, evidence suggests that this has a limited impact on young people's digital lives. Social network sites in particular are perceived as "the modern-day equivalent of the mall or movie theatre, a place where teens can hang out with friends and run into other friends and peers" (boyd, Marwick, 2011: 7). Indeed, similar to findings by Lenhart et al. (2010), Pascoe (2011) and Richards et al. (2015), our research suggests that social network sites are a very important "communication device" (Female, USyd FG2) young people use to socialise with their family and friends:

"If I didn't have Facebook I would hardly ever talk to my family or anyone at home because the time difference is 14 hours, so that's how we communicate." (Female, USyd FG2)

Also importantly, as we have examined elsewhere (Crofts et al., 2015), young people use technology, and social network sites, to explore their sexuality. They perceive social networks as "…relatively safe space(s) to experiment with adult identities and try to sort out social behaviors that they would not otherwise encounter" (Steeves, 2012: 355). Whether it is sexting, sex chats or exploring sexuality on social network sites, young people socialise and engage in sexual/romantic encounters with strangers or acquaintances online:

"I've had friends that have been 'poked' by friends [on Facebook] they haven't known and they're now going out." (Female, USyd FG4)

Dating and romance, however, are themes that dominate young people's engagement on social network sites (see Lenhard, Madden, 2007). The importance of Web 2.0 platforms has been especially highlighted in the context of intimate relationships. Research by Young and Brown (2012) and Rose

and Morstyn (2013) indicates that young people predominantly use Facebook to form or maintain a relationship. As one participant in our focus groups argued, a Facebook relationship status can save you from *"a lot of awkward conversations"* (Male, USyd FG4). Further, social network sites can not only help young people clarify a relationship status to their peers and friends but also to themselves:

> "[W]hen I was dating with my boyfriend and we weren't officially together, it was like everybody knew but it was not official, and then they say yeah you should put it on Facebook then it's official. So it's official only when you put it on Facebook." (Female, USyd FG3)

As Brown (1999) reminds us, technology meshes with young people's romantic relationships. Indeed, technology and social network sites in particular are simply an extension of young people's terrestrial lives. According to our participants, social network sites often play a vital role in maintaining or ending relationships:

> "I go online a lot especially for Internet messaging, because my boyfriend lives all the way in Gold Coast and that's our means of communication… With instant messaging we can reply straight away. Occasionally we do share funny photos, nothing explicitly nude or anything, just harmless innocent funny photos." (Female, UWS FG2)

> *"*[Social network sites] can make [it] or break [it]. So much drama happens online, so many relationships have been destroyed that I've seen, just from social network sites. It's sad, I think it's sad." (Female, USyd FG3)

Importantly, and similar to dysfunctional terrestrial relationships where only the 'glossy' side is presented to the public, social network sites sometimes present a dishonest portrait of relationships:

> "I think sometimes a lot of couples show off, like look at us, we've got such a great relationship. …And I also think it's really fake, because one of my first guy friends, he started dating this girl, but he liked me prior to that, and all over Facebook there'd be love hearts sent to her, I love you blah, blah, blah tagging her name, and then like he would sometimes ask me on a Friday night what are you doing tonight. It drives you mad." (Female, USyd FG3)

For young people then, the challenge is in balancing the risks and rewards, as well as sorting through dishonesty in a search for credibility in an increasingly digital world. Such balance is often sought through practices of fact-finding on the Internet and social network sites.

'We're weird': Surveilling others and scrutinising self on social network sites

Research suggests that young people routinely engage in practices of surveillance, while voyeurism, curiosity and distrust commonly underpin such practices (Subrahmanyam et al., 2008; Bruno, 2012; Junco, 2012). As Steeves (2012) notes, the Internet is particularly attractive to young people precisely because of its surveillance opportunities. Whether it is Google-ing people to find out information about them, or establishing how their online identity is represented on the biggest Internet search engine, young people spend considerable time online searching for information on persons of interest or themselves:

> "Yes, I do [use Google to find out information about people]. When I first started going out with my boyfriend I did [Google] him. It was fine, it's all boring stuff. I would only do that when I started dating somebody, and I did it with my own name – my school had a Moodle where they upload things and with me it was…, you have not paid your sport fees. I was like, it's not really the first thing I want to come up." (Female, USyd FG1)

Young and Brown (2012) suggest that young people overwhelmingly use social network sites, in particular Facebook, to find out information about people they have just met, and want to have a relationship with. Indeed, social media is "often the first place young people will go to seek information" (Rose, Morstyn, 2013: 6). Our research confirms that social networking sites are especially important in collecting data about potential partners, to satisfy curiosity, or to find out more information about people they will be spending time with:

> "It doesn't even come to mind when I think of using the Internet to find out more about someone I go straight to Facebook, I would never Google someone." (Female, USyd, FG1)

"I'm going on a trip with a group in a couple of weeks and they sent us everyone's name on email and all my friends got together and put their emails in Facebook and we stalked them all. That person's cute, that person looks kind of weird. So we had an idea of whom we were going with." (Male, USyd FG1)

A number of respondents, however, acknowledged the peculiarities of such practices, and indicated they often question their excessive interest in other people' online lives:

"[W]hen I started going out with my boyfriend six months ago, he had no privacy settings, my friends were going through all his photos and going who's this girl? Who's she? I'm like oh my God. And everything – what did he mean by that? It was incredible. I'd go through [his profile] and you'd get really annoyed when they got good privacy settings, you're like but I want to – you just go through and… we're weird." (Female, USyd FG1)

"We used to do that on teachers. One of the teachers at high school he didn't have any privacy settings and we found him on Facebook. … Everyone's going oh he went to Bali last week, and we're going through all his holiday photos with his family, then halfway through it we're going 'this is really weird'." (Female, USyd FG1)

The idea that there is a reciprocal component to (a lack of) privacy is very important here – young people expect a certain level of intrusion but there is clearly a threshold that should not be crossed. Consequently, some focus group participants agreed that there is a point at which a person should consider what their intentions are when seeking information on others:

"I think everyone does a sneaky bit of stalking, but I think the line is where the intention gets – like if you're not just doing it 'cause you're interested and curious, you're doing it because you're like I've got to know what they're doing,' then it's weird." (Female, USyd FG1)

Thus, while a 'sneaky bit of stalking' – or 'innocent stalking' (Steeves, Regan, 2014) is permissible, more intrusive surveillance practices should be considered, and treated as 'annoying stalking' or 'creeping' (Steeves, Regan, 2014) – that is, ignored or blocked. Such practices can have serious, negative

consequences for the young people in question. A number of focus group participants suggested that the outcomes of carrying out these over-the-top surveillance activities were not always beneficial. Such practices were seen to be especially damaging if carried out whilst in a relationship, as it may imply a lack of trust between the partners:

> "You have to draw that line for yourself, because I checked my boyfriend's Facebook for a while, like every day or something and I realised that I was going crazy, and checking up on him all the time and it drove me mad because I was checking it, so now I never check his Facebook again and I feel so much more calm and everything's okay." (Female, USyd FG3)

> "I think trust has kind of gone out the door because you have that constant like 24/7 I can check up on you, where are you checking in without me, you have it all there." (Female, USyd FG3)

While young people are clearly no strangers to the undertaking of surveillance activities, we were also interested in finding out how they experience/analyse situations in which their online (and consequently terrestrial) lives are subject to surveillance by others.

'Okay, they are stalking me': Young people's experiences of surveillance

Research finds that, contrary to popular belief, young people do care about privacy, and they do want their privacy online to be upheld (Livingstone, Bober, 2005; boyd, Marwick, 2011; Davis, James, 2012). Yet, young people are aware of, or have personally experienced, incidents of online stalking, when the line of 'appropriate' or 'tolerable' (and reciprocal) surveillance on social network sites by their peers is crossed:

> "[A] close friend of mine … they know each other in the real world kind of thing, but now – it's crazy, it's so weird. She is always on his [Facebook] wall and she comments on all of his photos and you can tell that she is just obsessed, messages she sends him and things like that, really inappropriate. … I think he needs a restraining order because his privacy is being invaded way too much" (Female, USyd FG1)

"Sometimes you get friends on Instagram … Like I get random notificati-
ons from people liking all the photos and think okay they're stalking me.
You can tell because they're looking through all of them. A photo that has
been there for two months or so, you think okay they're just looking at my
profile now. You sense a bit of stalking happening at the moment. Yeah it's
happened to me and I'm thinking okay why are they looking through this."
(Female, TAFE)

While young people are somewhat worried about these instances of peer
'stalking', surveillance practices by various government agencies and individ-
uals are also of concern to young people. The state has long been identified
as an intruder into young people's digital lives, supposedly driven by children
and young people's 'best interest' (Stoddart, 2015). The young people we spoke
with were also familiar with these surveillance cultures of control (Lyon, 2007):

"I'm in the Army Reserve … the day I got enlisted, I had to sign a decla-
ration, swear allegiance and it said do you have Facebook, do you have
this, do you have that and I ticked all the boxes. 'Cause they actually check
you up even though your account is private, the government gets in and
some people have been requested to take stuff down. But I have to now
complete a security clearance pack for the Australian vetting agency and
they also want to know all these details. So it can be a barrier to your
employment, yeah. Especially if you want to get into the military, police, or
the secret service like ASIO." (Male, USyd FG1)

However, in pre-crime society the responsibility for security against risk
goes beyond the state (Zedner, 2007). A range of agents are now on the
watch, including potential employers. The knowledge that these agents
might be checking your social network profile impacts on the choices young
people make around online privacy; what is available/hidden on their digital
profiles, but also how they use information technologies in their everyday life:

"My dad works for the New South Wales government. Any major organi-
sational company has, they do have departments of people who will go
through and search through these – like before they hire people they
check through [their online profiles]. … [It] just makes you think. I'm not
going to put photos of me disgustingly off my face from last Saturday
night on Facebook. That can stay private. You only put out what you feel

comfortable people seeing and consider the consequences of where the photos end up." (Male, UWS FG1)

Many participants in our focus groups were aware of numerous incidents of invasions of privacy undertaken by employers. While such interventions were sometimes seen as warranted, they were perceived as unnecessary in most cases:

"[Y]ou can have a personal life and business life, right? You have the right to that, and if you want to go out on the Saturday night and party and get drunk, you should be allowed to do that and it should not affect your business life. Maybe like Monday to Friday you're really working hard and stuff. Yeah, I think it's a bit unfair that they judge your entire personality on a photo of one night." (Female, USyd FG3)

"[If] you're someone who has things on Facebook that you're showing that you're – I don't know, involved in really dangerous sort of a life and then you want to be a babysitter, I think there's circumstantial (sic) definitely…. Like I don't know, if you're applying for a job at Maccas obviously they don't care at all what your private life is like, but yeah it depends on the job I reckon." (Female, USyd FG3)

As previously noted, schools have also become "sites of technologically mediated surveillance" (Barnard-Wills, 2012: 240). As young people we spoke with testified, school administrators and teachers often make use of social network sites to monitor students' activities and make students comply with school regulations. According to some of our participants, many of the sur-veillance strategies deployed by the school administration and teachers are covert, unknown to the object of surveillance:

"Our school was very dodgy the way they did it… we found out afterwards that some of the teachers were monitoring our Facebooks. … They would make fake accounts. The stuff they would to – they wouldn't talk to us about it but in a really sneaky way try to monitor our Facebook. … [We] found out later on that the teacher was actually stalking, not stalking but monitoring Facebook. That's how they saw it and the student was like, 'How did you find this photo', and the Principal was 'Oh some students

showed it to us', when really they were the ones that were monitoring her Facebook. She got suspended for three days for that." (Female, UWS FG1)

"Our high school had a Facebook page … and I know that the Principal monitors it to read what everyone writes, like about the lack of mirrors in the bathrooms and comments made about teachers and other students." (Female, UWS FG1)

While some focus groups participants argued schools would want to keep an eye on students, on balance they thought such activities were a privacy concern:

"That could be hard for the students' wellbeing because you're sort of like looking after them, but it could also be like you're invading our privacy, this is a bit much, it's really none of your business." (Female, USyd FG3)

However, when it comes to privacy invasion on social network sites the biggest culprits appear to be parents and family members. As Ahrens (2012: 1715) notes, "the rise of … the intensive parenting model means a substantial and increasing number of parents expect full access to information about their children and consider it necessary to involve themselves in all aspects of their children's lives." Parents, thus, increasingly monitor young people's online activity, including their social network profiles. While young people have an empathetic understanding of motivations for such surveillance (Steeves, Regan, 2014), they often resent it:

"[A] couple of times my mum called me and she said my aunt had seen my Facebook and I'm thinking my aunt doesn't even have Facebook, and from my picture [mum] gathered that I was drinking whiskey every day and told my grandparents that." (Female, USyd FG2)

Young people are, thus, increasingly unhappy with the above outlined intrusions, especially incidents of covert surveillance into their digital space and identity. They spend a considerable amount of time carefully crafting their image on social network sites, and engaging in strategies to minimise the impact of such intrusions.

Re-imagining a digital life: Resistance to surveillance and managing online identity

From our research, and that of others, it is clear that many young people have undertaken some form of action to hide their online activity from parents and other possible surveillance actors (see Livingstone, Bober, 2005: 3; Steeves, 2012; Newspoll, 2013: 9; Steeves, Regan, 2014). Indeed, young people have largely turned to the Internet "precisely because it was beyond the parental gaze" (Steeves, 2012: 353). The fact that something is posted on social network sites does not mean that there are no privacy expectations attached, and that anyone can access such content. In this context, as Steeves (2012: 356) notes "negotiating self in this space necessitates careful and deliberate judgments about who sees what." Participants in our research confirmed that they actively pursue a range of options to maximise privacy and minimise the opportunity for surveillance. A strategy they often pursue is operating a social networking profile under a pseudonym – or hiding in plain sight:

"I know a lot of people that are using false names that are recognisable as being their names, but they're un-Google-able. So if you say Ben Pikelet whoever, you go okay I know who that is." (Male, USyd FG2)

"When I applied to college everyone changed their names on Facebook, just temporarily in case the school was going to look you up. Even if it was just like you erased your last name and put a random name. Then once we all got into college we changed it back". (Male, USyd FG1)

"I still use a fake name on stuff. My Facebook is the only thing that sort of has my real name on it, but I have Tumblr, I have Twitter, I have a fair bit of social networking and everything else I just use a generic username. Not that there's anything bad about it but I just wouldn't want it coming up." (Female, USyd FG1)

Strategies they use to achieve privacy goals are many and varied, from almost complete withdrawal from certain social network sites' platforms, to carefully adjusting their privacy settings or even rethinking their online content to cater for their real or imagined 'audience'. Unwanted intrusions into

their digital lives sometimes deterred young people from sharing information on social network sites platforms, temporarily or permanently:

"You have the choice whether you want to put up the information or not. Like if there's something about me that I don't want people to know I don't put it on the Internet." (Female, USyd FG1)

"[It] depends on how much you disclose on your web pages, like date of birth, name, where you work and various other things. I think it is unsafe if you disclose too much information on there. Because then if someone knows where you work, if someone knows your date of birth, they pretty much know everything about you then, the important information." (Male, USyd FG1)

The main motivation for young people in self-policing their digital identity on social network sites is the impact their digital footprint might have on their potential or current employment. Photos were of particular concern to participants, and they sometimes get so cautious they either refrain from posting altogether or use pseudonyms to make sure their current or future employers cannot see their online activities:

"I personally make sure there's not an inappropriate photo of me being taken, I still want to look professional, I try not to curse as much, just in case you never know who's going to see [it]. I had a private link with my friend, so they can't see my wall or photos, but nowadays you never know and it's better to be safe than sorry." (Male, USyd FG3)

"Yeah like I'm not going to put [photos of me] cuddling naked with my boyfriend or whatever. You can control it and I'm becoming more aware that people can access my account. Getting a job now these days, a company can look at your Facebook. My mum will message me and say take that photo down, so I'm more aware of that." (Female, USyd FG2)

"I had to become a friend with my work on Facebook, and now I just don't post anything at all really because I have to think about it really carefully, about if I post anything they're going to see it and could have possible repercussions. So I think you have to think really carefully about who's seeing it now because a lot of people don't know who's viewing their page

through friends of friends or whatever, so you have to be careful about what you put out there." (Female, USyd FG4)

The above responses suggest that young people's understanding of privacy and surveillance requires further, and careful, elaboration. Better understanding young people's strategies to negotiate their privacy might lead to a better understanding of how online victimisation, as well as unwanted intrusions into their privacy, might be minimised in the future.

Conclusion

There is no credible evidence to establish the real extent and consequences of unsafe online practices by young people (Livingstone, Haddon, 2009). Nevertheless, young people are constructed as legitimate objects for surveillance intrusions. Such intrusions, justified as risk-based crime or victimisation prevention strategies, are arguably underpinned by pre-crime interventions that aim to anticipate and disrupt young people's non-conformist behaviour. Justified by "the need to pre-empt catastrophic threats by intervening at an earlier point in time than the law would normally contemplate" (McCulloch, Wilson, 2016: 133), such pre-crime interventions are tangible, and many. While overt forms of visual surveillance deployed in schools such as CCTV cameras are on the rise (Taylor, 2012), new strategies of surveillance often incorporate a range of actors (in addition to school authorities), and are becoming more covert, carefully hidden in a chaotic world of social network sites. In this context, young people's activity on social network sites have come to constitute a new risk, against which young people can 'legitimately' be scrutinised, monitored, followed and pre-emptively punished, 'for their own good'. Importantly, such surveillance strategies are not reciprocal and suggest that social actors such as schools, teachers, employers, and parents do not trust young people to do 'the right thing', and as such they negate young people's agency and self-expression. Taylor notes that "[u]pcoming generations will… have no experience or comprehension of a world without invasive surveillance for even the most mundane activities" (Taylor, 2012: 225). Monitoring both the terrestrial and digital lives of young people is becoming the mainstream, not the exception. As Lyon notes, "[s]urveillance has become

ubiquitous and taken for granted in today's world" (Lyon, 2007: 1). To this end it is also largely, if begrudgingly, accepted and even normalised (Lyon, 2007). However, as our respondents indicate, while living a digital life young people sometimes simultaneously engage in, experience being subject to, and resist surveillance. Friends, parents, teachers, police, corporations and others were identified at various times as surveilling young people, and our respondents also noted how they use social network sites and other new technologies to monitor others and themselves.

As has become clear from the discussions above, young people today live in a networked world shaped by cyber as well as terrestrial experiences. Our respondents clearly understood the risks and challenges of balancing these online lives and questions of their privacy in a context in which the public and private spheres of activity are fluid, unstable, and where one can never be certain anything is actually private. Moreover, they have internalised the messages of the permanency of online data and how this might affect their futures, while also remaining optimistic of their capacities to manage it. Our research suggests the complexity of online world in which young people spend a significant amount of their time, and as such responses to challenges that this complex world brings cannot be reduced to simple binaries.

Humans have always had an ambiguous relationship to new technologies, and the online lives of young people are regarded by adults variously with optimism on the one hand, and concern and anxiety on the other. The latter emerges particularly in the context of technologically facilitated sexual relationships, and the sexualisation of young people more generally though these technologies (Lee et al., 2013). Yet, technology also provides the capacity to monitor and correct such behaviour, even if that requires 'a sneaky bit of stalking'.

Funding acknowledgment

References

Ahrens, D. (2012) Schools, Cyberbullies, and the Surveillance State. *American Criminal Law Review*, 4, pp. 1695-1722.

Andrejevic, M. (2005) The Work of Watching One Another: Lateral Surveillance, Risk, and Governance. *Surveillance and Society*, 4, pp. 479-497.

Barnard-Wills, D. (2012) E-safety Education: Young People, Surveillance and Responsibility. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 3, pp. 239-255.

Bauman, Z., Lyon, D. (2013) *Liquid Surveillance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beck, U. (1992) *The Risk society: Towards a New Modernity*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.

Betts, L., Spenser, K. (2015) A Large Can of Worms: Teachers' Perceptions of Young People's Technology Use. *International Journal of Cyber Behavior*, 2, pp. 15-29.

Boyd, D., Ellison, N. (2007) Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13, pp. 210-230.

Brown, B. (1999) You're Going Out With Who? Peer Group Influences on Adolescent Romantic Relationships. In: W. Furman, B. Brown, C. Feiring (eds.) *The Development of Romantic Relationships in Adolescence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 291-329.

Bruno, F. (2012) Surviellance and Participation on Web 2.0. In: K. Ball, K. Haggerty, D. Lyon (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*. New York: Routledge, pp. 343-351.

Ceyhan, A. (2008) Technologization of Security: Management of Uncertainty and Risk in the Age of Biometrics. *Surveillance and Society*, 2, pp. 102-123.

Clarke, R. (1998) Information Technology and Dataveillance. *Communication of the ACM*, 5, pp. 498-512.

Cranmer, S. (2013) Listening to Excluded Young People's Experiences of E-safety and Risk. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 1, pp. 72-85.

Crofts, T., Lee, M., McGovern, A., Milivojevic, S. (2015) *Sexting and Young People*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Davies, J. (2007) Display, Identity and the Everyday: Self-presentation through Online Image Sharing. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 4, pp. 549-564.

Davis, K., James, C. (2012) Tweens' Conceptions of Privacy Online: Implication for Educators. *Learning Media and Technology*, 38, 1, pp. 4-25.

Evers, C., Albury, K., Byron, P., Crawford, K. (2013) Young People, Social Network Sites, Social Networking Sites and Sexual Health Communication in Australia: This is Funny, You Should Watch It. *International Journal of Communication*, 7, pp. 263-280.

Gabriel, F. (2014) Sexting, Selfies and Self-harm: Young People, Social Media and the Performance of Self-development. *Media International Australia incorporating Culture and Policy*, 151, pp. 104-112.

Hope, A. (2005) Panopticism, Play and the Resistance of Surveillance: Case Studies of the Observation of Student Internet Use in UK Schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 3, pp. 359-373.

Junco, R. (2012) The Relationship Between Frequency of Facebook Use, Participation in Facebook Activities, and Student Engagement. *Computers and Education*, 1, pp. 162-171.

Kelly, P. (2000) The Dangerousness of Youth-at-risk: The Possibilities of Surveillance and Intervention in Uncertain Times. *Journal of Adolescence*, 4, pp. 463-476.

Koskela, H. (2012) You Shouldn't Wear That Body – The Problematic of Surveillance and Gender. In: K. Ball, K. Haggerty, D. Lyon (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*. New York: Routledge, pp. 49-56.

Lee, M., Crofts, T., Salter, M., Milivojevic, S., McGovern, A. (2013) Let's Get Sexting: Risk, Power, Sex and Criminalisation in the Moral Domain. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, 1, pp. 35-49.

Livingstone, S., Bober, M. (2005) *UK Children Go Online: Final Report of Key Project Findings*. London: London School of Economics and Political Science.

Livingstone, S., Haddon, L. (2009) Conclusion. In: S. Livingstone, L. Haddon (eds.) *Kids Online*. Bristol: The Policy Press, pp. 241-252.

Lyon, D. (2001) *Surveillance Society*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Lyon, D. (2007) *Surveillance Studies: An Overview*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

McCulloch, J., Wilson, D. (2016) *Pre-crime: Pre-emption, precaution and the future*. London, New York: Routledge.

Mythen, G. (2014) *Understanding the Risk Society, Crime, Security and Justice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Pascoe, C. (2011) Resource and Risk: Youth Sexuality and New Media Use. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 1, pp. 37-50.

Richards, D., Caldwell, P., Go, H. (2015) Impact of social media on the health of children and young people. *Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health*, 12, pp. 1152-1157.

Selwyn, N. (2012) Making Sense of Young People, Education and Digital Technology: The Role of Sociological Theory. *Oxford Review of Education*, 1, pp. 81-96.

Shade, L. (2007) Contested Spaces: Protecting or Inhibiting Girls Online? In: S. Weber, S. Dixon (eds.) *Growing Up Online: Young People and Digital Technologies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 227-244.

Slane, A. (2010) From Scanning to Sexting: The Scope of Protection of Dignity-based Privacy in Canadian Child Pornography Law. *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*, 3-4, pp. 543-593.

Strauss, A., Corbin, J. (1998) *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, London and New Delhi: Sage.

Steeves, V. (2012) Hide and Seek: Surveillance of Young People on the Internet. In: K. Ball, K. Haggerty, D. Lyon (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*. New York: Routlege, pp. 352-360.

Steeves, V., Regan, P. (2014) Young People Online and the Social Value of Privacy. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, 4, pp. 298-313.

Stoddart, E. (2015) The Named Person: Surveillance and the Wellbeing of Children and Young People in Scotland. *Surveillance and Society*, 1, pp. 102-116.

Subrahmanyam, K., Reich, S., Waechter, N., Espinoza, G. (2008) Online and Offline Social Networks: Use of Social Networking Sites by Emerging Adults. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 6, pp. 420-433.

Taylor, E. (2012) The Rise of Surveillance School. In: K. Ball, K. Haggerty, D. Lyon (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*. New York: Routledge, pp. 225-232.

Thomas, M. (2011) Technology, Education, and the Discourse of the Digital Native. In: M. Thomas (ed) *Deconstructing Digital Natives*. New York and London: Routlege, pp. 1-11.

Young, C., Brown, B. (2012) Motives for Using Facebook, Patterns of Facebook Activities, and Late Adolescents' Social Adjustment to College. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 3, pp. 403-416.

Zedner, L. (2007) Pre-crime and Post-criminology? *Theoretical Criminology*, 2, pp. 261-281.

Internet sources

boyd, d., Marwick, A. (2011) Social Steganography: Privacy in Networked Publics. Available at: http://www.danah.org/papers/2011/Steganography-ICAVersion.pdf, page accessed 20.11.2017.

Lenhart, A., Madden, M. (2007) Social Networking Websites and Teens: An Overview. Pew Internet & American Life Project. Available at: http://www.pewinternet. org/2007/01/07/social-networking-websites-and-teens/, page accessed 22.11.2017.

Lenhart, A., Purcell, K., Smith, A., Zickuhr, K. (2010) Social Media & Mobile Internet Use Among Teens and Young Adults, Pew Internet & American Life Project. Available at: http://www.pewinternet.org/files/old-media/Files/Reports/2010/PIP_Social_Media_ and_Young_Adults_Report_Final_with_toplines.pdf, page accessed 22.11.2017.

Newspoll (2013) Like, Post, Share: Young Australian's Experience of Social Network Sites. Report Prepared for the Australian Communications and Media Authority. Available at: http://www.acma.gov.au/~/media/mediacomms/Report/pdf/Like%20 post%20share%20Young%20Australians%20experience%20of%20social%20 media%20Quantitative%20research%20report.pdf, page accessed 22.11.2017.

Rose, J., Morstyn, L. (2013) What Makes you Tweet?: Young People's Perspectives on the Use of Social Media as an Engagement Tool. Report. Youth Affairs Council of Victoria. Available at: https://www.yacvic.org.au/assets/Documents/ WhatMakesYouTweet-YACVic-report-Jun2013.pdf , page accessed 29.11.2017.

Stanley, T. (2013, 21 July) Living Life in Not Enough for Zombie Generation, *Sydney Morning Herald*. Available at: https://www.smh.com.au/entertainment/living-life-is-not-enough-for-zombie-generation-20130720-2qb5n.html, page accessed 22.1.2017.

Sanja Milivojevic[*]
Thomas Crofts
Murray Lee
Alyce McGovern

'Skriveno proganjanje':
Mladi, društvene mreže i praksa onlajn nadzora

U ovom radu su prikazani važni, mada nedovoljno istraženi odnosi između mladih ljudi, društvenih mreža i prakse nadzora sa kojim se susreću ili ga primenjuju u svom digitalnom životu. Polazeći od rezultata originalnog empirijskog istraživanja, u radu se raščlanjuju složeni digitalni identiteti mladih i analiziraju strategije nadzora, prikrivenog i otvorenog, kojima su mladi svakodnevno izloženi ili koje praktikuju. Često opravdavane narativima o prevenciji kriminaliteta zasnovanoj na riziku, takve nametljive strategije podrazumevaju detaljno proučavanje mladih, sa ciljem predikcije kriminaliteta i viktimizacije na društvenim mrežama, koji se nisu dogodili i koji se ne moraju nužno ni dogoditi. Kao takve, ove strategije su potkrepljene prekriminalnom logikom predviđanja i bavljenja potencijalnim kriminalitetom i viktimizacijom. Što je još značajnije, ove strategije nadzora se sve više prihvataju jer se nameću za „dobrobit mladih". Pa ipak, kako ovaj rad pokazuje, mladi su svesni takvih strategija i istovremeno ih primenjuju, izloženi su im, ali se i opiru ovakvim praksama nadzora.

Ključne reči: mladi, društvene mreže, nadzor, digitalni identitet.

[*]   Dr Sanja Milivojevic je viša predavačica na La Trobe Univerzitetu u Melburnu, Australija.
        E-mail: s.milivojevic@latrobe.edu.au.
        Prof. dr Thomas Crofts je redovni profesor na Univerzitetu u Sidneju, Australija.
        E-mail: thomas.crofts@sydney.edu.au.
        Prof. dr Murray Lee je redovni profesor na Univerzitetu u Sidneju, Australija.
        E-mail: murray.lee@sydney.edu.au.
        Dr Alyce McGovern je vanredna profesorka na Univerzitetu New South Wales, u Sydneju,
        Australija. E-mail: a.mcgovern@unsw.edu.au.