Social media companies’ policies against bullying between protection and participation rights
Children’s rights?

Following a statement of the aims and approach, this paper argues that Internet governance bodies give little consideration to children’s rights, despite growing calls from international child rights organizations to address their rights in the digital age. Typically, when children are acknowledged it is in the context of child protection while their rights to provision and participation are overlooked.

Stakeholders?
Privatization of internet governance

• Social media platforms (from: DeNardis & Hackl, 2015, p.2):
  • 1. Intermediation of user generated content
  • 2. Allow for interactivity among users
  • 3. Direct engagement with the content
  • 4. Ability to articulate network connections with other users
Scope of study

• How have anti-bullying policies evolved and how are they changing?
• How do these policies balance the right to protection vs. participation?
• Analysis of corporate documents
• Interviews with company, e-safety NGO representatives and independent e-safety experts
Self-regulation & privatized governance

• “The creation, implementation and enforcement of rules by a group of actors, industry in particular, with minimal or no intervention by the state.” (Lievens, 2016, p. 77 cf. Lievens, 2010).

• Criticism: Assigning too much responsibility to the industry resulting in privatized governance (Tambini, Leonardi, Masden, 2008; DeNardis, 2014).

• Regulation “by raised eyebrow” --when policy makers are dissatisfied with an issue they indicate the possibility of legislation in an ambiguous manner --an incentive for the industry to self-regulate (McLaughlin, 2013)
Self-regulatory initiatives--Independent evaluation?

- **EU:**
  - Safer Social Networking Principles (Lobe & Staksrud, 2010; Staksrud & Lobe, 2010; Donoso, 2011a,b)
- **CEO Coalition**
- **ICT Coalition** (O’Neill, 2014)
- **US:**
  - Internet Safety Technical Task Force (Berkman Klein Center for Internet & Society)
“Old” or “Standard” policies

- Reporting
- Content removal
- Blocking
- Filtering
- Focusing on the right to protection
Standard policies (reporting), example
“Advanced policies”

- “Allowing/Enabling/Empowering” the community of users to “manage” or “regulate” or “police” themselves – seek help on their own
- Digital citizenship approaches (education— prevention, Safety Centers)
- Facebook’s “social reporting”
- Up-voting & Down-voting (e.g. Yik Yak, Secret)
- Focusing on the right to participation
What You Can Do

While Facebook can't remove unflattering photos from the site, you may:

- **Send a message to Carolyn Wilson**
  - Ask Carolyn to remove the photo
  - Hey, I didn't like this photo. Please remove it.

- **Remove Carolyn Wilson as a friend**
  - Carolyn will not be able to tag you in photos

- **Block Carolyn Wilson**
  - You and Carolyn will become invisible to each other on Facebook, which means you can't see or contact each other

Source: https://www.facebook.com/notes/facebook-safety/details-on-social-reporting/196124227075034/
Example: Up-voting and Down-voting

Big dude in low-rise jeans. ugh. Cannot be unseen

One of the guys who works at sidewalk juice is kind of cute. To bad I don't have the guts to talk to him
Evidence of effectiveness?

• How to define effectiveness?
• Defining effectiveness in terms of rights?
• Evidence of effectiveness in terms of protection?
• Evidence of effectiveness in terms of participation?
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