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1. The Project

The Net Children Go Mobile project is co-funded by the EC’s Safer Internet Programme (now Better Internet for Kids) to investigate through quantitative and qualitative methods how the changing conditions of internet access and use – namely, mobile internet and mobile-convergent media – bring greater, fewer or newer risks to children’s online safety.

Participating countries include Denmark, Italy, Romania, and the UK, who have been directly funded by the EC’s Safer Internet Programme; and Belgium, Germany, Ireland, Portugal, and Spain, who joined the project on a self-funded basis.

Methods

Drawing on the experience of network members within the EU Kids Online network, the conceptual framework is operationalised in a child-centred, critical, contextual and comparative approach (Livingstone & Haddon 2009; Livingstone et al., 2011), which understands children’s online experiences as contextualised and shaped by three intersecting circles: 1) childhood, family life and peer cultures; 2) media systems and technological development; and 3) the European social and policy context. Accordingly, the project assumes that the voice and viewpoint of children is crucial to understanding online opportunities, risks and any harmful consequences of mobile media use. To reach this goal a mix-method research design was developed.

- The survey was conducted in seven European countries from May to November 2013 (UK, Denmark, Italy, Romania, Ireland) and February to March 2014 (Portugal and Belgium) (Mascheroni & Ólafsson, 2014) and involved a random stratified sample of around 500 children aged 9-16, who are internet users, per country.

- In order to maximise the quality of children’s answers and to ensure their privacy, the survey was conducted face-to-face in the home, but sensitive questions were self-completed by the child. The wording of the questionnaire was refined on the basis of cognitive testing with children of different age groups (9-10, 11-12, 13-14, 15-16) and gender in each country, in order to ensure children’s comprehension and to avoid adults’ terminology (such as “sexting”). Furthermore, particularly emotive terms, such as “stranger” or “bullying”, were also avoided.

- The qualitative research was carried out from January to September 2014 in nine European countries (the seven involved in the survey plus Germany and Spain).

Children were recruited in schools, where the focus groups and interviews also took place. The average number of focus groups was six in each country, three with girls and three with boys, with age distributions of 9–10, 11–13, and 14–16 (two focus groups each). Four or five children were included in each focus group. Children who were interviewed individually were different from the children included in the focus groups. The average number of interviews was 12 in each country, six for each gender, with the same age distribution as for the focus groups. Young people were selected from at least three different schools and/or youth centres, chosen to ensure a balanced composition of the sample.
in terms of type of school, area and socio-economic background of the families (public x private, city x suburban x rural). There were **55 focus groups** (N = 219) and **107 interviews** (N = 108) conducted across the nine countries.

Children aged 9 to 16

**55**

Focus groups  
(N=219)

**Interviws**  
(N=108)

**Parents** were recruited through schools, parents’ associations, after school programmes and researchers’ contacts. The average number of focus groups with parents was six, two for each children’s age group (9–10, 11–13, and 14–16). Where the recruitment of parents and the organisation of focus groups was particularly challenging, focus groups were replaced by individual interviews. A similar procedure was followed with **teachers** and **youth workers**, who were also recruited through schools, teachers’ associations, youth centres or after school programmes and researchers’ personal contacts. In some countries focus groups were replaced with individual interviews. The average number of focus groups was two with teachers (one group for primary school and one for high school teachers) and one with youth workers. Overall, there were 40 focus groups (N = 180) and 44 interviews (N = 50) with adults across the nine countries.
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Institute of Sociology  
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London School of Economics  
and Political Science
2. Adoption and use of smartphones and tablets

2.1 Use and ownership

Ways of going online are changing with the diffusion of mobile media: both locations and devices of internet access have diversified, with children using more devices overall and using the internet in more places. In terms of locations, while the home remains the main context of use, internet access from the child’s own bedroom and when out and about has increased substantially. Greater autonomy of use is experienced by British, Danish, and Italian children, who are more likely than average to access the internet both in the privacy of their bedroom and on the move. Figure 1 and 2 show how access to the internet from a private bedroom and on the move varies by age, gender, socioeconomic status and across countries.

Figure 1: Daily internet use in own bedroom and when out and about, by gender, age, and SES

The second major change relates to the ecology of devices that children inhabit, which includes more and more personal and portable devices (as in Figure 3). The two factors combined - increasing unsupervised access from private (often mobile) spaces and access by means of mobile devices - concur to a greater privatisation of internet access and use.

Figure 3: Daily internet use and ownership of different devices

% of children who own the device

% of children who use the device daily

Base: All children 9-16 years old who use the internet
Indeed, despite being the devices most likely to be used on the move, however, smartphones are mainly used at home, more often in the privacy of the child’s own bedroom.

In-depth interviews and focus groups with children also suggest that they value privacy and convenience more than mobility: smartphones especially are often at hand. Younger children are particularly excited by having a personal device that they do not need to share with siblings or family members. Moreover, even within the home, young people will often speak of pulling them out of their pocket to check something, rather than going to a PC and waiting for it to boot up:

The use and ownership of a device do not necessarily coincide, with children having access to a wider range of devices than those they actually own or have for private use. However, ownership and private use shape the quality of online experiences, with children owning a certain device being more likely to use it intensively throughout the day. Smartphones are the devices that children are more likely to own or have for private use. By contrast, tablets are in some households never personally owned, as they are bought for the whole family or for the children to share.

Policy recommendation

Industry

Even though mobile devices are designed to be used individually and privately (providing a unique user profile), research shows that at least tablets are often shared by all family members. Industry should consider this usage pattern and design devices that host multiple accounts, each with customisable safety settings.

While personal ownership is an important condition for autonomy of use, economic or technical constraints (such as the cost of mobile internet plans and the availability of public networks), and parental and teachers’ rules may actually limit where and how often a device is used to go online. Overall, children are slightly more likely to use laptops than smartphones or tablets to go online at least daily.
As shown in Figure 4 and 5, daily access to the internet by means of smartphones, tablets and laptops varies across countries and is also differentiated by age: while younger children are much more likely to use a laptop every day, teenagers use smartphones as much as laptops. The differences in daily use of smartphones by socioeconomic status (SES) are also notable: only 36% of children from lower SES homes go online from a smartphone every day, compared to 46% of higher SES families. As anticipated, this is also due to potential constraints on time and space of use, by which younger children, children from lower SES families and children in certain countries are more affected.

2.2 Constraints on use

Despite mobile-convergent media providing in principle “anywhere, anytime” connectivity, mobile internet use may actually be limited by economic and technical constraints, as much as by social rules. Among financial constraints, the cost of the device is taken into account by parents among the pros and cons leading to the initial acquisition of devices. Interviews and focus groups with both parents and children indicate that the cost of smartphones influences not only whether but also at what stage children might be allowed to have these devices, and which model they might get.

We went to the shopping mall and there were two phones that I liked most, so we checked the plan first, and then we chose the most convenient, since my mother says it doesn’t have to be beautiful for me to show off, it has to be useful.

Boy, 10, Italy

Use of smartphones is also influenced by other financial - the cost of ISP plans - and technical constraints - the availability of WiFi networks: both constraints are differentiated by age and socioeconomic status. Children aged 9-14 are more likely to go online from smartphones only through WiFi networks, while teenagers aged 15-16 use both internet plans and WiFi networks;
use of 3Gs connections only is more common among lower SES children, while their peers from higher SES homes are more likely to go online via both WiFi networks and mobile internet plans. Ways of going online from smartphones also vary across countries, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Ways of connecting to the internet from mobile phone/smartphone by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% mobile internet plan and free WiFi</th>
<th>% mobile internet plan only</th>
<th>% free WiFi only</th>
<th>% phone does not connect to the internet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All children who own or have for private use a mobile phone or a smartphone

As expected, the availability of internet plans is associated with the use of the internet on the move, as shown in Figure 6, and with specific usage patterns: those who can rely both on mobile internet plans and WiFi networks to go online from their smartphones, can actually benefit from more autonomy of use, while those accessing the internet either through free WiFi networks only or through internet plans only are likely to experience more constraints when using mobile devices to go online.

Figure 6: Daily use of the internet when out and about and availability of internet plans

Policy recommendation
School

The adoption and use of mobile devices is still unequal, characterised by both access divides (with more affluent children enjoying wider access through both monthly internet plans and WiFi, and more private access through personal devices) and usage divides (that is inequalities in the activities undertaken and opportunities they have access to, e.g. paid content). Schools and teachers should engage in mitigating existing divisions by offering equal opportunities to children and fostering inclusive uses of mobile technologies during class activities.
Policy recommendation

Government

It may not sound appropriate to recommend to commercial institutions that they should supply free WiFi access. However, the financial constraints on the increasing number of children with smartphones and tablets means that this audience would particularly appreciate the existing of such free WiFi spaces. Especially in countries where the commercial centre supplies few such spaces, government and other civic bodies should be encouraged to compensate by enabling such free internet access.

Policy recommendation

Industry

Young people often reported unexpected costs incurred by them unknowingly installing paid apps or using certain services (e.g. roaming). This can be particularly distressing for children (who have acted in good faith) not just because of the money involved but because it can lead to stressful interactions within the family. Digital literacy around the use of mobile devices and apps should be a priority, with industry taking a lead role in ensuring clear specifications of costs of applications and services and providing transparent tools to help control the costs of internet use (especially of roaming and in-app purchases).

Indeed, children ration their own use due to cost considerations: even children who are provided with mobile internet plans seek WiFi in public places or try to use 3G as little as possible, and to limit their time online if WiFi is not available:

I try to turn it off (3G) most of the time, otherwise it would cost a lot of money. If I want to go on Facebook or Snapchat, I turn it on. But immediately afterwards, I turn it off again.

Girl, 12-13, Belgium

In the most extreme cases, children had smartphones but simply did not use the smartphone for accessing the internet. For example, Marco, a 15 year old boy from Portugal, had recently deactivated his 3G access, because his internet tariff became too expensive for accessing the internet “wherever he wants”.

---

1 Many of the more dramatic examples of not using the smartphone for mobile access came from Portugal and Romania, which may in part reflect the difficult economic situation in these countries at the time of the research.
2.3 Age of first use

Children are using the internet and getting a mobile phone or a smartphone at ever younger ages. As shown in Figure 7, children start using the internet before they are given a mobile phone. The average age at which children receive a smartphone is older, at twelve years old; however, younger children are more likely to be given a smartphone when they are only eight. By contrast, older teenagers were fourteen on average when they got their first smartphone.

Figure 7: Age of first internet use, first mobile phone and first smartphone, by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Used the internet</th>
<th>Got a mobile phone</th>
<th>Got smartphone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All children 9-16 years old who use the internet

After 2011 children of all age groups are more likely to be given a smartphone than an ordinary mobile phone. Indeed, 15% of our interviewees had never owned a mobile phone that was not a smartphone.

Country variations are considerable: the average age when children started using the internet is lowest in Denmark and highest in Italy. Danish children were also younger when they were given their first mobile phone or smartphone. In contrast, children in Belgium tend to receive either a mobile phone or a smartphone considerably later than their peers in the other six countries surveyed.

As the qualitative data reveal, however, such statistics hide some more complex processes, whereby far more children gained access to and experience of smartphones before actually owning one, at an earlier age. Some children in effect serve apprenticeships, using or trying out other family members’ devices before they had their own. This can start at an early age, as when John (boy, 9-10, UK) reported how his 6 year old sister regularly played with their mother’s broken Blackberry: “She just wants to pretend she’s all girly, like. Blah, blah, blah. Always on the phone, texting!” Often devices were first borrowed by young children specifically to play games, as when Francesco, a 10 year old Italian boy, still borrows his mother’s smartphone for that purpose.

The “appropriate age” for owning a smartphone is a matter of debate among both parents and children, with children having to “prove” they are mature and responsible enough to look after a mobile phone before parents would buy them a smartphone, as Joost (boy, 12-13, Belgium) explains. Sometimes the decision about being responsible is flexible, depending upon the child, but a number of children refer to getting the smartphone at certain life stages, almost as a rite of passage - e.g. when they changed school to a more senior school; on occasions of the first Holy Communion or as a Confirmation gift in the Catholic countries; as gift for birthdays or as a remuneration for success in school.

The demand for smartphones and tablets does not always come from children. At times, mobile devices are an unrequested and unexpected gift from parents and grandparents, as Gaia commented about acquiring her iPhone:

I am always concerned I might lose it, or it could be stolen. Because I didn’t really ask to have an iPhone. My grandparents gave it to me (…) But I could have a cheaper phone, less expensive, less important, because it makes me anxious, as much as wearing an expensive watch.

Even when the acquisition is driven by children themselves, part of that demand is not specific to technologies: rather, it is about wanting things that are fashionable and socially legitimated. Indeed, there were cases of actual peer pressure as when Lilya and Anna (girls, 11-13, Romania) told how their classmates used to laugh at them because of their old mobile phones.
until they acquired smartphones. Parents can also be fashion conscious about what their children have relative to their peers:

At first I didn’t even want one! I got it for Christmas, and then my parents said: ‘Now you need a new phone, because everyone else has a touch phone’. At first I thought: ‘what should I use that for, I have my Nokia phone? But then I became fond of it.

Girl, 11-13, Denmark

Beyond providing children with the latest fashionable gadget, in order to prevent any form of exclusion from peers, the idea of a “digital leash” or “umbilical cord” also emerged as an important motivation for parents: both fathers and mothers seem to feel a similar anxiety and a need for the child to become “always reachable”, “always close to them”. In Belgium, Portugal or Italy, teachers and youth workers share stories of parents calling their children during class or outdoors activities, even though parents are aware of rules.

However, the meaning of the smartphone in the parent-child relationship is ambiguous. Often, in focus groups, parents expressed their “good parenting”, differing themselves from other parents who use technology to compensate their lack of time to support children. Lorenzo, an Italian father, says that “parents not enough involved in the education of their children usually see digital devices as baby sitters, something used to make their children quiet”. A Portuguese father, Abel, says “smartphones are given to children as toys because parents don’t spend enough time with them… a smartphone makes the child quiet, focused on it…”

Policy recommendation

Media

Parental motivations for providing (or not) mobile devices to children revealed common ideas such as teens lacking maturity, the “umbilical cord” and the correspondent lack of autonomy, as well as the challenge of balancing trust, surveillance and privacy, or the complex negotiation of rules within the families.

These issues may be an interesting topic for the news media, namely for news magazines, thus promoting a big picture on contemporary families and the role of key points such as trust, parental support, shared and private spaces and times within the families.

---

2 Although the references to peer pressure are cross-cultural, they emerged as the dominant motivation expressed by Romanian parents and teachers, as if they were embedded in the public discourse on children and new media.
Changes and consequences

3.1 Online activities: old or new practices?

The Net Children Go Mobile data show that communicative practices (social networking and instant messaging), entertainment activities (listening to music and watching videoclips), and use of the internet for schoolwork top the lists of activities done on a daily basis. Compared with the EU Kids Online data (Livingstone et al., 2011), it also shows that social networking, sharing and entertainment activities have increased substantially from 2010 to 2013-2014.

When we look at communicative abilities, however, we find support for the hypothesis that creative and interactive uses of the internet are still at the top of the “ladder of opportunities”: just 31% of children (and 40% of smartphone users) know how to create a blog. By contrast, 56% (69% of smartphone users) claim they know how to post a comment online and 63% (86% of smartphone users) how to upload and share content on social media.

Despite children are engaging with more and more online activities, they do not take advantage of the same online opportunities across all age groups and countries, also due to different levels of familiarity with the English language in each country, and unequal provision of positive content for children in national languages.

Figure 8: daily online activities

Base: All children 9-16 years old who use the internet.
Policy recommendation

Industry

With communication, sharing and entertainment activities at the top of the preferences for online activities of children, industry (content providers, mobile telecom operators, software developers etc.) need to ensure that **age-appropriate positive content is available**.

**More positive content in national languages** is also needed. Whereas children in Ireland and UK are unsurprisingly satisfied with the provision of content in their language, in other European countries children’s satisfaction is lower (lowest in Belgium and Italy), thus increasing the gap between children who can access a wider variety of content produced both locally and globally, and those who are more reliant on locally produced content.

Smartphone users engage more in each of the online activities measured, the greatest differences being found in **communication and entertainment practices** (see Figure 8). This does not imply a linear causation: children who engage in more online activities may actually have more motivations to use a smartphone, thus being early adopters. Tablet users also tend to engage more in each online activity measured, but the difference between users and non-users is lower than the gap between users and non-users of smartphones. This is due to the main advantage of smartphones compared to any other device: their **convenience** - being small, portable and always "at hand" - and **privacy** - being private devices.

The usability and ease of smartphones encourages **creativity** and sharing, turning both the **sharing** of photos with larger audiences and the **editing of pictures** into a **mainstream practice**: as Beryl a British mother, explains, her son “**Alistair uses his small device for photos. He’d take photos, edit photos, and clips of video.**" Indeed, 28% of smartphone users report uploading pictures of videos to share with others every day, against 10% of non-users. Pictures are modified by means of photo-editing apps and shared on Facebook, Instagram, or WhatsApp.

However, for some purposes newer portable devices do not displace the older ICTs. Many children speak of preferring to do their school homework on the PC (rather than the smartphone or tablet), because of its screen size and keyboard.

**It is just that, on a computer the screen is bigger, and then you have to scroll up and down that much, so you just have it so you easily can see it.**

Boy, 14-15, Denmark

Some download material onto a PC (or tablet) because it is quicker than doing it onto their smartphone, or else watch YouTube on a PC, once again because of the larger image. A similar preference for the old, well-proven technologies emerges also in relation to games and gaming: many children preferred to play games on
a PC or games consoles because of their faster processing power and higher resolution graphics. A 10 year old British boy, Fletcher, says that he prefers one platform over another for usability reasons. He used to use the games console a lot but, then, he got a tablet. He tried that out but he still prefers the games console because he found out that: “It’s much easier on the console.” Or Frederica (girl, 9-10, Italy) has a particular taste for detective games, available for the PC but not the smartphone, although Răzvan (boy, 11-13, Romania) notes that while more games on the tablet are accessible, those on the PC are more advanced. For whatever reason, it was clear how older devices have certain features, certain affordances, that continue to make them attractive for certain purposes.

3.2 Communication

Staying in touch with friends via social network sites (SNS) or instant messaging services is on the rise and represents a great part of youth’s online daily activities. Smartphones not only change where and for how long children can keep in touch with their circles of friends; they also expand the range of mobile communicative practices and the type of audiences children are now able to engage with.

Children associate new mobile devices with a rise in the volume of peer communication. Many interviewees believe they are more “sociable” since they had a smartphone: for example, Alan, a teenage boy from UK, explains that: “I talk more and I talk to a lot more people in general because the ability is there in my hands.”

Smartphones and, to a minor extent, tablets have widened children’s communication repertoires by extending the opportunities to access already popular social media tools such as Facebook, while supporting new apps such as WhatsApp, Instagram and Snapchat. The changing communicative practices are enabled by particular affordances of smartphones and new messaging services that children remark upon in their discourses: first, smartphones are portable devices, meaning that communication facilities are perceived as always “at hand”; second, contrary to SMS, communication through social media apps and instant messaging apps is free of charge, thus encouraging a continuous, intermittent flow of communication; third, these apps enable group communication, thus supporting the practice of “broadcasting”.

Well, how much do I use it? I use it… basically I always have the smartphone in my hand.

Girl, 15, Italy

Instead of using SMS, Snapchat is for free, here you can just take a picture, write a textbite and send it.

Girl, 11-13, Denmark
It’s free. (...) if you had normal text people only message you if they need to message you. And you can’t really create groups on text message so I think that’s why you might message more. So if you want to tell, let’s just say, about your birthday party, or something, you could instead of sending it individually, and paying a lot on the text message, on the group you could send it one time for free and everyone would know about it on the group.

Overall, 68% of children have at least one profile on a SNS, but the use of SNS varies consistently by age and across countries. Figure 9 and 10 show the number of children with at least one account on a SNS and of those indicating Facebook as their main SNS by age, gender and country.

Figure 9: Children with a profile on SNS by age and gender

The use of SNS has increased in most countries - substantially in Romania, Portugal and Denmark, while less in Belgium and Italy - Ireland and the UK excluded. Indeed, the lower diffusion of social networking in Belgium, Ireland, Italy and the UK is due to lower rates of under-age use in these countries.

Almost all respondents indicated Facebook as the SNS they use most - the rise being particularly notable in Portugal and Romania. By contrast in the UK just three out of four children who use SNS still favoured Facebook, while one in four children said the profile they used the most was on Twitter.

While Facebook is still being reported by the majority of respondents as the most used SNS, the use of social media is diversifying – children simultaneously use various services, each enabling specific practices and targeted at a specific audience.

One reason for using Facebook less can be found in its popularity among parents. The adoption of Facebook by adults has had an impact for children in some countries who rarely use Facebook for talking to each other but merely to keep in touch generally with those who don’t have the other SNS they use, knowing also they can be “seen” by parents: one UK father, Kelvin, who took an interest in his son’s Facebook while he learned how to use it himself, was quickly unfriended.
However, rather than replacing one SNS with another, children combine and integrate them with other communicative practices. Just like adults, children develop sophisticated repertoires of practices, devices and services from which they choose what best suits the particular communicative situation and relationship.

Two out of three children report keeping in touch with their friends several times a day by means of SNS or messaging apps. Indeed, full-time access to friends is praised as one of the major opportunities of smartphones. By extending their face-to-face interaction in a sort of 24/7 communicative bubble, children reinforce their friendship ties.

Children use SNS and messaging apps also to make new friends. While the practice of meeting people on the internet is sporadic, children tend to expand their social networks by activating latent ties, such as “friends of friends”. Indeed, only 9% of the respondents say they accept any request of friendship on SNS. By contrast, one in four children add people with whom they share offline friends, as shown in Figure 11 and 12. This practice is particularly legitimised among teenagers, children from medium SES and Italian children.

---

**Policy recommendation: Parents**

Parents need to be made more aware of the potential risks of underage social networking. Awareness campaigns against under-age use of SNS have been more effective in Belgium, Ireland, Italy and the UK. By contrast, in other countries the number of children under 13 who are using SNS is still high. Parents have to take up an active role in ensuring that their children are using the services in a safe and responsible manner. They should also be encouraged to act accordingly with child’s age and to adapt their mediation, combining supervising younger children’s use of SNS with a partnership approach for older children.
**Policy recommendation Industry**

Children express the need for safe, private spaces and services - for example when they praise Snapchat because of the freedom from the social pressure of always having to produce good-looking pictures. Service providers should consider how they might empower children by providing safe and private spaces and/or tools for customising apps and platforms. As the social networking platform most popular among European children, Facebook should continue its active role in promoting the safe use of their service (including age-sensitive privacy settings, ease of use of report mechanism). One should note the recent change in ‘private by default’ for 13-17 year olds as opposed to ‘friends of friends’, but introducing options of public viewing from others, meaning anyone can view what teenagers post, if they so choose. Unfortunately, this does not work if a child registers as being over 18. However, as other SNS become popular (e.g. Snapchat, Ask.fm), also these other providers/services should take up responsibility for ensuring safe use of their platforms.

**Figure 11: Children’s responses to friends’ requests on SNS, by gender, age and SES**

**Figure 12: Children’s responses to friends’ requests on SNS, by country**

Base: All children 9-16 years old who use SNS.
As children become more social media-savvy, they have become particularly sensitive to the kind of personal information they display, as Imogen, a teenager from UK explains:

So my Facebook has my birthday but I don’t have where I go to school, where I live, my phone number or anything like that on there, and I don’t have any of that stuff on Instagram or Twitter either, so I… the thing… some of the things that I do are public but none of my personal details are.

Children’s narratives about personal data and privacy concerns are consistent with survey data, confirming that children across all age groups do not disclose the most sensitive information such as their home address or phone number (as shown in Table 2):

### Table 2: What information children show on their social networking profile, by age and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% who say that their SNS profile shows...</th>
<th>9-12 years</th>
<th>13-16 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A photo that clearly shows their face</td>
<td>71/73</td>
<td>79/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their last name</td>
<td>81/80</td>
<td>85/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their home address</td>
<td>12/12</td>
<td>11/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their phone number</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>14/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their school</td>
<td>44/52</td>
<td>69/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An age that is not their correct age</td>
<td>62/65</td>
<td>29/28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All children who use SNS.

The practicalities of managing, for example, a private Twitter account combined with the use of SNS to make new friends mean that some children are more likely to moderate their personal data rather than deal with the inconvenience of staying private. Figure 13 and 14 show how the number of children keeping a public profile varies by age, gender and country, comparing 2010 and 2013-14 data:

### Figure 13: Children with a public profile, by age and gender, comparing 2010 ad 2013-14

### Figure 14: Children with a public profile by country, comparing 2010 and 2013-14
Net Children Go Mobile

The number of children who have a public profile on SNS has increased among boys, pre-adolescents, and children living in Romania or the UK. Different privacy settings may not necessarily be an indicator of risky behaviour, and also have to be contextualised within “friending” practices - with pre-teens more likely to use SNS as a way to make new friends and with Romanian children more open to accept all requests of friendship - and different platforms - with Twitter profiles being usually public, and with children in the UK who are more likely than average to indicate Twitter as the profile they use most. Indeed, different SNS may imply different notions of “friendship” and different regimes of privacy and disclosure. However, these findings also signal that, while many children are social media-savvy, others still lack basic safety skills.

3.3 Skills

Overall children claim half of the twelve internet skills measured - including instrumental skills, safety skills, critical skills and communicative abilities - as shown in Figure 15:

Comparing these findings with the EU Kids Online data collected in 2010 (Livingstone et al., 2010), we can observe how over the past four years children have developed greater social media skills that help them be safe on SNS. Critical skills such as comparing different websites to assess the reliability of information have also increased. By contrast, other competences measured in both surveys show a little increase.

As Figure 15 shows smartphone and tablet users claim nearly twice as many skills as children who don’t use mobile devices to go online. Therefore, these findings are supportive of the “usage hypothesis”: the more children use the internet, the more opportunities they take up and the more skills they develop.

Figure 15: Average number of internet skills, by country, comparing mobile internet users with non-mobile users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Average Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>5.1/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>5.3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>5.3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>5.9/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>5.5/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>6.9/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>7.1/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All children 9-16 years old who use the internet.
On average, children claim more smartphone and tablet specific skills - 7.5 out of 11 measured. Protecting a mobile device with a passcode, finding information on how to use the smartphone/tablet safely, and deactivating location-tracking functions top the list of the competences children possess.

Children are also more self-confident regarding their smartphone-specific skills: while 38% of children believe the statement “I know more about the internet than my parents” is very true of them, 58% say it is “very true” of them that they know more than their parents about using smartphones.

**Policy recommendation**

**Schools, parents, NGOs**

A way in which children might experience privacy issues is when others get unwarranted access to private content on their smartphone (such as unauthorized access to photo gallery or messages). These issues can be addressed to making children aware of responsible sharing of their own devices/features. Because of social inequalities in children’s home contexts, school remains the preferred environment to learn (operational) digital skills.

**Policy recommendation**

**Schools**

With a large proportion of children (especially younger ones) still reporting lack of basic safety skills, such as blocking unwanted content or using the report button, schools could step up their role in promoting digital safety by integrating safety skills in primary school curricula. Moreover, e-safety education in school should also include mobile-specific safety issues (such as the risks of geolocation, privacy settings of the device etc.). Indeed, when acquiring a personal mobile device, children should master a number of basic digital skills to operate the device in a safe and responsible way. Operational skills are required to change settings, such as selecting modes or turning off features. Because of social inequalities in children’s home contexts, school remains the preferred environment to learn (operational) digital skills.
3.4 Over-dependence

Mobile communication has become a taken for granted condition of our sociability and our everyday lives, bringing about notable benefits – for example, always being in contact with family and friends, easier management of everyday life activities and mobility, better employment of otherwise “dead” time, etc. – as well as some negative consequences – more stress, and the pressure to be “always on”. In general, the new practices that emerge from the availability of internet connectivity on the move (whether through WiFi networks or internet plans) is enriching the lives of many respondents. They like to feel always connected with their friends and to be able to instantly manage situations by searching the web, asking friends and family for advice and generally using the internet in a proactive way. However, this might be leading to an overdependence for some, who find solutions to problems from an external source rather than developing personal resilience and know-how for managing tricky situations.

Feeling less bored is identified among the most notable consequence of smartphones: the majority of children agree “a bit” (43%) or “a lot” (41%) with the statement “thanks to my smartphone I feel less bored.” On the other side, however, the smartphone can be the tool for perpetuating apathy: for some children, the “always on” availability of 24/7 information feeds becomes a perpetual circle of tedious non-activity, as they scroll through SNS finding nothing for them or nothing new, but looking again and again just in case they have missed something.

I get to the point where I’m kind of like, I get so bored, sometimes I just pick it up, and look at it and I have nothing. Or I’ll go onto Instagram, come out of it, go on Twitter, come out of it, go on Snapchat and come out of it, and just keep going in the circuit and I’ll not realise I’m doing it, because I’ve got nothing to do. So now I actually downloaded a game again the other day, so I’ve just been playing that recently.

Girls, 14-16, UK

Offering multiple opportunities for filling in awkward, uncomfortable moments experienced by children, the smartphone can lead to laziness as admitted by the same teenagers:

Teema: We’ll be in separate rooms and we’ll tweet each other.
Isleen: Or call each other because you can’t be bothered to get up.
(…)
Teema: That’s really bad.
Isleen: And then I call, I just call them to find out if they’re there; I can’t be bothered to get up and see
Teema: That’s lazy.
Isleen: I know.

Policy recommendation
Schools

As school is the place where children spend most of their day together, teachers are in a privileged position to promote the responsible use of mobile communication. Encouraging face-to-face interactions among children by means of engagement in shared offline activities without minimising the relevance of mobile communication for children is also recommended. Children need to realise that they can still manage face-to-face interactions and that mobile, online communication can be as problematic as co-present interaction.
A further consequence of smartphones, according to children, is feeling **more connected to their friends**: most children think it is “a bit” (39%) or “very” (42%) true of them. However, constant **accessibility to one another** by means of mobile communication has become **normative**: three out of four children (72%) also agree that they **feel they have to be always available to family and friends**.

While children feel perpetual social access to peers annoying, they usually conform to the social pressure to be “always on”:

> When we were younger, and we had those old phones it was like, you could easily forget it at home, but now, where you can use the social media, now it’s really important!

*Girl, 11-13, Denmark*

> What bothers me is that you’re always busy, and that you have no rest

*Boy, 15, Belgium*

Temporary or permanent disconnection is negatively sanctioned and troublesome, leading to the feeling of **exclusion** from the peer group:

> Because all the others have a smartphone, I think that I’m more unavailable now because nobody calls on the home phone but everybody is writing WhatsApp messages.

*Boy, 13-14, Germany*

> and when you go on WhatsApp you find a lot of messages, they might be interesting but you don’t bother to read them all and then the next day in class they talk and you don’t know what they are talking about

*Girl, 11-13, Italy*

The feeling of **entrapment** generated by this normative mobile etiquette - whereby one should be always accessible and reply in real time - appears to be radicalised by new features of instant messaging apps and SNS alike. Knowing that the sender is notified when the message has been received and read causes **anxiety** as well as **misunderstandings** in relationships with friends:

> So it’s not nice no to answer?

Andrea: Yes, in my opinion, well if you really have problems or if you’re away and cannot talk, yes, nobody says anything. But when you get messages and you see and you’re not in the mood to talk... (...) so, it’s a very stupid idea that they write and can see that I saw the message and this is the most annoying: to write someone and to get “seen at...”

*Girl, 15, Romania*
Policy recommendation

Parents

Children sometimes share parental concerns about the potential negative consequences of always being socially accessible to peers. Parents can help to empower children by educating them to more responsible uses of these devices, helping them to understand that mediated communication does not need to be in real time, that written words are less ephemeral than spoken words and that text can reach a wider audience than children had expected. Setting rules is also an effective measure, without downplaying the rules children set themselves when under no parental pressure - e.g. not using the smartphone until they have done with homework. Parents should also recognise - as they sometimes do - that they are also victims of the communicative bubble when they want their own children to be always available to them.

Industry

Children express concerns about the new technological affordances of messaging apps and social media, reporting that they feel socially obliged to reply in real time but how fast (sometime ill-thought out) replies can lead to conflicts or misunderstandings with peers. Notifications should be disabled by default for younger children or made optional for them to use. they are also victims of the communicative bubble when they want their own children to be always available to them.

Peers

Mobile (online) communication has the potential to exacerbate issues and problematic aspects of peer communication: issues of belonging, trust and respect are all at play. Children need to be themselves responsible for the safety of their (online) communication environment. Those children who are more aware of these issues should be encouraged to promote better mobile and online communication amongst their peers.
4. Risks

One major acquisition of research on online risks and safety in comparative perspective - and notably of the EU Kids Online project - is that online risky experiences do not necessarily result in harm, as reported by children (Livingstone et al., 2011). While internet activities are not beneficial nor negative per se, some online experiences are more likely to result in problematic experiences for children, namely, in harm. Harm is, therefore, considered as the distinct - subjective or objective - outcome of exposure to online risks.

Before asking children about specific risky experiences, we asked them a closed and an open-ended question, asking them to provide their overall view on negative online experiences. Children were asked, “In the past 12 months, have you seen or experienced something on the internet that has bothered you in some way? For example, made you feel uncomfortable, upset, or feel that you shouldn’t have seen it?” and “If you have seen or experienced something on the internet in the past 12 months that has bothered you in some way, can you write down what happened or what it was that bothered you or made you upset?”

Figure 16 and 17 show children’s experiences of problematic events, by age, gender, SES and country.

Overall 17% of children said they had seen or experienced something on the internet that had bothered them.
Gender and age differences are considerable: **girls (21%) and older teenagers (23%)** are more likely to report being bothered by something on the internet. Perceptions and experience of problematic events on the internet is also variable across countries: **Danish children (39%)** are more likely to report being bothered by something on the internet, while **Italian children (6%)** are the least likely to do so.

Figure 18 and 19 show how the number of children who have experienced at least one of the seven risks asked about - namely, being bullied (online or offline); receiving sexual messages; seeing sexual images; meeting online contacts offline; seeing negative user-generated content (concerned with hate, pro-anorexia, self-harm, drug taking or suicide); experiencing other risks such as privacy risks; and reporting excessive internet use - varies by gender, age, SES and country.

Figure 18: Child has experienced at least one of the seven risks (%), by gender, age and SES

![Chart](chart.png)

Base: All children 9-16 years old who use the internet.

Exposure to risks increases with age, and among smartphone and tablet users. This supports the so-called “more opportunities, more risks” hypothesis: older users and mobile internet users benefit from more online opportunities, but are also exposed to more risks. Moreover, country differences show that online risks do not necessarily have harmful consequences, as the case of Italy - where risk exposure is on average but the number of children bothered on the internet is the lowest - exemplifies this.
Policy recommendation

Industry

Smartphone users seem to encounter more risks—mostly because all the online opportunities are more readily available to them. Industry and other stakeholders can help to create safer and better internet experiences for young people by ensuring that supports such as content classification, age-appropriate privacy settings, and easy and robust reporting mechanisms on mobile devices and services, are widely available.

Figure 20 shows how the overall level of harm and exposure to specific risks has changed from 2010 and 2014:

**Figure 20: online risks and harm, comparing 2010 and 2013-14, for children 11 + 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bothered or upset by something on the internet</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had contact with someone not met face to face before</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen sexual images online</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received sexual messages</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen websites where people publish hate messages</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen websites where people promote eating disorders</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met online contact offline</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been cyberbullied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen websites where people talk about or share their experiences of taking drugs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen websites where people discuss ways of physically harming or hurting themselves</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen websites where people discuss ways of committing suicide</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All children 11-16 years old who use the internet.

Comparison with the EU Kids Online data shows that since 2010 exposure to negative user generated content—especially hate messages and pro-ana or pro-mia content—cyberbullying and face-to-face meetings with online contacts have increased substantially. By contrast, meeting new people on the internet has slightly decreased.

---

3 We focus here only on children aged 11 years old and above because in both surveys questions on receiving sexual images and/or on negative user generated content were not asked to children aged 9-10.
If we look at country differences, the number of children reporting an online experience that bothered them has increased in the past 4 years in Denmark (from 28% to 39%), Ireland (from 11% to 20%) and Romania (from 21% to 27%). It has been more or less stable in the UK (from 13% to 15%), Portugal (from 7% to 10%), Belgium (from 10% to 9%) and Italy (also 6% in 2010).

4.1 Bullying on- and offline

As anticipated, different risks are not perceived as equally problematic: some are more dangerous and harmful than others. Bullying is still the most harmful risky experience: two out of three children who have been bullied on- or offline claim they have been “very” or “a bit” upset.

The experience of bullying is gendered, with girls being more likely to be bullied (26%) and to be upset (20%) than boys. Age variations are also notable, and confirm that the transition from pre-adolescence to adolescence marks a time of increased bullying: 13- to 14-year-olds (26%) are more likely to be bullied. It is, however, the youngest children, aged 9-10, who report higher rates of harm (21%).

While 10% of children have been bullied face-to-face, offline bullying is no longer the dominant mode of mean and offensive conduct; indeed, if we sum all the forms of cyberbullying, 12% report being bullied online or through mobile communication. The rise in cyberbullying emerges clearly also from the comparison between 2010 and 2013-14 data, as shown in Figures 21 and 22:

**Figure 21: Being bullied off- and online by gender and age, comparing 2010 and 2013-14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Experienced some type of cyberbullying</th>
<th>% Bullied (on or offline)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girls</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9-10 yrs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11-12 yrs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13-14 yrs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15-16 yrs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All children 9-16 years old who use the internet.
Some children believe mobile devices facilitate online bullying, because these devices allow them to be constantly online and available. According to children, increased communication opportunities and the possibility to send free messages have led to impulsive, even aggressive communication:

Yes, I think smartphones have made it possible for people to be mean more, because if you were paying for text you’d probably think more, saying, I’m going to be paying for this text, or my parents will be paying for this text. Is it really worth sending it? Whereas now on WhatsApp or Facebook you can quickly message and send it for free. So I think that’s kind of opened it up to be like cyberbullying more, or sending silly messages…

Boy, 11-13, UK

More often, children describe unpleasant episodes on messaging apps or SNS as instances of “social drama” and aggressive communication, which extends to the use of mobile devices and new social apps, reported especially in Italy, Romania and Spain. By contrast, bullying is non-reciprocal, involving intentional, repetitive aggression and a power imbalance between the bullied and the bully.

Base: All children 9-16 years old who use the internet.

According to children, the rise in cyberbullying is associated with new communicative practices and opportunities. Some children believe mobile devices facilitate online bullying, because these devices allow them to be constantly online and available. According to children, increased communication opportunities and the possibility to send free messages have led to impulsive, even aggressive communication:

Yes, I think smartphones have made it possible for people to be mean more, because if you were paying for text you’d probably think more, saying, I’m going to be paying for this text, or my parents will be paying for this text. Is it really worth sending it? Whereas now on WhatsApp or Facebook you can quickly message and send it for free. So I think that’s kind of opened it up to be like cyberbullying more, or sending silly messages…

Boy, 11-13, UK

My daughter passed the limit on WhatsApp, so she lost, she had a conflict with her friends, for bullshit, and if she had talked face to face rather than texting she would have probably solved the issue before having a fight and losing their friendship...

Father, (9-10), Italy

Policy recommendation

Schools

Schools should play a more active role in preventing social media-based bullying, since most communication on SNS and messaging apps occur between schoolmates. Moreover, given that bullying is age-specific, with younger children reporting more face to face bullying and bullying through gaming websites, while adolescents report more bullying through SNS and phone calls, specific messages should be designed for different age groups.
Children reported being harassed through calls and messages on the smartphones, usually anonymously; most likely, these were pranks played by peers, but in most cases they could not identify the bullies. **Peers sharing phone numbers of others without permission** can lead to children being anonymously harassed though their smartphones.

New messaging services, such as WhatsApp, offer new modes of peer interaction, as well as new modes of inclusion and exclusion: one Italian girl reports missing out on WhatsApp group conversation due to technical problems with her mobile, only to return to find a lot of negative messages posted by another peer during her absence (Italy, girls, 12-13).

Another way of talking unkindly about peers on WhatsApp is creating “groups within groups” where children can badmouth excluded peers (boys, 14-16, Spain).

**The portability of the new devices makes it easier for young people to take each other’s phones and send rude messages** directly from the accounts of the owner or to answer messages on behalf of the owner, as reported by Italian 9-10 and 12-13 year old girls and Romanian 14-16 year old boys. Another issue that came up in several interviews was children having their phone number shared by peers without their permission and receiving annoying messages and calls as a consequence. This practice is connected with forms of sexual harassment, some girls reporting having unknown people calling them with sexual propositions (Italy, 12-13 girls).

**New platforms being embraced by young people can facilitate new modes of misconduct.** For example, one Italian girl (12) reported having her picture taken from Facebook and shared on WhatsApp with an entire group and being mocked for posing as “sexy”. Another girl reports on the new practice of boys secretly taking pictures of their peers on toilets and posting them on WhatsApp groups.

---

**Policy recommendation**

**NGOs**

The new forms of sociality enabled by mobile devices (e.g. WhatsApp) and their catering to the needs of group communication can further foster patterns of aggressive communication and peer victimization (such as excluding some from WhatsApp groups-within-groups).

The ease of snapping compromising pictures of peers and posting them on SNS is another way in which mobile devices can foster cyber-aggression and victimization. **Cyber-bullying prevention campaigns should include also the need for responsible use of mobile devices and the most recent and popular mobile apps.**
4.2 Privacy issues and personal data misuse

The number of children who reported privacy-related risks on their smartphones (e.g. people accessing their personal information or pretending to be them) is low, 5% overall. However, this rises to 9% of teenagers aged 15-16. Similarly, just a monitory of children (4%) experienced personal data misuse, that is having someone using their information in a way they did not like. However, privacy issues are at the core of other problematic experiences, such as anonymous bullying via phone calls or messages, or sexual solicitation on messaging apps following inappropriate sharing of their phone numbers. Aggression, sexual communication, privacy issues and personal data misuse are interconnected, with privacy-breaching aggressive acts such as “fraping” or “revenge sexting” being among the most salient examples.

Moreover, mobile devices are often regarded as facilitating exposure to privacy-related risks, because of mobile-specific functions. For example, the new platforms catering for groups of users can also facilitate the dissemination of screenshots of private chats into group chat windows (boy, 14, Italy).

A new way in which children experience privacy issues is from peers standing nearby and seeing their private messages or photos on their smartphone or tablet screens. Sometimes sharing devices with peers (such as for playing a game or checking Facebook) might lead to peers accessing the owner’s photo gallery or personal messages (as reported by 9-10 year old girls in Romania). Another Romanian girl (15) reported leaving her phone at home while on a trip and having her sister and father check her personal messages while she was away. Another girl recalls her experience:

I had my iPod with me on the train and they took it away from me anyhow. I had put it in my backpack and didn’t noticed that they took the iPod away and had a look at all my vacation photos. […] Where I lay on the beach in a bikini and then they made a photo of it with their phones and said: this is really nice.

Girl, 13-14, Germany

Policy recommendation

NGOs, Schools

Another way in which children might experience privacy issues is when others get unwarranted access to private content on their smartphone (such as unauthorized access to photo gallery or messages). These issues can be addressed to making children aware of responsible sharing of their own devices.

The rise in personal data misuse associated with mobile media and services is also an indication that the literacy necessary for the safe use of is in still in need of development, thus causing unpleasant situation to occur. As a consequence of their lack of skills, many children end up sharing personal details with unwanted people. For example, some children reported on things “getting messed up” when they merged Facebook or regular phone numbers and WhatsApp contacts.
I downloaded an app that looked like WhatsApp because the icon was very similar, but, instead, it was an app that you insert your telephone number and many people see it. So, they found my number on that app and wrote me on WhatsApp and… but they were grown-ups (adults)! And I did not know how to end this … Then, luckily, I changed my telephone number and smartphone.

Girl, 15, Italy

One 10 year old Italian girl reported some unknown people being able to add her on WhatsApp and sending her pornographic pictures, and not being able to figure out where they got her number. One Spanish girl mentioned finding an app which was supposed to give her access to other people’s chats, but instead the app was giving nearby phones the possibility of seeing her own chats (girl, 10, Spain).

Policy recommendation
NGOs, Schools

Children talked about receiving unpleasant phone calls and texts from “strangers” (most likely friends of friends) without having given out their phone number. Phone numbers sharing without permission is a reported way in which young girls experience unsolicited sexual communication.

As mobile devices have become more at the centre of children’s sociability increased attention should be given to being careful about who has one’s phone number and the potential consequences of distributing the phone numbers of peers should be emphasised in safety curricula and campaigns.
4.3 Sexual content and communication

Many children (28%) have come across sexual content in the past 12 months, whether online or offline, while 17% have seen sexual images on the internet. This experience is less bothering than bullying, with around half of the children who report being harmed by what they have seen.

Although some children believe that new devices are not necessarily linked to increased access to unwanted sexual content, others think that the new devices and platforms offer new options for young people to access and share sexual content. For example, a girl mentioned having a cousin using her mobile phone to access pornographic material, because his own phone was being monitored by his parents (girls, 12-13, Italy). Other girls from Romania and Spain complained about boys bringing and sharing sexual material at school (video clips watched on mobile devices during breaks or even during classes). A mother and youth worker from Italy also tells about a group of children watching a pornographic video on a child’s smartphone during a bus trip:

"Suddenly we saw a crowd of children at the end of the bus and they were all watching a video on a child’s phone. The kid accessed this video and showed it to the group. It was really a pornographic movie."

Even though encountering sexual content can be upsetting, children are much more concerned about the risks of sexting. As shown in Figure 20, sexting has decreased from 2010: overall 11% of respondents have received sexual messages. Exchanging sexual messages and content, and sometimes showing these on smartphones, can occur as part of sexual experimenting and/or joking between peers, especially among boys. Gender and age differences matter, with teenagers being more likely to experience sexual solicitation, and girls being more likely to being harmed by what they have received.

Similar to online bullying, children have the impression that mobile devices facilitate taking and sharing pictures, also sexy pictures that may be misused. Girls talked about the practice of boys sending girls requests for naked pictures of themselves.

Policy recommendation
Governments, NGOs, Schools, Parents

‘Revenge sexting’ (usually boys disseminating sexual photos of their ex-girlfriends to a larger group of peers, coupled with victim blaming - marked by “she shouldn’t have sent those pictures”-type attitudes) was one of the practices reported as being the most harmful.

While mobile devices are usually the common dissemination tools (i.e. photos taken and sent from mobile to mobile in first instance, and further shown or disseminated to larger peer audience), this type of victimization is something to be addressed by both digital rights (e.g. the right to personal image) and anti-gender discrimination and anti-sexism campaigns (e.g. it is not only the girls’ responsibility to ensure her personal image is not ruined online, but also the responsibility of young boys to treat them with respect).
We also had that, one boy said: Yes, I will send you a friend-request and then you just send me many photos of you and then she send him many pictures of her and then he – But she intentionally said: but don’t show them to anybody. And then the boys always show, and most of the time the boys are the ones who, - actually always the bad ones, who pass on for example secrets or you show – or they show pictures around of somebody, who didn’t agree to it.

Girl, 11, Germany

The practice of (girls) sharing sexy pictures is generally disapproved of, and seen as asking for trouble, whether the pictures are posted on social media or exchanged in private messages:

Rui: Because a mobile phone now ends up being a [photo and filming] camera.

Artur: It existed before, but there were not many and you had to take the picture, then transfer it to a computer etc, but...

Hugo: Now a girl can go to the bathroom, take a picture and send it… Now people are a bit scared to do this, even people in a stable relationship, because you never know what happens afterwards… if it will appear on Facebook. I think even married people… shouldn’t be doing this… afterwards they split up and sometimes men are a bit...

Mateo: But imagine. I am in a relationship with a girl and we decide, hypothetically, to send pictures to each other, we send them “like that” and we trust each other. So imagine the case that you split up with that person badly or there has been some serious problem and they have split up. Then you might be angry and you have the mobile in your hands, to get revenge you might use the photo and send it to other people. To use it like a weapon…

Boy, 13-14, Germany

The phone numbers shared without the young people’s consent is another way through which young people experience unwanted sexual communication (e.g. phone calls with requests of sex).
4.4 Excessive use

Many more children now spontaneously mention addiction or overuse, and many agree that they spend too much time online and/or on their smartphones. The survey findings are consistent with interviews and focus groups with children and adults alike, in showing that children are more likely to develop an overdependent attitude towards their smartphones because of its features: first, like mobile phones before them, smartphones are perceived among children and adolescents as extensions of their body, that can be easily stored in a pocket and carried around all the day long; and second, as anticipated, they provide full time access to peers and family. For these reasons, the smartphone has become so fully integrated into the social wellbeing of the user that it is almost a part of who they are. Many children grasp their phone in their hand, they take it to bed, they use it in places such as in school where it is against the rules to use it, and they flout their parents guidance and mediation regarding its use in their bedrooms, at night and in places where it is not appropriate such as during meals or on a night out with the family.

I think our generation has just grown up to have a phone in their hand'
-Girl, 14-15, UK

my daughter had a birthday party at home, they were 29 (...) the picture was the following: boys were dancing – it was kids aged 12-17 – the girls instead were with their phones in their hand, they danced with their phone in their hands, they didn’t leave the phone for a second, I guess they also brought it to the bathroom!
-Father, (14-16), Italy

As a consequence, it is understandable that children feel uncomfortable when they cannot check their phones, or tend to check them every once in a while when they can do so. Figure 23 and 24 compare excessive use of the internet and of smartphones:

Figure 23: Excessive use of the internet among children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>% Very or fairly often</th>
<th>% Not very often</th>
<th>% Never or almost never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gone without eating or sleeping because of the internet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt bothered when I cannot be on the internet</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caught myself surfing when I am not really interested</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent less time than I should with family, friends or doing schoolwork because of the internet</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried unsuccessfully to spend less time on the internet</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All children who use the internet.
At the same time overuse by other people is considered stupid and even irritating, especially when it gets in the way of (offline) social interactions. Children in all countries lament being bothered by peers who spend their face-to-face time texting with distant others because “for doing that you could have stayed at home!” (as a Spanish boy comments).

Victor: ‘There is some addiction.

Vlad: Because I tried to see it in some people, who even when they are on the street, they start typing. I think it’s pretty weird to talk to someone and they are staring at a screen.

Interviewer: when you talk about addiction, what do you mean?

Vlad: First, when they spend a lot of time, causes problems, and at school during classes or when I see them walking on the street and talking a lot, but a lot on the phone.’

What seems to be the (genuine) underlying concern behind fear of addiction, are online activities getting in the way of school and homework, with bad grades as a possible result. Across countries, social networking and messaging notifications on mobile devices are often mentioned as distractions from focusing on homework. Therefore, even without parental pressure, some children prefer to do their homework first before using their smartphones – even turning these devices off so that they cannot be disturbed by incoming messages.

I check my smartphone after lunch and then I go to do my homework, I leave it there, in the dining room, so that I get not distracted by it, indeed I started using this strategy because when I received messages I had the instinct to immediately go to see them, while if I leave it in the dining room maybe I do not even listen the sound of incoming messages and I keep studying.’
Policy recommendation
NGOs, Schools, Parents

Teach children how to deal with social pressure and overdependence. Children should know it is perfectly fine to be ‘offline’ sometimes and accept it is OK not to reply immediately to every message or notification. Self-monitoring techniques can be very helpful, but some children have difficulties in managing their own online and mobile activities. Tips and tricks for self-management and how to support each other in these practices would be valuable.

4.5 Other risks

Commercials, spam and pop-ups are found annoying, and many children say they avoid clicking on them. However, the new mobile devices require a specific set of skills, which children, especially younger kids, still need to fully acquire, particularly with regard to the commercial content they deliver. They talked about advertisements promoting other games on gaming apps, being redirected to the app store while in the middle of a game. Children also talked about having to deal with hidden costs of apps, such as discovering a lot of apps which they do not remember downloading and not knowing if they were charged money for those (Italy, boys, 12-13), downloading a games app which charges every SMS they send with 2 euros, being cheated by the “you’ve won an iPod” advertisement. More children mentioned they discovered they were charged money after they entered their phone numbers to claim the so-called prizes. Another mobile-specific risk one child mentioned was being charged a great amount of money for playing online games on the phone while on roaming (UK, boys, 11-13).

A further mobile-specific concern shared by many children across countries is about theft of or damage to the smartphone, which keeps many from taking their smartphones to school and other places (e.g. sports clubs), and from lending them to others. The actual experience of this is uneven across countries: in some instances children mention having their smartphones stolen (Italy, boys, 12-13, UK, boys 9-10), on others it is their tablet (Romania, boy, 10).

The reaction that children have to unexpectedly losing their smartphones (or tablets) is an emotional shock, a problem because of the value of the device, but in terms of losing communication and contact:

Isleen: ‘And I lost mine today actually.
Interviewer: So you haven’t got your phone at all?
Isleen: Well, I dropped it [by the house] next door. And I thought I’d left it on the bus so my Dad blocked my phone, but an old lady picked it up and I went and picked it up from her house. Interviewer: That was nice of her.
Teema: Yeah. Interviewer: So let me just ask you about that, so when you realised you’d lost it what happened? Isleen: I got really scared, I went oh no, I’ve lost everything because I can’t back it up. And then we went on the computer and then we were about to fill in the form.

Several children believe that the location-tracking features of mobile devices are risky because strangers would use these apps to find children. Many children mistrust geolocation in SNS, and claim not to feel comfortable about using geolocation apps or functions, and they avoid using it or only use it in very specific circumstances. The most common motive is fear about dodgy
people tracking or following them, or burglars robbing their house while away. Indeed, only 9% of children - but 15% of smartphone users - say they are used to register their location in statuses updates and posts. By contrast, most smartphone users (63%) claim they know how to deactivate location-tracking functions.

4.6 Responding to risks

Coping behaviour and preventive measures are strongly interconnected, as children’s coping strategies often aim at avoiding re-occurrence or further escalation of the unpleasant situation. In some situations children prefer to deal with the problems themselves, while in other situations they decide to seek support within their own social network (parents, peers, siblings, etc.) or institutional support (schools, online helplines, counsellors, etc.). Five main ways of dealing with online risks, smartphone-specific risks included - can be identified. Usually, in coping with problematic experiences, children combine more than one strategy:

- **Self-reliant strategies**, such as tactics of avoidance and self-monitoring, are employed in the prevention of risks associated with location-tracking functions, as well as in the management of privacy issues and excessive use.

- **Other-reliant strategies** are preferred when dealing with contact risks, as when children receive nasty or sexual messages.

- **Technical measures** involve active intervention or “interaction” with the device or service, with the aim to solve the problem or avoid (re)-occurrence of the unpleasant situation. It generally requires some level of digital skills to operate the device or service.

- **Confrontation** refers to personal confrontations or discussions, face-to-face or online. Non-violent confrontations are mainly aimed at clarifying misunderstandings and avoiding escalation. Violent encounters are often the results of taking revenge and getting back at the perpetrator. In the context of posting or sharing ‘unwelcome’ messages or pictures among peers (friends, classmates), face-to-face confrontation is a recurring strategy, mentioned across all age groups. Ea (girl, 11-13, Denmark) says that her mom encourages her to talk and stand face-to-face with the person who is angry with her, instead of trying to solve it through text messages.

- **Collective approaches**. Children acknowledge that social support in dealing with unpleasant situations online can be very helpful, both in terms of emotional support, as well as practical or technical assistance. Among all age groups, children talk about the benefits of collective coping. When confronted with online bullying, support from bystanders is perceived as helpful and important for emotional well-being.

- **Disengagement**: in some situations, young people decide not to engage in any preventive or reactive measures, because they perceive either technical or other-reliant strategies as ineffective. Young people’s motivation for not engaging in communicative coping is mainly the belief that adults will not be interested, do not take it seriously, would be angry or even reprimand or punish the child.

Therefore, communicative responses are a common way for children to deal with online problematic experiences, though one in three children say they are not likely to talk with anyone about what bothers them on the internet, as shown in Figure 25.

The people children are more likely to turn to in order to share their negative online experiences and seek support are mothers (71%), friends (57%) and fathers (54%):

---

4 Italian and Romanian seem to talk more about ‘collective’ coping among peers in situations of bullying and social drama. Peer support plays an important role, and children try to get support from bystanders when a situation is about escalating into drama.

5 Romanian children seem to report more often an attitude of ‘disengagement’; not (pro)actively dealing with (potential) risks because they believe it is unavoidable.
Figure 25: Children (%) who are very likely to talk to at least one person about things that might bother them on the internet, by gender, age and SES

5. Parental Mediation

The family sphere is an influential social space that shapes children’s online experiences: strategies adopted by parents in order to regulate their children’s internet use may result in different contexts of internet access - e.g. inhibiting or favouring private access and use - as well as mould the way children cope with online risks. Parents try to deal with the complexity of a convergent and mobile media environment, which apparently is no longer “under control”, by adopting multiple strategies of mediation, including:

1) Active mediation of internet use, where parents engage in activities such as talking about internet content while the child is engaging with it, and sharing the online experience of the child by remaining nearby.

2) Active mediation of internet safety, where the parent promotes safer and responsible uses of the internet.

3) Restrictive mediation, which involves setting rules that limit and regulate time spent online, location of use and online activities.

Policy recommendation
Parents, Schools, Peers

Encourage collective and collaborative coping strategies. Support and assistance from parents, teachers, family members and peers can be very helpful. Online resilience is fostered in a supportive social environment where children learn step by step how to deal with risks on mobile and non-mobile devices. Parents and other caretakers should find a good balance between active mediation, monitoring online activities and imposing restrictions, depending on the child’s age and personality characteristics.
4) Technical restrictions, that is, the use of software and technical tools to filter, restrict and monitor children’s online activities.

5) Monitoring or checking the record of online activities.

Some parents admit that their lack of digital literacy and skills constitutes a major challenge, as it prevents them from helping their children in an effective way. This problem is intensified by mobile devices, which are considered more complicated and harder to handle by parents. Smartphones and tablets also allow for a more individualised use in different circumstances, creating a “privatised sphere” even within the home making it harder for parents to control what their child is doing.

Irene: Yes, it is more difficult to control something that they have on their pockets, we have to ask ‘hand me your mobile phone so that I can know what you were doing’. It is a breach of …

Cesar: …privacy?

Irene: …Privacy of the kids. When they are in front of the computer it is easier to take a look and to see what they were doing by searching the browser history records, but as the devices get smaller it is more difficult to know what they are doing.

5.1 Active mediation of internet use and internet safety

The majority of parents (68%) engage in at least two forms of active mediation of internet use, according to their children, as shown in Figure 26 - with little variation by country. The most common of these strategies is talking to children about what they do on the internet (66%) and stay nearby when their child is online (58%).

Figure 26: Parent’s active mediation (%) of the child’s internet use, by country

Active mediation of children’s internet safety is even more popular, with 77% of parents that engage in at least two measures aimed at promoting their online safety, according to children. More specifically, 68% of parents helped their children when something was difficult to do or find on the internet, and suggested how to behave with others online. Equally popular are two other strategies: according to children, 66% of parents explained why some websites were good or bad, or suggested safer internet uses. Country variations in active mediation of internet safety, are, however, more pronounced, as shown in Figure 27.
In the case of children, asking for help about the use of particular devices or apps is one of the most common ways the exchange takes place. This happens with children of different ages, but particularly with younger ones, who are less experienced and lack more digital skills. Parents also suggest ways to behave online and to protect one's reputation, especially in order to mediate teenage girls' online self-presentation:

* % of those who answered ‘yes’ to at least two items of active mediation of internet use.
Base: All children who use the internet

My mom shows me exactly where I have to type and then she says… Because when you click then you see several things that you can click and give you different things, (so) she tells me the right one and I have to click it.

I must say that my daughter has been instructed not to publish certain images, that if she wants to share selfies the camera has to be far enough, she has to be appropriately dressed, I explained her all these things.

Policy recommendation Parents

Wider use of mobile devices has made young people’s internet use a much more private experience with less direct parental supervision. Therefore, parents, more than ever, need to communicate with children about their online experiences and together find mediation strategies that are perceived as helpful and not intrusive by children.
Setting rules is less common than active mediation of children’s internet use or online safety. Some parents do not want to set up strict rules or do not see them as necessary, because the media use of the child has never caused problems; other parents are not confident in setting up rules, because they are not familiar with the technologies – or in words of a Danish girl they “are really bad at smartphones” – and do not have clear knowledge of risks, setting options etc. By contrast, many also emphasise the need for parents to regulate the internet use.

Younger children receive more mediation in general and more restrictive mediation in particular; most parents seem to agree that the older the children become, the less they are able to regulate the media use and the more trust they need to have in their children. As an Italian mother said: “There are rules and as parents we have to make children obey these rules—until a certain age.”

According to children, 65% of parents adopt two or more forms of restrictive mediation, with great variations across countries, as shown in Figure 28:

Figure 28: Parent’s restrictive mediation (%) of the child’s internet use, by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Restrictive Mediation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* % of those who answered ‘yes’ to at least two items of restrictive mediation. Base: All children who use the internet.

Indeed, if we look at country variations in both parental restrictions and privatisation of internet use in the domestic context, as shown in Figure 29, we can observe three main patterns of restrictive mediation at play, that shape different context of internet use. In Belgium, Ireland and Portugal a pattern of high restriction and low privatisation of internet use can be observed. At the opposite is the pattern of low regulation and high internet use in child’s own bedroom, as observed in Denmark and Romania, which, however, are different under many respects. Third, in Italy and the UK children are slightly more restricted than the average but still use the internet in their own bedrooms more. Children in these countries are more regulated in their time online and/or in specific online activities than in autonomy of use.
Rules can be differentiated regarding different aspects (apps or services, time, location and situation) and regarding the level of differentiation (e.g. internet in general, different apps or services like SNS, or different activities like posting pictures).

**Rules regarding content** were mentioned quite rarely and mostly in relation to violent videogames or “inappropriate content”, which encompasses sexual content, violence, bad language etc. This rule includes both download and upload of inappropriate content like intimate, permissive pictures.

**Rules regarding time** are seen as an important tool to regulate the media consumption, but due to the diversification of devices and programmes and with regard to different age groups it is quite complicated for parents to find the right level. Some parents set a general limit for all screen media, while others try to limit the time for each single device. The limit seems to be set rather intuitively and individually without considering the characteristics and affordances of the particular media.

Apart the time limit, parents mention that **children have to switch off the smartphone and tablets** at 8 or 9 pm and/or during the night. Irish children mention that their parents switch off the router during the night and parents from Belgium and Romania mentioned that their children are not allowed to take the mobile or smartphone into their bedrooms.

They are not allowed to take up their mobiles to their bedrooms at night. They don’t agree, and they say we overreact, but they try to adapt to the rule. They believe we are too strict, because many of their friends are allowed to do so. But we don’t have real fights over this. They know it’s the rule. And if they break the rule and I notice it, their mobile is confiscated for a day.

Typically children are **not allowed to use their smartphones at dinner**. Children also allude to homework and good weather as typical situation in which they are not allowed to use the media as they like. Still, **consistency of rules** within families and between friends, peer groups and siblings is a challenge for parents. Ellen from Belgium points to the different rules she encounters:

My parents were angry because I posted photos and (also) they do not want me to write bad words and maybe I did write them, and also I had a photo in which I did the middle finger and they got mad and they made me delete Facebook.

I play, like… sometimes… three quarters of an hour and my mom wants that I play half an hour, like half an hour a day and I play more so she says ‘You pass the limit that I set’ and so she put me in punishment and the following day I cannot play. The extra time I spent online, she takes me that away for the following day.

They are not allowed to take up their mobiles to their bedrooms at night. They don’t agree, and they say we overreact, but they try to adapt to the rule. They believe we are too strict, because many of their friends are allowed to do so. But we don’t have real fights over this. They know it’s the rule. And if they break the rule and I notice it, their mobile is confiscated for a day.

Typically children are **not allowed to use their smartphones at dinner**. Children also allude to homework and good weather as typical situation in which they are not allowed to use the media as they like. Still, **consistency of rules** within families and between friends, peer groups and siblings is a challenge for parents. Ellen from Belgium points to the different rules she encounters:
Actually I don’t use the computer a lot, I do everything on my mobile phone. At my mom’s I’m not allowed to use it at the dinner table. At my dad’s it’s sometimes allowed, because he does this himself sometimes. When my homework is done, I can go online as long as I want.

5.3 Technical restrictions

Technical mediation - that is the use of software and technical tools to filter, restrict and monitor children’s online activities on computers, tablets or smartphones - is the least favoured mediation strategy by parents, as shown in Figures 30 and 31:

Figure 30: Parent’s technical mediation (%)* of the child’s internet use, by country

Figure 31: Parent’s technical mediation (%)* of the child’s smartphone use, by country

* % of those who answered ‘yes’ to at least two items of technical restriction.
Base: All children who own or have for their own use a smartphone.
5.4 Children's responses to parental mediation

Different monitoring strategies adopted by parents (from installing particular software to checking children online activity) are not only a form of surveillance and control but also a way of limiting children's privacy. From the point of view of children, different types of justifications are presented:

- **acceptance** – children accept parental surveillance, whether because they think (or agree) they need it, or just because they don’t have an alternative, since it’s their parents’ prerogative.

- **Non acceptance** – children feel bothered by parents’ surveillance, especially if it’s done furtively.

> I don’t like it when my mom sees these things [Facebook comment]. I don’t do bad things, but I don’t want them to know everything about me. When they pass by and they always ask ‘who is this’, then I’m thinking ‘go away!’: Some things are private.

> My parents check my messages, on Facetime. Every month. Actually I don’t mind, because I used to send nasty messages to my cousin Louise. It was more like a joke…

---

Policy recommendation

**Industry, Governments, NGOs**

Just 14% of the parents adopt two or more technical tools in order to control or to restrict children’s use of smartphones. In-depth interviews and focus groups with parents confirmed that they are often not aware of parental controls designed for smartphones. Increasing parental knowledge of technical mediation tools for smartphones that help provide a safer and better mobile internet experience for children (through public campaigns, informative leaflets in the specialised shops etc.) is strongly recommended. Moreover, in order to enhance their uptake and effectiveness, parental controls need to be user-friendly and flexible in terms of settings and functionalities, and tailored to children’s needs, so as to be perceived as helpful resources rather than invasive tools.
Strategies of **concealment** – children try to avoid parental surveillance, by adopting several tactics to evade parents control (from going online without parents knowing to protection of mobile device with password). These tactics might also include using the internet without parents’ knowledge:

**Actually… parents are very stupid. Because I know my neighbour’s WiFi password. My parents always tell they will turn off the WiFi. But… I know my parent’s password… so I can go online anyway. Because, my bedroom is next to their house, my room is right next to their office!**

The key challenge for parental mediation is trying to balance intended protection (from problematic situations) with children’s freedom to experiment (maximizing opportunities), avoiding the risk of overprotecting children or betraying their trust.

6. Schools

6.1 Rules

Huge variations across countries persist regarding internet use in schools, school provision of WiFi networks, and regulation of smartphones’ use in schools, as shown in Figure 32. These inequalities are the outcome of different stages of the digitisation of schools and learning processes, as well as of cross-cultural differences in the education system.

**Figure 32: Daily internet use in school, availability of WiFi networks in schools and use of smartphones with no or some rules, by country**

![Bar chart showing daily internet use and WiFi availability by country](image)
Beyond country differences, the digital infrastructure of schools and the availability of internet access by means of shared or personal devices is also strongly structured by age and socio-economic status. Younger children and lower SES children are considerably less likely to use the internet daily at school and to be provided with WiFi networks in school. These two categories of children are also least likely to be allowed to use their smartphones in school.

Policy recommendation
Schools

School regulations related to mobile devices and mobile internet use could hinder teachers or children’s desire to use this technology for educational purposes in class. A reflection on whether school regulations might also be designed to take into account the possible educational benefits of mobile technology for in-class activities is welcome.

Notwithstanding WiFi provision and rules regarding smartphones, the portability of smartphones and children’s strong attachment to their devices are rapidly changing the “climate” of European classrooms and schools. Indeed, even in schools where it is available, access to WiFi by students is usually restricted: the number of children accessing the school’s WiFi with no restrictions varies from 1% in Ireland and the UK to 56% in Denmark. Hence, students’ personal devices represent a quick and fast solution to access the internet bypassing the schools’ infrastructure, limitations and rules. Moreover, while 54% of children claimed that they are not allowed to use their smartphones at school and a further 31% said they were allowed with some restrictions, teachers tend to be flexible and make concessions, especially when secondary school children are concerned.

As a consequence, students and teachers report an increasing amount of interruptions that sometimes make it difficult to follow the lesson. Interruptions include phone calls by parents in the middle of the lesson; students also complain about classmates watching video clips next to them or admit feeling the need to check their phones once in a while.

A lot of students check Facebook, watch videos etc., in class so it has become the biggest problem.

Boy, 14, Denmark

At school? I use it anyway. I have been caught using my phone and it has been confiscated, but [laughing] it is stronger than me I can’t help replying to messages.

Girl, 15, Italy

Most often, students break the rules because they forget to turn off their ringtones, they send texts, check SNS or play video games. Occasionally they also accomplish something more advanced: for example in Romania and Germany some interviewees report having used their own personal devices to create an open WiFi hotspot for all their classmates. The practice of hacking the school’s WiFi network is more common in Italy, Portugal and Romania (where 12-13% of children say they had done so).

It is also worth noting that in many countries, some students seem to violate rules not because they really want to use their devices, but only because they want to defy teachers.
The majority of children, though, agree that rules are needed to regulate their use of smartphones in class. Teachers’ reactions to students’ infractions are very diverse, as it is for rules. A punitive approach prevails in which teachers confiscate students’ smartphones, the length of the punishment varying from a few hours - more common - up to one month, as reported by a Belgian child.

There are people who don’t switch off their smartphones in class (...). Sometimes some people take their phones out when the teacher goes out, and you say: what are you doing? And they say “nothing, I’m bored”. They think they are important because they do that.

Boy, 11-13, Spain

6.2 Opportunities

Confiscating a smartphone or forbidding its use are part of a wider variety of mediation strategies teachers engage in – namely, active mediation of internet safety, restrictions on internet and smartphone use, and promotion of positive, school-related uses of the internet and smartphones.

Regarding active mediation of internet use and safety, one in two teachers assist students in doing or finding things on the internet (54%), or explain why some websites are good or bad (56%), suggest ways to use the internet safely (56%) or how to behave with others on the internet (51%). According to children, teachers are also likely to talk to them about their online activities (49%), or about what they should do after a negative online experience (40%); they are least likely to help children cope with a bothering experience (23%), but we must not forget that children themselves are not likely to talk to teachers when they have such experiences.

Most of the problematic situations teachers have to cope with deal with privacy risks or the production and exchange of negative user generated content. Whilst posing new challenges for teachers, smartphones also provide them with more opportunities to engage in safety education: for example, the circulation of negative generated content is dealt with a safety or preventive talk by the teachers.

In a way, it’s good because you’ve got the evidence, whether it’s Facebook or Snapchat or whatever, but on the other hand, they don’t realise, the kids who send these messages don’t realise how A, permanent and B, how many people can see them. I know when they had the assembly about social networking a couple of weeks ago, the year tens were all in a bit of a state that lunchtime, because of photos and stuff they knew they had on their personal accounts, and A, I said to them, you shouldn’t have that sort of stuff on your account, but B, good you’re scared because now you won’t, maybe - but they will you know.

Teacher, Secondary Schol, UK
Teachers may also encourage positive uses of the internet by promoting use of the internet and smartphones in school-related activities. Two out of three children report being encouraged by their teachers to use the internet to do research for school assignments at least every week. Far less common is the use of smartphones for assignments in class. The integration of new technologies in learning activities increases with ages, but is still uneven across countries, being particularly poor in Belgium, Ireland and Italy, as shown in Figure 33:

Figure 33: Students who use the internet or smartphones daily at school, by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Use smartphones for assignments in class</th>
<th>% Collaborate with other students over the internet</th>
<th>% Use the internet to do research for school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All children who use the internet.

Children’s, teachers’ and parents’ comments seem to offer more reasons for using the mobile technology in school than to avoid it. Arguments in favour of the use of new devices in class are diverse, varying from health or ecological issues - the opportunity to replace heavy books and dictionaries - to psychological reasons - smartphones and tablets are more engaging for children. From the viewpoint of parents, replacing heavy dictionaries and books with digital books stored on a tablet is good for children’s health: “in this way children don’t have to carry 5 kilos of books daily” (Romanian mother).

Having digital and interactive educational supports, may be also very useful for children with cognitive disabilities: for example, Mario, an Italian 9 year old boy with a cognitive disability, already uses his tablet at school on a daily base for taking notes.

The adoption of tablets and other digital equipment in school can also promote more engaging teaching and learning methods, according to both students and teachers. Fabio, a 16 year old boy from Italy, says he felt more interested in class since the school provided students with an iPad. Some Romanian teachers agree, pointing that obtaining information very quickly by means of a tablet would increase children’s satisfaction and self-esteem, thus helping them delve deeper into academic subjects.

The challenges faced by teachers in managing and mediating their students’ use of digital devices are threefold: their own poor digital skills; the problem of plagiarism and the “copy-paste” practice - discussed especially by Italian and Romanian teachers and parents; and the need to allow for equality of access for their students.

Policy recommendation

Teachers

Some teachers have expressed concerns that the use of mobile devices and the mobile internet in class could enhance the copy-paste behaviour and plagiarism habits.

While some specific regulations and penalties for this kind of behaviour could be envisioned, allowing the use of mobile devices in class could represent a good opportunity for teachers to discourage in situ the copy-paste approach to information and promote critical engagement with online content.
Policy recommendation

Governments

European and national programmes to help teachers manage digital technologies for school related activities have had some results. Those designing teachers’ training programmes need to consider the capabilities of new technologies and applications even though some of them do not look, at first glance, appear to be designed for educational purposes. This is to say that, alongside the traditional and legitimate educational platforms, teachers also have to be trained about the potential of social media capabilities for education and how various apps might not only allow students to consult online information but also to create online content.
7. Country Fact Sheets

7.1 Belgium

Population (on January 1, 2013)
• 11,099,554 inhabitants
• 854,622 children aged 9-16 years old.

Education
Education is mandatory from 6 to 18 years, and is articulated in four stages:
• pre-school: age 2.5 to 5 (not mandatory);
• primary education: 6 grades, age 6 to 12;
• tertiary education: bachelor degree (3 years), and master degree (2 years).

ICTs
80% of Belgian households have internet access with 84% daily users among those who have accessed the internet in the last three months.

The internet is more diffused among young people and households with children: 93% of households with children have access to the internet, compared to 75% of the households without children. In the age group of 9 to 19 years old, 93% of the children have a laptop at home and 76% a desktop.

91% of the population (age 16-74) has a mobile phone. Among youngsters aged 9-19 this rises to 98%. Tablets are becoming more and more popular in Belgium, with 30% of the households having a tablet in 2013. In families with children aged 9 to 19, this increases to 69%.

Social networking sites are extremely popular among young people. Among adolescents (age 12-19), Facebook remains the most popular SNS, with 90% having accessed Facebook in the last month. Among the younger SNS users (9-12 years), Ketnet is the most popular with 43% of the children having logged on in the last month. This shows that the strategy of Ketnet as public broadcaster has become a success among its’ target group of young internet users. In the adult population (age 16-74), 53% has ever posted something on a social networking site, and 44% has used voip services like Skype.

The use of ICTs in schools
In Belgium, education policy is a competence at regional level, with the Dutch-speaking community and French-speaking community each developing their own educational policies and curricula. In the Dutch-speaking community, ICTs are more integrated into school curricula and the quality of facilities is better. In both communities, primary schools generally are more poorly equipped compared to secondary schools.

Dutch-speaking community
In primary education, there are 17 devices (desktops, laptops, tablets or e-readers) for every 100 pupils. In secondary education, this increases to 60 devices. Digital blackboards are more integrated in primary education, with 73% of the elementary schools and 78% of secondary schools having at least one digital blackboard at school. The large majority of the schools have a wireless internet connection: 86% in primary education and 92% of the secondary schools. About 3 in 4 schools have wireless internet.

French-speaking community
Although most schools are connected to the internet (90% primary and 97% secondary), only 11% of secondary schools has wireless internet access. In primary education, there are about 4 computers with internet connection for every 100 pupils. In secondary schools, this is about 8 computers for every 100 students.

Political initiatives and national ICT strategy

**Dutch-speaking community**

In 2012, the ministry of Media developed a policy note on media literacy. The aims are to create a solid and strategic framework for media literacy, starting with a collaboration between the ministries of Media and Education. The opportunities of ‘serious games’ will be explored towards youngsters. This should contribute to creating a safe and responsible media environment. Awareness raising initiatives will mainly focus on privacy protection and online bullying. On the level of the general population, this goal is to create an e-inclusive society and decrease digital inequalities by supporting collaborations between stakeholders in educational and socio-cultural areas (musea, libraries, cultural centres, etc).

**French-speaking community**

The Yapaka programme coordinates actions and initiatives related to safer internet use. It has launched several awareness raising campaigns in 2012 and 2013, focusing on youngsters. Yapaka's goal is to banish anxiety approaches in awareness raising campaigns, promote the internet as a tool for child development and ensure non-dramatized prevention. Efforts are done to engage NGOs and industry players to these awareness actions and initiatives (Microsoft, Belgacom).

**Political initiatives regarding ICT use in schools**

**Dutch-speaking community**

The policy note on Education 2012-2013 includes several initiatives and actions. Flanders will participate in the international project ‘eSafety label’, which provides schools with self-evaluation tools to develop awareness about ICT safety and stimulate ICT policy initiatives at school level. Furthermore, the government will collect and disseminate best practices related to new media use at school, and develop a common approach towards new trends such as ‘tablet schools’, ‘serious gaming’ and ‘bring your own device’. Alongside, the IWT project ‘a school for the future’ will be launched (www.svdt.be), which investigates possibilities for developing a user-friendly and flexible school environment. Additionally, the Flemish Education Council published an advice on the integration of ICT in mandatory school curricula.

**French-speaking community**

The government supports the Higher Council for Media Education, which is a platform for coordination between the government departments and other stakeholders for media education. The aim is to increase the availability of computer equipment in schools, with the School Digital Project (2013), as a follow up on the Cyberschool project in 1999 and the Cyberclass project in 2005. The website www.education.be will be a portal website with tools, advice and recommendations on Safer Internet for children.

**Political initiatives about promoting digital opportunities to children**

The Flemish government believes in the opportunities of serious games, and will launch a call for the development of serious games via the ‘Gamefonds’ [gaming fund].

**Examples of strategic or informative or cultural uses of mobile media in relation to children**

**Dutch-speaking community**

Some projects focus on new or mobile media in general (‘school of the future’, ‘digital week’), but recently more initiatives are taken towards the promotion of tablet use in educational contexts (‘tablio’) end educative use of smartphones at school (‘slimme media shake’). Also serious games (e.g. PING – poverty is not a game) are being implemented in school contexts.

**French-speaking community**

The Yapaka programme has supported several awareness raising initiatives (‘qui a peur du grand mechant web’, ‘3-6-9-12 maîtrisons les écrans’). However, not with a specific focus on mobile media.

---


8 [http://www.yapaka.be](http://www.yapaka.be)
Key organizations working in the area of children and media

- On the federal level, Child Focus is the key organization as the Belgian Safer Internet Centre, providing advice and educational materials in both Dutch and French. In the Dutch-speaking community, Gezinsbond aims at informing and supporting parents.
- The public broadcaster VRT develops positive online content for younger children (8-12 years old).
- The organization Mediaraven targets youth workers and adolescents, promoting creative internet use.
- In the French-speaking community, Media-Animation, Action Ciné-Médias Jeunes and Centre Audiovisuel Liège support the development and dissemination of awareness raising campaigns.

Examples of foci area for public debates on (children and) mobile media

In both communities, parents are considered important stakeholders and a combination of active mediation and monitoring is generally suggested. Issues of privacy and cyberbullying remain high on policy makers’ agendas.

In the Dutch-speaking community, these topics are recently more contextualised in a mobile internet environment. New techniques such as serious games are explored.

Collaboration between stakeholders in the area

In the Dutch-speaking community, the Flemish government supports the Knowledge Centre on Media Literacy (Kenniscentrum Mediawijs) aims at bringing together all Flemish stakeholders in the field of media literacy and digital skills, to gather and enclose all information and knowledge about online risks & opportunities, and online safety.

The Belgian Safer Internet Centre Child Focus has developed successful collaborations with industry partners (Belgacom, Microsoft) to educate children and parents towards positive internet use. Initiatives mainly took place in the French-speaking community.

---

10 www.mediawijs.be
11 www.childfocus.org
Net Children Go Mobile

7.2 Denmark

Population
- 5,629.00 inhabitants
- 537,948 children aged 9-16 years old

Education
10 years education is mandatory. It is on average from 6 to 16 years but a child should in general start the 0 grade the year it turns 6 year. Education in schools is not mandatory which means that parents can choose to teach their children at home. Most children frequent the common public basic school (Folkeskolen) but an increasing number of children are educated in private schools. Most children should continue their education in high school or other so-called youth educations after the basic school.

ICTs
Denmark has a high level ICT integration in the population and at various levels of society in terms of digital management of institutional and citizen activities. Almost all Danish households have computers and mobile phones in 2014 and 93% of have internet access. The number of households with fixed landline telephone subscriptions have decreased to 42% while 73% now has a smart phone. 45% have a tablet. 70% of the population have used a mobile phone or a smart phone to go online and 36% have used online banking from their mobile.

The percentage of Danes between 16 and 74 years who use the computer every day is 82% in 2014. Only 2% have never used a computer. The percentage of the population (16-89 years) who have opened a “Nem ID” (“easy identification”) profile is 91%. “Nem ID” is required in almost all interaction with institutions in society. In accordance with the national Danish ICT strategy it has been decided that 80% of all public administration and interaction (all levels) must be digital in 2015). Hence a number of initiatives to further this development have been started and implemented.

The ICT access and use in the Danish population is mapped and analysed in a yearly report, although only from 16 years up. The report (see note 2) covers a long list of accesses and uses.

The use of ICTs in schools
The inclusion of ICT and media literacy in the Danish school is currently a public as well as ministerial focus and many actors are involved in improving the Danish standards for IT use in the school. With the new digitalization strategy from the Danish government, 1, 5 billion DKK are invested in the use of it in the Danish Folkeskole (the Danish municipal primary and lower secondary school). These are earmarked for four main areas 1) digital learning tools 2) access to functional IT 3) clearer objectives for the use of it and digital learning tools and goals and 4) research in IT-based teaching modes. Presently, internet safety is not integrated as a topic in the Danish Folkeskole’s curriculum. In general, ICT is not a separate topic in the Danish Folkeskole. But the Folkeskole Act states that ICT must be integrated in all of the Folkeskole’s subjects, where it is relevant. The requirements for the students’ ICT competences are found in the binding common objectives in the form of the aims of the subjects, central knowledge and skill areas (final objectives). And are further developed in the advisory curricula and descriptions of the development of the teaching towards threshold- and end objectives. The common objectives were in 2009 and in this connection an expert panel was appointed to ensure that ICT- and media competences were involved in the work.

Political initiatives regarding ICT use in schools
Recent (2007-13) and coming (2014 -) political regulations regarding ICT use in schools aims at increasing the integration and use of ICT in learning activities at all levels. This follows the national digitalisation strategy from 2011-15. The political parties have agreed to prolong the initiative till 2017.

The action is managed by the steering committee for IT use in the Folkeskole and it focuses on the following areas:
- Support for purchase of digital learning equipment
- Efficient distribution of digital learning equipment
- Wifi in all schools in 2014
- Access to computers for all pupils in 2014
- Clear goals for the use of ICT and digital learning tools and learning goals.
- Research in IT-based learning forms

---

1. [http://www.statistikbanken.dk/statbank5a/default.asp?v=1366]
Political initiatives about promoting digital opportunities to children
In 2011 a new government was elected in Denmark and following this a new common digitalization strategy was launched. The main themes in this are concerned with more digital solutions replacing paper based communication with citizens, digital welfare in the school and other parts of the public sector, and a closer public authority digital cooperation ("Den digitale vej til fremtidsens velfærd" – “The digital road to future welfare”*).
Recent (2007-13) and coming (2014-) political regulations regarding ICT use in schools aims at increasing the integration and use of ICT in learning activities at all levels. This follows the national digitalisation strategy from 2011-15. The political parties have agreed to prolong the initiative till 2017.

Examples of strategic or informative or cultural uses of mobile media in relation to children
Examples of strategic or informative or cultural uses of mobile media in relation to children (e.g. a larger number of schools buy iPads for children and after schools institutions integrate them in activities. There are a number of experiments with using smart phones and other mobile platforms in learning processes)

Key organizations working in the area of children and media
A number of organisations focus on children’s media uses as the main or part of their objectives: The Danish Media Council for Children and Young People; Save the Children Denmark; Centre for Digital Youth Care; Children’s Welfare; Children’s Council; Digital Education; KLFL Church and Media; the Agency for Culture. Also industry and ISPs are involved in debating and securing online opportunities and preventing risks and harms. One way of doing this is i.e. to participate in advisory boards in the Media Council and in research projects and through collaborative actions.

Examples of foci area for public debates on (children and) mobile media
The debate about children and mobile media follow the general public waves of interest, which again may be released by the launch of a report, by a political initia-
7.3 Germany

Population
- About 81 million inhabitants\(^1\)
- About 6.8 million children aged 6-15 years\(^2\)

Education
Education is mandatory from 6 to 16 years, and is articulated in three stages:
- primary education: primary school (4 years);
- secondary education: divided in lower secondary school (5 or 6 years) and upper secondary school (2 or 3 years);
- tertiary education: bachelor degree (3 years), master degree (2 years), state examination (5 years) and PhD (3 years)

ICTs
In 2013, 82% of German households have internet access (broadband connection) and 77.2% of the population are internet users\(^3\). The internet is more diffused among young people and household with children: 97% of households with children have access to the internet. 52% of children aged 6-13 and 89% of teenagers aged 12-19 are internet users.

100% of German households with children own mobile phones and 81% own smartphones. 72% of Germans aged 12-19 own a smartphone, and 60% use it to go online (almost) every day. 83% of the 12-19 year olds use social network sites, and 77% visit their profile daily or at least several times per week.

88% of the 12-19 year olds own a web-enabled mobile device; 60% with a flat rate for mobile internet. The most popular Apps are Messenger-Apps (81%) like WhatsApp (80%), Community-Apps (61%) like the Facebook App (59%) and Games (20%) like “Doodle Jump”, “Temple Run” or “Subway Surfer”. About one quarter has already paid for Apps; older and formally better educated adolescents are more likely to pay for Apps on their smartphone.\(^4\)

26% of the 6-13 year olds have a mobile phone or a smartphone with internet access. 25% of the 6-13 years old children use their mobile device to go online at least once a week and 14% have installed Apps.\(^5\)

The use of ICTs in schools
Germany did not participate in the EC’s “Survey of Schools: ICT in Education” because of “administrative constraints”, lengthy “democratic consultation procedures” and strong data protection measures. Therefore, a comparison with other European countries in this context turns out to be difficult. In addition, a survey of IT equipment is primarily carried out on federal level – unfortunately the data for the national level are not up to date.

In 2008, the share of general education schools with computer equipment was 99.2%. 76.7% of the schools were equipped with their own computer rooms (average of two per school), with the proportion in lower and upper secondary schools being 97.9%. The proportion of schools with laptop classes in 2008 was 2.5% (ranging from 1.2% at primary schools to 8.8% at vocational schools). The most commonly available programs were educational software with 96.1% (e.g. learning games, multimedia sessions), multimedia reference with 62.8% (e.g. lexicons) and programs for creating multimedia applications with 53% (e.g. presentation programs, HTML generators). The proportion of schools with Internet access in 2008 was 98.1%.\(^6\)

Political initiatives regarding ICT use in schools
The Enquiry Commission on “Internet Society” calls for better media education in schools. For this purpose, educational media content should be firmly anchored in the educator and teacher training (uniform minimum standards for media literacy; media education concepts in schools). In addition, standards for hardware and software should be defined at the schools. The Enquiry Commission also calls for equipping every student with mobile computers (e.g. laptops, tablet PCs).

The Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs requests that the media education plans should be updated in the individual subjects. In addition, interdisciplinary criteria for media education should be formulated. Teachers should be strengthened in their media literacy and media educa-

---

tion skills – qualification and training opportunities for specific application situations and challenges relating school education should be mandatory. The required hardware and software should be available where teaching actually takes place.

Initiatives supporting ICT and digital education
Initiative D21 is a non-profit organization supporting measures for social changes. All measures are based on information and communication technologies. Initiative D21 acts as a partner of politics and economy. The initiative Digitale Bildung neu denken ("Rethink Digital Education") supports learning and teaching at schools and universities based on digital media. Digitale Bildung neu denken promotes the change to digital education. The framework concept Medienbildung entlang der Bildungskette ("media education in the educational chain") has a look at media education in the context of overall societal challenges and social developments (education biographical perspective; focus on transitions in the educational system).

Initiatives focused on media education
The initiative Keine Bildung ohne Medien ("No education without media") is a network for persons and organisations involved in media education. It initiates and supports regional and supraregional media educational activities. Likewise, the German association Gesellschaft für Medienpädagogik und Kommunikationskultur e.V. (GMK) ("Association for Media Education and Communication Culture") focusses on the promotion of media education of persons of all ages.

Examples of strategic or informative or cultural uses of mobile media in relation to children
The implementation of Tablet PCs for use in school is not comprehensive, but mainly tested in pilot projects in higher grades. Official figures for the use and dissemination of Tablet PCs in schools are not available yet. The use of smart phones in the classroom is usually not provided and normally prohibited.

Key organizations working in the area of children and media
- Institutional bodies: Federal Ministry of Education and Research, Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth, State Media Authorities (e.g. LfM, BLM, MA HSH), www.jugendschutz.net.
- NGOs: Media Educational Research Association Southwest (MPFS), JFF – Institute for Media Research and Media Education e.V., German Youth Institute (DJI), Telekom Foundation, internet-abc.

Examples of foci area for public debates on (children and) mobile media
The current public debate is particularly affected by questions of the appropriate duration of media use by children and adolescents, safety issues (e.g. Sexting, Cyberbullying, and Data Protection) and the strengthening of media literacy among parents and children. Moreover, the “correct” and “appropriate” use of smartphones and tablets, apps and instant messengers is part of the general discussion.

Collaboration between stakeholders in the area
In Germany, the Safer Internet Program (SIP) is being implemented by the Safer Internet group (DE).

Apart from the Awareness Centre klicksafe, the Hotline Internet-Beschwerdestelle (implemented by eco and FSM) and jugendschutz.net as well as the child Helpline Nummer gegen Kummer belong to the SIP. Klicksafe is a mutual project of the Central Authority for Media and Communication Rhineland-Palatinate (LMK), which is responsible for coordination, and the Media Authority for North Rhine-Westphalia (LfM).7

The Centre for Child Protection on the Internet (i-KiZ) was created by the Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth in 2012. The ambition of the i-KiZ is to focus on the protection of minors on the Internet and to create a lasting and strong alliance of public authorities with civil society partners, companies and associations.

Schau hin! (“Look closely!”) is a nationwide initiative of governmental and non-governmental organizations, helping parents to support their children while using media.

7 http://www.klicksafe.de/ueber-klicksafe/die-initiative/project-information-en/what-is-klicksafe/
7.4 Ireland

Population
- 4,588,252 inhabitants
- 623,300 children aged 5-14 years old.¹

Education
Education is mandatory from 6 to 16 years, or until children have completed three years of second-level education.
- Early education/Pre-school where early education is provided in infant classes in primary school;
- Primary education, from age 6 years and state-funded primary schools, special schools and private primary schools;
- Post-primary or secondary education consisting of a three-year Junior Cycle (lower secondary) followed by a two or three year Senior Cycle (upper secondary);
- Further Education covers education and training which occurs after second level schooling but which is not part of the third level system;
- Higher education as provided by universities, institutes of technology and colleges of education. Award types include bachelor degrees (3-4 years), masters degrees (1-2 years) and PhD (3-4 years).

ICTs²
- 82% of households in Ireland have access to the internet. 78% of individuals used the internet in the last three months (61% used it on a daily basis).
- Households with children are much more likely to have internet access: 95% of households with 2 adults and dependent children have access to the internet. Broadband subscriptions accounted for 99.5% of all internet subscriptions in 2014. 75% of internet connections offer speeds of 2Mbps-9.99Mbps.³
- The most popular activities of individuals who accessed the internet in the last three months were email (67% of individuals), Finding information about goods or services (61%), Social networking (48%) and Using services related to travel or travel related accommodation (45%).
- Mobile penetration rates in Ireland stand at 121.9%.

Smartphones account for 58% of all mobile phones. 55.7% use a pre-pay service while 44.3% a post-paid or contract service.
- 64% use a smartphone to go online every day. 91% of smartphone owners use it for communication (social networking and email), and 60% visit their social networking profile every day; 79% watch videos on their smartphones. On average, smartphones users have installed 31 apps on their phones.⁴

The use of ICTs in schools
The EC’s “Survey of Schools: ICT in Education”⁵ Ireland ranks twelfth, among the middle group of countries on the indicator of internet-connected desktop computers at grade 8 (with an average of 5 students per computer). Overall in relation to computers connected to the internet in schools, Ireland is close to the EU average at most grades, slightly above at grade 8.

At grade 8 all schools have access to broadband. The percentages of students in schools with broadband speeds faster than 10Mbps, is close to the EU mean. Compared to other countries, students in Ireland report relatively low use of their own mobile or laptop in schools. Use of interactive whiteboards is on par with the EU average.

Political initiatives and national ICT strategy
Ireland’s National Digital Strategy was published in 2013.⁶ The Strategy acts as a policy foundation to enable Ireland reap the rewards of a digitally-enabled society. It includes provisions to enable more businesses to get online; to encourage more citizen engagement; and to harness the benefits of ICTs in education and learning. A major focus of government policy has been to ensure high-speed internet access. Under the National Broadband Plan, public and private investment has been deployed in rolling out broadband across the country. The Plan commits the government to deliver 70Mbps - 100Mbps broadband to more than half of the population by 2015 and a minimum of 30Mbps for every remaining home and business in the country – no matter how rural or remote.⁷

---

¹ Central Statistics Office - http://www.statcentral.ie/
⁷ DCENR. (2012). Delivering a Connected Society. A National
Political initiatives regarding ICT use in schools
Government policy has since 1998 pursued a proactive strategy of integrating ICTs in education, through the ICT in Schools programme. Current measures include the provision of essential ICT infrastructure in schools and the roll-out of 100 Mbps broadband connectivity to all schools. A specialist professional support unit for teachers is also available. A new digital strategy for schools is in development to replace the current plan *Investing Effectively in ICT in Schools 2008-13*.  

Political initiatives about promoting digital opportunities to children
In addition to the National Digital Strategy and the ICT in Schools Programme, a new national policy framework to cover covering all aspects of children’s and young people’s public policy has been launched. This includes commitments to support safer and more positive use of technology and social media for young people.

Examples of strategic or informative or cultural uses of mobile media in relation to children
The national broadcaster, RTE, has invested heavily in providing new media content for children, including a cross-platform channel RTE Junior and a dedicated tablet aimed at children.

Key organizations working in the area of children and media
- PDST – Professional Development Service for Teachers is the primary governmental agency responsible for ICT support and development. It is a partner in the Safer Internet Centre for Ireland. Most organisations are in the civil society sector and promote children’s creativity in the use of media, including new media. Prominent examples include:
  - CoderDojo – an open source, volunteer-led coding club for young people
  - Fis (Film in Schools) – a digital engagement initiative to support schools and teachers use new media effectively and creatively

Examples of foci area for public debates on (children and) mobile media
The national Action Plan on Bullying is an initiative aimed at comprehensively tackling bullying, including homophobic bullying in schools. As a result, all schools are required to develop policies (including social media policies) to deal with the problem.

The Internet Content Governance Advisory Group has recommended a national strategy to implement better internet policies.

Collaboration between stakeholders in the area
The Insafe node in Ireland is coordinated by the Department of Education and Skills includes industry representation and NGOs who operate the Helplines. A multistakeholder Advisory Group includes representation from across the sector.

The government is currently implementing a strategy to expand this body and enhance the remit of multistakeholder governance related to internet use by children and young people.

---

Broadband Plan for Ireland. Dublin: Department of Communications, Energy and Natural Resources.
7.5 Italy

Population
- 59,685,227 inhabitants
- 4,475,840 children aged 9-16 years old\(^1\)

Education
Education is mandatory from 6 to 16 years, and is articulated in three stages:
- primary education: primary school (5 years);
- secondary education: divided in lower secondary school (3 years) and upper secondary school (5 years);
- tertiary education: bachelor degree (3 years), master degree (2 years) and PhD (3 years).

ICTs
61% of Italian households have internet access and 54.8% of the population are internet users.
The internet is more diffused among young people and households with children: 86% of households with children have access to the internet. 45% of children aged 6-10, 81% of those aged 11-14 and 90% of teenagers aged 15-19 are internet users.
93% of Italian households have mobile phones and 44% have smartphones. Households with children are more likely to own smartphones (63.5%).\(^2\)
41% of Italians aged 18-64 have a smartphone, and 63% used it to go online every day. 81% of smartphone owners use social network sites on their phones, and 55% visit their profile at least once a day; 78% watch videos on their smartphones. On average, smartphones users have installed 24 apps on their phones.\(^3\)

The use of ICTs in schools
The EC’s “Survey of Schools: ICT in Education”\(^4\) ranks Italy among countries with the lowest percentages of students having access to internet-connected desktop computers in Europe at grade 8. Also, in terms of internet-connected laptop computers at grade 8 Italy is among the bottom group of countries, and the situation is the same at all other grades. In Italy the percentage of students in schools without broadband is higher than the EU average, particularly at grade 4 where more than one in three students are in a school with no broadband.

Political initiatives and national ICT strategy
In 2012 the Monti’s government established the Agency for Digital Italy, responsible for the coordination of the initiatives listed in the Digital Agenda for Italy - including promoting broadband access, and the digitisation of public administration, health and education). Not all the measures foreseen in the agenda have actually been implemented but the following governments have re-included ICTs’ diffusion and digitisation as a primary goal for economic development.

Political initiatives regarding ICT use in schools
Initiatives promoting the use of ICTs in school are coordinated by the Ministry of Public Education through the “Digital Innovation at school: the Digital School” Division. In 2007, the Ministry of Education launched a National Plan for Digital Schools (Piano Nazionale Scuola Digitale), articulated in four initiatives: a fund to equip classrooms with interactive boards (Piano LIM), and three test projects in which pilot schools, selected through open competitions, experiment ICT solutions (cl@sse 2.0, scuol@ 2.0, Editoria digitale scolastica). The plan works on a voluntary basis.
In 2013 the Ministry of Education has also regulated the gradual transition from printed books to digital books from the academic year 2014-2015.

Political initiatives about promoting digital opportunities to children
The National Plan for Digital School also includes three projects targeted at children with specific needs: @uro-ra and Oltre l’@urora for children/teenagers followed by juvenile court and HSH@Network for hospitalized children.
Most of the initiatives aimed at promoting digital opportunities among children are promoted by NGOs, academic research units and local institutions like CORECOM (regional bodies of AGCom, the independent regulator and competition authority for the Italian communications system).
In 2014, drawing on the Computer Science Education week promoted by the Obama’s administration, the Minister of Education launched the “Programme Your
Future\textsuperscript{5} initiative aimed at educating primary school children to basic coding skills.

**Examples of strategic or informative or cultural uses of mobile media in relation to children**

As a consequence of the National Plan for Digital Schools, many schools are providing children with tablet computers. Smartphones, instead, are not usually integrated in school activities.

**Key organizations working in the area of children and media**

- Institutional bodies: the Ministry of Education, CORECOMs, the Children and Media Committee.
- NGOs: Save the Children, Telefono Azzurro and Terre des Hommes are the main NGOs operating at the national level.

**Examples of foci area for public debates on (children and) mobile media**

The policy, public and media agenda is now focused on a proposal for self-regulation aimed at preventing and contrasting cyberbullying, advanced by the Department of the Economic development. It involves a public consultation.

The debate is more focused on internet safety in general than to mobile internet use.

**Collaboration between stakeholders in the area**

The Insafe node in Italy is coordinated by the Ministry of Education and includes NGOs - Save the Children and Telefono Azzurro, Social Cooperative E.D.I. and Movimento Difesa del Cittadino (Movement for the protection of Citizen rights)- as well as other institutional bodies (the National Ombudsperson for Childhood and Adolescence and the Ministry of Interior Postal and Communications Police).

The Children and Media Committee is based within the Department of Economic Development and includes institutions, broadcasters and NGOs.

The Advisory Board of the Centre for children online is coordinated by Save the Children and includes: institutions, NGOs, broadcasters, internet companies, academic researchers.

\textsuperscript{5} \url{http://programmailfuturo.it/}
7.6 Portugal

Population

- 10,562,178 inhabitants
- 1,572,708 children below 15 years old (14.9%).

Education

Mandatory education: 12 years (since 2010), it includes:
- 1st to 4th grades (6-9 year olds)
- 5th and 6th grades (mainly attended by 10-11 year olds)
- 7th to 9th grades (mainly attended by 12-15 year olds)
- 10th to 12th grades (mainly attended by 16-18 year olds)

ICTs

According to INE (National Bureau of Statistics), in 2013, 67% of the population (16-74) had access to computers and 62% to the internet. Households with children were better equipped technologically: 86% of the households with children had access to the internet, whereas only 53% in the case of households without children. The same pattern may be observed in the case of broadband penetration: 52% against 85%, respectively, if a child lives in the household or not. According to the same source, in 2012, 95% of children (10-15 years old) had access to the internet.

In 2013, 3,7 millions Portuguese (more than one third of the population) had access to mobile internet, among them 878,000 use a modem. Also in 2013, smartphone penetration among mobile phone users represented 39%. About 25% of the population (15 or older) had internet access through their mobile phones.1

Data from 2013 shows that approximately three quarters of individuals use the Internet every day. The main place of use is at home (91%) and about 38% of users access the internet in portable equipment, either with laptop (31%) or smartphone (26%)2(INE, 2013).

The use of ICTs in schools

According to existing data, in 2012 85% of schools in mandatory education had computers with internet connection. 90% in the case of the 1st to 4th grades, 80% in the case of 5th to 6th grades, 82% in the 7th and 9th and 84% in the case of secondary. However, internet use in schools is conditioned or restricted to particular activities and occasions.

There has been a significant improvement on ICT in school in recent years in Portugal, including the modernization of the ICT equipment and infrastructure, increase of internet connections, and ICT training and certification for teachers, as a result of the Technological Plan for Education (2007-2010).3 The number of students per computer has decreased from 10,5 (2005/2006) to 2 (2010/2011) and the number of students per computer with internet access from 14 (2005/2006) to 2,2 (2010/2011).4 Although due to political changes and the economic situation, these indicators have reversed and in 2012/2013 the number of students per computer is 3 and per computer with internet access is 3,5. At the present time all Portuguese schools have high-speed broadband Internet connection, however its use is conditioned or restricted to particular activities and occasions. As an example, most teachers do not use the internet connection during classes either for presenting curricular contents or for encouraging students to explore academic subjects.

Political initiatives and national ICT strategy

From 2005 until 2010/11, government’s policy toward ICT was clearly expansionist, which translated into specific regulation and measures created to implement an ‘Information Society’, epitomized in 2010 by the ‘Technological Plan’, particularly through its key expression: ‘the technological shock’.

Since 2012, with a new government and a scenario of economic crises, the government’s discourse toward ICT is now bounded by austerity and economic restrictions. Currently, the main political initiative regarding a national strategy for ICT is the "Agenda Portugal Digital" (APD), which is delimited by the Global Strategic Plan for Rationalization and Costs Reduction in ICT, in Public

---

1 9 years (from 1986 to 2010).
2 According to Marktest media barometer and ANACOM (Portuguese Communications Authority).
3 INE (2013), Information and knowledge society – survey to families’ ICTs use
4 Directorate-General for Education Statistics and Science (DGCEC/MEC)
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Administration, approved in 2012 (Ministries Council Resolution nº 12/2012, 7th February), responsible for implementing several measures.

The DPA is defined by six general measures, to be accomplished until 2020, which include different areas of action: access to broadband and digital market (ranging from promoting broadband access to the entire population to specific programs for Small and Medium size Businesses - PME Digital – and e-government); investment in research and development and innovation (from ICT research to developing applications and services for e-Learning, e-Public Services, e-Health, e-Education); enhance digital literacy, qualification and inclusion (including learning skills for e-economy); fiscal actions (from combating fiscal fraud and evasion to simplification of communication with fiscal authorities); response to societal challenges (from distinct areas of e-government to digital enhancement of programs to support youth activities); entrepreneurship and ICT internationalization (from e-commerce to ICT innovation).

**Political initiatives regarding ICT use in schools**

From 2007, Portugal has witnessed a rapid diffusion in internet access among children and young people. This diffusion was largely encouraged by a national policy presenting technology as a dimension of modernity and development. Running in schools from 2008 to 2011, the programmes e-Escolas and e-Escolinhas, the latter popularised by the laptop Magalhães, sought to provide equipment and internet access to students and schools. The programme e-Escolinhas was discontinued in 2011-2012, after a policy change in education.

In 2012, the Article 10 of the Student Code (Estatuto do Aluno) on students’ duties, explicitly forbidden the use of mobile phones, programs and APPs in the classrooms, except for academic activities supervised by teachers (alinea r); students are not allowed to capture sounds and images inside the school area, including images and sounds of any member of the school community, without previous consent of teachers and board (alinea s); it is also forbidden to disseminate sounds and images capturated in the classes and outside using the internet and other media, without permission of the school dean (alinea t).⁹

Through their use of autonomy and pedagogic plans, schools interpret these rules in different degrees. During the classes, students that bring mobile phones to school should have them disconnected and in their bags; during the breaks, some schools allow students to access the school wifi, while others don’t provide the password.

In March 2014, the Ministry of Education limited the internet access in public schools, evoking a “overcharge of the network” attributed to accessing pages “without pedagogic character”. Accessing Facebook, Instagram, Tumblr and shops (Android and Apple) is forbidden between 08.30 and 13.30, to all the school community, including students, teachers and administrative staff. YouTube was not included but registered limits of use.

**Political initiatives about promoting digital opportunities to children**

There is no national policy for promoting digital opportunities to children, after the ending of the above reported program.

The Program Escolhas (Choices) is a nationwide program of social intervention, aiming to promote social inclusion of socially vulnerable children and young people (6-24 years-old). The program has been running since 2001 and puts a focus on the integration, embracing digital inclusion as one of its pillars. Mostly located in metropolitan areas, each one of the 132 centers has at least six PCs, broadband access and a printer; local teams are composed by 3-4 technicians and include a young person living in the community who acts as mediator. According to Escolhas’ statistics, in 2011, 10,700 children and young people between 6 and 17 years-old attended these centers. Some centers conducted digital projects with children and youth, related to content-creation and participation. A good example is the Project Radio Active 1.0, http://pt.radioactive101.eu/, currently working in three Escolhas centers.

There are local initiatives related to the use of school and radio TV, whose production also involves the use of digital media. Other local initiatives became visible in the SID.

**Examples of strategic or informative or cultural uses of mobile media in relation to children**

In recent years, the use of tablets in the classroom has become a reality in some private and public schools. Companies such as Microsoft offer devices at low price, as part of their campaigns. Some Portuguese schools participate in European Pro-
projects related to ICT:
- iTEC (Innovative Technologies for an Engaging Classroom), 3000 students involved – includes the use of tablets.
- Introducing Tablets in Schools – The Acer-European Schoolnet Tablet Pilot (www.1to1.eun.org)

Key organizations working in the area of children and media
- Centro Internet Segura (Safe Internet Centre)
- Rede de Bibliotecas Escolares (RBE) (School Libraries Network)
- Projecto Escolhas (Project Choices)
- Instituto de Apoio à Criança (IAC) (Institut for Supporting the Child)

Examples of foci area for public debates on (children and) mobile media
The recent interdiction/restriction of SNS in schools generated some discussion among teachers and boards of schools in the blogosphere.

The use of tablets for educational purposes among very young children has appeared recently in magazines/newspapers.

Children’s choice of smart phones as the most requested Christmas gifts in 2013 was also largely reported.

Collaboration between stakeholders in the area GILM (Informal Group for the promotion of media literacy) involves public institutions, schools, UNESCO, media regulators, academics, Minister of Education, National Education Council, FCT; among the initiatives are Seven Days with the Media (since 2013), and two national conferences attended mainly by teachers (in 2011 and 2013).

DGE (Education General Division in the Minister of Education) has active collaboration with the Polices.

Microsoft is partner in the Internet Segura Consortium.

7.7 Spain

Population
- 46,507,760 inhabitants
- 3,660,903 children aged 9-16 years old.¹

Education
Education is mandatory from 6 to 16 years, and is articulated in three stages:
- primary education: primary school (6 years);
- secondary education: divided in lower secondary school (4 years) and upper secondary school (2 years);
- tertiary education: bachelor degree (4 years), master degree (1 year) and PhD (2 years).

ICTs
70% of Spanish households have internet access and 65.3% of the population are internet users.²

The internet is much more diffused among children aged 10 to 15; 95.2% of the children use computers and 91.8% use the internet. As an average 63.0% of those children have their own. This percentage increases steeply with age from 26.1% among ten year olds to 90.2% for those who are 15.³

95.6% of Spanish households have at least a mobile phone and 86.8% of the individuals aged 10 or over are mobile users. 7.3% of mobile users go online on their mobile every day.⁴

Spanish children aged 12 almost 70% already has a mobile, and at 14 no less than 83%. 76% of Spanish children aged 11 to 14 are WhatsApp users. And 65% of Spanish children between 11 and 14 year olds participate in groups of Whatsapp. 23% of those under age from 11 to 14 years regularly upload their photos and/or videos on the internet. 52.5% of children 11 to 14 years old usually play with their mobile devices. 52% of children and adolescents aged from 11 to 14 never ask permission from their parents to download an application.⁵

¹ INE 2013 - http://www.ine.es/
³ Source: INE Encuesta sobre Equipamiento y Uso de Tecnologías de Información y Comunicación en los Hogares (TIC-H) 2013
The use of ICTs in schools
The EC’s “Survey of Schools: ICT in Education” shows that Spain in lower grades such as 4th and 8th the number of students per computer is lower than the European average quite close to the number in Nordic Countries. In fact, in grade 4 there are more online laptops than desktops and in grade 8 there are 7 students per laptop. As a general rule the number of students per laptop increases with age and Spain is among the top group of countries in Europe. However, Spain ranks among the countries with the lowest ratio of interactive whiteboards.

Political initiatives and national ICT strategy
In order to achieve the goals aimed by European Digital Agenda the Spanish Government implemented it for 2013 to 2015. The main goals set by the Spanish digital agenda are the following:
1. Promoting nets and service in order to provide digital connectedness
2. Developing digital economy in order to support growth, competitiveness and internationalization among Spanish companies.
3. Improving e- Administration in order to provide efficient public services.
5. Promoting i+D+i among Information and Communication Technologies.
6. Promoting digital inclusion and literacy and training ICT professionals.
Most of these goals have been developed through the actions in the AVANZA2 Plan leaded by the Ministry of Industry.

Political initiatives regarding ICT use in schools
Recently, the Organic Law for the Improvement of the Quality of Education was passed. Among its goals this Law aims to incorporate and promote the use of ICTs in the Education system. This goal prioritizes the promotion of digital environments for learning; the shared use of the Ministry’s digital and technological platforms by education administration, schools teachers and students; the selection of quality digital resources and the recognition of [the contribution] of the schools which comply with the quality requirements and the setting of some inter-operativity levels. As far as the implementation of this law is concerned there are two drawbacks. On the one hand, in Spain the Autonomous Communities are responsible for implementation of Education laws and some authorities are not willing to do it. On the other hand, economic difficulties, as well as the need to keep the deficit within a limit, make quite difficult to afford the investment required in order to fulfil the aims of the law.

Political initiatives about promoting digital opportunities to children
Some of the actions in the Avanza 2 plan are aimed specifically to the Education system. The web Educ@ conTIC, tries to provide a space for the spreading and exchange of good education practices centered in the use of ICTs. Didactic and tries to develop resources for the training of the education community in the use and learning of ICTs. Agrega is a repository for educational contents, based on free software. This initiative provides the schools with digital infrastructure such as computers or digital whiteboards. These actions are supported by the national government, but most of the Autonomous Communities have very similar plans concerned with the promotion of new technologies in education.

Examples of strategic or informative or cultural uses of mobile media in relation to children
At the moment several experimental studies are being conducted in order to test the use of tablets at schools, but there is not a strategy about it yet.

Key organizations working in the area of children and media
Institutional bodies: the Ministry of Education, regional departments of education, Ministry of Industry. NGOs: Protegeles, Pantallas Amigas and Aliados are the main NGOs operating at the national level.

Examples of foci area for public debates on (children and) mobile media
The policy, public and media agenda is now focused on a proposal for self-regulation aimed at preventing and contrasting cyberbullying. In fact, most of the Autonomous Communities are developing their own initiatives related to preventing and coping with this risk.

The debate is more focused on internet safety in general than on mobile internet use.
Collaboration between stakeholders in the area

The Insafe node in Spain is coordinated by the NGOs - Protégeles and CESICAT which run the Awareness Centre, the Helpline and the Hotline. Alia2 – other NGO – also runs a hotline as a member of INHOPE.

Protégeles also coordinates four groups with the participation of the most important stakeholders of the country – including: institutions, NGOs, broadcasters, internet companies, academic researchers, and police. One of the groups is focused on mobile technologies.

Red.es, a public corporate entity attached to the Ministry of Industry, Energy and Tourism (MINETUR) which is responsible for promoting the development of the Information Society in Spain also coordinates four workgroups on communication technologies that focus on the role of minors in relation to these technologies.

7.8 Romania

Population
- 21,355,849 inhabitants, as of 2012 census.
- 1,519,834 children of 9 to 15 year old

Education
Education is mandatory from 6 to 16 years, and is comprised of three stages: primary, secondary and tertiary.

ICTs
47% of Romanian households had internet access in 2011 (Eurostat). In 2009-2011 computer use rose from 42% to 43% while internet use from 33% to 40% (of population aged 16 to 74). Frequency of internet use in 2011 (% of individuals aged 16-74): used in the last three months: 40%; at least once a week (but not every day): 14%, and daily use: 24%.

The use of ICTs in schools
Access to a computer in school (2011-2012, for the students in the 8th grade) was: 30 students/ computer, 18 students per one Internet-connected desktop and 250 students per one Internet-connected laptop. Access to broadband-speed Internet in Romanian schools (2011-2012, for grade 8) was: 6% no broadband, 13% lower than 2mbps, 17% between 2-5 mbps, 29% between 5-10 mbps, 17% between 10-30 mbps, 13% between 30-100mbps and 5% faster than 100 mbps.

Political initiatives and national ICT strategy
E-Romania project (developed between 2009-2013 by the Ministry for Informational Society) is a national strategy and an action plan to develop a national digitalized infrastructure for e-government. The project is at the moment in public testing (December 2013 - March 2014).

Political initiatives regarding ICT use in schools
Initiatives promoting the use of ICTs in school are coordinated by the Ministry of Education. The National

---

1 National Institute of Statistic (2012) Tempo Database
2 Eurostat
3 Eurostat
4 “Survey of Schools: ICT in Education. Country profile: Romania (November 2012)”. European Schoolnet & University of Liège
5 “Survey of Schools: ICT in Education. Country profile: Romania (November 2012)”. European Schoolnet & University of Liège
Educational Law (1/2011), which gives the general legal framework for education in Romanian school, talks about ‘digital competence’ as compulsory, key-competence for secondary level and optional for primary educational level. The same Law states the necessity of setting-up the Virtual School Library and the E-learning School Platform.

**Political initiatives about promoting digital opportunities to children**

For the general digital opportunities, the IT-Based Educational System (SEI) is a national program of the Ministry of Education (developed by SIVECO) which has as the main objective to provide every school with at least one IT laboratory equipped with cutting-edge technology and also to elaborate e-Content lessons for various domains. Still, the project was criticized for being underutilised by the teachers and therefore inefficient. As regarding the use of mobile devices for educational purposes, there is no specific regulatory policy. Yet, the Current Minister of Education has promoted in many public statements the necessity of digitalisation of the classrooms. In order to accomplish this task, according to the Minister, the steps to be done are:

1. changing of The Internal School Regulation, as to allow children to bring their mobile devices at school (which, at the moment, is forbidden),
2. Providing all schools with Internet access;
3. developing educational software and digital textbooks;
4. training of teachers and 5. acquisition of mobile devices for children.

**Examples of strategic or informative or cultural uses of mobile media in relation to children**

Regarding the infrastructure, there are few examples of partnership between public schools and enterprises from industrial area in which the latter provided the equipment for an IT laboratory (sometimes in terms of mobile devices). Still, such partnerships are rare. With regards to the private schools and clubs (either vocational clubs or after-schools), there is an increased number of mobile media used for educational purposes (but at the moment, no official statistics).

For the educational part, two Romanian NGOs are very active in promoting media and digital literacy in school: Active Watch and Save the Children. The former published the first textbook in Romania dedicated to media education (aimed for secondary school as an optional course); they also organized training courses in the media education field for teaching staff, and published supporting materials for teachers interested in promoting media education and media-based learning among students. Moreover, Active Watch has launched in 2012 a new course for training teachers to attain Media and digital competencies – MediaSIS. On the other hand, Save the Children Romania is preparing a Guide for a safer Internet which is aimed to be taught in primary schools, in the compulsory curricula (still, this Guide was not launched yet, at the moment Save the Children being in negotiation with the Ministry of Education).

**Key organizations working in the area of children and media**

There are two NGOs who focus specifically on children and media relationship: Active Watch, with a major direction in media education in school, and Save the Children Romania (Romanian node for the Insafe network), with a focus on safer Internet for children.

**Examples of foci area for public debates on (children and) mobile media**

There are no public debates on the topic.

**Collaboration between stakeholders in the area**

The Advisory Board of the Centre for children online is coordinated by Save the Children (part of the Romanian Insafe node) and includes: institutions, NGOs, broadcasters, internet companies, academic researchers.
7.9 United Kingdom

Population¹
- 63.7m inhabitants
- 5.64m children aged 9-16 years old

Education
Education is mandatory from 6 to 16 years, and in England you must stay in some form of education until you are 18. The school leaving age in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland is 16.²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>81</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Age</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- primary education: primary school Years 1-6 (Key Stage 1-2)
- secondary education: secondary school Years 7-11 (Key Stage 3-4); Years 12 – 13 (Key Stage 5)
- tertiary education: bachelor degree (3 years), master degree (1-2 years) and PhD (3 years).

ICTs
According to the UK Office of National Statistics:³
- In 2013, 36 million adults (73%) in Great Britain accessed the Internet every day, 20 million more than in 2006, when directly comparable records began.
- Access to the Internet using a mobile phone more than doubled between 2010 and 2013, from 24% to 53%.
- In 2013, 72% of all adults bought goods or services online, up from 53% in 2008.
- In Great Britain, 21 million households (83%) had Internet access in 2013.
- Broadband Internet connections using fibre optic or cable were used by 42% of households, up from 30% in 2012.
- On 15 May 2013, as part of the Internet Access Quarterly Update, the Office of National Statistics reported that 42.4 million people in Great Britain had used the Internet, representing approximately 86% of the adult population. Use of a computer is inextricably linked to the ability of an individual to use the Internet. In 2013, 70% of adults in Great Britain used a computer every day, up from 45% in 2006.

In 2013, 6 in 10 adults (61%) had used a device such as mobile phone or portable computer (a tablet or laptop) to access the mobile Internet, away from home or work. Almost all those aged 16 to 24 (94%) had used a mobile phone or portable device to access the Internet “on the go”, compared with only 17% of those aged 65 or above.

The most popular device used to access the Internet ‘on the go’ was a mobile phone, with over half of all adults (53%) accessing the Internet this way. This has more than doubled since the 2010 estimate of 24%.

Almost 9 in 10 (89%) adults aged 16 to 24 used their mobile phone to access the Internet. However, this type of access is not solely limited to the early-adopting, younger age groups with just over half (51%) of those aged 45 to 54 accessing the mobile Internet on their mobile phone.

Accessing the Internet using portable computers such as tablets or laptops was popular with almost one third of all adults (32%). The three youngest age groups (16 to 24, 25 to 34 and 35 to 44) all reported similar rates of use, with those aged 25 to 34 leading the way at 43%. Of those aged 65 and over, 1 in 10 adults (11%) used a tablet or portable computer to access the Internet “on the go” in 2013.

One fifth (21%) of 16 to 24 year olds reported using a device such as a games console or eBook reader to access the Internet away from home or work. This type of access was heavily favoured by the younger age groups, with just 10% of 45 to 54 year olds accessing the Internet over these devices and only 11% of all adults.

The use of ICTs in schools
According to the Department for Education and Schools⁴
‘Pupils should be given opportunities to apply and develop their ICT capability through the use of ICT tools to support their learning in all subjects. At Key Stage 1, it is statutory to teach the use of ICT in English, mathematics and science. Teachers should use their own judgement to decide where it is appropriate across these subjects. At other key stages, there are statutory requirements to use ICT in all statutory subjects, except PE.’

¹ http://www.statistics.gov.uk/hub/index.html
² https://www.gov.uk/know-when-you-can-leave-school#related
³ http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778_322713.pdf
⁴ http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130802141748/https://www.education.gov.uk/schools/teachingandlearning/curriculum/a00199693/use-of-ict
Pupils should be given opportunities to support their work by being taught to:
- find things out from a variety of sources, selecting and synthesising the information to meet their needs and developing an ability to question its accuracy, bias and plausibility
- develop their ideas using ICT tools to amend and refine their work and enhance its quality and accuracy
- exchange and share information, both directly and through electronic media
- review, modify and evaluate their work, reflecting critically on its quality, as it progresses.’

The type of ICT used within UK schools and how it is implemented is largely the responsibility of the Head Teacher and their local education authority. Some schools have embraced the used of tablets from year 7 in day to day classroom working whilst others are more circumspect in their adoption of handheld or mobile devices limiting ICT use to specific classes and locations.

Political initiatives regarding ICT use in schools
As from September 2014 all schools in the UK must include computer programming as part of its curriculum. The UK Government is supporting public private partnerships and funding for organisations that will deliver to this new curriculum and promote the upskilling of UK school children.5

Examples of strategic or informative or cultural uses of mobile media in relation to children
The Education Endowment Foundation is funding a number of initiatives in UK schools that support the use of tablet computers in the curriculum.6 In 2013 they provided £3.5million (UK pounds) for 260 schools across England to test ways of using digital technology.

Key organizations working in the area of children and media
Multiple organisations operate within the UK that work in the area of children and media. These are from industry, charities, government departments and other interested parties. These organisations work collaboratively on different initiatives and a list (not inclusive) is provided below of organisations active in the area of

---

5 www.yearofcode.org
6 http://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/news/12-new-eef-grants-awarded
The network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>National Contact</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Leen D’Haenens - <a href="mailto:Leen.Dhaenens@soc.kuleven.be">Leen.Dhaenens@soc.kuleven.be</a> Institute for media studies Faculty of Social Sciences, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven Parkstraat 45 bus 3603, 3000 Leuven, Belgium</td>
<td>Leen D’Haenens, Sofie Vandoninck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Gitte Stald — <a href="mailto:stald@itu.dk">stald@itu.dk</a> IT University of Copenhagen, Ruud Langgaards Vej 7, 2300 Copenhagen</td>
<td>Gitte Stald, Heidi Jørgensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Claudia Lampert - <a href="mailto:c.lampert@hans-bredow-institut.de">c.lampert@hans-bredow-institut.de</a> Hans Bredow Institute for Media Research at the University of Hamburg, Rothenbaumchaussee 36, 2048 Hamburg, Germany</td>
<td>Claudia Lampert, Joana Kühn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Brian O’Neill — <a href="mailto:brian.oneill@dit.ie">brian.oneill@dit.ie</a> College of Arts and Tourism, Dublin Institute of Technology, Rathmines Road, Dublin 6, Ireland</td>
<td>Brian O’Neill, Thuy Dinh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Giovanna Mascheroni <a href="mailto:giovanna.mascheroni@unicatt.it">giovanna.mascheroni@unicatt.it</a> OssCom, Università Cattolica del S. Cuore, Largo Gemelli, 1, 20123 Milano</td>
<td>Giovanna Mascheroni, Barbara Scifo, Kjartan Ólafsson, Andrea Cuman, Maria Francesca Murrù, Piermarco Araldi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>José Alberto Simões — <a href="mailto:joseav.simoes@fcsh.unl.pt">joseav.simoes@fcsh.unl.pt</a> Departamento de Sociologia, Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas, Universidade Nova de Lisboa (UNL) Av. de Berna, 26-C, 1069-061 Lisboa, Portugal</td>
<td>José Alberto Simões, Cristina Ponte, Juliana Doreto, Celiana Azevedo, Eduarda Ferreira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Anca Velicu — <a href="mailto:anca.velicu@gmail.com">anca.velicu@gmail.com</a> Institute of Sociology Casa Academiei, Calea 13 Septembrie 13, Bucharest</td>
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