

Framing the Discourses of Harm and Loss: A Case Study of Power Relations, Mobile Phones, and Children in Australia

Dr Niranjala (Nina) Weerakkody

School of Communication and Creative Arts, Deakin University

Abstract

The current penetration of mobile phones in Australia is 92% and it records one of the world's highest rates of ownership among children under 18. The paper reviews the literature on mobile phones and Australian children and examines the various discourses dominating the public debates; the systematic frames used in these discourses; and whose interests are served in the process. The frames discussed fall under the optimistic (gains); pessimistic (losses, costs or harms); pluralistic (technology per se is neutral but how it is used matters); historical development (skills learnt and the importance of using mobiles); futuristic predictions (promises and dangers for the future); current uses (connectivity, convergence and interactivity); and the techno-realist view (as a mixed blessing) views of technology. Taking the critical perspective and borrowing from Joshua Meyrowitz, the paper illustrates how mobile phones have eroded parental power over how, when, where and with whom their children communicate, surpassing adult supervision, intervention or knowledge, while at the same time, becoming a 'digital leash' for parents to re-establish their control and an 'umbilical cord' for their offspring to remain connected with parents, at all times.

“Mum/Dad, Can you pick me up, please?” This is a common telephone call many Australian parents receive late at night on weekends, when their teenage children need to get home from an outing. Therefore, mobile phones give parents at home and their children a link to each other when the children are away from parental supervision providing both groups a sense of safety and connectivity.

The current rate for mobile phone penetration in Australia is over 92% or 19 million subscribers which was reached in less than 20 years since adoption. In comparison, the number of fixed line phones number only 11 million (Chapman, 2006). The nation also records one of the world’s highest rates of mobile phone ownership among children under the age of 18. In 2005, mobile phones were owned by about 80,000 five to nine year-olds, with 50% of all owners being those between 13 and 15, and a third between 10 and 13 (O’Riordan, 2005). This is in a nation with a population a little over 20 million (ABS, 2006). Even though the advantages of mobile phones to children and others are many and obvious, there are many different and often valid view points or discourses expressed as to their disadvantages, harms and potential and actual abuses affecting children, circulating in Australia and elsewhere. Therefore, it is important to examine all issues related to mobile phones and children of this relatively new technology because limited studies have been so far carried out as to how the relevant debates and discourses are framed about the technology’s impacts on Australians and their children. It will also help users, society at large and its institutions to examine measures to optimise the advantages and minimise the disadvantages of this useful and ubiquitous technology with its known as well as potential long term adverse effects, in a range of areas such as health, economics, culture, and the politics or power relations between children and adults. Therefore, this paper takes the interpretive and critical theory perspectives (Crotty, 1998) in examining the main discourses (Dicken-Garcia, 1998) and debates about mobile phones and children in Australia in the form of a comprehensive literature review, in depth analysis, and discussion.

The resources accessed in searching for the literature on the subject included the *Mass Media Complete* (formerly the Matlon Index) and EBSCO Host for scholarly articles and books; the Factiva database (similar to LexisNexis) for newspaper and trade articles; and the Google, and Google Scholar sites. The websites of the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA), Australian Mobile Telecommunications Association (AMTA), and the Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts (DCITA) were also searched on several occasions between 2005 and 2006. These data were supplemented with interviews with Andrew Funston, an Australian academic widely cited for his work on mobile phone use by young people in Australia (Funston & McNeill, 1999; Funston & Hughes, 2006) and Ross Monaghan, also an Australian academic, former executive of the Optus telecommunications company and the former Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of AMTA- the group that represents mobile phone operators, manufacturers, dealers and carriers in Australia.

The High Mobile Phone Bills and Australian Teenagers

The most problematic area with respect to children (mainly teenagers) and mobile phones in Australia appear to be that of unexpectedly high mobile phone bills (in extreme cases up to \$5000 in accumulated charges) incurred by about 10% of users, which parents end up paying, or the teens themselves pay with a loan from a parent or other adult, which results in anxiety, depression and other problems (Funston & McNeill, 1999; A. Funston, pers. comm., 14 the

November 2006; R. Monaghan, pers. comm., 29th November, 2006). Anecdotal evidence suggests that most teens rack up higher monthly bills than expected, due to getting ‘carried away’ during weekends with too many calls sent unnecessarily or downloading games or ring tones on impulse. Sending Multimedia Messaging Service (MMS) messages using mobile phones with cameras for still and video photography, also incur much higher call charges but teen users do not realise it until they receive their bills.

Due to aggressive marketing and confusing advertising that promises a ‘free’ handset or ‘low’ monthly charges and not reading the contract or not understanding its clauses about the specific terms, conditions, and charges for various services (generally written in legal or business jargon instead of plain language), many young people find themselves faced with high bills they cannot afford to pay. The availability of ‘premium services’ such as wall papers, ring tones, music and games downloads, sports scores, and sports highlights may be enticing, but the teen consumers may not realise that these are provided on subscription involving on-going charges and are difficult to discontinue (ACMASphere, 2006). Hoping to alleviate this problem, the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) proposes a Mobile Premium Services Self-Regulatory Scheme hoping to protect those who access a premium service by requesting service providers to make available ‘more information about the nature of services, costs, terms and conditions’, to subscribers before their first use (ACMASphere, 2006; 3).

Most teenagers and/or their parents faced with exorbitant mobile bills are often unaware of how to resolve them or whom to contact in case of a dispute with a mobile phone company or dealer, such as the office of the Telecommunications Industry Ombudsman (TIO) (A. Funston, pers. comm., 14th November, 2006; R. Monaghan, per. Comm., 29th November, 2006). Many also find that their contract has locked them for 18-24 months, which they cannot discontinue without a costly penalty even if the set is broken and un-repairable or better models or deals become available with the same company. These subscribers had not realised that they have to pay for accessing and leaving voice mail messages even if the mailbox is provided free as advertised; that the ‘free calls’ allowed each month under the plan may be used up fast when timed as 30 second segments; that the cost of the handset is included in a mobile phone plan which says ‘Free hand set’; and that pre-paid calls with a phone card (an option to control costs) charge more than those on a plan or contract with the card’s credit expiring after 3 months if unused. ACMA’s Chairman Chris Chapman (2006) admits that ‘transparency of the costs and terms and conditions of premium services has continued to be major source of complaints for the TIO’... ‘sloppy, even unacceptable, practices by some providers of content have led to financial harm to consumers’ which he thinks harms the industry’s reputation and destroys consumer confidence about mobile or m-commerce (p. 5).

Funston and McNeill (1999) found that those from non-English speaking homes and those on government welfare payments (received by 13% of Australian homes which are on low incomes, (Croucher, 2006)) were more likely to face problems with excessive bills than others, probably due to their parents’ inability to understand the contracts and inexperience with the procedures. As a result, in recent times, the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA, 2006) has provided a toolkit on its website, for teenage users to understand the system and lists a set of questions to ask when purchasing a mobile phone (ACMASphere, 2006). Consumer Affairs Victoria, a state government entity has articles in free youth-oriented magazines such as the *Stuff Magazine* with advice for young people (Totally Mobile, 2006). However, it is not clear as to how many parents and teens would

know about or refer to these resources before purchasing a mobile phone. At the same time, research has shown that many young people and teens use the mobile in an exercise of responsible and essential usage; developing financial and time management skills; and learn to use mobiles to better coordinate their everyday social and other activities (Funston & MacNeill, 1999).

Public Debates on Mobile Phones and Children in Australia

Even though the excessive bills faced by teens is a major issue for mobile phone use and teenagers in Australia, most legal, administrative, public and political debates initiated or contributed to by politicians, lobbyists, interest groups and even the media about the technology in Australia appear to be not about these mobile phone-related financial problems but about the potential 'harms' or 'losses' to children from inappropriate mobile phone content or anti-social behaviour such as bullying, cheating at exams or paedophilia. They also argue for the need to censor or control these behaviours via criminal legislation to punish or deter offenders and for installing parental control systems on the mobile phones to 'protect' children from these 'villains' (Richardson, 2006; Australian Government to Censor 3G Mobile content, 2006; Ace*Comm, 2005; Handsley, Frost & Biggins, 2004; Osbourne, 2006; Spiked-Debate, 2006; Miletic, 2006). No real efforts appear to be made by these same politicians, lobbyists, interest groups or the media about addressing the real issue of excessive and exorbitant mobile phone bills affecting the mostly teenage users via regulation of the Telecommunications companies (Telcos) and their dealers. The factors responsible for these mobile cost blowouts are often linked to inflexible mobile phone contracts, confusing and aggressive marketing strategies specifically aimed at the teenage market, inadequate information provided to prospective subscribers, hard to understand contracts, and the lack of education for dealers, the public and young people about potential pit falls and the responsible management of their mobile phone use and expenditure (A. Funston, pers. comm., 14th November, 2006; R. Monaghan, pers. comm., 29th November, 2006).

The Discourses of New Communication Technologies

Herschheim (1985) presents three main views on the social impact of new technologies. They are the *optimistic view*, which takes the utopian approach of technology being all positive and is themed as 'leading to progress' while providing 'gains' to human kind. It is the view taken by theorists such as Marshall McLuhan (1969). In contrast, the *pessimistic view* taken by those such as Beniger (1986), sees technologies as creating harms and increasing the power and control of those with power and authority. Foucault (1977) too takes the same view and links technologies to the *panoptic control* or surveillance of those on the 'periphery' (the less powerful or powerless) by those at the 'centre' (those holding power). Such control is seen as leading to abuses, misuses and oppression. The *pluralist view* of technology on the other hand sees a technology as neutral in themselves such as a building block or brick, but as a structure, how it is used depends on the wishes and desires of the designers and controllers of the technology, which leads to positive, negative or neutral outcomes depending on how they are used (Burns, 1981). The above views are the three main *discourses of technology* and the most commonly used ones in society today.

Discourse

A discourse refers to how a subject or topic gets ‘talked about’ in society at a given time and location in everyday conversations or in the media. They are shaped by the culture and in turn shape culture (Dickens-Garcia, 1998). Any given subject or topic can be discussed using several different discourses or in different ways, all of which can be valid. But the discourses used in a discussion or debate is shaped and dominated by the agendas, interests, viewpoints, ideologies, subjectivity and subject position (of being dominant/ privileged /powerful or oppressed/marginalised /powerless in society) of each of the individuals or groups participating in it. This explains why any topic or subject can be debated or discussed using several different discourses and why some discourses dominate while more or equally valid, urgent or legitimate others get sidelined or ignored. For example, the perceived ‘harms’ of mobile phone content of apparent concern to middle and upper class parents in Australia, dominate over the issue of high mobile costs, which Funston and McNeill (1999) found to negatively affect the less affluent and minority teenagers more than others.

The additional discourses described by Dickens-Garcia (1998) as applied to the internet and adapted here for the mobile telephone, include the *historical development* of mobile phones, emphasising the skills learnt and their importance such as to bridge the ‘digital divide’ between the rich and poor individuals, groups, and nations; and the discourses of *futuristic predictions* relating to promises and dangers for the future. The discourse of *current uses*, discusses the importance of mobile phones today such as connectivity, convergence, interactivity and the realisation of the *global village* (McLuhan, 1969). The *techno-realist view or discourse* takes the middle ground and sees mobile phones as a mixed blessing.

Discourses and their Framing

Framing or the frameworks used in a discourse involve *selection* (of certain aspects) and *salience* (importance) of the aspects included in the discourse. Frames *diagnose* (identify the sources causing the problem), *evaluate* (make moral judgements about causal agents and their effects), *prescribe* (suggest remedies, offer and justify treatments) and *predict* (their likely effects) for an issue or subject under discussion (Entman, 1993; Solomon, 1992). In simple terms, one can ‘frame’ a glass that contains water as ‘half full’ or ‘half empty’. Each discourse is shaped by the outlook of the person using the frame and in turn shapes how others are influenced to look at the situation (Dickens-Garcia, 1998). Framing is the basis of advertising, marketing and political as well as public relations messages and campaigns. Media messages are framed –either consciously or otherwise, by journalists and other creators of messages, in particular ways and carrying particular discourses. They tell us ‘what to think about and how to think about them’. In journalism, framing is linked to the ‘angle’ used in a news story and choosing a ‘lead’ for it. The lead controls how one tells the rest of the story and what headlines may be used (Dickens-Garcia, 1998).

Strategies of Framing

Framing uses various strategies (Dickens –Garcia, 1998) such as *adjectives* (describing words such as ‘empowering’); *metaphors* or understanding one thing in terms of another (Lekoff & Johnson, 1980; p. 5) (such as the mobile phone as a ‘digital leash’ of tying teens to their parents for control or an ‘umbilical cord’ tying parents to their children providing ‘sustenance’, with both parties contactable at all times); *analogies* (drawing similarities

between two things such as comparing the changes brought by driving a car and mobile phones for teenagers, to express their freedom and independence from adult supervision) (Levinson, 2004). Frames can also use *euphemisms*- a strategy of using a neutral or 'fancy' term to cover up an unpleasant reality (Planalp, 1998; 69)- such as using 'child protection' to hide the fact that the policy involves surveillance and control of teenagers and their movements using GPS (Global Positioning Systems) and other 'spying products' (Spiked-debate, 2006) or the use of the term 'premium services' to downplay the fact that they are expensive and provided by subscription; and *disphemisms* – the opposite of euphemisms where exaggerated terms are used to make something sound more unpleasant than it really is (Planalp, 1998; 69)- such as those advocating surveillance of mobile phones arguing about the 'risks' of 'child abuse' and its detractors referring to these arguments as 'manufactured hysteria' (Spiked-debate, 2006). Those seeking more controls on mobile phones by parents on children, argue that 'paedophiles' may use the technology to lure children. They in turn are accused of creating 'moral panics' arguing that paedophiles are unlikely to use mobile phones which are more easily traced than the internet, which is often used by paedophiles.

Frames as Rhetorical Weapons

Framing of discourses is central to political debates where discourses serve as rhetorical weapons created and used by political and economic elites to advance their interests and ideologies. But alternative frames can tip the balance of policy debates and public opinion (Kinder & Sanders, 1996). By framing a discourse in a particular manner or direction, a sender of a message can place 'blinkers' or 'blindners' on the receiver guiding their view or attention in a particular direction and away from any alternative viewpoints. This guides the receiver to think only about the sender-highlighted aspects of an issue under consideration (XXXX, 1999). In other words, different discourses and frames can contribute towards creating specific *connotations* (implied meanings) for the receivers of such messages and /or make their minds unconsciously stick to a particular *paradigm* (a pattern or the way of looking at something).

For example, Senator Helen Coonan– the Federal Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts in Australia announced plans to introduce legislation to 'restrict (children's) access to inappropriate or harmful content' on 'emergent content services' that included 3G mobile phones which are able to receive TV and Pay TV broadcasts (Australian Government censors 3G mobile content, 2006). Her announcement followed the controversy related to the airing of the 'Turkey slapping incident' on the *Big Brother 6* reality TV show in 2006, where two male contestants sexually harassed a female contestant, which was streamed live on Channel 10 TV's 24 hour webcasts- a subscription-only service, during the early hours of the morning on July 1, 2006 (Big Brother Australia, 2006; p. 18). This announcement can be interpreted as an attempt at political point-scoring by the government and the Minister. This also carries out an agenda setting function (McCombs & Shaw, 1972) by highlighting the potential for children accessing porn on mobiles and making it an issue for parents.

According to the same news item, a report submitted to the minister had suggested that internet access via mobile phones be restricted to customers over 18 unless minors have permission from parents or guardians (Australian Government censors 3G Mobile content, 2006). Interestingly, under current Australian law, a minor cannot sign up for an account with an Internet Service Provider (ISP) but is able to access WAP (Wireless Access Protocol) internet services without restriction. However, wireless internet services on mobiles are

unlikely to be subscribed to by the average minor due to its current cost but this was not pointed out in the news item, which is an exclusion of alternative discourses and frames from the discussion.

Discourses of Mobile Phones and Children in Australia

The main discourses about mobile phones and children, commonly encountered today in Australia relate to their actual or potential ‘harms’; ‘losses’; ‘mobile phones today’ with respect to connectivity, convergence, and interactivity; and using mobile phones for ‘surveillance and control’ of teens. The following is a critical examination of these discourses.

The Mobile Phone as ‘Villain’

The mobile phone is often framed as a ‘villain’, in cyber-bullying. A newspaper article by Miletic (2006; p. 6), headlined ‘Technological trauma: Cyber bullies more powerful than schoolyard thugs’, takes the ‘angle’ or discourse of ‘harms’. The *diagnosis* of this frame is that: since bullies get to use text messages and mobile phone photos and videos that can be uploaded to social networks such as YouTube and MySpace, anonymously and virtually for anyone, anywhere to see, bullying has become a 24-hour 7-day possibility that goes far beyond school boundaries. The *evaluation* is that this causes trauma, increases the humiliation and victimisation of those targeted than real life bullying, leading to anxiety, depression, truancy, self-harm, eating disorders or even suicide, as the humiliation can reach a wider audience and go on for a longer period of time than when carried out face-to-face in the ‘real’ world. It *prescribes* harsh punishments to perpetrators such as expulsion citing the King’s School in Sydney, and including cyber bullying to school anti-bullying policies drafted in consultation with students, citing Melbourne’s Methodist Ladies College as examples. It *predicts* that since cyber bullying leaves records on computer hard discs, culprits may be caught and all students will understand the inappropriateness of cyber bullying and that redress and repercussions can be expected in future situations.

Discourses of ‘Harms’ and the Mobile Phone

Levinson (2004) points out that each new technology becomes a ‘villain’ when first adopted and remains so till the next one comes along, making the old one legitimate. He cites the example of movie viewing seen in 1910 as ‘destroying the moral backbone of the future when children spend their afternoons (at the cinema)’, making the earlier villain of the ‘bawdy’ theatre a legitimate medium (pp. 86-87).

Spiked-debate (2006) describes the ‘harms’ posed by mobile phones to children as the 3 Cs- *Contact* (by paedophiles), *Content* (illegal or harmful materials) and *Commercialism* (risk of spending too much money or buying unsuitable goods). Other less debated fears involve health risks due to Electro Magnetic Radiation or EMR from handsets. A longitudinal study of 300 children over a period of three years is underway in Melbourne to study the effects of EMR even though several earlier studies worldwide have indicated no harm-either to children or adults (Allison, 2004). However, Andrew Funston argues that the effects of such health hazards will take up to 30 or so years to be observable or research findings to be conclusive as seen with the poisoning of workers in an asbestos factory in Australia. ‘Sperm motility affected by mobile phones (kept in trouser pockets)... (mobiles) may cause a particular form

of brain tumour ...or create temporary loss of intellectual capacity...Holding a device with EMR close to your head and generating heat, plastic etc .. Something that might have negative effects in 30 years may not affect us adults today but a 10 year old child today will be, in 30 years' (A. Funston, pers. comm., 14th November 2006).

Even though mobile phones are no longer an 'exclusive' technology and affordable to the majority of the population, its 'status symbol' function still appears to be in existence. Many successful men are known to place their latest model mobiles on the table at meetings, restaurants, or in bars to impress onlookers. Today, the BlackBerry –an expensive mobile phone with almost computer-like functions is a status symbol for professional men. Teenagers keep updating their mobiles and buy expensive and unnecessary accessories such as covers, ring tones and wall paper to stand out from the crowd.

Discourses of 'Loss' and Mobile Phones

Some Australian educators and politicians lament that text messaging is destroying children's writing, and results in their losing their spelling and grammar skills. The limited number of characters allowed in a text message and the convenience and practicality of sticking to fewer characters and words has given rise to a new text messaging 'shorthand' such as 'Satdy' (Saturday), 'GTSY' (good to see you) and the use of '4' (for), r u (are you) (Topsfield, 2006). Some teachers have warned students not to use such spelling at examinations. They complain that many students have lost the art of cursive writing (running script) due to word processing and many only write in block letters and fail to learn spelling, grammar and punctuations correctly due to the availability of spell checks and grammatik. They fear this could lead to future generations failing to write or read scripts handwritten in cursive in historical documents (Pressler, 2006).

However, discourses of children losing their writing skills due to a new technology are not new. When the pencil with an eraser attached to it was introduced, some argued that it would make children become careless when writing (Marvin, 1988) as they knew they can erase a mistake and re-write it. When ball point pens were introduced, children were discouraged and even forbidden in schools to use them on the argument that they make a person's handwriting 'ugly'. I would argue that languages, writing styles, fonts and rules are dynamic, culture and time-based, and adapt to changes in society and the technological environment and therefore need to be discussed within that context. Since this generation is far more techno-savvy than earlier ones, they will develop and need different skills and literacies to those of their parents. Therefore, the above argument is an attempt by adults to privilege and impose their paradigm of literacy as the 'norm' or the 'ideal' for the next generation. The adults seem to forget that each generation is also different to its parents' and faces the same criticisms, fears and discourses of 'loss' during their formative years, such as with ball point pens.

As for failing to read historical documents, the affected generation would probably develop computer software or other system to decipher them, if it becomes necessary or commercially lucrative or as with reading historical documents such as the Dead Sea Scrolls or those written in dead languages such as Sanskrit or Latin, the field will become the realm of specialists.

Andrew Funston thinks that 'text messaging is not about crunching the English language but creatively adding to the language... Imaginations will be tickled by the enormous creative work gained into making (the messages) attractive. We will be constantly asked to shift paradigms in our thinking... But text messages are so elliptical, sparse and open to misunderstanding (due to the absence of non-verbal aspects of communication including pitch, tone and phatic communication or small talk)... Even though it gives power to young people and a strong speaking position... it could lose them the opportunity to talk expansively.... They need the full range of (language) ability, a balance and a range of skills (A. Funston, pers. comm., 14th November 2006).

Pluralist Discourses on Mobile Phones

On the subject of adult material on mobile phones being accessible to children, Andrew Funston thinks that 'porn is a major driver of selling the internet to the world. I can't see why it can't be the case with mobile phones... and children can find them (inappropriate content) solicited (by content creators) or find it themselves. (The government) regulation is not looking into it much as they are more concerned about building telecommunications markets because the (telecommunications) companies have a lot of clout. The government does a lot to censor what goes on in a film festival but not about (other) media content...' However, he thinks that 'mobile phones will be a way young people will be enticed into anti-social behaviour' as seen with the 'Werribee Kings' incident of June 2006, where two school boys contacted a 17 year-old girl (with a mild development delay) on the internet, arranged to meet her using mobile phones and a gang of 12 boys then sexually and physically assaulted her while taking videos using mobile phone cameras. The footage was made into a DVD and sold for \$5 and uploaded on YouTube (Melbourne teenage DVD controversy, 2006). Andrew saw such teens as 'callous and hateful young men who had not been well parented or supervised' and who 'had the technology in hand to make what they did even worse' (A, Funston, pers. comm., 14th November, 2006), evoking the pluralist view.

Presenting an alternative frame, Andrew Funston argues that 'The bigger issue is not whether the technology is dangerous... but about how we educate ourselves as a community on ways of not patrolling information but empowering them to get the information they want and not suffer information they don't want. So the idea of home-based screening is important for families to learn how to talk among themselves about what is suitable and the damage done to people in the making of it (adult content). Self-serving technology, education systems and public information should be available (A, Funston, pers. comm., 14th November, 2006). Unfortunately, such views and alternative frames and discourses do not get the media exposure enjoyed by politicians, lobbyists, Telcos, advertisers and journalists.

Ross Monaghan points out that 'In Australia, sex sells...in advertisements, on the (web) page of mobile phone companies,.. the very first thing you see is 'download the hot babe' and it's going to cost you two dollars ... With a pre-paid mobile, they (content or service providers) don't know if it is a 11 year old or 60 year old (downloading)... (But) the government makes sure there is no hard core porn out there. ..The commercial side of mobile phones means porn available free will be limited. ..They have relationship services like 'texting a hot babe' (chat lines analogous to the 1-900 phone calls). If you read the fine print those text messages are ...expensive ...3, 4, 5 dollars to send texts. Sometimes these messages may be sent daily and some can get caught out by these services (R. Monaghan, per. comm., 29th November, 2006). In other words, there may be adults as well as teens who may end up racking up mobile phone bills and facing economic hardship in the future due to

these services, just as with the regular mobile phone functions or 1-900 numbers for sex chats on landline phones.

However, Ross Monaghan also thinks giving a mobile phone to a child early in life could teach a valuable lesson about money. ...‘So there isn’t so much of a novelty factor...when they eventually get one (of their own)... they are not going to go berserk with it.’ ... ‘Just don’t give them a phone... Sit down with them and explain the costs, the dangers, the reasons why they have the phone’ (AAP. 2006).

Discourses of Parental Control and Changes in Power Relations

In the past when using landline phones at home, its use was a site of conflict and control for parents as gatekeepers (White, 1950) over its use by the teenage children as to who they communicate with, for how long and when. However, with mobiles, teens are able to call any one, any time, anywhere since mobile phone use –especially with texts, can be very private, which they often pay for. Funston & Hughes (2006) found that many children under the age of 18 from separated or divorced families found it useful when contacting or staying in touch with their non-resident parents when the parents are in conflict or they have to worry about the feelings of their resident parent when contacting the other. These teens will also find that they can circumvent the gatekeeping of the landline phone by one parent or the parents’ new partners, when contacting the other, and can do so in private with mobiles. The current divorce rate of Australia is at 48%, similar to other western industrialised countries and 1.1 million children under 18 are estimated to live with just one parent in separated families, with 85% of them living with their mothers. Mobile phones help these children to maintain contact with fathers living too far away or in conflict with the mother (Funston & Hughes, 2006).

The phenomenon of mobile phones eroding parental power fits in with Joshua Meyrowitz (1985), who theorised for television but which could be extended to the internet and the mobile phone. He argued that electronic media have allowed children (as well as women and followers who are less powerful than adults, men and leaders respectively) to access hitherto restricted information. (For example, kids can now access adult information without parental or power holders’ supervision, intervention or knowledge via the media). This is in contrast to the times before the advent of media technologies, when parents decided when to make adult information available to children. Assuming that information (and the ability to communicate) is power, he argues that this situation reduces the power imbalance between children and adults (just as between women and men and leaders and followers) (Meyrowitz, 1985). However, as with any power struggle, this situation is a ‘tug-o-war’ for the parties concerned- in this case, between parents and teens.

The Tug-o-War for Control

One of the issues related to mobile phone use in Australia is its potential use in the surveillance of users. Global Positioning Systems (GPS) installed in mobile phones are promising parents to know the locations of their kids at all times (Handsley, Frost & Biggins, 2004). However, the same authors argue that it provides paedophiles and bullies the location of a child, outweighing its benefits. They also discuss the use of filtering controls for ‘inappropriate’ mobile phone content similar to those used on the Internet. However, the

efficacy of such software is doubtful considering the failure of spam control software used for emails or filters for internet content.

Accordingly John Carr – Chairman of UK’s Children’s Charities Coalition, ‘In the so called ‘child protection’ market, many spying products are being heavily promoted’ (cited in Spiked-debate, 2006). Andrew Funston sees surveillance technologies as unnecessary and a ruse for companies to sell another product (A. Funston, pers. comm., 14th November 2006).

The Teenage Turning Point

Frank Furedi, author of *Paranoid parenting* describes the dilemma faced with mobile phones as ‘young people’s aspirations to independence run counter to parents’ strategies of safety and control’ (cited in Spiked-debate, 2006). Levinson (2004) describes the telephone and the teenager as a ‘technological fable’ where a device long sought after, which once possessed had quite the reverse of the benefits expected (p.85). Even though teens today can own their mobiles and pay for them and be ‘free’ of parental control to use it, they are expected to have the mobile phone ‘switched on’ at all times to be contactable by parents and can no longer ‘walk away’ (from parents). Having the phone switched off or not answering the phone (when they can see who is calling) has now become a point of conflict for parents and teens. In other words, the mobile phone has reversed the trend of new media empowering and emancipating teenagers by extending the ‘sinews of family’ creating a ‘mobile hearth’ (and home) with continuous familial information-sharing making teens more accountable to parents about their whereabouts (p.89). Levinson (2004) sees the mobile phone as ‘an excellent assistant on both sides of the transformational process- the little child before and the adult after- just not the middle, at the point of transformation, the teenage turning point (p. 90).

Discourses of Convergence, Interactivity and Connectivity

Mobile phones are excellent examples of convergence, interactivity and connectivity provided by new communication media that can bind time and space.

Convergence refers to ‘coming together’ of previously separate technologies, industries and functions in the same equipment. **Interactivity** is the ability of customers or end users of mobile phones to choose the timing and location to send or receive messages as well as to create and choose the content they send and receive (XXXX, 2006). The small screen of the mobile phone with a still and video camera has the capacity to send and receive messages combining voice, text and multimedia, emails, faxes; surf the internet, receive audio and video content from service providers such as music, Pay TV, and free-to air TV; use it as an alarm/clock, personal telephone directory, note pad, answering machine, video game console, vote for a reality TV contestants; donate money to a charity (as seen during the Tsunami Appeal after Dec. 2004) or buy items such as soft drinks from a vending machine, using their mobile phone credits / account. In the case of the BlackBerry, the functions of a computer are also included with a Qwerty keyboard and an operating system to run business applications. These indicate examples of convergence and interactivity

This convergence and especially their interactivity make mobile phones different to other contemporary technologies such as TV, Pay TV and the Internet and more problematic or of concern to parents, as the others are more one-way and non-interactive technologies (Levinson, 2004; 88). The mobile phone’s multimedia functions (or convergence) such as

cameras lead to privacy abuse, criminal and anti-social activity with the young more likely to be the victims as well as perpetrators (Funston & Hughes, 2006; p. 78). Due to this convergence and interactivity, Thomas (2006; p. 1) calls mobile phones as every day mobile 'devices' rather than 'phones' and sees them as cultural artefacts, adopted as well as adapted by their users.

Connectivity of the mobile phone has produced interesting effects on both teens and their parents, becoming a double edged sword. It serves as an 'electronic or digital leash' for teens, expected to be contactable by their parents at all times who want to know where they are and if they are safe. At the same time, mobiles have become an 'umbilical cord' linking kids to parents, which parents seem unable to 'cast off', even if they wished to. Recently, a senior professional woman chairing an important meeting excused herself to answer her mobile around mid-day saying 'Sorry, I have to take this call. It is my 13 year-old daughter and this is her umbilical cord'. In other words, a mother or father can not expect to be left alone at work, as their teenage children can now call them anytime to ask for lifts, 'What is for dinner?', or say 'I forgot to take the house key (and can't get in), so can you come home please?' when a parent is working late, restricting their freedom.

'Luke', a father of two sons aged 18 and 20 living at home, summed up his situation as being unable to go out on weekends because he has to be 'on call' in case one of them needed a lift home after an evening out in the town. Luke often drops off his sons and their friends in town for their outings as well. Due to the absence of public transport during late hours and the high cost of taxis to come home in the suburbs from the city centre, the sons need transport as they cannot drive after consuming alcohol even if they have their own vehicles. Luke describes himself as 'working for the fire brigade' waiting to 'run' when the call comes.

Australian teens and youth today labelled 'Echo Boomers', 'Generation Y' or the 'Millennium Generation' (born between 1982 and 1995) (Reikert, 2006; 6) remain home much longer than earlier generations due to going for higher education, thereafter repaying student loans, and the rising cost of home ownership in the last decade limiting their ability to buy or rent their own homes. Some remain home with their doting 'Baby Boomer' parents to save the down payment on a house. So Luke and others like him can expect to live with this 'umbilical cord' intact for a few more years. In other words, the mobile that was supposed to keep children and teens 'freer' and 'safer' when out of the home, had transferred part of that responsibility on to the parents for much longer than before in a contradiction of the mobile phone. At the same time, this is not a surprise as contradictions are the hallmark of the post-modern society we live in today.

Conclusion

The dominant discourses of the mobile phone and its effects on children in Australia appear to be dominated by those serving the interests of middle and upper class parents, lobbyists, telecommunications companies and politicians, who frame the discourses to fit their agendas, viewpoints, ideologies, subjectivity, subject position and interests. Parents appear to be faced with a double edged sword of having the capability to be connected to their teenage and younger children giving them peace of mind about their safety while at the same time, both parents and teenagers find themselves facing a situation of eternal connectivity with each other- whether they wish to be or not.

Future Directions for Research

Just as Goggin (2006), who traced the history of mobile phones in Australia, the author too found that it difficult to locate up-to-date official data and statistics for the technology, partly because they change so rapidly. Scholarly research on mobile phones were also few. The subject of Australian telecommunications, appear to be most often researched in terms of policy (Goggin & Newell, 2000; Langtry, 1998) and mobile phones and relationships (Horstmanshof & Power, 2005; Funston & Hughes, 2006). The author also found that telecommunications companies carry out research on issues of interest to them and organisations such as ACMA were commissioning research that examine media use (Media and society research project initiated, 2006) and other subjects within the frames of reference of their organisations, rather than those of sociological and economic impact to the Australian populace.

The author sees the need to examine the issue of mobile phone bills of teens and related matters as a follow up to Funston & McNeill (1999), to compare the situation between then and now and to carry out a comprehensive content analysis of media coverage of issues related to mobile phones and children in Australia from the critical theory perspective (Crotty, 1998), with respect to their discourses and framing to examine which discourses dominate and whose interests are served in the process.

References

- AAP, (2006). Phone companies target six-year-olds, November 11. Retrieved on 21 st November 2006 from http://www.theage.com.au/news/National/Phone_comapanys_target...
- ABS, (2006). *Population clock*. The Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra. Retrieved on 1 December 2006 from <http://www.abs.gov.au/Ausstats>
- Ace*Comm, (2005). Kids and mobile phones: How service providers need to address parental concerns. *Vendor White Paper, November*, pp. 14.
- ACMA, (2006). *Annual Report 2005-2006*. Australian Communications and Media Authority, Melbourne, VIC.
- ACMASphere, (2006). New scheme to protect premium mobile content service users. *Issue 14* (November), 3-4. Australian Communications and Media Authority, Melbourne, VIC.
- Allison, S. (2004). Australia wins mobile phone race. *Youth Studies Australia, December*. pp. n.a.
- Australian Government to censor 3G mobile content, (2006). *Wikinews, June 15*. Retrieved on 28th July 2006 from http://www.wikinews.org/wiki/Australian_govt_to_censor_3G_mobile_content
- Beniger, J. R. (1986). *The control revolution: Technological and economic origins of information society*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Big Brother Australia, (2006). *Wikipedia*. Retrieved on 4 th December 2006 from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Big_Brother_\(Australia_Series_6\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Big_Brother_(Australia_Series_6)).
- Burns, A. (1981). *The microchip: Appropriate or inappropriate technology?* Ellis Harwood, Chichester.
- Chapman, C. (2006). Regulating a dynamic mobile telecommunications industry: Extract of speech to the Mobile Telecommunications Conference 2006. *ACMASphere, Issue 13*(October), 3-5.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspectives in the research process*. Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
- Croucher, J. S. (2006). Number crunch. *The Age-Good Weekend Magazine, 2 December*, p. 13.
- Dicken-Garcia, H. (1998). The Internet and continuing historical discourse. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 75 (Spring), 19-27.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
- Funston, A. & McNeill, K. (1999). *Mobile matters: Young people and mobile phones*. Communication Law Centre, Melbourne, VIC.
- Funston, A. & Hughes, K. (2006). Use and value of ICTs for separated families. *Telecommunications Journal of Australia*, 56(2), Winter, 76-85.
- Goggin, G. & Newell, C. (2000). Crippling competition: Critical reflections on disability and Australian telecommunications policy, *Media International Australia-incorporating Culture & Policy*, No. 96, 83-93.
- Goggin, G. (2006). Notes on the history of the mobile phone in Australia. *Southern Review: Communication, Politics and Culture*, 38(3), 4-22.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of a prison*. Trans. A Sheridan, Alan Lane, London.
- Handsley, E., Frost, L. & Biggins, B. (2004). *Submissions to the commonwealth Department of Communication, Information Technology and the Arts: Protecting consumers against illegal or offensive content on mobiles*. September, Young Media Australia, Glenlg, SA.
- Hirschheim, R. A. (1985). *Office automation: A social and organizational perspective*. John Wiley, New York.
- Horstmanshof, L. & Power, M. R. (2005). Mobile phones, SMS and relationships. *Australian Journal of Communication*, 32(1), 33-52.
- Kinder, D. R. & Sanders, L. M. (1996). *Divided by color: Racial politics and democratic ideals*. University of Chicago Pres, Chicago, IL.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Langtry, B. (ed.) (1998). *All connected? Universal service in telecommunications*. Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, VIC.
- Levinson, P. (2004). *Cell phone: The story of the world's most mobile medium and how it had transformed everything*. Pelgrave-Macmillan, New York.
- Marvin, C. (1988). *When old technologies were new: Thinking about electric communication in the late 19th century*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda setting function of the mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36, 176-187.
- McLuhan, M. (1969). Interview with Eric Norden: A candid conversation with the high priest of pop cult and metaphysician of media. *Playboy, March*, 53-62, 64-66, 68, 70 72, 74, 148.
- Media and society research project initiated, (2006). *ACMASphere, Issue 14*, November, p. 5.
- Melbourne teenage DVD controversy, (2006). *Wikipedia*. Retrieved on 4th December 2006 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2006_melbourne_teenage_DVD_controversy.

- Meyrowitz, J. (1985). *No sense of place: The impact of electronic media on social behavior*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Miletic, L. (2006). Technological trauma: Cyber bullies more powerful than schoolyard thugs. *The Age*, October 28, p. 6.
- O'Riordan, (2005). Children studied for signs of mobile phone harm. *The Guardian*, November 21. Retrieved on 28th July 2006 from <http://www.mastaction.co.uk>.
- Osbourne, P. (2006). Mobile phone porn jail term planned. *The Australian*, June 14. Retrieved on 28th July 2006 from <http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au>
- Planalp, S. (1998). Current issues arising at the confluence of communication and emotion. *Australian Journal of Communication*, 25(3), 65-79.
- Pressler, M. (2006). Cursives foiled again as writings on the wall. *The Age*, October 14, p. 18.
- Reikert, M. (2006). Tune in, turn off. *The Age-Green Guide*, July 13, p. 10.
- Richardson, T. (2006). Mobile cheats diddle exam system. *The Register*, 27 March. Retrieved on 28th July 2006 from http://www.theregister.co.uk/2006/03/27/mobile_cheats/print.html
- Solomon, W. S. (1992). News frames and media packages: Covering El Salvador. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 9, 54-74.
- Spiked-debate, (2006). Mobile phones and child protection: How far should we go? *Spiked/O2*, April. Retrieved on 28th July 2006 from <http://www.spiked-onlien.com/childprotection>, April.
- Thomas, J. (2006). Editorial: Mobile histories. *Southern Review: Communication, Politics and Culture*, 38(3), 1-3.
- Totally Mobile, (2006). *Stuff Magazine*, Issue 7, Government of Victoria, Consumer Affairs Victoria, Melbourne, VIC.
- White, D. M. (1950). The gatekeeper: A study in the selection of news. *Journalism Quarterly*, 27(4), 383-390.
- Weerakkody, N., (1999). *Media and the construction of public opinion about Affirmative Action, race and related issues: A case study of opinion expressed during the 1992 US Presidential campaign*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, YYYY University, ZZZZ.
- Weerakkody, N., (2006). A 'mobile' technology and the broadband 'horse trade': An examination of webcasting in Australia. *The International Journal of Learning*, 13 (8), 45-60.