"Why Does a Teacher Feel the Need to Post My Kid?": Parents and Teachers Constructing Morally Acceptable Boundaries of Children's Social Media Presence

DAVIDE CINO[1]
University of Milan–Bicocca, Italy

CHIARA DALLEDONNE VANDINI
University of Bologna, Italy

Posting about children on social media is common practice today, with adults acting as agents who make choices about these digital representations. This study focuses on the management of children's online presence as debated in an online parenting forum by thematically analyzing 556 posts from 13 discussion threads about daycare and elementary school teachers sharing pictures of their students online. Findings show how this event is framed as a boundary crossing undermining parents' ability to steward their children's digital footprints. Furthermore, posters stress the risks associated with such photo-sharing behavior, construct moral identities creating the roles of the good or bad parent and teacher in a social media age, and propose solutions to regain control and restore parental agency. These findings suggest that this occurs to affirm the family as a higher-level system when it comes to setting boundaries about children's social media presence.

Keywords: sharenting, children's social media presence, privacy boundaries, digital dilemmas, family-school communication

Sharing information and pictures of children on social media is a common habit for parents in the global North (i.e., sharenting; Blum-Ross & Livingstone, 2017). Controversies associated with this practice have to do with the lack of children's agency in the process, especially when they are too young to give their consent. Parents, though, are not naïve about their children's social media presence. Empirical evidence, in turn, suggests they try to regulate their photo-sharing behavior by avoiding posting embarrassing photos

of their kids, and thinking about the long-term effects of their sharing (Chalklen & Anderson, 2017). Additionally, studies found that many parents also set explicit and implicit rules for relatives and friends on whether and what to share online about the offspring, to define boundaries with people from systems surrounding the child (Ammari, Kumar, Lampe, & Schoenebeck, 2015). Taken together, these studies suggest that parents act as children's personal information gatekeepers (Steinberg, 2017), as they try to govern their social media presence. Such an effort is theoretically aligned with communication privacy management theory (CPM; Petronio, 2002) according to which families tend to erect borders to metaphorically draw a line between interacting systems (e.g., extended family, school) in the form of rules about exterior privacy boundaries, to mark the ownership of personal information. When boundaries are crossed, turbulence may occur because a person's intended level of privacy was not respected. As children get in touch with other people from different systems who may have different photo-sharing preferences compared with the family (Autenrieth, 2018), such a negotiation becomes pivotal to guarantee parents an appropriate level of control. Children's lives, in fact, unfold within interacting systems, with family and the school being among the first ones they have experience with (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Although research has investigated occurrences where parents complain about extended family members sharing about their children online (Ammari et al., 2015), little is known of instances where it is members from other external systems—like teachers—who do the sharing.

Drawing on a broader project on digital dilemmas parents experience concerning boundaries with their children's digital footprints, this study reports on a thematic analysis of a purposive sample of 556 posts from 13 discussion threads about teachers posting pictures of students on their own social media, as discussed by parents and teachers on a parenting forum. Informed by CPM theory (Petronio, 2002), the analysis will emphasize the role of computer mediated communication as a way to construct socially acceptable boundaries of children's social media presence while posters discuss the topic, framing it as a moral matter in a "moral arena." In doing so, it will be highlighted how posters define not only "good parenting" but also "good teaching" in a social media age, framing parents and teachers as appropriate or inappropriate agents when it comes to managing minors' digital footprints.

Literature Review

Managing Children's Digital Footprints Between Interacting Systems

The school and the family represent two of the main systems that children have experience with (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). In the digital age, both systems are represented through websites, blogs, and social networking sites (Näsänen, Oulasvirta, & Lehmuskallio 2009). Thus, the opportunity for children's information and pictures to be shared online can result from either members of the family or the school posting content concerning them in their social media accounts and websites (Kumar, Chetty, Clegg, & Vitak, 2019). All of this is part of and contributes to the everyday datafication of children, which is the normalized and often well-intentioned transformation of their identities, bodies, and practices into online data (Mascheroni, 2018).

When parents govern their children's online presence, privacy stewardship is enacted as the responsibility they take on when making decisions about what is appropriate for them and third parties to

share online about their offspring (Kumar & Schoenebeck, 2015). On the other hand, given the normalization of posting about children (Leaver, 2017), people from external systems could violate such rules, conflicting with parents' privacy orientation. In this regard, the American Board (2016), a nonprofit organization for teachers, states that educators should never post about their students on social media, to avoid violating their privacy and their families' boundaries.

CPM theory (Petronio, 2002) is particularly suited to better frame how individuals make sense of privacy, both offline and online. Three elements are constitutive, according to CPM, with how people make sense of and manage private information: privacy ownership, privacy control, and privacy turbulence. Privacy ownership posits that people believe they own their personal information, for which they can grant or deny access. Granting access means allowing other people to become co-owners of the shared information and expecting them to respect the privacy boundary set. Even while giving a third party access to personal information, the original owner would still feel he or she is the one regulating his or her own privacy. To control that recipients do not cross the boundaries, specific privacy rules are developed and used. Petronio (2002) states that when generating these rules, people evaluate risks and gains associated with disclosing private information. There is evidence that when parents grapple with dilemmas about sharing about their children online, benefits and hazards that may come with their sharing behavior are considered (Chalklen & Anderson, 2017). However, as this assessment still implies parents' agency, turbulences may take place when such agency gets lost because of other actors sharing about their children.

Several studies address collective privacy management online through the lens of CPM, stressing the fuzzy dimension of online privacy as known and unknown users may have access to the posted contents (Child & Starcher, 2016). For example, focusing on distributed responsibilities of collectively held privacy boundaries, Jia and Xu (2016) point out that, when strategies lack for collaboratively managing privacy among all information stakeholders, crossing boundaries on social media is likelier to happen. This occurs when users make privacy decisions that collide with the preferences of co-owners. The authors refer to control agency theory, stressing the distribution of responsibilities and agency from the self to collective control occurring when private information is shared with other people.

Schools' websites and social media pages represent a place where information and pictures about students and families can be shared online (Näsänen et al., 2009), asking for some sort of boundary coordination between parties. In the realm of institutional interactions, privacy policies can be adopted to distribute agency between interacting parts (Xu, Dinev, Smith, & Hart, 2011), like families and schools, giving the former confidence concerning their ability to manage the disclosure of private information. For example, parental consent forms can function as means of boundary coordination teachers can refer to evaluate whether, where and what is appropriate to post about their students (Higgin, 2017). Institutional privacy forms, though, can still be violated, causing turbulences between parties (Xu et al., 2011). Although research has examined how parents manage their children's privacy when relatives post about their offspring online without their consent (Ammari et al, 2015), and some preliminary findings suggest that educators wonder how to manage students' online privacy responsibly (Kumar et al., 2019), little is known about parents' perceptions of and reactions to privacy violations occurring between families and schools.

Framing Children's Online Presence as a Moral (Panic) Matter

Children's online presence has often been understood through the lens of moral panic, framing the Internet as a risky place for youth (Jewkes & Wykes, 2012).

According to Facer (2012), children's online presence is a way for identities for both children, as dependents, and adults, as protectors, to be constructed in a public space, with adults being morally accountable to protect them from online harms, such as "stranger-dangers." Additionally, the discourse on the "cyber-paed" (focusing on strangers who commit cybersex crimes against children) depicts the digital realm as a place where the possibility of child abuse is very likely, ignoring that it mostly occurs offline and within the family (Jewkes & Wykes, 2012).

Having adults as third parties sharing about children online, though, represents a peculiar case. When it is other people who share about children, their online presence becomes passive, calling for the responsibility of the adults who are doing the sharing to manage possible risks and safeguard their privacy.

The narrative about child safety online states that parents should know how to manage possible harms that could potentially affect their offspring (Facer, 2012). Governing children's online presence, then, can be understood as a moral matter, framing the "good parent" as the one who prevents dangerous situations from occurring (Shirani, Henwood, & Coltart, 2012). Because morality can be interactively discussed and constructed (Heritage & Lindstrom, 1998), parenting forums can enhance new ways to morally orient parents, as it has been shown with respect to several topics such as pregnancy, birth, or health choices (Das, 2017; Hookway, Elmer, & Frandsen, 2017). This occurs while paving the way toward the confirmation of moral parenting identities, allowing parents to consume and (de)construct parenting ideals through peer interactions (Geinger, Vandenbroeck, & Roets, 2014).

Parenting Forums as (Moral) Arenas to Address (Digital) Dilemmas

Parents are active users of digital technology and social media in the global North, with mothers being likelier to use parenting forums and social networking sites for information seeking and getting emotional and social support online (Lupton, Pedersen, & Thomas, 2016).

Although parents use many platforms to share about their parenting and children, in this study we focus on parenting forums, which have continued to play an important role for many parents in the global North (Lupton, et al., 2016). Parenting forums, in fact, have been shown to be particularly suited for getting support for dilemmas, challenges, and difficulties of parenthood, while offering parents mediated frameworks of reference to discuss, interpret, and make sense of their experiences (Das, 2017). As such, these spaces allow posters to engage in discussions where their cultural belief systems about parenting and children (i.e., parental ethnotheories, Harkness & Super, 1992) can be dialogically constructed and revised through social interactions with weak ties. In fact, a wide array of topics is discussed online concerning parenting difficulties, upbringing, health, and diet (Dworkin, Connell, & Doty, 2013). However, although close-ties and professionals continue to be seen as better sources of support for nondigital questions about parenting, parents may lack support for

digital dilemmas, with the Web being among the available resources for them to address questions and concerns in relation to digital media (Livingstone, Blum-Ross, Pavlick, & Ólafsson, 2018).

Given the moral dilemmas and controversies associated with creating and managing children's digital footprints (Blum-Ross & Livingstone, 2017), we argue in this study that parenting forums may represent a fertile soil to investigate parents' quandaries about such online-sharing experiences, as naturally reported by them.

The Present Study

The broader ongoing project this study is part of explores digital dilemmas parents experience about their children's social media presence and privacy online (Blum-Ross & Livingstone, 2017). In today's family life, the Web plays an important role to support parents in the global North, especially mothers, via online communities of advice (Lupton, et al., 2016). As asking for advice, "by its very nature, responds to some kind of dilemma" (Blum-Ross & Livingstone, 2016, p. 12), we opted for an exploratory investigation of parents' quandaries associated with children's social media presence, as reported in their own words in a parenting forum.

Several studies have investigated parents' discussions online and the moral nature of the advice they get or exchange (Hookway et al., 2017; Mickelson, 1997). Also, online discussion sites have been shown to generate quality naturally occurring data, with posters' responsiveness having the potential to engender rich interactions (Smith, Bulbul, & Jones, 2017). Given the exploratory nature of this study, this approach was considered appropriate, as it allowed us to investigate quandaries that parents themselves deemed discussion worthy.

With respect to parents' photo-sharing behavior, scholars have discussed appropriate ways of sharing and the underlying considerations about risks and privacy rights (Steinberg, 2017). However, the ways in which such appropriateness can be discussed and constructed by parents themselves has not been thoroughly investigated.

The broader project here researches how the moral "good" practices of managing children's online privacy are socially constructed and questioned in online peer interactions, looking at how parents orient themselves in the digital age, discussing digital dilemmas in these moral arenas. This study focuses on privacy turbulence experienced by parents when a member external to the family, but very present in a child's life—such as a teacher—crosses the metaphorical boundaries of expected online behaviors.

The present investigation has been conducted in the United States' section of the BabyCenter Community website, a parenting forum deemed to be one of the most popular parenting online resources (Lupton et al., 2016). According to the website information page, it is "the world's partner in parenting," reaching more than 50 million parents all over the world and having 7 in 10 new and expectant mothers using it monthly in the United States (BabyCenter, n.d.). Allowing parents to post online threads to be discussed with peers through comments, and for visitors to read postings without participating or being members, these discussions are made available for everybody to read, functioning as potential resources parents can rely on when grappling with some dilemmas. A content analysis of the website (Jang & Dworkin,

2012) found that the vast majority of posters are mothers, most of whom are between 20–30 years of age, and that discussions revolve around three main areas: pregnancy and labor, concerns related to the baby, and issues concerning parenting challenges.

Data Collection

Data for the broader project this study is part of were collected from the BabyCenter Community forum, a public area of the website. Being our focus on parents discussing posting about children on social media, the forum was searched for occurrences of threads dealing with this topic through keyword search terms. Using the website's search engine, a sequentially top-down data collection approach was employed (Eriksson & Salzmann-Erikson, 2013), screening the first 150 pages of results. This parameter was chosen to confine the main corpus of threads to a manageable number, informed by previous studies on parenting forums (Pedersen & Lupton, 2018).

All the discussions were filtered to select those pertaining to the study's focus, with the inclusion criteria being that they had to deal with sharing about children on social media. This led to a sample of threads concerning either parents' own sharing behavior (i.e., questioning their own photo-sharing habits) or other people sharing about children on social media (e.g., grandparents, relatives, friends, teachers). This study focuses on the latter, through a thematic analysis of a purposive sample of 556 posts from 13 threads concerning cases of teachers sharing photos of their students on social media.

These posts were authored by 300 posters who, looking at cues like usernames or the pronouns in the comments, appear to be mostly women. The number of posts per thread ranged from 4 to 151 ($M = 42.769$, $SD = 42.29$). Number of posters per thread ranged from 3 to 58 ($M = 23.076$, $SD = 16.21$), although the number of posts per posters ranged from 1 to 19 ($M = 1.853$; $SD = 2.52$). The whole sample of discussions was 55.121 words in length, with the word count per thread ranging from 487 to 18974 words ($M = 4240.076$, $SD = 5177.58$).

In analyzing this data set, we were guided by the following research questions:

RQ1:   *In what terms do posters discuss instances of teachers sharing about children on social media?*

RQ2:   *How, if at all, are the figures of the parent and the teacher framed in relation to children's digital footprints?*

RQ3:   *What solutions to these turbulences, if at all, are discursively proposed and co-constructed?*

Data Analysis

We analyzed the data following an inductive coding approach to look for common themes among threads and posts (Boyatzis, 1998). The unit of analysis was every single post within a thread. First, the two authors read through threads independently and extensively, employing initial coding to break down "qualitative data into discrete parts, closely examining them, and comparing them for similarities and difference" (Saldaña,

2009, p. 81). Each author prepared an initial list of codes, which was jointly revised by comparing coding of the same posts to look for similarities and to resolve disagreements (Campbell, Quincy, Osserman, & Pedersen, 2013). Pattern coding followed as a second cycle method to organize the corpus of initial codes into a few categories (Saldaña, 2009). Inductive codes and concepts were further developed with respect to existing theoretical frameworks and empirical studies, in line with CPM's tenets of privacy turbulence and solutions to restore agency (Petronio, 2002). This led to the development of a codebook containing definitions, examples, and instructions.

Informed by perspectivism (Cornish, Gillespie, & Zittoun, 2013), we tried to bring a diversity of perspectives to the study by including two external coders in the analysis, to discuss our interpretative biases. The coders tested the codebook by independently coding the corpus of data and writing analytic memos. The team met regularly throughout the coding process, and the codebook was iteratively discussed and adjusted to resolve disagreements. The authors then completed a third confirmatory pass to revise all the threads, adjusting the coding scheme as needed. Finally, we thematized our findings and grouped them to address our research questions.

For our analysis, we did not calculate statistical intercoder agreement, for its requirement to apply mutually exclusive codes (Cohen, 1960). As Campbell and colleagues (2013) claim, qualitative data may present unique challenges in this regard. Our analysis focused on rich, complex, and evolving interactional data, allowing posters to engage in collective meaning-making, which did not follow linear paths. As such, where appropriate, we employed simultaneous coding when data suggested "multiple meanings that necessitate and justify more than one code" (Saldaña, 2009, p.62).

Working with two more coders as "auditors," though, led us to critically rethink some latent interpretative certainties by building on rich discussions that asked us to closely return to the data and engage in a process that fostered accountability and facilitated "systematicity, clarity and transparency" of the data analysis process (Cornish et al., 2013, p. 3).

Ethical Considerations

Collecting data online arises ethical questions. Many authors who conducted similar studies did not seek consent when data were publicly available, not protected by password and forum registration, and posters used usernames (Roberts, 2015). Because the debate is open and no agreement has been established, the Association of Internet Researchers invites scholars to make decisions on a case-by-case basis and not along binary lines (Markham & Buchanan, 2012). We extensively looked at the published research that focused on the same or similar forums to further orient us. While studying the BabyCenter forum, Jang & Dworkin (2012) did not seek consent. Neither did Milne and associates (2017) as "researchers did not participate in forums or interact with members, the results did not identify individuals, and the forums are in the public domain" (p. 268). Following the same principle, Das (2017), Hine (2014), Pedersen and Lupton (2018), and Whiteman (2012) did not seek posters' consent, among many others. Consistently, we did not interact with posters, but only focused on already existing discussions without soliciting any information. All the discussion threads we focused on were publicly accessible (i.e., with no need of registration or password or authorization), asynchronous, and archived, which—as other researchers indicated—made contacting the posters almost

unfeasible (Whiteman, 2012). Even though all the posters used usernames to conceal their real identities, these were not included in the study. As an additional step to ensure anonymity, following Smedley and Coulson (2018), we checked all the reported quotes using the Google search engine to make sure they could not be traced.

Findings

The discussions analyzed revolved around the participation of parents and teachers. A common trend we found across themes was that, in commenting on children's presence on teachers' social media, posters followed a problematization and deproblematization argumentation revolving around the concept of "online risk." This is theoretically in line with Lee and colleagues' (2014) understanding of problematization as a neoliberal social construct that emphasizes risk as a constant speculative threat for the youth and the need for caring adults to protect children from these threats everywhere, at any time. Not only do our findings align with this framework, but they also shed light on how some of the actors in conversation (i.e., parents and teachers) deproblematize—that is, question and resist—this discourse.

Findings for RQ1

RQ1 asked in what terms posters discussed instances of teachers sharing about children online. This section reports on posters' debating on the fuzzy online boundaries between the family and the school, because of a lack of well-understood frameworks on the matter.

The Fuzzy Nature of Online Boundaries Between Interacting Systems

All the threads were opened by parents who followed a problematization argumentation, reporting either firsthand (i.e., happened to themselves) or secondhand experiences (i.e., happened to other people) concerning daycare or elementary school teachers sharing class or group photos of their students via their own— noninstitutional—social media (personal Snapchat accounts, Instagram, Twitter, or Facebook pages).

Parents framed these occurrences as a boundary crossing, asking their peers how they would interpret the situation and what they would do. On a general level, the boundary violation was mostly associated with the idea that parents could not control the context where these pictures were shared (i.e., context collapse, Marwick & boyd, 2011), especially with respect to the people who could access the photos and gain information about children. In this regard, a poster stressed that "it's well proven that there is no way to guarantee or completely remove anything from the internet," referring to the persistence of what is published online. Hence, the fact that someone external to the family could violate parents' intended privacy level was framed as the reason why a turbulence occurred (see Petronio, 2002). Specifically, such turbulence was understood in relation to the violation of the "media release" by teachers, or a consent form that serves as an institutional privacy policy (Xu et al., 2011). This document is aimed at distributing agency between the family and the school systems concerning children's online presence, allowing or denying the school to post information about students on the Internet. Although this instrument was perceived as useful by parents, as it distributed responsibilities between parties, it could still be violated or misunderstood because of its often being not very clear and "poorly worded."

A recurring idea, indeed, was that the teachers who were sharing students' photos on their personal (i.e., noninstitutional) accounts were either intentionally violating the media release or at least misinterpreting it. This extract by a parent exemplifies that:

> My main problem with this is that parents most likely believe they are giving the school permission, not the teachers so they can use pictures of their kids however they want. My kid has no place on a teacher's social media.

A dichotomy emerged that we identified as Teacher≠School. Heated debates occurred between those who intended the media release to cover the sharing of students' photos and information on official channels (like the school's website) and those claiming that it also includes teachers' personal social media accounts. Such a different interpretation led to different evaluations of whether the privacy boundaries were violated. It also suggests a multidistribution of agency between the subjects and the object (Caronia, 2011). On the one hand is the media release that, once in the world out there, continues to have its own agency as fixed by what it states; on the other, however, are parents and teachers, whose subjective agency can overcome what the policy states because of an interpretative act. So, although some will judge that "those photos 'belong' to the daycare" or the school, others will understand the consent they are giving to the school as also including the teachers, stressing that even if public, a social media page of a single teacher might even be "more restricted" than the school webpage. Some teachers took part in the conversation, sustaining this deproblematization argument, positioning themselves in a Teacher=School parallelism, as the example below illustrates:

> Just chiming in to say I'm a teacher at a public school. Our district has an opt-out policy. When you enroll the children there's fine print that says they can use the child's image in publications. This includes district and school Facebook pages, teachers' blogs, apps which send pictures to all parents in the school, etc. I don't think a lot of parents realize this,—but it is completely legal!

Questioning the right of posting pictures of one's students on personal social media led several posters to put the matter into perspective, thinking whether that would result, in general, into a loss of one's right to post what they want. This extract illustrates that:

> Whose rights trump whose? Does your choice to not share photos of your child on social media trump my choice to take/share pictures? [. . .] I believe the only time you have a right to privacy is on your own property where there is a reasonable expectation of privacy.

Framing the discussion in terms of the right to and the reasonable expectation of privacy, those posters who followed a deproblematization line of argument gave examples of situations where children and people in general could be unintentionally caught in photos that would eventually end up online, such as when pictures are taken at the park, at a party, or at a public event. Given that such occasions are very common, they argue, worrying about a child's social media presence is not only framed as "ridiculous" because "you can't shield your child from the over-sharing world we have become," but also as limiting one's own right to post. These positions were often accompanied by comments aimed at challenging the perspective of those who, in turn, problematize pictures online. This extract from a parent exemplifies that:

> I went to my children's Halloween Costume Parade at school yesterday and I took pictures, lots of pictures. The focus was my child/children, but other people's kids still appeared in the background and guess what? I posted them on social media-multiple platforms too!

Findings for RQ2

RQ2 investigated whether and how, in discussing children's digital footprints, posters framed the moral identities of the parent and the teacher as agents of children's privacy. This section reports on the dialectic between being a good or bad parent or teacher in the digital age.

Constructing (and Questioning) the "Good Digital-Parent"

The greatest risk posed by the Internet was at the core of many posters' statements, who highlighted that "this world is not a safe place." This position was supported by several parents who took part in the conversations as if they were to experience such a boundary violation, eliciting strong emotional reactions. As a parent put it:

> Dude, I am getting SOOOOO ANGRY thinking about this. [. . .] I realize that I can't prevent a random stranger from taking a photo of my daughter when we're in public, but I'll still do everything in my control to limit the photos of her out in the greater sphere.

This position is in line with the neoliberal idea of the "good parent" and her or his expected awareness to identify and prevent risks for her or his child (Hays, 1998). Indeed, stressing the hazards of this online exposure, the topic of the stranger-danger was recurrent and, as the abovementioned example shows, the online environment, as a "greater sphere," was perceived as riskier for children's safety from cyber-paeds. Following a common moral panic discourse, labeling the stranger-danger as "sicko" and "pervert" (Jewkes & Wykes, 2012), some parents stressed this aspect, as "out of 1k people there is no doubt there's a *creeper* in there somewhere," and, as another one states, "any *weirdo* can access a picture of my kid and where she goes to school" (emphasis added).

Discursively, posters who problematized looked at children's online presence in teachers' social media through the lens of what Lee and associates (2014) call "*the 'what ifs' of everyday life*" (p. 11, emphasis added): a daily framework of reference reinforcing the idea that children are "de facto 'at risk'" (p.11), referring more to the possibility than the actual probability of harm. Within this framework, the good and morally responsible parent is concerned about possible threats, for example: "What about the idea that someone she knows could be a creep and know that the kids she is posting are in her class?"

In turn, those following a deproblematization approach questioned the rationale behind the "what if" framework and—indirectly—the good parent ideology, stressing that what exactly "risk" means is uncertain. The following extract illustrates this:

> I think it's ridiculous to think that someone is going to target your child because another
> parent or teacher posted a photo that he is in. But ANYONE can see it 😱 ANYONE can see
> him get on the bus, or walk into school, or play at the park, or or or . . .

While dismissing the general worries as irrelevant, also strategically employing emoticons to convey her tone (see Filik et al., 2016) this poster equates offline and online arenas as holding the same level of risks.

Finally, those taking a middle-stance position in the problematization and deproblematization continuum presented some cautionary ways to control risks without totally condemning the act, as this poster highlights: "As long as a photo release is signed and the pics are appropriate it's ok" (e.g., did not display personal information or children without clothes on).

The level of appropriateness, however, can be highly subjective, calling for a decision on the part of who shares—such as the teacher—which can be evaluated as morally acceptable or not.

Bad Teacher, Good Teacher: Social Roles and Moral Identities

The decision about sharing contents as a teacher that could potentially identify a child and his or her own information (e.g., name or school location), was framed as a moral one. This adds to the literature on the "good teacher" (Moore, 2004) the construction of the moral identity of the "good" and the "bad" teacher in a social media age. Indeed, the risk of a teacher crossing boundaries was felt as so relevant by posters that it led them to define such behavior as "weird" and "creepy." As this parent exemplifies: "I think it's kind of weird and creepy. Why does a teacher feel the need to post my kid? Yeah, he's cute and everything, but how about you work on teaching and not on capturing social media likes." These and similar statements framed the "bad teacher" in a social media age as the one who cares more about posting on social media to get validation and with a lack of morality to the point where he or she can put students at risk and violate their privacy. Several educators took part in the conversations, stressing their roles of "good teachers" as a way to distance themselves from the inappropriate moral behavior of their colleagues, who were deemed to be "setting a bad example for internet privacy and respect." As another educator put it, "it's our job as caregivers to put our children's needs ahead of the constant need to document every moment via a snapshot."

Some teachers evaluated the fact in generational terms, assuming that, given the normalization of online sharing for millennials (Fulton & Kibby, 2017) new teachers were likelier to violate boundaries of morally appropriate behavior, as in the next excerpt:

> I think this is more common with younger teachers who've grown up just posting everything
> on FB [. . .]. I got my teaching degree when FB was still new and I was told not to post
> students' pics. I wouldn't have anyway, but I'm sure as younger and younger generations
> enter the workforce and teaching profession this will be an issue that society and schools will
> have to decide where the line is.

Others, though, stressed that taking pictures of students is nothing new. For example, though not dismissing parents' worries, this teacher remembered a "nondigital" sharing experience that happened to her when social media were not popular yet:

> I remember taking pictures of my class with a camera, getting them developed and even showing everyone "*My*" kids. I was super proud of the activity we did together. So, I technically did the old version, it just wasn't on the Internet (emphasis added).

By stressing the affective reasons behind her photo-sharing behavior (i.e., being proud of her kids), this poster normalized the desire for teachers, as caregivers, to record and show moments with their students. Social media sharing, in this sense, was framed as an extension of that.

At the same time, several teachers recognized that when sharing class photos, the very nature of online photo-sharing comes with the risk of violating at least someone's privacy expectation, leading them not to share at all: "I ended up avoiding even taking pictures of my students, as there's no way of knowing which of the 200+ kids I teach has the correct permissions without checking with the office."

While teachers debated extensively on the nature of the media release as allowing them to share pics of their students even outside of official canals, many educators stressed that in order for them to be "good teachers" they needed "common sense" in regulating their photo-sharing behavior, even in the absence of clear written rules about boundaries between systems. As in the words of this educator:

> I'm a teacher and it is definitely a no-no to post students' pictures on social media, especially on your private page. Whether it is a written rule or not, it is a privacy issue, and you have to be careful with what you post.

Failing to respect these boundaries was seen, in turn, as typical of a bad, "irresponsible" colleague who is "asking for trouble." In this case, punitive actions were deemed necessary to reestablish agency and, according to some, make the teacher "suffer the consequences of her impulsive lack of common sense."

Findings for RQ3

RQ3 asked what solutions to these turbulences were discursively proposed and co-constructed, as reported in this section.

Solutions and Courses of Action

As a way for parents to restore agency and affirm the superiority of the family system over the teacher, several solutions—ranging from radical to dialogic ones—were proposed by both parents and educators. Most of them concerned getting back control (Petronio, 2002) via legal and disciplinary actions. Talking about a teacher who posted photos of her students on her own social media, a poster advised to "report her ass." These kinds of solutions were very common among those posters who took a problematization stand, while also offering supporting legal documents to further frame the teacher's

behavior as illegal. One of the posters, for example, mentioned the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (see U.S. Department of Education, n.d.), an American Federal law protecting students' privacy of their educational records, inviting other parents to investigate whether students' photos could fit into this frame. Not only did these solutions serve the purpose of reinforcing the good parent identity as the one who gets back control after a boundary crossing, but they also constructed the appropriate child's online presence as the one managed by parents (Ammari et al., 2015). These solutions were supported by several teachers themselves, who reported how, in their own institutions, sharing about students was a "fireable offense," inviting parents to take action: "At my school she would be fired. No pictures, for any reason."

In turn, those posters who positioned themselves on the other end of the spectrum highlighted that, before facing consequences, teachers should be made aware of a violation by opening a conversation with them. Trying to soften the solutions proposed by her colleagues, this teacher stated:

> She could get in trouble if you report it. And sure, she shouldn't do that at all, but what about the rude, uncaring educators that don't even like your kids? Those teachers aren't taking pics or even care to get to know your children.

Finally, a poster further referred to a climate of misalignment and mistrust between parents and teachers, claiming that "asking for a teacher to be punished or fired for something like this is asinine, and parents treating teachers like outsiders is the reason we have so many shitty teachers around."

Discussion

This study tackles an understudied area in research on the parental governance of children's digital footprints: parents dealing with people from systems external to the nuclear family—such as teachers—who share about the offspring on social media. In doing so, it offers new theoretical nuances that can help frame this topic while suggesting practical implications informed by its findings, as will be highlighted below.

Theoretically speaking, the contribution of this work is twofold.

First, the article adds to the corpus of empirical works on parenting forums by exploring their function as moral arenas to address digital dilemmas, through the potential activation of hermeneutic circles (Gadamer, 1975). In terms of communication processes, our findings suggest how the acceptable child's online presence can be constructed through interpersonal online communication that can orient parents grappling with digital dilemmas while setting moral standards that create the moral identities of adults as good and bad agents to manage children's online presence. The construction and deconstruction of the good or bad parent and teacher in a social media age is an example of that. Although sharing about children on social media is a normalized practice (Leaver, 2017), digital dilemmas stemming from this practice are brand new. As such, communicating online can serve to frame them and evaluate courses of action to take. These exchanges, in turn, can offer actors-in-conversation frameworks of reference to use to make sense of these dilemmas, and researchers an interesting window to explore posters' collective meaning-making. At the same time, as our findings suggest, these discussions can be inflammatory and even lead to extreme opinions and exasperated views, which are not necessarily informative of how a broader population of

parents and teachers would think about this topic. While communicating, in fact, posters positioned themselves in a problematization or deproblematization continuum where several ideas and opinions were shared, aimed at defining a "reality" out there that was either too fixed (e.g., posting online is always risky), extremely open to every interpretation (e.g., worrying about online risks is pointless), or, in turn, a mild point in between. When considering those at the two ends of the continuum, both the arguments were characterized by essentialist views of parenting and teaching, childhood, and the Web. As such, the discursive products of this communicative process need to be understood and contextualized within these exchanges.

Second, looking at the content of these conversations through the lens of CPM theory, our findings show how privacy turbulence may occur between systems in interaction (i.e., the family and the school) when it comes to managing children's social media presence. In doing so, moral panics concerning risks for children online were highlighted. Interestingly, most of the posts analyzed were primarily concerned with adults' and not children's agency: how children would feel and what they would want about their online privacy. However, although including them in the broader conversation about their social media presence would more equally distribute control rights between parties, asking for their opinions might not always be feasible if they are too young to give their consent, leaving adults the responsibility of the choice. This ambivalence can be problematic for at least two reasons. First, when parents share about their children online, and they are too young to consent, a first-level loss of agency occurs, concerning the subject about whose photo or information is shared. Second, because parents govern their children's online presence (Ammari et al., 2015), a second-level loss of agency takes place when other people (e.g., teachers) share about the child without his or her consent. We contend this occurrence is illustrative of a *double loss of agency*, where neither the child, nor his or her first personal information gatekeeper (Steinberg, 2017) have full control of the process. This is relevant in explaining posters' tendency to affirm the family as a higher-level system in setting boundaries of children's online presence, because if parents don't know who teachers are sharing with, they cannot control the breadth and depth of their children's online exposure.

In terms of practical implications, our findings can inform educators and school principals, inviting them to open a clear conversation with families concerning representing students on websites and social media and marking boundaries between institutional and teachers' personal accounts. Even though some preliminary findings seem to suggest that educators understand the need to manage students' data responsibly when it comes to sharing about them online (Kumar et al., 2019), in our study, several posters stressed how the media release was too open to interpretation, suggesting that schools may consider better ways to refine this document so that clear rules between interacting systems can be defined and turbulence avoided. Although parents' worries need to be listened to and considered, a more measured stand in terms of solutions to take against teachers who may violate their online boundaries could be beneficial to resolve conflicts and engage in privacy recalibration. Research informed by CPM stresses the relative nature of privacy expectations, inviting interacting parts to state unambiguous rules instead of relying on a dimension of common sense (Steuber & McLaren, 2015). Clearly defined boundaries between interacting systems, in this sense, could help fostering systemic differentiation, preventing turbulences, and providing common frameworks to better orient families and schools in the digital age.

Observing these online interactions allowed us to take a close look at a collective, contextual, and situated construction of these frameworks. Such an approach was in line with our aim of exploring dilemmas parents themselves felt the desire to discuss. We were, in fact, more concerned with particularity rather than generalizability of findings (Creswell, 2014).

However, limitations of this work need to be addressed. First, as it is the case when working with natural data, we were not able to collect posters' demographics and background information, apart from those already present. Although we were more concerned with the discursive processes associated with these discussions, this kind of information would have been useful to better contextualize our findings. Also, because we focused on the United States' section of BabyCenter, this data set is more likely to reflect U.S. perspectives and experiences, which should not be generalized to other cultures and geographical areas. According to CPM, in fact, culture represents a core criterion to account for when interpreting experiences of boundary crossing (Petronio, 2002).

The boundary violations reported here may be more extensively investigated by seeking to triangulate and contextualize these findings with self-report methods. Qualitative studies could help explore more thoroughly how parents, teachers, and, if possible, even children feel about and deal with similar experiences, using interviews or focus groups. Quantitative analysis, in turn, could provide an estimate of the breadth of this phenomenon and build on existing measures (see Child, Pearson, & Petronio, 2009) to investigate relationships between parents' personal privacy orientations for their children's social media presence and conflict eruptions occurring when adults from other systems (like teachers) share about them online. As contextual cues may suggest, most of these posters could have been women; gender differences in terms of children's privacy expectations and solutions to restore agency should be considered. Additionally, broader motivations and goals behind teachers' photo-sharing behavior should also be investigated. Although our findings suggest these may have to do with affective reasons, not much was available in terms of their own goals, if not what was presumed by posters in conversation.

We contend that enhancing mutual understanding between parties in terms of photo-sharing motivations and privacy expectations can be a way to respect privacy boundaries and foster systemic comprehension within the family-educational milieu, which, in turn, can prevent boundary crossing and turbulence between systems.

References

American Board. (2016, March 29). 10 social media rules for teachers. [Blog post]. Retrieved from https://www.americanboard.org/blog/10-social-media-rules-for-teachers/

Ammari, T., Kumar, P., Lampe, C., & Schoenebeck, S. (2015). Managing children's online identities. In J. Boy, F. Detienne, & J. D. Fekete (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (1895–1904). New York, NY: Association for Computing Machinery Press. doi.org/10.1145/2702123.2702325

Autenrieth, U. (2018). Family photography in a networked age. Anti-sharenting as a reaction to risk assessment and behaviour adaption. In G. Mascheroni, C. Ponte, & A. Jorge (Eds.), *Digital parenting. The challenges for families in the digital age* (pp. 219–231). Gothenburg, Sweden: Nordicom, The Clearinghouse Yearbook.

BabyCenter. (n.d.). About BabyCenter. Retrieved from https://www.babycenter.com/about

Blum-Ross, A., & Livingstone, S. (2016). *Families and screen time: Current advice and emerging research. Media policy brief 17*. London, UK: London School of Economics and Political Science.

Blum-Ross, A., & Livingstone, S. (2017). Sharenting: Parent blogging and the boundaries of the digital self. *Popular Communication*, *15*(2), 110–125. doi.org/10.1080/15405702.2016.1223300

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Campbell, J. L., Quincy, C., Osserman, J., & Pedersen, O. K. (2013). Coding in-depth semistructured interviews: Problems of unitization and intercoder reliability and agreement. *Sociological Methods and Research*, *42*(3), 294–320. doi.org/10.1177/0049124113500475

Caronia, L. (2011). *Fenomenologia dell'educazione. Intenzionalità, cultura e conoscenza in pedagogia* [Phenomenology of education. Intentionality, culture and knowledge]. Milano, Italy: Franco Angeli.

Chalklen, C., & Anderson, H. (2017). Mothering on Facebook: Exploring the privacy/openness paradox. *Social Media + Society*, *3*(2), 1–10. doi.org/10.1177%2F2056305117707187

Child, J. T., Pearson, J. C., & Petronio, S. (2009). Blogging, communication, and privacy management: Development of the blogging privacy management measure. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, *60*(10), 2079–2094. doi.org/10.1002/asi.21122

Child, J. T., & Starcher, S. C. (2016). Fuzzy Facebook privacy boundaries: Exploring mediated lurking, vague-booking, and Facebook privacy management. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *54*, 483–490. doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.08.035

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20*(1), 37–46. doi.org/10.1177%2F001316446002000104

Cornish, F., Gillespie, A., & Zittoun, T. (2013). Collaborative analysis of qualitative data. In U. Flick (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 79–93). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Das, R. (2017). Speaking about birth: Visible and silenced narratives in online discussions of childbirth. *Social Media + Society*, *3*(4), 1–11. doi.org/10.1177/2056305117735753

Dworkin, J., Connell, J., & Doty, J. (2013). A literature review of parents' online behavior. *Cyberpsychology*, *7*(2), 1–17. doi.org/10.5817/CP2013-2-2

Eriksson, H., & Salzmann-Erikson, M. (2013). Supporting a caring fatherhood in cyberspace—an analysis of communication about caring within an online forum for fathers. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Science*, *27*(1), 63–69. doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6712.2012.01001.x

Facer, K. (2012). After the moral panic? Reframing the debate about child safety online. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *33*(3), 397–413. doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2012.681899

Filik, R., Ţurcan, A., Thompson, D., Harvey, N., Davies, H., & Turner, A. (2016). Sarcasm and emoticons: Comprehension and emotional impact. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *69*(11), 2130–2146. doi/10.1080/17470218.2015.1106566

Fulton, J. M., & Kibby, M. D. (2017). Millennials and the normalization of surveillance on Facebook. *Continuum*, *31*(2), 189–199. doi.org/10.1080/10304312.2016.1265094

Gadamer, H. (1975). Hermeneutics and social science. *Philosophy Social Criticism*, *2*(4), 307–316. doi.org/10.1177/019145377500200402

Geinger, F., Vandenbroeck, M., & Roets, G. (2014). Parenting as a performance: Parents as consumers and (de)constructors of mythic parenting and childhood ideals. *Childhood*, *21*(4), 488–501. doi.org/10.1177/0907568213496657

Harkness, S., & Super, C. M. (1992). Parental ethnotheories in action. In I. E. Sigel, A. V. McGillicuddy-DeLisi, & J. J. Goodnow (Eds.), *Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children* (pp. 373–391). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hays, S. (1998). *The cultural contradictions of motherhood*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Heritage, J., & Lindstrom, A. (1998). Motherhood, medicine, and morality: Scenes from a medical encounter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *31*(3–4), 397–438. doi.org/10.1080/08351813.1998.9683598

Higgin, T. (2017, March 28). Protecting student privacy on social media: Do's and don'ts for teachers. [Blog post]. Retrieved from https://www.commonsense.org/education/blog/protecting-student-privacy-on-social-media-dos-and-donts-for-teachers

Hine, C. (2014). Head lice eradication as everyday engagement with science: An analysis of online parenting discussions. *Public Understanding of Science*, *23*(5), 574–591. doi.org/10.1177/0963662512453419

Hookway, N., Elmer, S., & Frandsen, M. (2017). Risk, morality and emotion: Social media responses to pregnant women who smoke. *Health, Risk & Society*, *19*(5–6), 246–259. doi.org/10.1080/13698575.2017.1385731

Jang, J., & Dworkin, J. (2012). Babycenter.com: New parent behavior in an online community. *The Forum for Family and Consumer Issues*, *17*(2), 1–14.

Jewkes, Y., & Wykes, M. (2012). Reconstructing the sexual abuse of children: "Cyber-paeds," panic and power. *Sexualities*, *15*(8), 934–952. doi.org/10.1177%2F1363460712459314

Jia, H., & Xu, H. (2016). Measuring individuals' concerns over collective privacy on social networking sites. *Cyberpsychology*, *10*(1). doi.org/10.5817/CP2016-1-4

Kumar, P., & Schoenebeck, S. (2015). The modern day baby book: Enacting good mothering and stewarding privacy on Facebook. In D. Cosley, A. Forte, L. Ciolfi, & D. McDonald (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing* (pp. 1302–1312). New York, NY: Association for Computing Machinery Press. doi.org/10.1145/2675133.2675149

Kumar, P. C., Chetty, M., Clegg, T. L., & Vitak, J. (2019). Privacy and security considerations for digital technology use in elementary schools. In S. Brewster, G. Fizpatrick, A. Cox, V. & Kostakos (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems—CHI '19* (pp. 1–13). New York, NY: Association for Computing Machinery Press. doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300537

Leaver, T. (2017). Intimate surveillance: Normalizing parental monitoring and mediation of infants online. *Social Media + Society*, *3*(2), 1–10. doi.org/10.1177/2056305117707192

Lee, E., Bristow, J., Faircloth, C., & Macvarish, J. (2014). *Parenting culture studies*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Livingstone, S., Blum-Ross, A., Pavlick, J., & Ólafsson, K. (2018). *In the digital home, how do parents support their children and who supports them? Parenting for a digital future: Survey report 1*. London, UK: Report of the LSE Department of Media and Communications.

Lupton, D., Pedersen, S., & Thomas, G. M. (2016). Parenting and digital media: From the early Web to contemporary digital society. *Sociology Compass*, *10*(8), 730–743. doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12398

Markham, A., & Buchanan, E. (2012). *Ethical decision-making and Internet research (version 2.0): Recommendations from the AoIR ethics working committee*. Retrieved from: http://www.aoir.org/reports/ethics2.pdf

Marwick, A. E., & boyd, d. (2011). I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience. *New Media and Society, 13*(1), 114–133. doi/10.1177/1461444810365313

Mascheroni, G. (2018). Researching datafied children as data citizens. *Journal of Children and Media*, *12*(4), 517–523. doi.org/10.1080/17482798.2018.1521677

Mickelson, K. D. (1997). Seeking social support: Parents in electronic support groups. In S. Kiesler (Ed.), *Culture of the Internet* (pp. 157–178). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Milne, A., Weijs, C. A., Haines-Saah, R. J., & McLaren, L. (2017). Parents' online discussions about children's dental caries: A critical content analysis. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, *108*(3), 265–272. doi.org/10.17269/CJPH.108.5944

Moore, A. (2004). *The good teacher: Dominant discourses in teacher education*. London, UK: Routledge.

Näsänen, J., Oulasvirta, A., & Lehmuskallio, A. (2009). Mobile media in the social fabric of a kindergarten. In D. R. Olsen, & R. B. Arthur (Eds.), *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 2167–2176). New York, NY: Association for Computing Machinery Press. doi.org/10.1145/1518701.1519031

Pedersen, S., & Lupton, D. (2018). "What are you feeling right now?" Communities of maternal feeling on Mumsnet. *Emotion, Space and Society*, *26*, 57–63. doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2016.05.001

Petronio, S. (2002). *Boundaries of privacy: Dialectics of disclosure*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Roberts, L. D. (2015). Ethical issues in conducting qualitative research in online communities. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *12*(3), 314–325. doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2015.1008909

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Shirani, F., Henwood, K., & Coltart, C. (2012). Meeting the challenges of intensive parenting culture: Gender, risk management and the moral parent. *Sociology*, *46*(1), 25–40. doi.org/10.1177%2F0038038511416169

Smedley, R. M., & Coulson, N. S. (2018). A practical guide to analysing online support forums. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 1–28. Advance online publication. doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2018.1475532

Smith, H., Bulbul, A., & Jones, C. J. (2017). Can online discussion sites generate quality data for research purposes? *Frontiers in Public Health*, *5*(156). doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2017.00156

Steinberg, S. (2017). Sharenting: Children's privacy in the age of social media. *Emory Law Journal*, *66*(4), 839–884.

Steuber, K. R., & McLaren, R. M. (2015). Privacy recalibration in personal relationships: Rule usage before and after an incident of privacy turbulence. *Communication Quarterly*, *63*(3), 345–364. doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2015.1039717

U.S. Department of Education (n.d.). Family educational rights and privacy act (FERPA). Retrieved from: https://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html

Whiteman, N. (2012). *Undoing ethics: Rethinking practice in online research*. Boston, MA: Springer.

Xu, H., Dinev, T., Smith, J., & Hart, P. (2011). Information privacy concerns: Linking individual perceptions with institutional privacy assurances. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, *12*(12), 798–824. doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00281