

Staff training activity

Activity instruction sheet

This activity may be used by a DSP to explore the issues of nudes and semi-nudes with staff. It is designed to illustrate a range of scenarios and highlight that an appropriate and proportionate response needs to be considered for each incident.

Instructions to trainer

Resources required

- Resource sheet 1 – typology definitions (one per delegate)
- Resource sheet 2 – case studies (one per group)
- Resource sheet 3 – response (one per delegate)
- Coloured card – six colours
- Adhesive putty

Preparation

Prepare a set of case study cards per group (this takes a little time, but the cards can be reused). If you prefer, you can use anonymised case studies that you are aware of.

The 15 case studies (Resource sheet 2) match the six typology categories as follows:

- aggravated adult (case studies 4 and 7)
- aggravated youth intent to harm (case studies 3, 5, 6, 8 and 12)
- aggravated youth reckless misuse (case studies 9 and 10)
- experimental romantic (case studies 2, 11 and 12)
- experimental attention seeking (case studies 1, 13, 14)
- experimental other (case study 15)

Assign a distinctive coloured card to each of the six categories above, then cut and mount each of the 15 case studies accordingly.

Prepare six white 'header' cards for wall mounting – each card should display the title of one of the typologies.

Activity

1. Divide delegates into groups of 3 or 4. Where appropriate mix delegates to include a wide range of experience and job roles.
2. Give each group a set of case study cards (all 15 if time permits, if not then ensure that they have at least one of each colour).
3. Instruct delegates to read each study and consider as a group the following questions.
 - What level of risk do they think is attached to each case – green, red, amber?
 - What should the action of the setting be?
 - At this stage, which of the case studies would they refer out to police and or social services?
 - At this stage a simple outline plan of action – no more than three minutes per case.
4. Give each group member a copy of Resource sheet 1 and discuss with them Finkelhor and Wolak's typology. Finkelhor and Wolak's typology will help them to define the kind of incident and will also help them to decide on the appropriate and proportionate response.
5. Give each delegate a copy of Resource sheet 3 and ask them as a group to decide for each case study which typology category they would assign to it. Ask them to record any comments on their sheets.
6. While delegates are working, use adhesive putty to stick the six 'header' cards around the room.
7. When delegates have categorised each of their case studies, ask them to post the cards on the wall under the appropriate 'header' card around the room. (It will become apparent quite quickly that the colours match up in groups and show where groups agree or disagree on categorisation.)
8. Comment on where there has been agreement or disagreement to pull out variation in group thinking.
9. Pull out a variety of incidents that reflect the different typologies, for example, romantic, attention seeking, aggravated adult, and ask delegates to consider the following questions.
 - Do any of the case studies reflect any of the five points for immediate referral to other agencies?
 - If they do, which external agency should they be referred to and why?
 - If they don't need to be referred to an external agency, why not?
10. Where there are case studies that don't hit the referral threshold ask the groups to consider their response. This should take into account how they would respond as a setting. They should consider the following:

- How would the child be supported?
- How would parents or carers be informed?
- How would the deletion and removal of the images be handled?
- How would the incident be recorded?
- Who would take the lead in managing the incident?
- What would follow the management of the incident?

11. Allow for discussion in small groups on these topics and where possible get them to refer to the main body of the advice. Draw out any key elements for discussion and take the opportunity to remind staff of any relevant policies and procedures in managing incidents of youth-produced sexual imagery.

Resource Sheet 1 (Adapted from Wolak and Finkelhor 'Sexting: a Typology' March 2011)

1. **Aggravated incidents** involve criminal or abusive elements beyond creation, sending or possession of nudes or semi-nudes.
 - **Adult offenders** attempt to develop relationships by grooming teenagers into criminal sex offenses even without the added element of youth-produced images. Victims may be family friends, relatives, community members or contacted via the internet. The youth-produced sexual images may be solicited by adult offenders.
 - **Youth only: intent to harm cases** that arise from interpersonal conflict such as break-ups and fights among friends, involve criminal or abusive conduct such as blackmail, threats or deception, or involve sexual abuse or exploitation by young people.
 - **Youth only: reckless misuse** involves no intent to harm, but images are taken or sent without the knowing or willing participation of the young person who is pictured. In these cases, pictures are taken or sent thoughtlessly or recklessly and a victim may have been

2. **Experimental incidents** involve the creation and sending of nudes or semi-nudes, with no adult involvement, no apparent intent to harm or reckless misuse.
 - **Romantic** episodes involve young people in ongoing relationships make images for themselves or each other – such images were not intended to be distributed beyond the pair.
 - **Sexual attention seeking**: the phrase 'sexual attention seeking' is taken directly from the typology; however, it is important to note that incidents within this category can be a part of normal childhood. A child or young person should not be blamed for taking and sharing their image.
 - **Other**: there are cases that do not appear to have aggravating elements, like adult involvement, malicious motives or reckless misuse, but also do not fit into the 'romantic' or 'attention seeking' sub-types. These involve either young people who take pictures of themselves for themselves (no evidence of any sending or sharing or intent to do so) or pre-adolescent children (age nine or younger) who did not appear to have sexual motives.

Resource sheet 2: Case studies

Case studies adapted from *Sexting: A typology* by J Wolak and D Finkelhor (University of New Hampshire – Crimes against Children Research Center, 2011).

Case study 1

A girl (aged nine with mild learning difficulties) was speaking to a group of friends from school via a popular messaging app. Her mobile, which had a camera, was upstairs in her room. She was getting ready for bed and was sat in a towel and 'flashed' on webcam. Another learner (girl aged 10) from the group told the class teacher what had happened the next day at school, who then reported the concern to the headteacher.

Case study 2

A Year 6 girl (aged 11) texted a photo of herself, topless but covered, to her 12-year-old boyfriend (an ex-pupil). No physical sexual activity took place between them prior to this event, on or offline. The image was discovered on the boy's mobile phone by his mother who deleted the image and then contacted the girl's parents. The girls' parents approached the school for advice.

Case study 3

A girl, 15, sent a topless photo of herself to her girlfriend, who was also 15. When they broke up, the girlfriend sent the photo to numerous friends and many recipients forwarded the image to others. The school found out when one recipient told a parent. By then more than 200 pupils had received the picture.

Case study 4

The parents of a 14-year-old girl found nude pictures of her on her mobile device and approached her school for advice. She admitted sending the pictures to a 37-year-old man she met online. The girl stated she was in love with the offender, who lived in another part of the country. The victim never met him face to face.

Case study 5

A 14-year-old girl reported to the DSP she had been forwarded a naked photo of one of her friends, 13. Her friend had initially sent the photo to a boy, 15, she liked who attended a nearby school.

Case study 6

The parents of a 16-year-old contacted the school because a boy was blackmailing their daughter. The victim said she had accidentally uploaded a nude picture of herself to a social networking site. When she realised this, she deleted the image, but a boy from another school had already downloaded it. He threatened to distribute it if she did not send him more nude pictures. When the girl refused, the boy sent the picture to about 100 people.

Case study 7

A 16-year-old girl used the internet to send sexually explicit photos of herself to numerous men. She was using a stolen computer because her parents had taken her computer away from her. The parents discovered the online conversations and approached her school for advice.

Case study 8

A 13-year-old girl took sexual pictures of her three younger sisters (ages five, six and eight) and touched them sexually. A classmate disclosed this information to their class teacher. Children's social services had been involved with the family for some time.

Case study 9

A 14-year-old girl from the school posted content of herself in her underwear simulating oral sex; the school's DSP had not seen any of this content but had been told about it by pupils. (The DSP at another neighbouring school had called to raise awareness of a local 'competition' between children to see what the riskiest videos they could upload to social media sites were without the videos being reported and removed.) When spoken to the pupil insisted this was not true and that she was fully clothed in any content.

Case study 10

A boy, 16, who had been bullied in school and teased about his 'male anatomy' took a picture of his penis and sent it to a female classmate. The classmate, in turn, but without permission, sent it to four other girls. The incident was disclosed when a teacher confiscated the boy's mobile phone and found he was using the picture as a screensaver on his phone.

Case study 11

A 13-year-old boy sent one picture of himself masturbating to another pupil in his class. The pupil was shocked and shared the image with two others asking for their advice about what to do. One of the pupils showed the image to their parents who emailed it to the form tutor at the school demanding that something be done.

Case study 12

Two 16-year-old males in a relationship had faced some homophobic abuse online that culminated in their heads being photoshopped onto pornographic images which were shared. One of the boys confided in a member of staff about what had happened and explained that they had exchanged nude images with each other. Another young person claimed to have a copy of the image (although there was no proof of this) and had threatened to share it. One of the two boys was worried that if his family found out about his relationship there could be 'serious consequences for us both'.

Case study 13

A boy, 15, sent unsolicited naked pictures of himself to three different girls in his school. One of the girls reported it to their class teacher.

Case study 14

A girl, 17, posted nude pictures of herself on a social networking site. The website identified the images as possible child abuse images, removed them and reported the incident to NCA-CEOP, which referred the report to the local police force. The police approached the school and talked with the girl, but she was not charged.

Case study 15

An 11-year-old girl took naked pictures of her breasts with her mobile phone. Her grandparents discovered the images, did not realise they were of the girl and brought the phone to school. The girl, when interviewed, admitted she took the pictures of herself but said she had not sent them to anyone.

Resource Sheet 3 – Response

Case study	Comments	Response
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		

8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		