

## POLICY AND REGULATION: A GUIDED READING LIST

The field of research on policy and regulation covers a wide range of substantive topics (such as platform regulation, content moderation or data protection). It has also developed its own theories, concepts and debates to address these topics and to critically examine the rationale for intervention or policy change. In relation to children, such concepts tend to concern child rights, equity and inequality, children’s agency, voice and activism, and child protection.

In relation to the digital environment, much debate centres on the varieties of regulation – self-regulation, co-regulation, legislation – and on actions available to organisations – the state, international bodies, civil society organisations, the business sector and others.

*Citation: Livingstone, S., Stoilova, M., and Rahali, M. (2022). Policy and regulation: a guided reading list. CO:RE – Children Online: Research and Evidence.*

### **Useful starting points**

 **Brown, I. & Marsden, C.T. (2013).** [Regulating Code: Good Governance and Better Regulation in the Information Age](#). The MIT Press.

This is an important text introducing the key debates in technology regulation. While this is a fast-changing area, this is a very solid foundation for the law/policy-oriented scholar.

 **Livingstone, S. (2016).** [Reframing media effects in terms of children’s rights in the digital age](#). *Journal of Children and Media*, 10(1), 4–12.

This article is essential for researchers who are considering whether to frame their work in terms of effects or rights. Livingstone compares these frameworks with regard to the conception of children and media, assumptions, methodologies and evidence-based policy.

 **Lundy, L. (2019).** [A lexicon for research on international children’s rights in troubled times](#). *The International Journal of Children’s Rights*, 27(4), 595–601.

Lundy provides a critical analysis of the lack of engagement and recognition of children’s rights discourse in relation to protection, participation and wellbeing.

### **Further reading**

 **Broughton Micova, S. & Jacques, S. (2020).** [Platform power in the video advertising ecosystem](#). *Internet Policy Review*, 9(4).

The authors propose a framework that operationalises the concept of platform power using a theory of harm and wellbeing to define the audiovisual advertising ecosystem.

🔒 Bulger, M., Burton, P., O'Neill, B. & Staksrud, E. (2017). [Where policy and practice collide: Comparing United States, South African and European Union approaches to protecting children online.](#) *New Media & Society*, 19(5), 750–764.

This is an interesting piece for two main reasons: first, it accounts for protection policies in both the Global North and the Global South. Then it questions the 'innocent-child-in-need-of-protection' framework informing many policies on children online, highlighting dilemmas of policies and practices.

🔒 Chilenski, S. M., Ang, P. M., Greenberg, M. T., Feinberg, M. E., & Spoth, R. (2014). [The impact of a prevention delivery system on perceived social capital: The PROSPER project.](#) *Prevention Science*, 15, 125–137.

This study seeks to understand whether collaborative community health initiatives can increase social capital by exploring of the impact of the PROSPER delivery system on indicators of social capital.

🔒 Ciboci, L., Kanižaj, I. and Labaš, D. (2013). [The efficiency of regulation and self-regulation: Croatian media's protection of children's rights \(2008–2012\).](#) *Časopis za upravljanje komuniciranjem/Communication Management Quarterly*, VII(29), 147–170.

A detailed analysis of the role of regulators in protecting children's rights in electronic media.

🔒 Ciboci, L., Kanižaj, I. and Labaš, D. (2015). [Public Opinion Research as a Prerequisite for Media Education Strategies and Policies.](#) In S. Kotilainen & R. Kupiainen (eds) *Reflections on Media Education Futures* (pp. 171–182). Nordicom.

This is an example of how public opinion research can help build new policies and initiate new projects at member state level. It argues in favour of improved coordination, new educational programmes and better cooperation among the relevant institutions.

🔒 Dulong de Rosnay, M. & Stalder, F. (2020). [Digital commons.](#) *Internet Policy Review*, 9(4).

This article discusses the principles and historical development of 'digital commons', where the resources are data, information, culture and knowledge that are created and/or maintained online.

🔒 European Audiovisual Observatory (2016). [Mapping of Media Literacy Practices and Actions in EU-28.](#) European Audiovisual Observatory.

This report provides an overview of media literacy projects in several European countries and lessons learned about media literacy education based on case studies.

🔒 Feinberg, M. E., Jones, D., Greenberg, M. T., Osgood, D. W., & Bontempo, D. (2010). [Effects of the Communities That Care model in Pennsylvania on change in adolescent risk and problem behaviours.](#) *Prevention Science*, 11, 163-171.

This study seeks to find whether the 'Communities That Care' (CTC) model has a positive impact on risk or protective factors and academic and behavioural outcomes for adolescents, and concludes that CTC is an effective model.

Frau-Meigs, D., Velez, I. & Michel, J.F. (2017). [Public Policies in Media and Information Literacy in Europe : Cross-Country Comparisons](#). Routledge.

This book takes a long-term perspective of the development of media education in Europe, and includes an appraisal of media, information, computer and digital literacies as they coalesce and diverge in the public debate over 21st-century skills.

 Gillespie, T., Aufderheide, P., Carmi, E., Gerrard, Y. Gorwa, R., Matamoros-Fernández, A., Roberts, S.T., Sinnreich, A. & Myers West, S. (2020). [Expanding the debate about content moderation: Scholarly research agendas for the coming policy debates](#). *Internet Policy Review*, 9(4).

This article proposes the reconceptualisation of content moderation, recognising it as an expansive socio-technical phenomenon that functions in many contexts and takes many forms. It highlights policy implications.

 Hestres, L., Rochman, A., Volmert, A. & Busso, D. (2021). [How Are Advocates Talking About Children's Issues? An Analysis of Field Communications](#). *Frame works*.

This report discusses the frames and narratives that organisations in the field of children's advocacy use to discuss children's issues, and suggests how new framing and a narrative strategy can be developed to mobilise children's rights.

 Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2013). [Embracing Emergence: How collective impact addresses complexity](#). *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter.

The authors address how collective impact efforts are disrupting the conventional understanding about the aims and achievement of social progress.

 Lievens, E. & van der Hof, S. (2017). [Protection of Children under the GDPR: How to Achieve Meaningful Control over Personal Data by Parents and Children?](#). Presented at the Children and Digital Rights: Regulating Freedoms and Safeguards.

This paper provides the context for enforcing Article 8 of the GDPR in the context of children's rights, and discusses the issue of meaningful consent under this regulatory framework. It is a very useful read in the context of children's privacy online.

 Lievens, E., Livingstone, S., McLaughlin, S., O'Neill, B., & Verdoodt, V. (2018). [Children's rights and digital technologies](#). In *Children's rights and digital technologies*. Springer.

This chapter investigates the impact of digital technologies on children's rights through the lens of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

 Livingstone, S. & Bulger, M. (2014). [A global research agenda for children's rights in the digital age](#). *Journal of Children and Media*, 8(4): 317–335.

Building on the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, the authors suggest a global research agenda designed to produce valuable evidence for policymakers who promote children's rights.

Lundy, L. (2007). [“Voice” is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child](#). *British Educational Research Journal*, 33(6), 927–942.

Lundy’s model highlights the various conditions that aid effective participation of children and young people in decision-making processes. In particular, the model draws attention to four integrated elements related to Article 12 of the UN Convention of the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) - those of space, voice, audience, and influence - and proposes these elements as chronological stages in the development of an effective model of child participation.

🔒 Macenaite, M. & Kosta, E. (2017). [Consent for processing children’s personal data in the EU: Following in US footsteps?](#). *Information & Communications Technology Law*, 26(2), 146–197.

This article assesses the provisions of GDPR as it relates to children. Drawing on COPPA in the US, the authors identify pitfalls to consider when moving forward in the implementation of the EU parental consent requirement.

Milosevic, T. (2018). [Protecting Children Online? Cyberbullying Policies of Social Media Companies](#). The MIT Press.

This book provides a critical overview and evaluation of social companies’ policies designed to fight cyberbullying (a largely understudied aspect of the topic), together with an overview and analysis of self-regulatory, co-regulatory and traditional approaches to regulation of bullying on social media platforms. Policy recommendations are provided in the context of balancing children’s rights to protection and participation.

Montgomery, K.C. (2015). [Youth and surveillance in the Facebook era: Policy interventions and social implications](#). *Telecommunications Policy*, 39(9), 771–786.

This article provides an overview of the policy implications of data collection taking place on social media as well as an understanding of the process and methods and shortcomings of current regulation.

🔒 O’Neill, B., Staksrud, E. & McLaughlin, S. (2013). [Towards a Better Internet for Children? Policy Pillars, Players and Paradoxes](#). Nordicom/UNESCO Clearinghouse for Children and Media.

This book provides an overview of policy-making for online safety in a European context. It is organised around the main pillars that have defined the EU response, with particular reference to the Safer Internet Programme (2000–12) that features education, awareness-raising and a hybrid approach in self- and co-regulation as its main anchors. A number of chapters focus on the emerging consideration of children rights in a digital context.

🔒 Preskill, H., Parkhurst, M, & Splansky Juster, J. (2014). [Guide to evaluating collective impact: 01 Learning and evaluation in the collective impact context](#). *Collective Impact Forum*.

In the context of collective impact, this report discusses the role of continuous learning and adaptation, presents a framework for approaching performance measurement and evaluation, and offers guidance on planning for and implementing performance measurement and evaluation activities.

 Senge, P., Hamilton, H., & Kania, J. (2015). [The dawn of system leadership](#). *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 13, 27-33.

In the context of collective social change, this article focuses on the skillset required by leaders who can effect the changes necessary to accelerate progress against pressing social problems.

Staksrud, E. (2016). [Children in the Online World: Risk, Regulation, Rights](#). Routledge.

Staksrud provides a critical analysis of the policy approaches to child online safety in the European Union, applying Beck's institutionalised individualisation theory in the context of children's rights.

Third, A., Collin, P., Walsh, L. & Black, R. (2019). [Control Shift: Young People in Digital Society](#). Palgrave Macmillan.

This book advocates children and young people's rights in the digital environment by focusing on the intergenerational tensions that shape and limit their opportunities. In particular, the adult society that has the power to influence young people's outcomes is critically examined for its anxieties, near-exclusive focus on risk and safety, and its persistent misunderstanding of the perspectives of young people. The authors call for a move away from efforts to 'control' young people's digital engagement and for greater intergenerational understanding.

 van Audenhove, L., Vanwynsberghe, H. & Mariën, I. (2018). [Media literacy policy in Flanders – Belgium: From parliamentary discussions to public policy](#). *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, 10(1), 59–81.

This article presents a theoretical overview of three trends in media literacy debates, with specific application to Flanders' policy formulation.

 White, D. (2020). [Digital inclusion and well-being](#). *Internet Policy Review*, 9(2).

White discusses the relationship between digital inclusion and different aspects of wellbeing and how these have informed the work of the Carnegie Trust UK.

**You can find more guided reading lists covering the following areas:**

[children and young people](#), [digital environment](#), [access, opportunities and benefits](#), [skills and literacies](#), [risk and harm](#), [health and wellbeing](#), and [social support](#).



www.CORE-evidence.eu

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020

Grant Agreement ID 871018