[ch]45   Digital mediation, connectivity and affective materialities: Gender and sexual cultures of networked teens
[au]Jessica Ringrose and Laura Harvey

[a]Introduction
[tx]While physical cultural studies takes active embodiment as its analytical starting point (Andrews, 2008), it has to date tended to focus on exercise, fitness, health, movement, leisure, recreation, dance, and sport practices. Not surprisingly, there has been a plethora of technologies that articulate with our physical cultures – from m-health apps to 'smart' baby-grows, gaming to GPS fitness trackers such as RunKeeper, Runtastic; Nike+ Running, Endomono and so on – all of which demonstrate the crabgrass like entanglements between everyday physical culture and new media technologies (Williamson, 2015). In this context, this chapter explores the embodiment of teen gender and sexual cultures and practices, examining their interconnectedness with media technologies. In doing so, we argue that the active embodiment of both technologies and sexualities are important questions for the emerging field of physical cultural studies.

danah boyd's (2008, 2014) work has consistently illustrated how much young people 'heart' social networking and find digital connections, including flirtation and sexual communication 'dramatic', exciting and fun (Marwick and boyd, 2011). Marwick and boyd (2011) and boyd (2014) have explored the notion of 'drama' as a concept youth use to identify, and to explain, often conflict-ridden relationships online, while rejecting the notion of bullying imposed on these events by adults. Drama references a more complex frame of 'testing out friendship and understanding the dynamics of popularity and status' (boyd, 2014: 138). Despite, however, noting that the escalation of conflict online is stereotypically viewed as 'girls' work', there is little attempt to understand how social networking practices may be reshaping gendered and sexualized discourses and power relations, both on and offline, in complex ways. As Van Doorn (2010: 538) notes, social networking research on young people has 'largely neglected the gendered and sexual dimensions of SNS participation'.

Our key interest in this chapter is in understanding how social networking affordances mediate gender and sexuality in the social lives of networked teens. As argued by boyd, mobile digital media platforms are characterized by common elements of 'Persistence: the durability of online expressions and content; Visibility: the potential audience who can bear witness; Spreadability: the ease with which content can be shared; and Searchability: the ability to find content' (boyd, 2014: 11). But how do these technological affordances shape youth intimacy, flirtation, and sexual communication thereby transforming young people's networked gender and sexual cultures?

In this chapter we argue that what boyd calls social media 'drama' signals how social media affordances are *affective*. By affective we mean they mediate the bodily capacities to *affect or be affected* (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987; Massumi, 2002; Clough, 2010; Ringrose and Coleman, 2013). As new media theorists suggest, the digital reshapes the energetic flows and psychical qualities of social life including physical material 'reality' (Kuntsmen, 2012). Paasonen, Hills and Petit (2015) argue theories of networked affect can help us to see 'how individual, collective, discursive and networked bodies both human and machine … are modified by one another'. Social networking practices enable new flows of temporality and connectivity (Van Dijck, 2013) experienced as a range of modifications to bodies, or what Massumi (2002) would call variable 'intensities'.

Our contribution is to argue these flows, connectivities, and intensities are not totally open – they filter through gendered and sexual discourses, as well as age and other axis of difference (race, ethnicity, locality etc.). As Van Doorn (2010: 538) maintains, we can't:

[dq]separate bodies, gender and sexuality from the technological networks that give them form and meaning. Conversely, media technologies cannot be apprehended without accounting for the

embodied and gendered use cultures that imbue them with significance by mobilizing them within larger everyday networks – both virtual and concrete.
[dqs](Van Doorn, 2010: 538; emphasis added)

[tx]As such, to understand the concrete – that is physical culture, including everyday experiences of (in)active bodies in material space – we must also grasp the workings of online space given we are now dealing with what has been called a posthuman, *digitally mediated* cyborg body: the hybrid techno-corpus (Haraway, 1991; Braidotti, 2014). With this remit in mind, we approach digital mediation not as a 'transparent layer or intermediary between independently existing entities–such as young people *plus* their Blackberries and their Facebook profiles–but rather as a vital, temporal process, in which technologies, media and lives are intimately entangled and intra-meshed (Kember and Zylinska, 2012). We hold our understandings of mediation together with recent work on the affordances of digital technologies, examining these affordances not as separate entities but as part of what Kember and Zylinska (2012: 23–24) term the new 'lifeness of media … which hold the potential to generate unprecedented connections and unexpected events'.

We develop the notion of digital *intra-actions* drawing on Barad (2007), to think about how digital life, particularly relationality around gender and sexuality unfolds online, suggesting digital flows are also, of course, experienced as variable intensities as 'subjective' affective states (Wetherell, 2010) with discursive, 'material' (that is physical) embodied effects offline. In relation to this volume, digital practices are thereby at the heart of young people's physical cultures, and we try to illuminate the temporality of these embodied practices in the merging of the online and offline in young people's peer cultures. We do this through a discussion of how young people negotiate *sexualized online* content, messaging and images in their networked content, and how it shapes on and offline relationships. In previous writing we have explored the negotiation of sexual content online in relation to research literature and debates on youth *sexting* (see for instance Ringrose et al., 2012, 2013; Ringrose and Harvey, 2015). Here we focus instead on how the relationships between *online digital space and offline material physical cultur*e intra-act (see also Ringrose and Renold, 2016) demonstrating some of the complexities associated with how young people perform and negotiate their mediated gender identity and sexual relationships online and in the shared physical space of the school.

To further understand this cyborgified, posthuman physical culture we draw on a research project that mapped experiences of digital sexual communication among economically and racially marginalized young people in London. We worked in-depth with a total of 35 young people aged 13–15, in two school communities located in two inner-city, multicultural London schools in 2011. Our methodology included first conducting focus groups where we asked young people to 'walk us through' their online and mobile phone practices. Young people were then invited to connect with us on Facebook for a three month period during the research project. Next we conducted online ethnographic observation – 'netnography' (Kozinets, 2006) – of these young people's online interactions on their Facebook profile. Finally we returned for 22 in-depth individual case study interviews with research participants.

In this chapter we focus mostly on one of the schools, Langthorpe College,[1] located in a southeast London neighbourhood with high levels of economic deprivation and associated violence (Harvey et al., 2013). We focus on one school and only two interrelated case studies, one boy and one girl, Kamal and Cherelle, in order to understand how the 'affordances' (boyd, 2008, 2014) of social media technology work and 'mediate' everyday gendered and sexualized power relations and intimacies in youth peer groups. Moreover we have chosen to explore the experiences of two teens in our younger age range (aged 13–14) set, since we know less about the construction of teen sexual cultures among younger teens (Buckingham et al., 2009).

Through the two cases we consider how young people experience the new 'visibilities' of intimate relationships in a range of ways that shape the gender and sexual peer cultures. For instance, the searchability of contact information for 'flirting' and 'hooking up' can be seen as useful but also risky in gender specific ways that extend into offline experience (Livingstone and Helsper, 2009). Visibility of personal information online can be both affirming and anxiety provoking (when unknown contacts suggest they know where you live). The sharing or 'spreadability' (Jenkins et al., 2013) of sexualized images of girls' bodies can also be something that is experienced as desirable and problematic at the same time. As an example, we explore the posting online of 'pornified' sexual content (Paasonen et al., 2009), which one can both enjoy but later come to 'regret' (Gregg, 2012), since posting a sexual shock or joke image has a 'persistence' or duration that can continue to shape the material possibilities of peer relationships long after the moment of posting. Overall, we show how our approach helps us to map out the 'doing' of teen femininity and masculinity online, through showing the affective dimensions of these technologically mediated gender and sexual power relations.

[a]Hyper-connectivity: digitally mediated friendship and flirting
[tx]Mobile digital technologies cannot be treated like some add on feature to young people's lives today. Technology has created posthuman cyborgs, where the mobile phone is an actant (Latour, 2006), and more like an additional limb or appendage, rather than separate object from the body (Haraway, 1991). These technologies are radically transforming the possibilities around connectivity with temporal and material affects (Van Djick, 2013). Consider how year 10 girls discuss how their mobile phones shape their daily rhythms:

[!The following is the first of several dialogue-style quotes in this chapter. Please style all of them the same way as the ones in Chapter 36!]
[dq]Interviewer: So how much are you using your [mobile] phone do you think in an average day?
Monique: Like all the time.
Kylie: I use it to wake myself up, then I use it to phone Riley or you to see where you are to meet each other in the morning, and then when I get on the way to school I will be texting people from school.
Tracy: Yeah and using it to get the time.
Kylie: Yeah to get the time. I use my phone every second of the day. If I am not using it I feel a bit weird.
Monique: I use it to go to sleep with my music on.
Tracy: I talk on my phone all day long.

[tx]These technologies are loved and felt to be central to life, and to young people's sense of self. Indeed, life could be unthinkable without them. As Jodie (13) put it, 'I would die without my BlackBerry', and Claire (13) told us she found 'communicating on Facebook is easier than in real life'. Phone, Text, Facebook, BBM, Twitter, Tumblr, Instagram, Snapchat and others are multiple overlapping, interfacing simultaneously (Koefed and Ringrose, 2012) with one another, so texting, posts, image sharing or speaking on the phone can take place on multiple mediums at the same time, although some mobiles or apps can quickly overtake previous favourites. As Adam (15) explained that once the group at his school had BlackBerry (in 2011) 'everyone' had to get it to communicate and it mostly replaced texting and Facebook ('in-boxing') because it was cheaper and less easily monitored by adults. Similarly, Kaja (15) told us that 'BlackBerry Messenger is much better because it is kind of like portable. It is always in your pocket and it is like – and it is more secret as well. That is better. You don't need no internet connection.'
Currently, however, times have changed and Blackberry is mostly obsolete. But what is critical for the purposes of this chapter, is how all of these rapidly changing technologies forge new bonds and

intense degrees of connection:

[dq]Kylie (15): My boyfriend, he got me to call him the other day, he stayed on the [mobile] phone for like three hours. That is like half my minutes gone and then he fell asleep…But do you know what the weirdest thing is, once he fell asleep I couldn't hang up because I wanted to listen to him breathing.
Interviewer: You wanted to listen to him breathing.
Monique: When they are sleeping it is funny, it sort of has this cute, it is like, ahh, it is like listening to a little baby. It is cute. I have been on the phone like from six o'clock in the afternoon until maybe six o'clock the next morning.
Interviewer: So you stay up all night?
Monique: Because he won't come off the phone. But what we do is we drop in and out of sleep and then it is like, he will press the button and it will like make a noise so I will wake up, and be like, oh I'm awake now, so it is just weird, I don't know, it is just one of those things that you do.

[tx]Staying on your personal mobile phone with your boyfriend all night and reports of young people keeping Skype on all night long to be visibly and aurally 'in touch' with one another, or more recent disappearing media like snapchatting photos which erase after a few seconds, all show the radical or hyperconnectivity and its strange durations (Wellman, 2001; Handyside and Ringrose, forthdoming) of mobile technologies. These degrees and forms of connection transform temporality and relationality initiating new forms of mediated intimacy . For instance, Year 10 boys explained how they only initiated flirting with people on BBM through the distance created by the BBM 'Broadcaster' of messages. The intra-action of mobile phone, messaging app, and flows of desire and emotion function to both create connection (such as the ability to communicate in private spaces and at any time) and dynamic temporal patterns of distance and closeness, in which both simultaneous and delayed communication are possible. As Kylie (15) stated:

[dq]But like our phones play a massive part in relationships. Like phone calls until late hours. Texting, not as much because now we have got BBM. BBM is like Match.com basically, you have got everyone there and it is like – and people send broadcasts over BBM. Like there will be a smiley face and then next to the smiley face there will be something like 'Would you have sex with me?' 'Would you do this, would you do that?' and then by sending that broadcast, like the boy will answer it and then you will start talking to them … Like the question will be like, 'Would you have sex with me lights on/lights off. Socks on/socks off. What position? To what song? Condom or no condom?' Stuff like that.

[tx]Kylie refers to BBM as like match.com and also calls Facebook 'Baitbook'. These new hybrid terms point to how technological processes are reshaping and remediating teen sociality, connectivity and sexuality – friendship, dating and intimacy – in complex gendered ways, which we continue to explore through our two case studies of young people in year 8 (13–14 years old).

[a]Cherelle
[b]Facebook, BBM and the playground: on and offline sexual harassment
[tx]Cherelle is a British-born, black, 13-year-old girl. She lives in an economically deprived area surrounding Langthorpe College. She lives with her mum on a council estate. Cherelle described her attachment to the social media technology of BlackBerry Messenger (BBM) as a vehicle to stay in touch with existing friends and make new ones, saying she can't put the phone down. As we have

been discussing, BBM was the dominant social media environment that the young people were using in 2011 in the research schools. In BlackBerry you have a profile image like Facebook, but contacts are added by circulating a pin number together with a description to the user's friend network, asking them to add the contact: this is called a pin 'broadcast', which is interesting because it requires a description of the user to be sent around the network. Cherelle explained that the body was central to these pin descriptions. She went on to describe the importance of the body parts, and the physical appearance of black girls, in particular, with 'big tits and a big bum' as desirable body parts (see also Weekes, 2004):

[dq]If it is a boy and a girl told a boy to BC [broadcast] their pin then they will say, 'Oh she has big tits and a big bum and she's fit and if you get to know her, she's nice' … It's mad.

[tx]She went on to mention the idea of 'linking up' or meeting the people she's made contact with online, depending on their 'personality' and whether they are 'nice':

[dq]Depending on the person, because if the person can't see your picture properly, they say 'Can you send me a picture of your face, so I can see you clearly?' and sometimes they can be very nasty, saying 'Can I have a picture of your tits?' or stuff like that, and yeah, sometimes they will get upset and overact and maybe delete you. But that's alright, but when you are linking someone they want to know what you want to do when you link. But most boys will say 'We are gonna lips and hug and stuff' and yeah just go to the park and do stuff and yeah that's what most people do.

[tx]Cherelle talks about how sometimes boys will ask for a 'picture of your tits' and also ask if you want to 'link' or meet up in ways that seemed fun with banter around 'lips' (kissing) and hugging. She was also, however, very wary of too many 'facts' being posted about her which located her in real life, an aspect of 'searchability' that she felt threatening:

[dq]When I lost my BBM there is some girl in Year 10 and I told her to BC my pin, asked her, and … she BCd my pin she put lots of facts about me … so I had lots of adds and then for example, a boy, he said 'Oh you're peng' that means oh you're pretty and stuff and 'where do you live?' I said '[area] but I hang around [other area]'. They said, 'Oh I live in [area]'. 'Okay so what school do you go to?', they said [school] and then he was all like, 'Oh do you want to link?' I was like, 'Maybe' and he said, 'What would you do if we linked?' and I said, 'I dunno' and then he said, 'Oh would you give me blows?', that means suck my dick?' and I was like, 'No not really' and then he said, 'Why?' and I said, 'Because I'm not like that', but he became furious when we got deep in a conversation and then I just ended up deleting him because of what he is saying.

[tx]Here Cherelle is wary of too many 'facts' being released about her, something that she felt exposed her in relation to a sexually aggressive boy who asked her 'would you give me blows'. Several of our year 8 girls described how being asked for blow jobs was a regular, everyday occurrence, and related to boys they did not know personally but also to boys in the school:

[!Set the following quote in dialogue style!]
[dq]Cherelle: Well, I know lots of times I've been asked and sometimes I will say 'No' and they will say, 'Okay' and they will be like nice to you and then they will ask again and then they will put pressure on you and stuff like this and I will just be like, 'I'm sorry I don't want to' and they will say 'Why' and I will say 'I just don't want to', and they will say, like 'There's nothing wrong like all you need to do is just suck on it' and I will be like, 'But I don't want to do that' and just keep going and

put the angry face on BBM and dedicate their status to you in a negative way.
Interviewer: Like say what kind of thing?
Cherelle: Like, 'Oh this girl is pissing me off'.
Interviewer: And do they say it to you or do you just kind of know?
Cherellle: You know, you can tell … I just delete them.
Interviewer: Okay, and do they ask you in person? …
Cherelle: Oh people in our school? … Some boys would say oh whatever and sometimes they would just get your head and go like that, but like you come up quick and just say, 'Get off me', but yeah that is as far as it goes.

[tx]The embodied and affective patterns of desire, pleasure, anger and aggression cannot be separated from the affordances of the media through which they are articulated and felt. Angry faces, deleting and negative statuses entangled with gendered and physical relations of power, which young people had to navigate online and offline. The relations between being online and being asked to perform a blow job, and having boys say something negative about a refusal online, is greatly complicated by knowing the contact as part of the wider peer group at school, to whom you cannot simply 'delete'. Cherelle describes being physically approached on the playground and head being pushed down towards the boys' groin. Despite saying 'this is as far as it goes' Cherelle recounted numerous other stories of boys 'rushing girls' pushing them over, touching them up on their 'tits' and 'bum', and daggering them (humping them from behind or front):

[!Set the following quote in dialogue style!]
[dq]Interviewer: So do you really feel concerned about them or do you just think, no they are not really going to do anything to me.
Cherelle: I feel concerned most of the time because I'm okay with the boys now because before if I said something on BBM or Facebook and they got upset, I just like got into little arguments, like they would say, 'Watch tomorrow, gonna rush you' and this stuff. And tomorrow they will just floor you and kick and run, all this. But yeah.
Interviewer: So they threaten to like basically beat you up?
Cherelle: Mmm.
Interviewer: But they don't do it?
Cherelle: They do.
Interviewer: They do. So you have been beaten up by a boy?
Cherelle: Yeah, not like really hard and stuff, but like they will kick me, I have got punched quite a lot of times and yeah, but I haven't said anything about it, but since that assembly I know that I can trust – I can trust my mum. I had a talk to her.

[tx]What is critical here is the impotency of being able to 'delete' content or contacts online. The issue is not simply online persistence or duration, since the complex relations of the peer group bleed into the *material, physical offline* material space of school: 'watch out tomorrow I'm gonna rush you'. Cherelle also raises the important issue of not wanting to tell anyone, which girls and boys described could get you labelled a 'snitch' or a 'grass'.
Cherelle also described how BBM and Facebook has a really fun game of 'wifey and husband' that you play with a boy who is your 'best friend' on Facebook, who was Kamal, a black boy in her same year group, but how Kamal was 'changing' so she could not be 'close with him anymore':

[!Set the following quote in dialogue style!]
[dq]Cherelle: Like when Kamal first started school he used to hang around with Veronica and me so I

became good friends with Kamal because he was quiet then, but then he met the boys in our year group who are popular and stuff and then he started hanging around with them and he became the same and worse.

Interviewer: Like how, like what do they do?

Cherelle: Like they rush people. Like they beat them up for no reason and just loud and yeah … you walk past and like a boy will pass and they will squeeze your bum or something and like just touch your tits … like every boy that I have on BBM, well not everyone but most have put nasty pictures … a girl naked or on top of a boy. The pictures what you will find on a dirty boy's display picture is either of him or his penis and a girl sucking it, or a girl naked or a dirty cartoon, things like that …

Interviewer: Oh yeah, dirty cartoon. I wanted to ask you about this one. So this one is from Kamal

Cherelle: Oh gosh …

Interviewer: because you commented on it [on Facebook] … I was just wondering what you thought about that?

Cherelle: I was looking through his pictures and then I saw that and I was like, that is disgusting. I was talking to him about most of his pictures on the phone and yeah and he said, 'Oh why are you acting like it's all that and stuff' and I was like, 'It's disgusting and it's on your Facebook' and he was like, 'Yeah and' and I was like, 'Yeah'. But most boys just don't think that is – they don't take it seriously they take it like it is just normal and yeah.

Interviewer: It is interesting because you said, 'LOL ouch' and he says, 'Cherelle knows' and then you realize that and you said, 'Shut up' right?

Cherelle: Mmm.

Interviewer: And I am just wondering like, do you try to be jokey with him?

Cherelle: Mostly I am joking with him. I think that the way of joking that I can speak to him, because like when I speak to Kamal I have to speak to him in a way like for him to speak to me, for me to know stuff and understand stuff. And yeah –

Interviewer: So you feel like he listens to you then?

Cherelle: Yeah, that's how we became friends because like we was really close, but that was then when he started to change, that is when I saw this picture.

[tx]Cherelle is discussing an explicit cartoon image on Kamal's Facebook page of a black man entering a white blonde haired woman from behind who is crying. The man's penis is visible in the image, The comments on the photo were mostly 'Lool' and 'wooooow' but Cherelle said 'O:Lord', to which Kama replied 'Cherelle knows' and Cherelle replies ' LOL shut up, Kamal'. There is a complex set of relations where it is supposed to be jokey and funny online, but Cherelle suggests the image is connected to how she felt Kamal 'started to change.' The image is consequently part of an affective entanglement of disgust, laughter and discomfort at a moment in which their friendship is shifting and both young people are negotiating their place within the peer group and their own friendship via online comments and physical interactions at school. These changes included offline 'touching up' in the playground as well as posting 'nasty' images. To continue discussing these affective intra-actions between Cherelle and Kamal, specifically, we turn to Kamal's interview next.

[a]Kamal
[b]Facebook, BBM and the playground: competitive, hierarchical heterosexual masculinity
[tx]As mentioned by Cherelle, Kamal is a British-born, black, 14-year-old boy, also living with his mum on a different estate, and he transferred only recently to Langthorpe College after being excluded from his previous school. As a newcomer to year 8, Kamal was negotiating his relationship with different peer groups at school and he worked hard in the focus groups and the individual interview to perform a kind of 'older', 'popular', hard masculinity. As part of this popular masculine

bravado he proudly displayed his topless body on Facebook saying about one image of his back muscles:

[dq]Kamal: Wow this picture is good I think it should go on Facebook!
Interviewer: And like do you get ratings if lots of people like the picture?
Kamal: Yeah right now I've got 42 likes on the picture and lots of comments.

[tx]In this way, Kamal is negotiating the 'visibility' of displaying and showing your own and others bodies, but the relationalities around his image is dramatically different from those of girls. His image is publically available and rewarded, enabling him to describe pleasure and pride from its circulation, whereas the group described how girls' bodies in contrast are traded as part of a semi-private networked form of exchange. For instance, Kamal claimed he had around 30 images of girls on his phone, a number that also appeared to signal high status or 'ratings' in other focus groups with girls and boys. Kamal as with others suggested that getting images of pictures of girls in their bras was 'competition':

[dq]Kamal: Because sometimes when you and your friend could have a competition of how many girls you can get and you can just do it and then just compare how much pictures you get.
Interviewer: So you have got like 30 of them. So then do you go to your mates, 'Look at this I've got 30 pictures'?
Kamal: No. I go, 'I've got bare pictures of girls here' and then when they say, 'How much?'. I will tell them how much but I won't really show them.
Interviewer: You won't really show them?
Kamal: No, I will show them but like where they will like hold my phone and look at it and try to go through the next ones which might have a girl's face in it, for example, I won't let them. I won't let it out of my possession … I wouldn't want them to know who the girl was because like I would only do it for someone I didn't like and I wouldn't have a picture of someone I didn't like, so yeah.

[tx]Having 30 images of girls was a number that had emerged in the data as a quantity signalling high popularity, and so we interpret this not as an accurate description of his 'collection', but more as part of macho bravado and the performance of herteronormative, desirable, and conquering masculinity. Kamal also describes as a kind of heroic masculine (Reay, 1995) code of honour of not revealing the faces of the images of the girls he's been sent, as if he has the power to 'expose' or reveal a girl's identity, To expose a girl's image meant to post it without consent publically on social media (commonly now understood as revenge porn). This was a form of digital 'visible', 'spreadable' and 'searchable' sexual 'stigma' (Trottier, 2014) attached to teen girls' bodies when they were publically posted, and it is worth noting that this practice was positioned as familiar although extreme across our sample of young people in both schools.
The power to expose the girls does not actually seem to be within Kamal's reach, however, since it is not clear if Kamal even knows the girls in the images he is posting. Indeed Kamal's BBM profile image was an image of a girl's breasts, which he claims is his girlfriend, but then says no one actually knows who it is because it is 'just her bra without her head' in the image. It is ambiguous as to whether the image is a girlfriend – the images are deployed to construct an older and knowing form of masculinity in conditions that are less certain than possibly claimed. Kamal also talked about tagging himself in girls' images he doesn't actually know:

[!Set the following quote in dialogue style!]

[dq]Kamal: I can tag it if I like the picture I could tag myself in it and then it will come to my profile. I could make it my profile picture … it all leads to ratings because he's got that girl on Facebook and she's nice and how did he get her, they just want to find out, things like that.

Interviewer: And what do the girls think if you tag yourself in their pictures?

Kamal: Nothing, sometimes they will untag you, if they don't want you to tag them. But by the time they get to know that you are tagged in it, you could have made it your profile picture already. They can untag you from it but then you have still got the picture.

[tx]Tagging technology allows for a form of connectivity and digital attachment to other girl's sites and images (Renold and Ringrose, 2016), although Kamal suggests it is not usually girls he is actually friends with offline whose images he tags himself in. So it is not clear if the 30 images he claims he has on his phone have been sent to him or he has tagged himself in them. Indeed, Kamal explains how the negotiation of asking for images for girls you *know* is actually quite complex:

[!Set the following quote in dialogue style!]

[dq]Kamal: Well you only get pictures from girls that like you or your girlfriend yeah. That is like mostly the only time you will get pictures …

Interviewer: Do some people say 'No, I'm not sending you a picture'?

Kamal: Yeah.

Interviewer: And do you say, go on go on go on, or do you just go away?

Kamal: No, I will ask why first. And if they don't give me a good reason then I can see that they don't really want to talk about it so I just change the subject.

Interviewer: What counts as a good reason?

Kamal: Like when they go, like for example they will go 'Because you are not my boyfriend' then that means that some people will do a wink face or an I can't watch face, and that is like okay, she wants you to move to her, like she wants you to be her boyfriend. Because she doesn't trust you as a friend but she trusts you as a boyfriend, if that makes sense?

[tx]Kamal suggests that girls want to have some sort of trust in you as a boyfriend before they will send an image to you, which is actually a much harder negotiation to sustain. These discussions all point to the discrepancy between having images on your phone and actually having a known girlfriend in the peer group. The digital mediation of masculinity then here involves a meshing of both girls' and boys' body parts via circulated images, but whose meaning is not always stable in the ever-changing affective interactions in the peer group (Harvey and Ringrose, 2015).

Indeed, recall that Cherelle has challenged Kamal's physical harassment and his posting of 'dirty' pictures on Facebook and BlackBerry, behaviour that seems to be potentially interfering with girls liking and trusting him, which Kamal is also struggling with. This became apparent when we discussed the sexually explicit cartoon on his Facebook page. It was a difficult part of the interview as Kamal became defensive, understandably saying at first that it was just funny and 'boys sense of humour is better than girls', but when the interviewer presses him about why it is funny because the woman is crying Kamal said 'I don't know' four times, and cracked his chewing gum loudly. This part of the interview is decidedly uncomfortable, and Kamal says he is tired, so the interviewer changes the topic to get back onto more neutral ground around Kamal having images of girls' breasts. A few minutes later when the tension has abated the interviewer returned to the issue of the cartoon:

[!Set the following quote in dialogue style!]

[dq]Interviewer: Do you think about that person and image them being a person or like what do you

think? … What do you think she is thinking?

Kamal: She is enjoying it. It is a way of expressing feelings yeah … Like people get hurt yeah but that like they enjoy getting hurt, because they know how it will feel next time or like see, erm, like they enjoying it. Not like they were enjoying getting hurt the next time, but next time they will know what it feels like and they will like be prepared.

Interviewer: So like just generally like sex being painful then, like that prepares them for that?

Kamal: Yeah.

Interviewer: Do you feel that as a picture that is really realistic, as a picture of sex?

Kamal: No.

Interviewer: Why don't you think it is?

Kamal: Well for one it is a cartoon, two the people don't look real like, yeah. It just looks unreal but then it looks funny but real at the same time. Do you get what I'm saying?

Interviewer: Yeah, I get it. But I'm still not entirely sure what is funny about it. Maybe it is just because as you were saying not quite sure.

Kamal: Because people just find other people's pain funny. They find things like that funny.

[tx]Kamal insists that the cartoon is not 'real', but that what it depicts also makes it 'funny' at the same time. This is just one of many forms of images that circulate in the network that have the 'disgust', 'shock' and humour factor (Bale, 2011). Certainly not all boys liked these images or participated in this sexual shock/disgust dynamic. Kamal's comments that girls are preparing for pain in real life sex is, however, an important site of discussion and intervention around young people's sexual cultures and versions of sexually aggressive masculinity (Haste, 2012). The cartoon is also racialized given it is a black man on top of a white woman a complex sexual power dynamic which signals taboo boundary crossings in relation to racism and sexuality (Holland, 2012).

What is critical is that this image is tied in our findings to 'changing' the relationship with the girls in his school based friendship group, namely Cherelle. These complex sexual power relations that Kamal is negotiating and his need to display access to collect, comment upon and possess girls and women's bodies also extended into the school space, where Kamal talked about touching up as a joke and part of the everyday experiences of being a 'teenage boy and girl':

[!Set the following quote in dialogue style!]

[dq]Interviewer: Yeah, so does that happen quite a bit, like people just getting touched up in the corridor?

Kamal: Yeah.

Interviewer: What is going on there?

Kamal: Like boys just touch girls' breasts and their bums and that.

Interviewer: And what do the girls reckon about that?

Kamal: Nothing, most girls don't mind it.

Interviewer: How can you tell which girls mind it and which don't?

Kamal: Because say for example I touch a girl's breasts, if she doesn't say like stop or don't touch me then she doesn't mind it …

Interviewer: How does it work?

Kamal: It is like for example, my friend and my girlfriend yeah. My friend will do that to my girlfriend yeah. My other friends would rate him for that because it is my girlfriend and I am going out with her. So obviously like I won't get angry but I will go and do the same thing to his girlfriend.

Interviewer: Okay what do the girlfriends think about all of this?

Kamal: Nothing, they just think it is funny.

[tx]The interview illustrates a pattern across the year 8 interviews about consent and touching, as normative and expected by both girls and boys, as part of the dynamic of having access to girls' bodies both online and offline. There is a homosocial (Sedgwick, 1992) exchange where touching up of girlfriends is a funny competitive rivalry between the boys, as they navigated entry into competitive hierarchical masculinity with unclear boundaries around sexual consent and both in person and online sexual harassment (Powell, 2010). Many young people were critical of these practices and girls were angry but made excuses, such as the year 10 girls and boys who said it was year 8s boys 'crazy' hormones.

[a]Conclusion

[tx]This chapter has begun to develop an analysis of how the 'affordances' of social media technology (boyd, 2014) are reshaping the possibilities of connectivity and relationality in young people's gender and sexual cultures. Cherelle's case study enabled us to explore how new norms of feminine desirability (visibility) were negotiated online, posing risks of searchability of information. Crucially, these online relations intra-acted with material and embodied experiences of being 'touched up' and sexually harassed at school from boys in her peer group.

Kamal's (14) case study showed how popular masculinity is performed (or attempted) via the ambiguous possibilities of tagging (connecting), and collecting images (visibility with material affective force as commodities that persist), afforded by new media technologies. We explored how the persistence of Kamal's pornographic cartoon image as well as his attitude to ownership and access to 'touching up' girls bodies offline greatly impacted his friendship with girls, like Cherelle, in his peer group. Kamal's case study showed an attempt to perform 'older' popular masculinity and male bravado via the ambiguous possibilities of tagging (connecting) and collecting images (visibility with material affective force as commodities) afforded by new media technologies; we considered the persistence of his taboo image and how it shaped his relationship with Cherelle. We explored how issues of objectification and ownership over girls' bodies extended offline, with important implications for schools, which we mention briefly here but which deserve further attention. Significantly, our findings suggest that e-safety policies about stranger danger and 'deleting' online contacts are not especially helpful for coping with problems of relationships with *known contacts* from the school based peer group online. Girls were dealing with sexual innuendo, tagging, and comments online as well as being 'touched up' and sexually harassed in the physical spaces of the school playground. The flow of affect and material experiences online and offline was particularly evident in cases where girls were dealing with harassment from the *same boys* online and then offline in the corridors and outside spaces of the school. The mediation of physical culture here shows that the boundaries between what is considered 'online' and 'offline' are dissolving or indeed dissolved. Overall our analysis shows the urgent need to continue unpacking how social networking affordances have a complex range of affective and material effects, which shape the possibilities of gender and sexual power relations in young people's school based and wider peer relationships and physical cultures in profound ways. In line with Kember and Zylinska's (2012) arguments about the new forms of liveness and vitality emergent through new media practices, gender and sexuality take on new life-forms, but many of these are troubling and in need of further exploration. Indeed, many of the examples we discussed are reminiscent of older patterns of sexism and sexual double standards informing young teen femininities and masculinities.

What is perhaps 'new' about new media is how the digital affordances add more layers – extra temporal, spatial, affective and performative dimensions – to how we understand gendered and sexual (and racialized and classed) power relations, embodiment and identity work in teens' networked peer and everyday physical cultures. We have then, in this chapter, begun a discussion of how digital affordances shape the possibilities of connectivity and relationality in young people's gender and

sexual cultures, and how this is played out in other physical cultural arenas and spaces. We have argued that sexual practices and cultures are an important site of analysis for physical cultural studies. We certainly need further work on how the new affordances of visibility, searchability, spreadability and persistence of social media may also present spaces for reworking and transforming age-old gender and sexual inequalities in ways as yet unforeseen. For instance we know little about how young people use social media to connect with gender and sexual activisms (e.g. feminism and LGBTQ rights) although there is now some emergent research on youth digital activisms like hashtag feminism, for instance (see Berridge and Portwood-Stacer, 2015; Keller et al. 2016; Retallack et al 2016). We also need to continue to explore in far greater detail how social media technologies intra-act with embodied cultural practices. So doing will provide for enhanced possibilities of intervention into unequal power relations that coalesce around the hybrid physical techno-corpus.

[a]Note

1   The school and participant names are all pseudonyms.

[a]References [Q1]

Bale, C. (2011) Raunch or romance? Framing and interpreting the relationship between sexualized culture and young people's sexual health. *Sex Education*, 11(3): 303–313.

Barad, K. (2007) *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Berridge, S. and Portwood-Stacer, L. (2015) Introduction: feminism, hashtags and violence against women and girls. *Feminist Media Studies*, 15(2): 341–344.

[!In the reference below, after the word 'Youth' is a heart symbol – please ensure it doesn't get misrecognized!]

boyd, d. (2008) Why youth ♥ social network sites: the role of networked publics in teenage social life. In D. Buckingham (ed.), *Youth, Identity, and Digital Media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 119–142.

boyd, d. (2014) *It's complicated: the social lives of networked teens*. Yale University Press.

Haraway, D. (1991) A cyborg manifesto: science, technology, and socialist-feminism in the late twentieth century. In D. Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge.

Jenkins, H., Ford, S. and Green, J. (2013) *Spreadable Media: Creating Value and Meaning in a Networked Culture*. New York: New York University Press.

Keller, J., Mendes, K. and Ringrose, J (2016) Speaking 'unspeakable things:' Documenting digital feminist responses to rape culture, *Journal of Gender Studies*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2016.1211511

Kember, S. and Zylinksa, J. (2012) *Life after New Media: Mediation as a Vital Process*. Cambridge; London: MIT Press.

Kuntsmen, A. (2012) Introduction: affect fabrics of digital cultures. In E. Karatzogianni and A. Kuntsmen (eds), *Digital Cultures and the Politics of Emotion*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Livingstone, S. and Helsper, E. (2009) Balancing opportunities and risks in teenagers' use of the internet: the role of online skills and internet self-efficacy. *New Media and Society*, 12(2): 309–329.

Marwick, A. and boyd, d. (2011) The drama! Teen conflict, gossip, and bullying in networked publics. Paper presented at A Decade in Internet Time: Symposium on the Dynamics of the Internet and Society, Oxford.

Paasonen, S. Nikunen, K and Saarenmaa, L. (2007) *Pornification: Sex and sexuality in media culture*, Oxford: Berg Publishers

Paasonen, S. Hillis, K. And Petit, M. (2015a) 'Introduction: Networks of transmission, intensity, sensation, value' in K. Hills, S. Paasonen, and M. Petit, (eds.) *Networked Affect*, Cambridge, MIT Press: 1-26.

Powell, A. (2010) *Sex, Power and Consent: Youth Culture and the Unwritten Rules*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Renold, E. and Ringrose, J. (2016) Selfies, Relfies and Phallic Tagging: Posthuman part-icipations in teen digital sexuality assemblages, *Educational Philosophy and Theory* DOI:10.1080/00131857.2016.1185686

Retallack, H. Ringrose, J. and Lawrence, E. (2016). 'Fuck your body image': Teen girls' Twitter and Instagram feminism in and around school in J. Coffey Shelley Budgeon and Helen Cahill (Eds*.) Learning Bodies: The Body in Youth and Childhood Studies* (pp.). London: Springer.

Ringrose, J. and Renold, E. (2016) Cows, cabins and tweets: posthuman intra-acting affect and feminist fires in secondary school. In C. Taylor and C. Hughes (eds), *Posthuman Research Practices in Education*. London: Palgrave.

Ringrose, J., Gill, R., Livingstone, S. and Harvey, L. (2012) *A Qualitative Study of Children, Young People and 'Sexting'*. London: NSPCC .

Sedgwick, E. K. (1992) *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Trottier, D. (2014) *Identity Problems in the Facebook Era*. London: Routledge.

Van Dijck, J. (2013) *The Culture of Connectivity: A Critical History of Social Media*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van Doorn, N. (2010) The ties that bind: the networked performance of gender, sexuality and friendship on MySpace. *New Media and Society*, 12(4): 583–602.

Wetherell, M. (2012) *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding,* Sage Publications Ltd.