

---

This item was submitted to [Loughborough's Research Repository](#) by the author.  
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

## **‘Fraping’, ‘Sexting’, ‘Trolling’ and ‘Rinsing’: social networking, feminist thought and the construction of young women as victims or villains**

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

PUBLISHER

BSA Gender Study Group

VERSION

AM (Accepted Manuscript)

PUBLISHER STATEMENT

This work is made available according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) licence. Full details of this licence are available at:  
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

LICENCE

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

REPOSITORY RECORD

Lumsden, Karen, and Heather M. Morgan. 2019. “‘fraping’, ‘sexting’, ‘trolling’ and ‘rinsing’: Social Networking, Feminist Thought and the Construction of Young Women as Victims or Villains”. figshare.  
<https://hdl.handle.net/2134/15756>.

# **‘Frapping’, ‘Trolling’ and ‘Rinsing’: Social Networking, Feminist Thought and the Construction of Young Women as Victims or Villains**

**Dr Karen Lumsden and Dr Heather M. Morgan<sup>1</sup>**

## **Abstract**

This paper explores the contradictory framing of young women’s social networking use in public and media discourses and situates it within current debates regarding the future of feminism for young women. While social networking activities began as relatively trivial, recently public and media concern has grown, especially in light of a so-called rise in ‘problematic’ gendered/sexualized behaviours on social networking sites. Examples include ‘frapping’, ‘sexting’, ‘trolling’ and ‘rinsing’; behaviours that push the boundaries of acceptability in terms of normative gendered/sexualized and embodied practices. Paradoxically, young women are presented as both victims of more predatory, deviant and/or criminal behaviours on social networking sites, such as cyber-stalking and cyber-bullying and their consequences, and villains in terms of their engagement in the aforementioned gendered/sexualized interactions.

## **Keywords**

Facebook, feminism, gender, media, social networking, trolling

## **Introduction**

In the last decade, social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter have become essential interactional tools for negotiating both public (professional) and private (personal) lives. Via these sites, online spaces are created for individuals to parody and play with a multitude of identities by presenting themselves in one or several virtual profiles, thus allowing for the constant contesting and re-moulding of their electronic personas depending on the specific purpose or context. Hence, through information and communications technologies such as the internet, ‘individuals increasingly exist beyond their private bodies’ (Sheller and Urry 2003, 116). While social networking activities began as relatively trivial, even peripheral, recently, public and media concern has grown, especially in light of a so-called rise in ‘problematic’ gendered/sexualized behaviours on social networking sites, which involve young women in particular. Examples of these behaviours include ‘frapping’,

‘sexting’, ‘trolling’ and ‘rinsing’; behaviours which push the boundaries of acceptability in terms of normative gendered/sexualized and embodied practices, but which have become central to women’s everyday interactions. Hence, paradoxically, young women are presented as both victims of more predatory, deviant and/or criminal behaviours on social networking sites, such as ‘cyber-stalking’ and ‘cyber-bullying’ and their consequences (wider deviant/criminal acts such as paedophilia and pornography), and villains in terms of their engagement in the aforementioned gendered/sexualized online interactions. In terms of feminist thought, the latter behaviours have been said to indicate a shift from second-wave feminism, which promoted women’s opportunity for independence from, rather than acquiescence to, heteronormative sexualization, to a third-wave in which a new generation of young women ‘outwardly embrace sexual imagery’ (Karaian 2012, 69). Hence, this paper explores the contradictory and paradoxical framing of young women’s social networking use in public and media discourses and situates it within current debates regarding the future of feminism for young women.

### **Feminism(s) and Youth Culture: Past, Present and Future**

‘Post-feminism’, ‘third wave feminism’ and ‘new femininities’ are terms frequently used to explain the changes in young women’s engagement and experiences in the social world of late modernity (Nayak and Kehily 2008, 59). ‘Like feminist subjectivities, this “active girlhood” places an emphasis on the rights of the individual to be an active sexual subject without recourse to moral judgement from patriarchal or feminist discourse’ (Nayak and Kehily 2008, 59). As Natasha Walter (2012, 3) points out in *Living Dolls*, however, ‘in this generation a certain view of female sexuality has become celebrated throughout advertisements, music, television programmes, films and magazines. This image of female sexuality has become more than ever defined by the terms of the sex industry’. This ‘hypersexual culture’ is commonly viewed as evidence of women’s growing freedom and power (Walter 2012, 5).

Nevertheless, Walter (2012) argues that the rise of this ‘hypersexual culture’ is not proof that we have reached full equality. Instead, it has reflected and exaggerated the imbalances of power in society, replicating them as they are represented in the sex industry. Hence, it has become acceptable (and perhaps expected) for young women and girls to actively engage in the cultural formations, practices and discourses

described above. This can be sexual and should not be judged by patriarchal or feminist discourses (in terms of the latter – or so the argument goes). And, still, there is a lens through which they are interpreted and it is that of the sex industry. As Laura Mulvey (2004[1975], 62) notes in her work on the ‘male gaze’:

In a world ordered by sexual imbalance, pleasure in looking has been split between active/male and passive/female. The determining male gaze projects its phantasy on to the female figure which is styled accordingly. In their traditional exhibitionist role women are simultaneously looked at and displayed, with their appearance coded for strong visual and erotic impact so that they can be said to connote *to-be-looked-at-ness*. Women displayed as sexual object is the leit-motif of erotic spectacle...

The ways in which young women (and girls) are presented in online spaces such as Facebook, and the ways in which they display and position themselves (in terms of the camera lens, angle, and parts of body which are displayed), indicate the way in which the ‘male gaze’ is potentially internalized by young women who have been exposed to a culture which is highly sexualized. The display of self and body via Facebook thus demonstrates the ‘to-be-looked-at-ness’ connotation highlighted by Mulvey (2004[1975]).

### **(Anti-)Social Networking: Gender, Sexuality and Deviance**

Examples of particular behaviours which have recently come under the scrutiny of the media, authorities, charities, government and so on include: ‘fraping’, ‘trolling’, ‘rinsing’ and ‘sexting’. ‘Sexting’ is the ‘practice of sending or posting sexually suggestive text messages and images, including nude or semi-nude photographs, via cellular telephones or over the Internet’ (*Miller v. Mitchell* 4-5 cited in Karaian 2012, 57-58). However, we are not going to discuss ‘sexting’ in the context of this paper. Instead, we will focus on three behaviours directly related to social networking sites which have become ubiquitous in recent years but have not yet received systematic feminist and social scientific attention. These (deviant or even criminal) behaviours highlight the fluid or tenuous boundary between sexualized behaviours engaged in by young women online and the external threat women face from for instance, ‘trolling’ (a form of cyber-bullying). This paper examines social networking trends in this

context and through the lens of gender. These particular behaviours have been initially selected as they highlight the ambiguous and contradictory ways in which sex/gender are understood, conceived of, and reflected in online spaces.

### *'Fraping': Manipulation and Symbolic (Sexual) Violence*

'Fraping' is the act of 'raping someone's Facebook profile when they leave it logged in' (Urban Dictionary 2007) and involves changing account or privacy details or updating their profile with a phoney status message or picture whilst they are temporarily unaware (away from the computer/phone or when their account has been compromised). More simply, it is defined as 'a portmanteau of Facebook and rape; to manipulate someone else's profile' (Graham and Mathis 2012). The sexual connotation, and symbolic violation, is linguistically interesting and characterises the normalized sexual/violent online interactions that are now ubiquitous. As Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992, 167) argue symbolic violence is the 'violence which is exercised upon a social agent with his or her complicity'. Graham and Mathis (2012) claim that terms such as 'fraping', and their definitions, exclude and even attack homosexuals and women and 'betray power structures external to the online world'. As Ryan (2011) writes:

According to Facebook, talking about raping your friend's girlfriend to see 'if she can put up a fight' is neither violent nor hateful, and advocating such a scenario is a 'belief'. Not for the first time, we are told rape is something to be trivialised – the special crime that can be actively promoted with the confidence that few will bat an eye.

'Fraping' reinforces heteronormative relations and can also reinforce hetero-social solidarity, particularly amongst young male friendship groups.<sup>2</sup> It also normalises the language used – people discuss 'fraping' with no sensitivity. Why is the use of this term and the behaviour deemed acceptable on Facebook? Given that some individuals would consider that they do not exist unless they are on Facebook, as it is a virtual manifestation of themselves but has become an essential means of mediated interaction, particularly for younger generations (who, unlike most of us here today, have no knowledge or memory of the pre- social networking, mobile phone and internet days). Hence, is the 'fraping' practice actually really dangerous? Also – the

victim is public, but the perpetrator remains (or could potentially remain) anonymous. Is there any sort of symbolic justice? No, so basically you can ‘fraped’ without consequence? The individual who has been ‘fraped’ is blamed for leaving themselves ‘open’ to be ‘fraped’. Plus, because no one takes it seriously, the victim cannot be seen to complain. Is leaving your computer logged on and ‘open’ conceived of in the same way as the rape victim who was ‘asking for it’ because she was wearing a short skirt? In both cases, the blame is apportioned to the ‘f/rape’ victim.

*‘Trolling’: Outrage, Sexism, Misogyny and Racism*

‘Trolling’ can be likened to a form of cyber-bullying and involves the sending or submission of provocative emails or posts with the intention of inciting an angry response. In contrast to visibility, anonymity has also been deemed important in terms of online identity. This makes ‘trolling’ possible in a variety of cyber settings, from online news comments pages, to individual profiles on Twitter and Facebook, through to internet blogs. As Williams (2012) writes in the *Guardian*:

Trolls aren't necessarily any more pleasant than haters, but their agenda is different – they don't just want to insult a particular person, they want to start a fight – hopefully one that has a broader application, and brings in more people than just the object of their original trolling. The term derives from a fishing technique – say your stupid thing, watch the world bite.

Societal offense is the main aim of the ‘troll’: ‘This is the dead centre of troll territory; what they're looking for is that sharp intake of breath; the collective, "How can you say that?" outrage’ (Williams 2012). Advice to the innocent internet user advises them to ignore the ‘troll’, or do not ‘feed the troll’.<sup>3</sup>

The ‘trolling’ of certain celebrity figures, from athletes to footballers, pop stars to politicians, has raised public awareness of this form of cyber-abuse. Recent high profile cases of ‘trolling’ include biology student, Liam Stacey, who mocked footballer Fabrice Muamba after he collapsed on the pitch during a match in March 2012. Stacey, branded an internet ‘troll’, pled guilty to the charge of racially aggravated harassment and disorder and received a prison sentence of 56 days for

inciting racial hatred (Osborne 2012). During the 2012 London Olympic Games, Olympic diver Tom Daley also became the victim of abusive and threatening messages on Twitter (*The Telegraph* 2012). The teenage ‘troll’ avoided prosecution after apologizing for his comments and quickly removing the post. Just this past week, 19-year-old Matthew Woods was sentenced to 12 weeks in prison for making ‘grossly offensive’ remarks about missing five-year-old April Jones on his Facebook page (see Rozenberg 2012). In 2012 X-Factor finalist Cher Lloyd spoke out about persistent cyber-bulling which included regular racist ‘tweets’ calling her a ‘dirty pikey’ (*BBC* 2012).

Moreover, examples also abound of a phenomenon known as ‘RIP trolling’, where anonymous individuals post offensive comments on tribute pages set up on Facebook. For instance, Sean Duffy, jailed for 18 weeks in 2011, targeted Facebook tribute pages and posted videos on YouTube taunting the dead victims and their families (Morris 2011). He was also given a five-year Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO), which prohibited him from creating and accessing social networking sites.

Social media face increasing pressure from criminal justice authorities and the police to act quickly to remove offensive posts in order to avoid arrests (Sabbagh 2012). The Communications Act 2003 governs the internet, email, mobile phone calls and text messaging. Under Section 127 of the act it is an offence to send messages that are ‘grossly offensive or of an indecent, obscene or menacing character.’ The offence occurs whether those targeted actually receive the message or not. In 2012, the UK government began debating an amendment to the Defamation Act, which would allow for tracking of the identities of users, while excluding internet providers from any recourse for individuals’ publication of inflammatory comments online. As justice secretary Kenneth Clarke commented:

...most operators are not in a position to know whether the material posted is defamatory or not and very often – faced with a complaint – they will immediately remove material.... Our proposed approach will mean that website operators have a defence against libel as long as they comply with a procedure to help identify the authors of allegedly defamatory material. (Press Association 2012)

In a House of Commons Debate on ‘Internet Trolling’ in September 2012, politicians called for a change to the law. The debate highlighted the argument that increasing regulation would threaten ‘freedom of speech’. Labour Member of Parliament (MP) Steve Rotherham stated:

Trolling is wide-ranging and stirs up strong social feelings, among people who want it criminalized and want those who indulge in it to be jailed, and among those who believe it is their inherent right to indulge in it – as they see it – a bit of banter, and who claim that freedom of speech is one of their human rights, whether or not it causes offence. It should be noted that the right to freedom of speech is not absolute in any country, and that right is commonly subject to limitations. (House of Commons Hansard Debates 2012)

He added that there was ‘universal recognition’ from police, politicians, Facebook and the Crown Prosecution Service, that ‘trolling’ exists, is ‘grossly offensive’ and ‘escalating’.

Changes in the law are all very well, when called for (and we will return to this point in the discussion), however this also highlights the need for cultural changes, particularly in the context of the current ‘sexualized’ celebrity *exposé* culture, epitomized in various media forms such as magazines, reality television shows and newspapers (both tabloids and broadsheets).

Moreover, concerning as the above ‘trolling’ cases are, what is lacking in public discussions and in academic understandings thus far, is the gendered nature of this practice and its repercussions, both in terms of ‘who’ (villain) is engaging in this deviant cyber-act, and who is on the receiving end of these forms of online abuse (victim). For instance, in November 2011, Helen Lewis reported in the *New Statesman* that female bloggers are increasingly on the receiving end of ‘death threats’, ‘rape threats’ and ‘misogynist comments’. Drawing on interviews with a variety of female bloggers she highlights the extent of online sexual abuse and harassment: ‘Being a woman on the internet seemed to be enough to anger people, regardless of what you were writing’ (Dawn Foster, blogger for F at Philistine).



Others female bloggers claimed that:

The vast majority of the abuse is gender-related. There is a clear link to internet pornography. Much of the language used could have come straight from pornographic sites. For example, from this week: 'IF THIS TRASH TALKING K\*NT HAD HER F\*CKNG, TONGUE RIPPED OUT OF HER SUCK-HOLE...' [I won't correct the spelling or grammar, that would seem odd]. (Kate Smurthwaite, feminist activist and comedienne, original emphasis)

As feminists, we know that there's at least something about us or something we want to say that will incur the wrath of misogynists. We're constantly ducking and diving, choosing our words carefully and having to walk the tightrope of being completely true to our beliefs, regardless of whether they happen to please other feminists or (conversely) the sexist majority, but also making sure we don't prompt misogynists to attack us because of an ill-chosen word or two. (Anonymous blogger)

Last night, I was informed that if all women looked like me, there would be no more rape in the world. I have to admit that I laughed when I read it, as it was exactly the level of response I was expecting. If there is one thing I have learned about being a woman with vocal opinions, it is that everything I ever do or say is wrong because of my physical appearance. Well, at least according to the common or garden internet troll. (Natalie Dzerins, author of feminist blog *Forty Shades of Grey*)

Lewis (2012) wrote in July this year that the reaction to the above article was largely positive, however, Brendan O'Neill, from the *Telegraph* blogs section wrote that feminist campaigners pointing this out was a, "hilarious echo of the 19th-century notion that women need protecting from vulgar and foul speech". We were, he said, "a tiny number of peculiarly sensitive female bloggers" trying to close down freedom of speech'.

Therefore sexism and misogynistic (and racist) attitudes take myriad forms in cyberspace. Although racism (particularly in relation to the world of football) has

been challenged in public discourses and media, gender discrimination and sexism remains largely unchallenged.

*'Sex, Lies, and Rinsing Guys'*

'Rinsing' refers to the act of 'getting something for nothing' (Wollaston 2012) and in the context of social networking sites involves women searching the internet for rich men to fund their extravagant lifestyles and their basic ones too in the sense that they 'live' off of the proceeds of their 'rinsing'. The description of the 2012 Channel 4 documentary *Sex, Lies and Rinsing Guys*, stated (Whitelocks 2012):

To get their hearts' desires traditionally some women have used their natural charms to exploit men's weaknesses. But today, a new breed of women are making it big business.

These women are getting whatever they want from men - from life's luxuries to their gas bill paid - in a phenomenon known as 'rinsing'.

These relationships are always on the women's own terms. Sex is never part of the deal - the men's wallets may open, but the girls' legs stay firmly closed.

Fake tan, boobs and eyelashes are all part of the game. And now Facebook, Twitter and smart phones enable these women to work their men at the touch of a button.

Channel 4's portrayal of the 'rinsing' phenomenon is reminiscent of other documentaries and reality television shows which champion the objectification of women and a return to traditional gender roles where men play the role of provider. Do these signify female progress via the claim that these women are making it 'big business'? Similar justifications are used by celebrities such as Jordan and Amy Childs for instance, who counter claims regarding their objectification with claims that they are independent business women, carving their own way through the world of celebrity and consumption. However, as Walter (2010, 2) points out:

Living a doll's life seems to have become an aspiration for many young women, as they leave childhood behind only to embark on a project of

grooming, dieting and shopping that aims to achieve the bleached, waxed, tinted look of a Bratz or Barbie doll. The characters they watch in romantic comedies are women who make exaggerated femininity seem aspirational, and the celebrities they read about in fashion and gossip magazines are often women who are well known to have chosen extreme regimes, from punishing diets to plastic surgery, to achieve an airbrushed perfection.

### **Discussion: Men's Domain?**

Payne (2008, 32) claims that 'the Internet and the properties of cyberspace more generally have been represented as constituting an unsafe space where a range of existing social problems and moral dangers are intensified'. Thus, panics over these mediums of communication and their utilization are undoubtedly followed by proposals and attempts to regulate and control them. Hence, on the one hand, we have the representation of young women as victims of the dangers of cyberspace. 'Trolling' in particular highlights the (sexual) abuse and harassment experienced by women who dare to step or trespass into (cyber) spaces deemed to be 'men's domain'. For instance girls and young women who play video games such as 'Call of Duty' have also reported experiences of sexist treatment and abuse from male participants. This form of abuse also continues in the form of 'RIP trolling' where the identity (and memory) of the victim, which has been immortalized via the Facebook tribute page, is attacked or desecrated by the 'troll'. Metaphorically, and symbolically, this cyber-act resonates with instances of the physical desecration of gravesites.

Women are, in the behaviours we note, characterized as '(f)rape' victims or, in the case of 'rinsing', as glorified prostitutes – which is really not dissimilar to in previous generations when women who were not in the home/domesticated/wives (private spaces – in which they are actually statistically more dangerous – domestic violence) and who entered men's (public) spaces without reserve are castigated and their victimhood is not given without caveats. They are seen as contributing to their own demise. Therefore, they become villains. The boundary is blurry.

However, on the other hand, young women are also *villains* due to their involvement in the gendered and sexualized behaviours outlined above, which can be viewed through the lens of the sexualization of culture, which they appear to actively and

artfully embrace. Young women's participation in these behaviours (and more generally acceptance of a hyper-(hetero)sexualized necessitated presentation of female embodiment, epitomized in reality television show *The Only Way is Essex* (*TOWIE*), for instance, particularly in relation to the practice of 'vajazzling' (the adorning of a woman's private parts with jewelled stones). The playful parodying of the working-class 'Essex girl' stereotype in reality television culture has had wide-reaching implications in terms of celebrity culture and the music, fashion and beauty industries (for example fake tan, 'vajazzling', summer parties in Marbella and so on). For instance, one female star of the show, Amy Childs, rose to fame through *TOWIE* and is now a celebrity icon in her own right. Her 'ample cleavage' and fashion choices are a regular point of discussion for the newspapers and in celebrity magazines (see for instance Saunders and Dadds 2012). As Walter (2012, 26-27) notes, the aesthetic of glamour modelling has also affected the ways that women present themselves socially with online social networking sites often foregrounding similar images of young women.

Hence, identity, social class, race, ethnicity and so on are interrelated with gendered and sexualized identities and practices. Moreover, Beverley Skeggs (2005, 967, see also 1997) draws our attention to a 'historical-representational moralizing, pathologizing disgust-producing register attached to working-class women'. It is here that: 'The disparate discourses of familial disorder and dysfunction, fecund and excessive femininities, of anti-social behaviour, and of moral and ecological decay combine (Skeggs 2005, 967). For instance, *TOWIE* (and the practice of 'vajazzling') reflect the rise of the *nouveau riche* (or 'Z-list') celeb and highlight the complex and contradictory notions surrounding what is/are legitimate 'taste(s)' in our contemporary (sexualized) culture. As Bourdieu (1984, 57) notes: 'Objectively and subjectively aesthetic stances adopted in matters like cosmetics, clothing or home decoration are opportunities to experience or assert one's position in social space, as a rank to be upheld or a distance to be kept'.

Additionally, how and why are these behaviours defined as 'deviant' and responded to in public, media, and legal discourses? The 'troll' for instance, appears in these discourses at present as a 'gender-neutral' creature, despite the fact that the vast majority of 'trolls' (villains) appear to have been male (and the vast majority of

victims appear to have been female). Moreover, the focus on ‘celebrity’ victims of ‘trolling’ threatens to overshadow those everyday online interactions, which tell us a great deal about gendered/sexualized interactions in cyber-space. A curious situation is occurring with the online (‘virtual’) world being treated in the same sense as the offline (‘real’) world. The private becomes the public and is the public. Sheller and Urry (2003, 113) argue that, ‘changing forms of physical and informational mobility... uproot bodies from place and information from space...’ They point to a hybridization of public and private and claim that ‘any hope for public citizenship and democracy... will depend on the capacity to navigate these new material, mobile worlds that are neither public nor private’ (Sheller and Urry 2003, 113). Thus, socio-technologies such as the internet ‘undo all divisions between public and private life through their machinic, mobile hybridities’ (Sheller and Urry 2003, 115). Due to this hybridization, privacy itself becomes transformed.

Evidently this has direct implications in terms of how society responds to, regulates, and polices social networking sites, and how it punishes transgressors. For instance, online spaces consist of their own rules of conduct (and hence misconduct) applicable to individuals who wish to participate in the virtual world:

...online communities employ a form of online community policing through norm maintenance which tends to exploit the ‘natural surveillance’ of networked technologies to facilitate both primary and secondary social control functions, while also mediating where they arise, any disparities arising from national or jurisdictional legal differences in definition.’ (Wall and Williams 2007, 410)

They add that as online behaviour becomes more complex, so too does its governance (Wall and Williams 2007). McGuire (2012, 63) argues that the spatial extension of agency that information and communications technologies (ICTs) enable is crucial here, since ‘unlike physical harm, almost anything that can be done to damage an individual’s psychological well-being at close proximities can also be enacted at a distance’. Moreover, what is ‘said’, ‘written’, or visually presented online, even in those spaces which are taken-for-granted as private such as Facebook pages, take on a

life of their own in the cyber-world and go beyond the authorship of their creators (Berger and Luckmann 1967). As Sheller and Urry (2003, 117) argue:

Fluids move according to certain novel shapes and temporalities as they may break free from the linear, clock-time of existing routeways – but they cannot go back, they cannot return since all times are irreversible. The messy complexity of relatively unfixed and mobile publics and privates can best be understood as emergent configurations of people, technologies and places within these global flows.

Like cave etchings or drawings of early humankind, online ‘tweets’, Facebook ‘messages’, ‘chat’, ‘pokes’, and ‘likes’ are permanent (in the future lifespan of the relevant social networking sites) and can be used by police and the Crown Prosecution Service as evidence (a fact which many Facebook or Twitter users appear to be unaware of and is evidenced in recurrent debates about privacy and security on these sites). The virtual Facebook ‘wall’ is thus currently as enduring as the solid cave wall etching, and its messages can have wide-reaching (and unintended) ramifications.

## **Conclusion**

This paper discussed the contradictory framing of young women’s social networking use in public and media discourses and situated it within current debates regarding the future of feminism for young women. While social networking activities began as relatively trivial, recently public and media concern has grown, especially in light of a so-called rise in ‘problematic’ gendered/sexualized behaviours on social networking sites. Examples include ‘fraping’, ‘trolling’ and ‘rinsing’; behaviours that push the boundaries of acceptability in terms of normative gendered/sexualized and embodied practices. Paradoxically, young women are presented as both victims of more predatory, deviant and/or criminal behaviours on social networking sites, such as cyber-stalking and cyber-bullying and their consequences, and villains in terms of their engagement in the aforementioned gendered/sexualized interactions.

What do the emergence of these forms of deviant (gendered and sexualized) behaviours, and young women’s engagement in them, tell us about their

understandings of gender, self-identity and sexuality in the 2000's ('naughties'). How can feminism respond to and unpack these shifts which at face-value appear to indicate a return to sexist, misogynist behaviours, which worryingly appear to be largely taken-for-granted and deemed acceptable in the online world (particularly for instance in relation to the aforementioned example of 'fraping')? This highlights the central issue in feminism of whether these young women are cultural dupes, or are afforded agency via the individual and collective possibilities and pleasures which spaces such as the virtual world can provide (see Richardson and Robinson 2008). Thus, how do we move forward in terms of feminist thought and political activism in the context of the increasing 'sexualization of culture'? Perhaps, the internet, and the promise it brought of a free, democratic space for personal expression (and moulding of identity/ies) has not come to fruition, particularly in relation to the aforementioned examples of 'trolling', 'rinsing' and 'fraping'. Greater understanding of these issues is vital in order to inform the shifts and trends which are occurring in relation to the surveillance, policing, and legal regulation of social networking sites and interactions within/on them, and the definition and punishment of anti-social, deviant or criminal cyber-practices. Knee-jerk reactions engaged in thus far by police, government, and the criminal justice system (in line with political debates and heightened media coverage of online offences such as 'trolling') must be informed by academic insights into the social, political, cultural (and particularly classed, gendered and racialized) nature(s) of electronically-mediated social interactions.

## References

- BBC (2012) *Panorama: Hunting the Internet Bullies*, London: BBC.
- Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. (1967) *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, London: Penguin.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. R. Nice, London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L.J.D. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Graham, C. and Mathis, K. (2012) *Frape, Stalking and Whores: Semantics and Social Narrative on Facebook*. Inter-disciplinary.Net. Available online at: <http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/critical-issues/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/grahamtmpaper.pdf> (accessed October 2012).

- House of Commons Hansard Debates (2012) *Internet Trolling* (17 September 2012: Column 754). Available online at: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmhansrd/cm120917/debtext/120917-0004.htm> (accessed October 2012).
- Karaian, L. (2012) 'Lolita Speaks: "Sexting", Teenage Girls and the Law', *Crime, Media, Culture* 8(1): 57-73.
- Lewis, H. (2011) "'You Should Have Your Tongue Ripped Out.'" The Reality of Sexist Abuse Online', *New Statesman*. Available online at: <http://www.newstatesman.com/blogs/helen-lewis-hasteley/2011/11/comments-rape-abuse-women> (accessed October 2012).
- Lewis, H. (2012) 'This is What Online Harassment Looks Like', *New Statesman*. Available online at: <http://www.newstatesman.com/blogs/internet/2012/07/what-online-harassment-looks> (accessed October 2012).
- McGuire, M.R. (2012) *Technology, Crime and Justice: the Question Concerning Technomia*, London: Routledge.
- Morris, S. (2011) 'Internet Troll Jailed After Mocking Deaths of Teenagers', *The Guardian*. Available online at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2011/sep/13/internet-troll-jailed-mocking-teenagers> (accessed October 2012).
- Mulvey, L. (2004[1975]) 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema', in L. Brandy and M. Cohen (eds) *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, New York: Oxford University Press, pp.833-844.
- Nayak, A. and Kehily, M.J. (2008) *Gender, Youth and Culture: Young Masculinities and Femininities*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Osborne, R. (2012) 'Muamba "Troll" Jailed After Racist Comments', *ITV News*. Available online at: <http://www.itv.com/news/wales/2012-03-27/muamba-troll-jailed/> (accessed October 2012).
- Patchin, J. W. and Hinduja, S. (2010). 'Trends in Online Social Networking Adolescent Use of Myspace Over Time', *New Media and Society* 12 (2): 197–216.
- Payne, R. (2008) 'Virtual Panic: Children Online and the Transmission of Harm', in C. Krinsky (ed.) *Moral Panics Over Contemporary Children and Youth*, Farnham: Ashgate, pp.31-46.
- Press Association (2012) 'Internet Trolls Targeted in New Bill to Tackle Defamation Online', *The Guardian*. Available online at:



<http://www.guardian.co.uk/law/2012/jun/12/internet-trolls-bill-defamation-online>

(accessed October 2012).

Richardson, D. and Robinson, V. (2008) *Introducing Gender and Women's Studies*, 3rd edn, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ringrose, J. (2008) “‘Every Time She Bends Over She Pulls Up Her Thong’: Teen Girls Negotiating Discourses of Competitive, Heterosexualized Aggression’, *Girlhood Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*. (1): 33–59.

Ringrose, J. (2010) ‘Sluts, Whores, Fat Slags and Playboy Bunnies: Teen girls’ Negotiations of “Sexy” on Social Networking Sites and at School’, in C. Jackson, C. Paechter and E. Renold (eds) *Girls and Education 3–16: Continuing Concerns, New Agendas*, Basingstoke: Open University Press.

Rozenberg, J. (2012) ‘April Jones Facebook Comments: Should Matthew Woods be in Prison?’ *The Guardian*. Available online at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/law/2012/oct/09/april-jones-facebook-comments-prison> (accessed October 2012).

Ryan, F. (2011) ‘Why Facebook’s Rape Jokes Are No Laughing Matter’, *New Statesman*. Available online at: <http://www.newstatesman.com/blogs/the-staggers/2011/10/abuse-based-facebook-offensive> (accessed October 2012).

Sabbagh, D. (2012) ‘Facebook and Twitter Could be Asked to Increase Moderation of Networks’, *The Guardian*. Available online at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/2012/oct/09/dpp-criminal-tweets-facebook-posts?intcmp=239> (accessed October 2012).

Saunders, L. and Dadds, K. (2012) ‘Amy Childs (Just About) Squeezes Herself into Another Pencil Dress to Celebrate Her New Boutique Opening’, *Daily Mail*. Available online at: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/tvshowbiz/article-2198917/Amy-Childs-just-squeezes-pencil-dress-celebrate-new-boutique-opening.html> (accessed October 2012).

Sheller, M. and Urry, J. (2003) ‘Mobile Transformations of “Public” and “Private” Life’, *Theory, Culture & Society* 20(3): 107-25.

Skeggs, B. (1997) *Formations of Class and Gender*, London: Sage.

Skeggs, B. (2005) ‘The Making of Class and Gender Through Visualizing Moral Subject Formation’, *Sociology* 39(5): 965-82.

*The Telegraph* (2012) ‘Hunt for Tom Daley Twitter Troll: Seaside Police Raid Nets Suspect, 17’. Available online at:

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/diving/9442445/Hunt-for-Tom-Daley-Twitter-troll-seaside-police-raid-nets-suspect-17.html> (accessed October 2012).

Wall, D.S. and Williams, M. (2007) 'Policing Diversity in the Digital Age: Maintaining Order in Virtual Communities', *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 7(4): 391-415.

Walter, N. (2010) *Living Dolls: the Return of Sexism*, London: Virago Press.

Whitelocks, S. (2012) 'Rise of the "Rinsers": Meet the Women Trawling the Internet for Rich Men to Fund their Extravagant Lifestyles', *Daily Mail*. Available online at: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/femail/article-2145249/Sex-Lies-Rinsing-Guys-Meet-women-trawling-internet-rich-men.html> (accessed October 2012).

Williams, Z. (2012) 'What is an Internet Troll?' *The Guardian*. Available online at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/technology/2012/jun/12/what-is-an-internet-troll> (accessed October 2012).

Wollaston, S. (2012) 'TV Review: Sex, Lies and Rinsing Guys', *The Guardian*. Available online at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/tv-and-radio/2012/may/15/sex-lies-and-rinsing-guys> (accessed October 2012).

---

<sup>1</sup> Contact details: Dr Karen Lumsden, Department of Social Sciences, Loughborough University, Loughborough LE11 3TU, UK [K.Lumsden@lboro.ac.uk](mailto:K.Lumsden@lboro.ac.uk); Dr Heather M. Morgan, Health Services Research Unit (HSRU), University of Aberdeen, 3rd Floor, Health Sciences Building, Foresterhill, Aberdeen, AB25 2ZD, UK [h.morgan@abdn.ac.uk](mailto:h.morgan@abdn.ac.uk)

<sup>2</sup> For examples of 'fraping' rules see: <http://facebookcraze.com/20-hilarious-frape-rules-and-ideas-for-facebook-fraping/>

<sup>3</sup> Fox 11 News Report on 'trolling' (2011): <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vJqeAhjsjAw>