Article | **Trusting children:**
How do surveillance technologies alter a child's experience of trust, risk and responsibility?

Tonya Rooney

University of New England, Australia. tonya.rooney@une.edu.au

Abstract

The growing use of new forms of surveillance technology across the day-to-day lives of children and the spaces they inhabit brings with it potential changes to childhood experience. These technologies may change the way children interact with others and the way they come to understand the world around them. This article investigates the nature of these changes by looking at the impact of new surveillance technologies on a child's experience of trust. It aims to show that an increased surveillance presence across a child's everyday activity may be denying children important opportunities both to trust others and to be trusted.

Introduction

There are many types of surveillance technologies used to observe, monitor and control the lives of children and they are used for a variety of reasons. Surveillance technologies are often used for security purposes, such as when CCTV cameras are installed in childcare institutions to deter or detect harm perpetrated against children. In other cases the primary reason for installing surveillance technology may be to improve administrative efficiency, one example being the use of fingerprinting in school libraries to administer and monitor borrowing. There is no question that children require care, protection and guidance in order to thrive. Surveillance technologies are often applied to children and children's spaces with these aims in mind. However, the use of surveillance technologies also has the potential to bring about changes to the spaces children inhabit. They may for example change the way children conduct their day-to-day activities, build relationships with others and come to an understanding of who they are and the world they live in. The question is, what is the exact nature of these changes, and is it possible to identify any situations where an increased surveillance presence might be to a child's detriment, perhaps inhibiting rather than enhancing childhood experience? There are many angles from which this question could be investigated. Here I limit my assessment to one such angle - an analysis based on the notion of 'trust'.

When I refer to surveillance technologies in this paper, these are generally 'information' technologies that bring with them the capacity to record, store, collate, relay and replay data about a child. My interest is in those that are becoming a more common part of childhood experience, including: webcams and CCTVs that are now found in homes, childcare centres and schools; tracking devices including GPS locators fitted in a range of children's accessories such as clothing items, backpacks and mobile phones; biometric ID and fingerprinting systems for school roll-calls and borrowing library books; online 'spyware'; drug testing kits for parents; and an expanding range of other devices and database tools that provide new ways to track, monitor and control children's activities. This is not an exhaustive list but rather aims to give a general idea of the types of technologies that fall within the scope of this discussion.

The increasing use of these types of technologies to monitor and track children reflects a global trend. In the United Kingdom, the government recently launched a database known as 'ContactPoint' that will eventually hold key personal, health and school details of 11 million children (BBC News 2009). The United States is experiencing a growth in use of CCTV cameras in school playgrounds and classrooms, with the majority of new schools now installing these devices (Dillon 2003). A new initiative in India is considering the use of biometrics to monitor school attendance at a state-wide level (Sindh Today 2009), and under-skin RFID chip implants have been promoted in South American countries as a tool to combat child kidnapping (Masters and Michael 2007; Scheeres 2002).

The expanding use of these technologies is in part revealed through the changing practices of the surveillance industry itself where products are now marketed direct to parents and schools, rather than the more traditional markets of law enforcement and security. The fact that these technologies are now more readily available and affordable has allowed individuals and families to turn to the use of such devices, whether to secure homes against intruders or monitor other individuals (Katz 2006; Monahan 2006). This encroachment in use of surveillance technologies from the public to the private sphere is a notable change in the surveillance landscape and one that arguably increases the likelihood that a child will find themselves under surveillance in the day-to-day spaces they inhabit. Another emerging trend in the use of surveillance technologies on children is that they are no longer just about discipline and control, but are used or perceived as a form of 'care' as well. We only need to look at the brand names of some of the technologies available to see this emerging trend: a 'net nanny' to keep track of a child's online activity; the 'remote peace' internet video monitoring service for childcare centres and schools; and a 'teddyfone' with tracking capacity for toddlers. This paper aims to explore the impact of the expanding use of these technologies on a child's experience of trust, including how a child is trusted by others and in turn learns to trust.

In her 2002 BBC Reith Lectures, Onora O'Neill addressed the apparent 'crisis of trust' within society. O'Neill observed that while the media continually raises new stories about the perceived untrustworthiness of certain individuals and professions, there is little actual evidence to suggest that people are more untrustworthy than in the past. What is new is the increasing evidence of a culture of suspicion. According to O'Neill, the problem lies in our response to this changing environment, where we seek to impose more stringent forms of control on those who are perceived to be untrustworthy, rather than look at the way we trust others and how we might make changes to (re)build trust in society (2002). While the focus of O'Neill's lecture was on trust in public and private sector institutions, I suggest something similar is happening when we look at the way surveillance technologies are used on children, raising questions such as: Is the increased use of surveillance technologies on children in part a response to the fact that we do not trust children or that we do not trust others who are with/around them? If so, is our response based on an informed assessment of the risks involved? Further, is the use of technologies as a form of control, or even 'care', an appropriate response to addressing a lack of trust or minimising risk? What are the implications for children, if we use surveillance technologies in this way, rather than building trust via alternative means?

Before turning to these issues, I firstly discuss the notion of trust itself: what is trust, and why is it important? In particular, I recommend using an extended notion of trust when it comes to children, as this provides more insight into what may be at stake for children in an environment where trust is undervalued or absent.

Trusting another and being trusted

When looking at the notion of 'trust', I first of all consider how a child trusts others based on an understanding of 'trust' as a need to rely on the good will of others, and in this case the way children rely on others such as parents, carers, friends and strangers in a variety of ways to care for and protect them. I then extend this to look at 'trust' from the perspective of a child being trusted by others to be responsible, to take control and do things in ways that extends their skills and competencies. It is this second dimension that is not as prominent in the literature on trust, and yet which reveals much of what is important for a child in 'being trusted'. Overall, I argue that, if we are to fully appreciate the formative role of trust in childhood experience, we need to consider both these aspects of the notion of trust. This is because, taken together, they help to explain the key foundations of a child's relationships with others and the importance of trust in a broader sense for a child's development as a competent, confident and active human agent.

In a key article on trust, Annette Baier (1986) develops an account of what it is 'to trust' others. The motivation for Baier is to address the moral question 'whom should I trust in what way and why?' (1986, 232) According to Baier, trust is a form of reliance on another's good will. That is, when I trust someone, I am depending on their good will toward me, and in doing so become vulnerable to the limits of that good will. This is in part because I leave the way open to being harmed by another, and have to trust that they will not do this (1986, 234-5).

Why then do we trust others when this leaves us vulnerable? There are many reasons. One is that trusting others can be beneficial, even necessary. Trust allows us to form and build relationships, to rely on the safety of the food we eat, to drive on the roads and use public transport, to seek advice from health professionals and to carry out many other basic day-to-day actions (McLeod, 2006). Further, we need to trust others, not just to meet these needs or to avoid harm, but in order to create and transform things in our day-to-day lives. This is because many things we value – whether this relates to children, political life, the arts, reputation or friendship – require us place ourselves in a position where others may:

> injure what we care about, since those are the same positions that they must be in in order to help us take care of what we care about. (Baier 1986, 236)

Another reason we trust others, even though this may leave us vulnerable, is that we often have little or no choice; we simply find ourselves in a position where we must trust another. Trust is therefore inextricably tied with notions of choice, power and control. When we are in a position to make a choice, trust inevitably involves giving the person being trusted some control, and in many cases discretionary power, over what is entrusted.

One of the features of trusting others is that this does not always involve a conscious decision to trust another or not, or therefore an explicit decision to place oneself in a vulnerable position to another; this may happen without being aware of it (Baier 1986, 244). Trust also often involves people in dependent or unequal power relations with each other, and Baier argues that we need to acknowledge these relationships of dependency if we are to move beyond a simplified, contract-based approach to how we understand trust (1986, 241). This is particularly helpful in understanding a child's trust-based relationships with others. If we consider how an infant trusts a parent, the infant is initially powerless in such a relation. The infant can however be said to 'trust' enough for example to accept food that is offered. As the infant gains increasing power, they learn that the parent is not invulnerable and that they too in turn need to trust the child (Baier 1986, 242-3). What develops therefore is a relationship of mutual trust, and even over time as the relationship tends to become more equal, it would not make sense to characterise the relationship as a contract-based one:

> Not only has the child no concept of virtual contract when she trusts, but the parent's duty to the child seems in no way dependent on the expectation that the child will make a later return. (Baier 1986, 244)

A child might not make a conscious decision to trust a parent when they are first born, but can develop a more conscious sense of trust over time. A child can also easily come to distrust a parent if the trust is destroyed, and while trust can be easily broken, distrust is much harder to mend. It is however from the most basic trust between a parent and child, that emerges a sense of trust that becomes amongst other things more conscious, controlled and discriminatory, allowing children to 'trust [themselves] as trusters' (Baier 1986, 244-5).

In summary, when someone is trusted, this generally refers to them being relied upon for some benefit or non-harm to the person doing the trusting. While initially children may have little choice but to trust others, from very early on they do have this choice with respect to some activities, and this soon expands, and includes the choice to distrust or to withhold trust. Just as children need to trust adults, there are instances when an adult or another child will need to trust a child. That is, they will rely on the child to behave in a certain way or perform a certain task in order not to harm, or in order to meet some interest of, the person doing the trusting. These situations might range from simple interactions such as keeping a friend's secret, to even quite onerous circumstances such as where a young child might at times need to feed, protect and care for a parent who is not well.

One of the other benefits of trusting children is that it can be shown that 'trust leads to trustworthiness' (Lahno 2001, 183; Pettit 1995, 218). This happens because, when others trust us, we become trustworthy beings. Further, it is through the act of trusting others that we learn to trust and we come to know the value of trust. Some have described this as a self-perpetuating feature of trust, and it applies equally to distrust as well. If we distrust someone:

> we tend, except in extremely clear cases, to interpret his or her actions and statements in a negative way; even intended overtures may be rejected as attempts to manipulate or deceive. (Govier 1992, 18)

Having opportunities to trust and to be trusted are therefore a crucial part of a child's learning how to be with others in a way that supports their capacity to live and to live in a meaningful way. This is not to say that trusting others or being trusted is always a good thing. There may be situations where trust is unwelcome or misplaced, or where it imposes limitations on a person's action that is unwanted or feels 'coercive' (Jones 1996, 9). There are also situations where distrust may be warranted and a necessary response to potential danger. Children therefore not only need to learn to trust, but they need to learn to trust with good judgement, to trust well (O'Neill 2002). Children also need to be seen as dialogical partners in negotiating trust and risk, not simply subjects of control, a theme that will be returned to later in this paper.

The lessons of trusting and being trusted are important for children. However, there is something else that is happening when we (as adults) 'trust' a child that is not fully addressed by the notion of trust discussed so far. These are the situations where an adult trusts a child to perform a certain action competently or responsibly, but where this does not involve relying on the child to do this in order to serve the interests of the adult. Rather, the child is being trusted in order to further the interests of the child via a positive expression of confidence in a child's ability to perform a particular action or task. This is the notion of 'trust' that is involved when a parent says to a child 'I trust you to walk to your friend's place on your own' or 'I trust you to climb that tree safely'. That is, the adult expresses confidence in the child's capacity to do something (even if this is for the first time) based on what they know of the child's competency and risks involved, with the aim of allowing the child to extend their confidence and skills. Of

course, trusting a child to perform such tasks may at the same time indirectly serve the interests of another (such as the parent), but usually it is primarily in the interests of the child and the child's development. This is similar to what Horsburgh refers to as 'therapeutic trust', where we trust someone as a form of moral support and expression of confidence in their capacity with the aim of increasing the trustworthiness of the person being trusted (1960, 348).

I therefore suggest that, when we talk of 'trust', particularly when it relates to children, we also include a notion of trust that refers to a positive expression of confidence in a person where the benefit is more for the person being trusted than for the person doing the trusting. For children, many actions are new and untested. If they are trusted to extend themselves, this may help them to develop both competence and confidence. In the context of educational settings, it has been observed that a teacher may give a student a task that requires responsibility even where they believe it is fairly risky to trust a particular child with that task. In placing this trust, they signal confidence in that child, and in doing so 'the teacher may count on the pupil being additionally motivated by the signal of trust to do what is right' (Lahno 2001, 184). Teachers may therefore trust children in order to awaken these skills. That is, the teacher trusts a child with a responsible task in order to reveal to the child their own capacities and potential. In this way the child does not just gain the confidence of others around them, but acquires a sense of self-confidence as well. This is supported by Lahno's argument that:

> This sort of trust is at the heart of any genuine educational enterprise. It requires a positive sympathetic attitude toward the pupil as an evolving person (Lahno 2001, 184).

What we can take from Lahno's argument, is that it is sometimes appropriate to trust children, even when we are unsure if they have the skills to perform the task set, as it signals confidence in the child and may in turn build a child's confidence in themselves.

There are a range of reasons a person may welcome the opportunity to be trusted; for example, someone may wish to be trusted in order to receive the good opinion of the person who has trusted them (Pettit 1995, 219). This may be some of what a child is responding to when they take on the trust placed in them to (at least try to) perform a certain task. That is, they aim to please their parents or carers who will then think well of them. However, it is possible that, in part, a child simply wants to have control over particular actions and do things for themselves for the sheer pleasure of succeeding at something new, or perhaps to overcome the frustration of not being able to do things they see others do. The desire to be trusted on this view stems from a sense of determination and growing self-confidence, in addition to any desire to please others.

So, when we talk of 'trusting' children, it is helpful to consider an expanded notion of trust with two key dimensions: the notion of trust as relying on others for a certain benefit or non-harm to the person doing the trusting; and, trust as a positive expression of confidence in the child. It is this second dimension that takes account of a child's a desire to do or control something that is new or for them as yet unchartered territory – not simply to please those who care for them, but as a self-confident expression in their own creativity and subjectivity.

I turn now to the relationship between trust and risk, as this helps to reveal some of the implications for a child if opportunities to trust others and to be trusted are denied through an over-reliance on surveillance technologies.

Surveillance technologies – childhood experience of trust and risk

It has been observed that 'risk is generally held to be a central characteristic of a trustful interaction' (Lahno 2001, 171), and, even more strongly, that 'trust necessarily involves risk' (McLeod 2006, 1). This is because trusting others inevitably opens up a window of risk – that being what is at stake if the trust is

misplaced or disappointed. Given that we must trust others if we are to get through many both mundane and meaningful day-to-day activities, it follows that there will be situations where it is either necessary or on balance a good thing to take some types of risks. If we take the expanded view of trust just discussed, trusting children leads to risks on a number of fronts. It raises the risk that others may not care for, or may harm, a child in a situation where the child is vulnerable to or reliant on another, and there is also a risk that the child themselves might not live up to the trust placed in them. Just as we need to trust, we therefore need to take the risks that trusting entails; and this is not just to meet our basic needs, but also because 'it seems impossible to live a satisfying life entirely without risks' (Lahno 2001, 172).

It is clear then that people do not aim to live a life that is entirely risk free, as this would render us immobile. Indeed some would argue even more strongly that risks lie at the very basis of creativity, and that what is missing in all the attempts to assess, measure and control risks is:

> the acknowledgement of unpredictability and non-calculability (true risk, that is) as an inherent, disruptive and creative force of teaching and learning. (Papastephanou 2006, 50)

Papastephanou argues that the tendency in education to apply a discourse of control is far removed from the reality of the lack of certainty we face in human life (2006, 48). Further, what we see from learners is a 'longing for the risks that make life meaningful' (Papastephanou 2006, 49).

It may seem obvious to make the point that life inevitably involves risks, but the ways in which surveillance technologies are used on children appear to aim at achieving a risk-free environment, with 'risk-avoidance' promoted as a given good. A couple of examples illustrate this point. Baby monitors can be used to detect temperature, humidity, breathing and heart rate in addition to transmitting sound and video images, aiming to promote peace of mind and reassurance for parents that their baby is safe while sleeping or resting. While such monitors may provide a helpful tool in particular situations, it is open to question whether promoting such devices as the 'must have' gadget for 'responsible parents' (Baby Video Monitors Review) is an appropriate response to the actual risk that all parents encounter. GPS tracking systems that are installed in children's clothing, mobile phones or watches are also promoted as a general parental tool, aiming to provide reassurance to parents that they will always know where their child is. (See for example Track My Kids) It is the growing promotion of these forms of surveillance as 'normalised' responses to everyday risks that reveal how efforts to monitor and control children using such technologies promotes an approach to childhood that aims to leave little to chance.

There is no doubt that questions of balancing trust and risk are complex. Parents, carers and teachers need to consider on the one hand whether children are protected sufficiently from harm, and whether there are certain technologies that can help achieve this. On the other, they may need to consider whether there are situations when it is appropriate to accept some risk rather than make use of surveillance technologies in a way that is over-reactive and out of proportion to the risks involved.

Sometimes, the desire to protect children from harm may be motivated by an exaggerated fear of the risks involved or an under-estimation of a child's competency to deal with a particular situation. For example, in a study of parental concerns about children's use of public space, Valentine argues that the global media coverage of violent crimes heightens parental awareness of these types of risks, and, even though the parents acknowledge the risk is very low, they nonetheless fear for their children and take steps to protect them and keep them from public spaces (2004, 15). In public spaces, children are discouraged from interacting with strangers, and:

> Unable or unwilling to trust their children to manage their own safety in public places, most parents actively control and restrict their children's use of space. (Valentine 2004, 55-6)

Valentine explores the types of negotiations about the spatial ranges that children are allowed to explore in public spaces without an adult present (2004, 56). The study revealed that:

> While some parents actively try to develop their children's autonomy and streetwise skills, for example, by giving them special 'licences' to make specific journeys, others are more cautious, keeping their offspring under covert surveillance. (Valentine 2004, 57)

While the reaction from children may differ, evidence from Valentine's research suggests that children often have capacity to make decisions about risk, and may at times resist and subvert the levels of control adults try to put in place. Valentine gives examples of children colluding with each other to tell stories that will reassure parents while giving them the freedom to go out and about, and of children hiding incidents from parents to save the parents from being anxious (2004, 63 & 65).

Where there is a climate of fear about public spaces, it is possible to see how parental fears might lead to a tendency to use tighter mechanisms of control, including the range of surveillance technologies that are now more readily available to parents. However, such an approach, particularly where it is an over-reaction to the risks involved, makes it difficult for children to negotiate an appropriate, realistic and constructive balance between trust and risk. One reason for this is that surveillance technologies are relatively inflexible, and tend to be applied in a constant, homogeneous manner, and as a result the opportunities for a child to negotiate terms of freedom or to subvert the controls that are placed on them rapidly diminish. The technologies, when applied in this way, have no mechanisms to account for or adapt to each child's capacity and surrounding context. A CCTV installed in a school classroom does not operate differently depending on the context or needs of each individual child. It is there as a 'catch all' measure for any person – whether student, teacher or visitor - under its gaze.

Another reason that the use of surveillance technologies makes it difficult to negotiate a balance between trust and risk is that they take away some forms of communication that are critical to achieving this. The chance for a child to negotiate or find some space where they can be trusted is limited by the often distant and non-interactive way in which surveillance devices such as CCTV cameras are used. In some situations, limited negotiation may be possible; for example, some parents 'trust' a child to go out on their own or with friends on the condition that the child agrees to being monitored via a mobile phone or type of GPS tracking systems (Jones, Williams, and Fleuriot 2003, 175; Fotel and Thomsen 2004, 544). However, more often than not, because surveillance technologies are used to allow monitoring from a distance, they potentially reduce the opportunity for negotiation.

While it is possible to establish and build trust over a distance (as is evident across a range of online transactions), it has been noted that there are some features of trust that can only be conveyed in co-present encounters. In a co-present conversation, it is the timing, the pauses, and the fact that there is no set pattern to the discussion, which all contributes to establishing and underpinning the trust that is established in any such encounter:

> A certain form of trust can be displayed and appreciated between actors – a trust that derives from the observable timing and placement of talk and gesture. (Boden and Molotch 1994, 267)

The subtleties of such encounters are lost if trust is replaced with a surveillance device, as there become fewer openings for dialogue, less chance to understand and respect the other as a person, and less opportunity for the child to establish a trust-based relationship with the observer.

It has been observed that constant negotiation between children and adults is a key feature of childhood experience (Eckert 2004, 10). Wherever there is an opportunity to negotiate options for balancing trust and risk there is also the possibility for re-negotiation and greater extension of autonomy for the child as

his/her capacity develops and the adult's confidence in the child's capacity is reinforced. To the extent that using surveillance technologies might remove such opportunities, there is a risk that a child's experience and development of trust may be diminished.

The complex layers of control, and the messages that accompany the promotion of surveillance technologies, make it difficult for parents and carers to keep sight of the fact that there are some situations when it may be all right and even necessary to expose children to some risk. While protecting or caring for children using surveillance technologies may be well-intentioned, we need to question both whether this provides a realistic form of protection and also whether the technologies may in fact be depriving children of the opportunity to develop confidence and competence in skills that would in turn leave them in a stronger position to assess and manage risks across a range of life experiences.

Surveillance technologies do not always provide a viable form of protection, either because the technologies do not work or because they are attempting to control things that in reality cannot be controlled in this way. There is evidence to suggest that, while surveillance technologies, such as CCTV cameras, have shown some effectiveness in allowing criminals to be tracked down after the event, they do not actually prevent or reduce crime in any significant way (Monahan 2006, 4). Furthermore, it has been suggested that the focus on security in childhood may in fact distract from other dimensions of childhood experience that also require our urgent attention. Katz notes that the rise in parental anxiety about children has resulted in strategies of 'hyperviligence' (as evidenced by the growing market in surveillance technologies) that can never really be up to the task of protecting children in the ways that are most needed. In relative terms, the need to protect a child from a dangerous or neglectful nanny, or even a stranger, is not as pressing as other challenges such as poverty, inequality, homelessness and 'under-stimulating public environments' (Katz 2006, 31-2). If children are overprotected across a range of situations by an ever increasing array of micro-mechanisms of control, then the problem becomes not just that this may be an over-reaction to the potential risks involved, but that this may in turn add to the climate of suspicion and fear perhaps at a cost to other skills and experiences that a child needs if they are to face broader life challenges.

If we consider the example of a child's online activities, we can see the range of issues that might arise. On the one hand, children may need protection from the potential harms of online activity (such as bullying, harassment, criminal activity, identity fraud, exploitation for commercial gain and inappropriate content to name some concerns that emerge). On the other hand they may also need to develop skills and acquire their own knowledge about how to make judgements about 'others' they meet online or information they come across that might be potentially harmful. High level, secretive monitoring by parents of a child's email or online activity is one approach to controlling children in this situation, but it ignores the role trust plays in developing a child's capacity to eventually handle such situations on their own. One benefit of trusting a child is that they can learn to deal with difficult situations in a way that develops further skills and competencies. Also, a child who is not trusted, may in fact engage in more secretive (and perhaps more risky) behaviour. The potential damage to the trust relationship between parent and child is far greater if the child is not aware they are under surveillance, as it is not just the act of surveillance itself, but the deception involved which destroys the basis of any trust relationship (O'Neill 2002).

The impact on the development of skills and competencies in childhood can also be seen if we consider the growing use of smartcards and online ordering systems to replace cash transactions in a school canteen. While these new systems may aim to improve efficiency or to develop healthy eating habits, they also introduce a new level of control over how parents and the school monitor what a child eats and how they spend money (Rout 2007). As these types of systems become more widespread, one question to explore is whether there are any consequences of denying a child the opportunity to be trusted to spend canteen money wisely without this type of monitoring. If children are not at some point trusted with

handling money, then there is a risk they may fail to learn important skills or that the development of such skills may be delayed. Of course, a child in whom such trust is placed may fail on some occasions to spend the money as they were asked to, choosing to spend it otherwise. However, the benefits arising from the opportunity to be trusted (for example, in terms of skills or confidence generated), may be significant in comparison to any risk of a child failing to live up to the trust placed in them in this instance. This example highlights how opportunities for children to have some discretion and control in matters that are relatively 'safe' seem to disappear when new technologies with surveillance capacity are introduced, as they take away from children an opportunity to be trusted.

These examples draw out some of the changes children face in their day-to-day experience of trust as surveillance technologies become an increasing feature of the spaces they move about in. One additional complexity is that the messages about trust are not always clear; for example in determining who and in what regard it is thought a person(s) cannot be trusted. The ambiguity of the surveillance gaze makes it unclear who in the population cannot be trusted, and it potentially extends to all, making it difficult for a child to know when to trust another or not. When a school introduces CCTV cameras into the classroom, this may be for purposes of security for the teacher or students, yet the message about trust that accompanies this may not be so clear. One of the ironies is that a surveillance presence can produce unease and fear for all under its gaze because it implies that there is a reason to mistrust or suspect those around you. In this sense, the use of surveillance technologies can add to the culture of suspicion, rather than build a sense of security and trust. It has also been noted that there is a degree of complicity in the role of both the media and the companies who make surveillance technologies in perpetuating this culture:

> The culture of fear generated by the media spills over into a culture of control in schools. ... Surveillance equipment is one material and symbolic manifestation of this reactionary culture of control. (Monahan 2006, 117)

Such influences need to be acknowledged if we are to understand the range of pressures that bear on a child's experience and understanding of trust.

The examples mentioned here show that the use of surveillance technologies (whether intended or not) carry with them a judgement about trust, even if the exact target of this activity remains unclear or ambiguous to those under the gaze. If we take this a step further, it is possible to view the use of surveillance technologies as a replacement for trust and trust based relationships. That is, instead of relinquishing some control and trusting a child, or others with a child, or even trusting one's own judgement in caring for the child, and accepting the risks this entails, an attempt is made to replace this 'need to trust' with some sort of surveillance device. Of course, such devices cannot obviate the need to trust entirely, but the intention appears to be to go some way to reducing the trust that may be required.

None of this discussion is intended to say that we should not seek to avoid risks in some situations – of course we do this regularly throughout each day. It is usually necessary for example to hold a two-year old child's hand near a busy street, and if an older child is being bullied it is reasonable to discuss strategies with the child to deal with this to avoid escalating the potential for harm. Rather, the key point is that it is unrealistic to avoid risks in all situations, and if one of the trends of the use of surveillance technologies is to watch, control and monitor children at all times 'just in case' of some perhaps unknown or remote risk, then the consequences of this may be significant. Rather than simply 'playing it safe', parents and carers may be depriving children of the opportunity to be trusted and to learn about trusting others, and the opportunity for growing competence and capacity that can result from this. The greater risk may therefore lie in using surveillance technologies as a risk avoidance strategy, rather than adopting a more realistic and flexible approach to balancing trust and risk. As noted earlier, part of what it is to trust is to relinquish some control: 'we do not have the power to control other people's actions completely, we must necessarily trust' (Lahno 2001, 172). Perhaps acknowledging this contingency is a key part of

forming a more realistic assessment of the limits of what surveillance technologies might achieve in reducing risks to children.

Beyond surveillance to building trust

The fact that the increasing use of surveillance technologies has the potential to change a child's experience of trust is significant. Children, generally speaking, have less choice when it comes to the need to trust others, and are at a key stage in developing an understanding of others and society more broadly in a way that sets the foundation for their own sense of self. As discussed earlier, the lack of opportunity for trust-based activity has the potential to undermine a child's developing sense of self-confidence and may even fail to provide the conditions for this development to occur in the first place. A child's capacity to become competent and responsible is therefore threatened if the role of trust in a child's emerging agency is overlooked rather than nourished.

This raises an important ethical dimension to a child's experience of being trusted and trusting others, and from being exposed to risks that trust-based encounters with others give rise to. It has been noted that there is a certain 'moral blindness' at play when risks from unknown others are exaggerated, often perpetuating cultural preconceptions that have no basis in fact (Papastephanou 2006, 58). Unless a child is able to place themselves in a position of trusting the 'other', and exposing themselves to whatever risk this may entail, then they also have little basis for understanding the 'other'. This type of risk is a 'necessary condition for an ethical relation to the other, it makes the welcoming of the other possible' (Safstrom quoted in Papastephanou 2006, 58). Without such trust-based encounters, there is also no basis for making decisions about which risks may be worth taking and which are to be avoided. It is only by building trust, that we can in turn understand and make better judgements about trusting.

One of the limitations of surveillance technologies when they are used to monitor the spaces children move about in, is that children are given the message that there are 'others' who cannot be trusted. Yet, as a basis for ethical decision making, this presents a view of others that is often highly arbitrary and all encompassing, providing no basis on which a child can come to an understanding of others as beings who are also vulnerable and reliant on trusting relationships in the same way. There is also no basis for a child to develop as a 'truster'; that is, to learn how to make well-placed decisions about who to trust in the future. Whether it is intended or not, the ways in which surveillance technologies are increasingly being used to monitor and control children's lives conveys, and perhaps even betrays, an underlying lack of trust both in the children themselves and in all those others who share the spaces around them. Furthermore, these acts of surveillance fail to bring with them any ways in which the child may build the necessary trust-based relationships that are needed for the child to become both trusting and trusted.

This leads to the question, if we only trust a child or others with the child because surveillance technologies are being used, then in what sense can we be said to be genuinely trusting them? It has been argued, that the only way we can trust others is if their actions or behaviour reinforces the trust we have placed in them, and those others have taken responsibility for meeting that trust (Bailey 2002, 6). If a child acts in a certain way (for example, decides not to go into the swimming pool area because an alarm will be triggered from the CCTV if they do so), in what sense are they genuinely fulfilling the trust placed in them if this only arises from the fear of detection and punishment rather than because they understand the responsibility they have been entrusted with? Raising such questions may help determine the extent to which a child's experience of trust may be weakened with a surveillance presence.

None of this is to say that trust cannot have a place in any decisions around the use of surveillance technologies. Perhaps, if surveillance is applied in a well-judged manner based on the risks posed to children in a certain circumstance, and done with the knowledge and involvement of the children under surveillance, then it may be possible for trust to retain a place in a child's encounters with others. Similarly, if such technologies can be used to maximise potential benefits, and at the same time respect the

child as an active agent in any such situations, then some of the potential problems may be overcome. This however would require a conscious acknowledgement of the value of trusting children, and working to ensure they do not become a victim of over-reactive and over-controlling applications of surveillance. One possible approach would be to monitor children at a population or group level (such as when monitoring the content of children's online usage in a school environment) to determine whether there are any significant risks posed to the children, and discuss the potential risks and consequences with them, before considering whether and when it may be appropriate to monitor activity at the individual level. In this way surveillance is used as a tool only when a significant risk has been identified, all other avenues of learning and negotiation have been followed through and where there is evidence that the use of surveillance might lead to a reduced risk for the child.

Conclusion

In practice, the problem that surveillance technologies pose for trust, is not just in how and when the surveillance is used, but in the very fact that it has been introduced at all. Without a surveillance gaze, children have the opportunity to be trusted, to learn how to trust others, and perhaps to show others they can live up to this trust. Once the surveillance is in place, this opportunity is greatly reduced. Pettit makes the point that intrusive, heavy regulation can remove opportunities for trust by leaving little room for the opportunity to demonstrate that one can act responsibly in the absence of such rules (1995, 225). It is possible to see here how over-surveillance might do the same. That is, to the extent that surveillance technologies take away the opportunity for a person to show they can be trusted without the need for surveillance, then building trust cannot even get started.

As CCTV cameras are introduced into more classrooms and fingerprinting becomes more commonplace for roll-calls and borrowing library books, as parents are marketed drug-testing kits they can use on their children and two year olds have cameras embedded in teddy bears to watch over them, it is important to question whether these are the methods we (as adults) ought to be using to care for, protect or even discipline our children. If surveillance is applied as a response to fear, rather than a more balanced response to any actual risks involved, then arguably both adults and children become reactive agents contributing to a cycle of suspicion and anxiety, robbing childhood of valuable opportunities to trust and to be trusted.

It is only through understanding the value of trust, and coming to an acceptance of the necessity of some risk, that we can begin look for alternative ways to guide a child's development that can provide the foundations for an active and creative sense of selfhood, rather than stifle such opportunities.

References

Baby Video Monitors Review. 2010, Retrieved 1 February 2010 2010from http://babyvideomonitorsreview.net/

Baier, A. 1986, Trust and Antitrust *Ethics*. 96. 2. 231-260.

Bailey, T. *On Trust and Philosophy*. BBCi The Open University 2002. Retrieved from http://www.open2.net/trust/on_trust/on_trust1.htm accessed 21 August 2009

BBC News. 2009, Database of all children launched. *BBC News*, 18 May 2009.

Boden, D, and H L Molotch. 1994, The Compulsion of Proximity. In *NowHere - Space, Time and Modernity*, edited by D. Boden and R. Friedland: University of California Press.

Dillon, S. 2003, Cameras Watching Students, Especially in Biloxi. *The New York Times*, 24 September 2003.

Eckert, G. 2004, 'If I Tell Them Then I Can': Ways of Relating to Adult Rules *Childhood*. 11. 1. 9-26.

Fotel, T, and T U Thomsen. 2004, The Surveillance of Children's Mobility *Surveillance and Society*. 1. 4. 535-554.

Govier, T. 1992, Trust, Distrust and Feminist Theory *Hypatia*. 7. 1. 16-33.

Horsburgh, H T N. 1960, The Ethics of Trust *The Philosophical Quarterly*. 10. 41. 343-354.

Jones, K. 1996, Trust as an Affective Attitude *Ethics*. 107. 4-25.

Jones, O, M Williams, and C Fleuriot. 2003, A New Sense of Place? - Mobile 'Wearable' Information and Communications Technology Devices and the Geographies of Urban Childhood *Children's Geographies*. 1. 2. 165-180.

Katz, C. 2006, The State Goes Home: Local Hypervigilance of Children and the Global Retreat from Social Reproduction. In *Surveillance and Security: Technological Politics and Power in Everyday Life*, edited by T. Monahan. New York, London: Routledge.

Lahno, B. 2001, On the Emotional Character of Trust *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*. 4. 171-189.

Masters, A, and K Michael. 2007, Lend me your arms: The use and implications of humancentric RFID *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*. 6. 1. 29-39.

McLeod, C. 2006. Trust. In *Standford Encyclopedia of Philosohpy*.

Monahan, T. 2006, Questioning Surveillance and Security. In *Surveillance and Security: Technological Politics and Power in Everyday Life*, edited by T. Monahan. New York: Routledge.

———. 2006, The Surveillance Curriculum - Risk Management and Social Control in the Neoliberal School. In *Surveillance and Security: Technological Politics and Power in Everyday Life*, edited by T. Monahan: Routledge.

O'Neill, O. *A Question of Trust* 2002. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/reith2002/ accessed 21 August 2009

Papastephanou, M. 2006, Education, risk and ethics *Ethics and Education*. 1. 1. 47-63.

Pettit, P. 1995, The Cunning of Trust *Philosophy and Public Affairs*. 24. 3. 202-225.

Rout, M. 2007, Tuck shop swipe card watches kids' waists. *Herald Sun*, 22 March 2007.

Scheeres, J. *Politician wants to 'get chipped'*. Wired, 15 February 2002 2002. Retrieved 1 February 2010 from http://www.wired.com/science/discoveries/news/2002/02/50435

Sindh Today. 2009, Gujarat schools to use biometric system to tackle absenteeism. *Sindh Today - Online News*, 7 June 2009.

Track My Kids. 2010, Retrieved 1 February 2010 2010from http://www.trackmykids.com/

Valentine, G. 2004, *Public Space and the Culture of Childhood*: Ashgate.