

“Harnessing power: Exploring citizen’s use of networked technologies to promote police accountability”

David Schwartz

A thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Master of Arts (MA) degree in Criminology

Department of Criminology
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Ottawa

© David Schwartz, Ottawa, Canada, 2016

Acknowledgements

I would like to take a moment and thank all the ‘sousveilleurs’ who shared their stories and experiences with me. Your conviction, wisdom, and unwavering dedication to social justice have not gone unnoticed and are reflected throughout this paper. Thank you for trusting me and recognizing the importance of studying citizen surveillance. This research is dedicated to you.

To my thesis supervisor, Professor Michael Kempa, I want to thank you for your guidance throughout my graduate experience. Your unwavering support and insightful thinking facilitated my ability to become a better writer and a better researcher. It was a privilege working with you.

To my parents, Bernie and Riva, and brothers, Robbie and Matthew, thank you for your loving support and patience with me over the last few years. I would not have been able to reach this point without you.

To my friends and colleagues, you helped me remain calm in moments of panic, and joyful during periods of worry. You provided me with words of encouragement and clarity when I thought there was no end in sight. For that I am truly grateful.

To Cassandra, you helped keep me grounded and pushed me to deliver the best project that I could muster. You are the embodiment of what it means to be hard working and by following your words of encouragement, I have been able to produce a greater piece of work than I would have been able to otherwise.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Abstract	v
1. Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 The Purpose and the Significance of the Present Study	1
1.2 Overview and Chapter Breakdown	4
2. Chapter 2: Literature Review	12
2.1 Citizen surveillance and the changing visibility of the police.....	13
2.1.1 New visibility of the police	15
2.1.2 State citizens in a techno-fix society.....	16
2.2 The increasing alignment of web 2.0 technologies and citizen surveillance.....	17
2.3 Characterizing citizen surveillance as a social movement.....	20
2.4 Theoretical Framework.....	24
2.4.1 Surveillance theory: Examining panoptic models of surveillance.....	27
2.4.2 Linking rhizomes with surveillance theory	29
2.4.3 Synopticism.....	34
2.4.4 Lateral Surveillance.....	37
2.5 The Development of My Study	38
2.6 Chapter Summary	44
3. Chapter 3: Methodology	45
3.1 Epistemology.....	45
3.2 Method of Data Collection: The Semi-Structured Interview.....	47
3.3 The Interview Guide	49
3.4 Method of Data-Analysis: The Critical Content Analysis	52
3.5 Method of Data-Analysis: Thematic Analysis	56
3.6 Sampling	58
3.6.1 Characteristics of my Participants	59
3.7 Reliability and Validity.....	60
3.8 Ethical Considerations.....	62
3.9 Chapter Summary	63
4. Chapter 4: Presentation of Findings	64
4.1 Thematic Category 1: New civic duty/responsibility	64
4.2 Thematic Category 2: Distrust between community members and the police.....	68
4.3 Thematic Category 3: Technology facilitates new forms of political activism.....	76
4.4 Thematic Category 4: Citizen surveillance is conditional of one's reality	82
4.5 Thematic Category 5: Citizen surveillance is versatile and adaptable	86
4.6 Thematic Category 6: Citizen surveillance induces new feelings of empowerment....	93
4.7 Thematic Category 7: Citizen surveillance users challenge hierarchical power	95
4.8 Chapter Summary	96
5. Chapter 5: Discussion & Analysis:	97
5.1 Citizen surveillance of the Police.....	98
5.2 Citizen surveillance and Web 2.0 Technologies	103
5.3 Citizen surveillance and social movements	107
5.4 Typographic information about citizen surveillance	112

5.5 Chapter Summary	113
Chapter 6 – Conclusion & Recommendations	115
References	121
Appendix A	135
Letter of Information	135
Appendix B	137
Consent Form	137
Appendix C	140
Interview Guide	140
Appendix D	142
Codebook	142
Appendix E:	186
Ethics Approval Notice	186

Abstract

In this examination of *citizen surveillance*, I engage with Foucaultian and Deleuzian conceptualizations of surveillance, power, resistance, control, and desire, to explore the motivation(s) of community members who film and disseminate footage of the police. Methodologically, I conducted semi-structured interviews with community stakeholders to study the latent thematic ideas embedded in their responses. These themes represent the underlying motivational factors a citizen surveiller may have when filming the police. In my analysis of these themes, I explore: citizen surveillers' logic for resisting power; citizen surveillers' understandings of power; and, citizen surveillers' reported approaches to both passive and active forms of resistance. Subsequently, there appears to be an underlying desire *for* power and a resistance *to* power when filming the police. However, given the exploratory nature of this study, there is a need to continue investigating the theoretical and under substantiated claims about citizen surveillance and its association with race, gender and socio-economic status.

1. Chapter 1: Introduction

In this chapter, I outline the purpose of this present study, as well as the academic and practical significance of researching citizen surveillance, a concept that draws from literature associated with both sur- and sous-veillance theory. From there, I outline how I will be engaging with Foucaultian and Deleuzian conceptualization of power to explore the motivations of community individuals who film the police (citizen surveillers). Then, I conclude with an overview of the five remaining chapters of this paper.

1.1 The Purpose and the Significance of the Present Study

In March of 1991, a man by the name of George Holliday stood on the balcony of his Lake View Terrace (Los Angeles) apartment and captured on video 5 police officers assaulting a man by the name of Rodney King. That assault being captured on video was one of the first (reported) instances of a community member using technology to film the police and disseminate the footage through news media. His video received national attention and signified a moment in time that saw a community member help another community member by reporting on the malpractice of the police in a public capacity (Ortiz, 2015). While Mr. Holliday's decision to film the police was novel at the time, it foreshadowed the impact that technology would eventually have on our society. Specifically, how community individuals constitute a civilian-based group that adds to the institutional police watchdog groups that already exist in our growing surveillant society.

Now, the actions of Mr. Holliday are more common than ever before. Canadians have reached a point in time where technological advancements have facilitated new ways to participate in the gathering and dissemination of information (Doyle, 2011). This

ability to disseminate information is aided by a larger phenomenon known as “web 2.0” (Bakir, 2010; Doyle, 2011; Fuchs, 2011; O’Reilly, 2007). While it will be examined in greater detail in my review of the literature, web 2.0 is essentially web-based platforms that invite mass user-intervention to participate in the consumption and analysis of content disseminated by other users (Bakir, 2010; Doyle, 2011; Fuchs, 2011; O’Reilly, 2007; Mawby, 1999). Essentially, the ability for mass user-participation has made it possible for community members to actively gather information about what they see, and then share that information with others using the Internet and new media platforms like Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter to name a few (Bakir, 2010; Doyle, 2011; Timan & Ourdshoorn, 2012; Newell, 2014; Marwick, 2012).

So, from the time when George Holliday filmed the police with a shoulder-mounted video camera, technological advancements have introduced a number of new ways for community members to film other community individuals, as well as state bodies like the police. Accordingly, specific developments in web 2.0 technology have engineered new means of: anonymity, speed (to both upload and download information), search-ability (or the ability to find specific content based on a few keys words), blurring the lines between public and private (the changing limitations of who has access/knowledge of an event/situation that occurred in a self-contained situation), and the ability to reach a large(er) audience (which may be emphasized by the fact that people can now share content with others in their social networks who may then share this information to other users) (Mayer-Schönberger, 2011; Shifman, 2013). In turn, these developments have brought about new ways for members of the community to watch those who were previously thought to be exempt from being watched, like the police

(Haggerty & Ericson, 2000; Hier, 2003; Doyle, 2011). Subsequently, these changes have also enabled innovative means of mass user-participation, which is thought to have affected the hierarchal nature of how information itself is thought to flow throughout society (Doyle, 2011; Fuchs, 2011; Andrejevic, 2005).

Thus, at the heart of this project is the theoretical concept of *citizen surveillance*, drawing from Professor Steve Mann's conceptualization of "sousveillance"¹ and exiting surveillance theory/literature. Sousveillance originated as a theoretical means for members of the community to record, film, and generally gather data about others, while under *surveillance* themselves (Mann, Nolan & Wellman, 2003). Subsequently, since its conceptualization, scholars have examined the theoretical implications of sousveillance and its growing association with the prevalence of citizen surveillance targeting the police in our growing surveillant society (Bakie, 2010; Fernback, 2013; Ganascia, 2010; Kearon, 2012; Mann, 2005). Specifically, sousveillance has been framed a theoretical way in which community individuals can actively engage with, and challenge, the larger surveillance system that they are a part of (Mann et al., 2003). Alternatively, citizen surveillance relates to the specific notion of community individuals engaging in the surveillance of authoritative institutions/institutional figures like the police.

However, despite growing interest as a thought provoking neologism, citizen surveillance is still predominately an exploratory area of research. This is largely

¹ Prof. Steve Mann, University of Toronto
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
10 King's College Road; Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
10 King's College Road; Toronto, Ontario, Canada

² Power is the notion that a governing body has the capacity to directly influence the behaviour of those it governs, by being able to influence the ways in which this governed population carries out day-to-day routines and behaviour.

³ Resistance then, is challenging the effort made by those who wish to enact power over a given population.

attributed to only a few empirical studies being completed to support the many theoretical claims being made. As a result, there is very little evidence to substantiate: the reported motivations of a citizen surveiller; a citizen surveillers' understanding of how power is embedded within certain social institutions as a part of their function; a citizen surveillers' logic for resisting this power; and, a citizen surveillers' reported approaches to passive and active forms of resistance against this power.

1.2 Overview and Chapter Breakdown

So, in order to effectively study citizen surveillance, I investigated the above-mentioned issues to explore the potential motivations of citizen surveillers. In doing so, I am able to better understand the association citizen surveillance as drawing from overarching sousveillance and surveillance themes and theory associated with: power², resistance³, and control⁴. To provide context, *surveillance*, broadly being defined for the moment, is an embodiment of ideas concerning: control, governance, security, profit, entertainment, order, discipline, productivity, inspection, supervision, oversight, crime prevention; or, recording a person/group of people for the purpose of data collection, or influencing, managing, or directing one's behaviour (Foucault, 1975; Deleuze & Guatarri, 1987; Deleuze, 1992; Garland, 1997; Patton, 1994; Haggerty & Ericson, 2000; Hier, 2003; Mann et al., 2003; Marx, 2003; Mann & Ferenbok, 2013). When broken up, surveillance includes the word "sur" (over/above) and "veillance" (to watch/observe): to watch from above, or to watch from a position of power (Mann et al., 2003).

² Power is the notion that a governing body has the capacity to directly influence the behaviour of those it governs, by being able to influence the ways in which this governed population carries out day-to-day routines and behaviour.

³ Resistance then, is challenging the effort made by those who wish to enact power over a given population.

⁴ Control is a potential result of power. Specifically, through power, one has the capacity to influence or direct another's behaviour, molding and shaping them, over an unknown duration of time.

Alternatively, *sousveillance* is an exploratory and under developed concept that studies surveillance from the perspective of community individuals, rather than the presupposed perspective of the state or powerful agencies such as corporations (Mann & Ferenbok, 2013). When broken up, *sousveillance* incorporates the words “sous” (below/under) and “veillance” (to watch/observe): to watch from below, or to watch from a position of no power (Mann et al., 2003). However, as will be seen in the next chapter, *sousveillance* differentiates itself from the idea of citizen surveillance, in that those who engage in *sousveillance* are primarily concerned with aspects of ‘life-logging’ or carrying out surveillance independently of traditional systems. Alternatively, citizen surveillance, which draws from ideas of *sousveillance*, is characterized as a non-hierarchical assemblage of community individuals challenging the top-down nature of state/corporate means of power/surveillance (Haggerty & Ericson, 2000; Doyle, 2011; Fuchs, 2011). Subsequently, the aim for this paper is to examine the phenomenon of citizen surveillance, its association with the concept of power, the role of networked technologies, and ultimately, uncover potential motivations one may have when filming the police.

To do so, my primary research question that guides this project is: *What motivates a community member to record the actions of the police and then subsequently share this footage with a more public/general audience via the Internet?* Thus, it is important to first recognize that citizen surveillance appears to have developed into a regular occurring socio-political phenomenon. As my study goes on to reveal, citizen surveillance is composed of community individuals harnessing the power of the camera for both social and political activism. Specifically, citizen surveillance appears to be aimed at restoring

the confidence in the police that both scholars and community stakeholders perceive to be damaged (Bakir, 2010; Mann et al., 2003; Reeves, 2012; Kearon, 2012).

With respect to people who engage in citizen surveillance, Curtis and Grabb (2002) argue that by filming the police, these individuals embody the traits of those who make up a social movement. Accordingly, a social movement is comprised of individuals whose ability/interest to resist domination is done by striving for ideals that better society and its citizens (Carroll, 2002). This includes individuals who are thought to have a critical view on society, and are looking to change it in some way. As will be seen over the course of this project, citizen surveillance is associated with social movements because of the ways its users *challenge* the problematic policies, laws, behaviours and power embedded in society, and specifically, within the institution of policing (Mann et al., 2003; Bakir, 2010; Goldsmith, 2010; Bradshaw, 2013).

For the remainder of this overview chapter, I provide a brief outline of how my thesis project has been arranged. In my literature review, I examine 3 prominent areas of both surveillance and sousveillance literature. This is to provide a base of knowledge regarding how citizen surveillance is currently being studied in contemporary society, and its association with the concept and theories of both sur- and sousveillance literature. Thus, the first section I present is an examination of citizen surveillance and its association with the police. In turn, by filming the police it is thought that one can reveal/identify problematic behaviours of certain (but not all) police officers. As a result, citizen surveillance appears to have had an impact with respect to how community members perceive the police. In turn, community individuals are under the assumption that power is something that can be harnessed when filming the police (Doyle, 2011;

Mann et al., 2003; Marx, 2003; Goldsmith, 2010; Kearon, 2012). Next, I examine how citizen surveillance is associated with advancements in wireless mobile technologies and web 2.0 platforms. Specifically, I consider how the Internet and Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) have facilitated/democratized new means for community individuals to mobilize his or her discontent of the police. Lastly, I examine how citizen surveillance users embody traits that are also seen in the make-up of social movements. Specifically, by filming the police, I frame citizen surveillance as a consensus-based assemblage that sees community individuals unify in their desire to challenge those who are in a position of power/embodiment of power.

Something to note going forward is that many scholars, who have examined citizen surveillance and its association with the concept of power, have done so by engaging with Foucaultian ideas of surveillance and control. As a result, and as I go on to describe, I am contributing to an ongoing discussion of engaging with surveillance theory by moving away from an exclusively Foucaultian framework. This is because Foucault's ideas are useful when studying how power is *supposed* to work, but tells us very little with respect to how power may *actually* be resisted and/or demonstrated. Specifically, Foucault did not examine resistance or agency of those perceived to be under surveillance/control.

So, in order to answer my research questions, I take lead from scholars like Garland (1997) and O'Malley, Weir, and Shearing (1997) who argue that it is not academically impure to expand on the ideas of Foucault through sociological-based research practices. Thus, for the purpose of this study, I highlight the benefits of engaging with Foucaultian ideas of power to examine citizen surveillance, but, because he tells us

very little about how power may *actually* be resisted/demonstrated, I include a greater emphasis on how people *think* about power and *seek* to shape it through citizen surveillance. This permits me to answer my research question by more closely analyzing how citizen surveillers think about power, and based on his or her experience, his or her logics for resisting or challenging it.

As a result, one of the goals of this paper is to compliment what Foucault says about ideas like power, resistance, and control by incorporating the ideas of Deleuze. Specifically, as will be seen over the course of this project, I compliment Foucault's conceptualization of power with Deleuze's ideas of "rhizomes", "assemblages" and "war-machines" (all concepts will be defined in the next chapter) (Deleuze & Guatarri, 1987). Additionally, by engaging with Deleuze, I am able to draw from other scholars who reflect on the ways in which citizen surveillance reveals potential new manifestations of how power is thought to exist when community individuals film the police and engage in surveillance. Thus, by engaging with Deleuze, I am able to consider *alternative* understandings of power, resistance, and control, which may be underlying factors embedded in a citizen surveillers' motivation to film the police. These alternative understandings of surveillant themes are attributed to how Deleuze believed society is comprised of heterogeneous lives and represents multiple realities. Subsequently, Deleuze believed each life is an embodiment of that person's own truth. Truth, in this regard, suggests that every single community individual represents his or her own single-unique reality (Loseke, 2008).

After introducing Deleuze, I go on to consider how surveillance models/theory have developed since Foucault's initial analysis of Bentham's panopticon. In this section,

my aim is to establish a time line regarding how advancements in news media, technology and the Internet have impacted the ways in which surveillance theory has developed over time. This has led to the formation of new contemporary ideas regarding participatory surveillance, web 2.0, citizen journalism, and the surveillant assemblage.

Finally, I end my literature review by examining the interesting, but under-developed citizen surveillance motivations identified by scholars thus far. Briefly, these ideas characterize citizen surveillance users being composed of individuals who are either concerned with: the hierarchal nature of power/resistance, or alternatively, how one can socially benefit from engaging in citizen surveillance (including the potential celebrity that may result from sharing exclusive content). In either case, what my study is concerned with is examining why we are all watching each other and how this motivates us to film each other.

With respect to my methodology, I carried out 11 semi-structured interviews with members of the community whom I identify as community stakeholders (generally, a community stakeholder is an individual who is concerned with how society runs). Then, I conducted a qualitative content analysis (thematic analysis) to draw out the underlying meaning of my participants' responses. This is so that I could analyze the latent content/information embedded in my participants' responses. In turn, this latent information was then used to develop *themes*. These themes represent the underlying ideas regarding how my participants think about citizen surveillance. Subsequently, I utilized these themes to develop a typographical catalogue of potential motivations one may have when engaging in citizen surveillance and its association with power.

In turn, my data helped facilitate my ability to present a preliminary, but non-exhaustive, typographical list of motivations and/or rationales one may have when engaging in citizen surveillance. This snapshot of citizen surveillance knowledge is attributed to the fact that I am basing my findings on an in-depth analysis on a small amount of data. However, as I will go on to explain, I am less concerned with authenticating a single *truth* about citizen surveillance, and more interested in being able to substantiate knowledge about the motivations of citizen surveillers at this moment in time.

Briefly, with respect to my findings, it would appear that citizen surveillance is predominately characterized as a new political responsibility or civic duty to help other community members. This is attributed to the second most prominent theme I found, which suggests that there is a growing distrust of the police. As a result, citizen surveillance appears to be a way in which community individuals can feel inspired to act on his or her desire to resist potential police misconduct (to be defined in the next chapter) that he or she may experience, or that other community individuals may experience.

In my discussion section, I further analyze my thematic findings by incorporating the main ideas discussed in my theoretical framework. Ultimately, it would appear as though community individuals characterize citizen surveillance as a way in which they are able to harness power themselves. As I will go on to explain, this is in an attempt to challenge the hierarchical manifestations of power, including the power embedded in the institution of policing. Thus, by engaging with Foucaultian and Deleuzian conceptualizations of power, resistance, and control, citizen surveillance *appears* to

represent a way for community members to act on his or her desire *for* power, and at the same time develop a potential resistance *to* power.

In my conclusion, I stress that citizen surveillance appears to be influencing how community individuals' perception of how the idea of power is thought to manifest between themselves and social institutions, like the police. This reconceptualization of power is thought to be possible because of how we are all watching each other all the time, and that this has had a potential effect on how we behave both passively and actively. So, despite my small sample size, the knowledge that I have generated should be considered for future studies that are concerned with where the direction of citizen surveillance is headed, and its impact on the power dynamics between members of the community and institutions of power, including the police.

2. Chapter 2: Literature Review

In this chapter, I introduce the key concepts and ideas that are necessary to answer my primary research question: *What motivates a community member to record the actions of the police and then subsequently share this footage with a more public/general audience via the Internet*. Specifically, the beginning of this chapter examines: the role of the police and their association within a developing citizen surveillance culture. Next, I consider the progress of web 2.0, wireless mobile technologies, and the Internet being used as a democratizing platform, which has enabled new means and methods of carrying out citizen surveillance. Finally, I conclude with an examination of how citizen surveillance can be characterized as a tool being used by social movements for innovating methods of activism.

Following my review of the scholarly claims/debates discussed in my examination of both sur- and sousveillance literature, I then introduce and develop my theoretical framework to further investigate how key *sur- and sousveillance* themes like power, resistance, and control contribute to the development of themes associated with the ongoing development of citizen surveillance. In doing so, I engage with Foucault and his examination of how power is thought to occur, and the *intended* uses of power structures. However, as I mentioned previously, a Foucaultian framework would only present a partial understanding of citizen surveillance. This is because his analysis did not consider how power may *actually* exist and/or be resisted. As a result, I incorporate Deleuze, who is more of a symbolic interactionist, to consider how the realities/truths of community individuals contribute to the development of being able to reimagine how power can be operationalized and given meaning in a growing networked society. Thus,

by engaging with both Foucault and Deleuze, my aim is to reconsider the role of power, and potential resistance to power, through citizen surveillance.

2.1 Citizen surveillance and the changing visibility of the police

Drawing from the ideas of Heir (2003) and Doyle (2011), because community individuals are now armed with wireless mobile technologies, a potential use for these devices is to target state officials as a form of civilian-led oversight/surveillance. As Haggerty and Ericson discussed, this is important given that state bodies whom were previously free from being watched, are now at risk of being exposed as our surveillant society continues to advance (2000).

As a result, Goldsmith argues that the “first visibility” of the police is transforming to a “secondary visibility” (2010). First visibility of the police is understood as *seeing* the police based on one’s direct observation or experience with them. Examples of first visibility include recognizing a police officer’s uniform, badge, or cruiser, as they all represent symbols associated with the police (2010). Now, however, “secondary visibility” is seeing the police through the publication of disseminated content, or simply through talking with people about his or her experience with the police (Goldsmith, 2010). Ultimately, secondary visibility has enabled a whole new way to not only see the police, but the actions of the police as well (Newell, 2014).

This changing visibility of the police is facilitated by previously *hidden* or *unknown* actions of the police now accessible for the general public to see and analyze (2010). Thus, the footage/information obtained by citizen surveillance is thought to be a result of the increased distrust between the police and community individuals. This has resulted in the idea that police violence is on the rise (Kearon, 2012; Bradshaw, 2013; Bakir, 2010). In turn, this changing perception of the police has led some scholars to

claim there is a crisis in the confidence of policing as an institution (Goldsmith, 2010; Kearon, 2012; Mawby, 1999; Thompson, 2005; Reeves, 2012).

This crisis is attributed in part to the videos being captured by community individuals that often portray the police being engaged in illegitimate or even unlawful behaviour. Consequently, both scholars and community individuals have already begun to question the following areas within policing: police training, police policy, and the police themselves (Kiss, 2009; Mann & Ferenbok, 2013; Wilson & Serisier, 2010; Bakir, 2010). Broadly speaking, the illegitimate or unlawful police behaviours captured via citizen surveillance may include (but are not limited to): systemic issues of racism or sexism, targeting individuals exclusively based on aspects of race or gender, the use of profane and abusive language, unwarranted violence, excessive violence or force, the threat to use force if not obeyed, random stops and searches, questioning people without a warrant or reasonable cause, or finally, no respect towards a community member and talking down to them (including being addressed by a slur possibly based on their race or gender). These characteristics contribute to a concept known collectively as *police brutality* (Babovic, 2000; Stenning, Birkbeck, Adang, Baker, Feltes, Gabaldón, Haberfield, Machado & Waddington, 2009; Reiss Jr., 1968).

This conceptualization of *police brutality* appears to have had an affect on how police-related violence has become an increasingly debated social problem (Babovic, 2000; Bradshaw, 2013; Ganascia, 2010; Goldsmith, 2010; Bakir, 2010; Mann & Ferenbok, 2013). However, whether or not problematic policing is *actually* increasing or not, is unknown at this time. Nevertheless, even if these problematic issues within policing are not something inherently new, as it has been the focus of past academic

debates (Reiss Jr., 1968), the prevalence of violent policing *appears* to be increasing nonetheless (Kearon, 2012; Ganascia, 2010; Bakir, 2010).

2.1.1 New visibility of the police

As David Hedley wrote, “seeing-is-believing” (Hedley, 2013, pg. 66) and this changing visibility of the police can be attributed to new means of civilian-based surveillance. Thus, for a growing body of community individuals, citizen surveillance serves as a legitimate response to raise awareness of police misconduct that may have gone unseen or undocumented in the past. As a result, the ways in which a community individual perceives police violence is thought to be associated with what is being presented to them (especially if it comes from another community member’s experiences rather than State/Corporate means) (Hedley, 2013). For example, Professor Mann argues that despite the fact that not all “officers are corrupt... there exists the occasional corrupt officer, and that sousveillance may help capture this corruption and bring it to the attention of the honest majority or non-corrupt officers” (Mann, 2005, pg. 636).

To make this point, I want to identify instances of police violence that have been captured on video in recent years, either by stationary, or citizen-captured forms of surveillance. Specifically, I want to identify the cases of Robert Dziekanski⁵ (2007), Ian Tomlinson⁶ (2009), Oscar Grant⁷ (2009), Adam Nobody⁸ (2010), Sammy Yatim⁹ (2013),

⁵ Robert Dziekanski was a polish immigrant who was killed by RCMP officers during an arrest at Vancouver airport. A bystander nearby filmed Dziekanski being repeatedly tasered and ultimately succumbing to death, subsequently sharing this footage later to the general public.

⁶ During the London G20 protests in 2009, Newspaper vendor Ian Tomlinson was killed after being struck by a police officer’s baton. A visiting tourist who was in London on business captured his death on video; the video was sent to prominent London Newspapers a week after the incident.

⁷ Oscar Grant was shot early New Years day by Bay Area Rapid Transit District Police Department (BART Police) at the Bay Area Rapid Transit train returning from San Francisco. Multiple witnesses used digital video cameras and cell phones to capture his detention and ensuing death. His story was turned into the movie Fruitvale Station in 2013.

⁸ Adam Nobody was unconstitutionally assaulted and detained by Toronto police during the G20 protests in June 2010. His assault, captured on shaky video by a fellow citizen has become a symbolic reminder of the

Tamir Rice¹⁰ (2014), and Eric Gardner¹¹ (2014), as just a few examples of recent policing that resulted in the death of a community individual. These incidents have been characterized as important moments that have resulted in community members calling for changes in police policy, including: better police training, greater accountability, and more transparency of policing overall.

2.1.2 State citizens in a techno-fix society

Accordingly, amid the recent increase of violent police occurrences, citizen surveillance is perceived to be a progressive and trustworthy method for community individuals to usher in a new era of accountability and police reform (Bradshaw, 2013; Mann et al., 2003; Mann, 2005; Bakir, 2010; Ganascia, 2010). This is thought to be possible because of how citizen surveillers are looking to identify problematic-issues within the institution of policing. However, the idea that citizen surveillance can ultimately improve the problematic issues within policing suggests a “techno-fix” attitude (Barnard-Wills & Wells, 2012; Kearon, 2012). A techno-fix paradigm surmises that technology can ultimately lead to a better society and that citizens would be afforded with a new sense of calmness, empowerment, and feats of self-protection to alleviate problems with the police that did not exist previously (Weber, 2012; Reeves, 2012; Mann, 2005; Mann & Ferenbok, 2013; Bakir, 2010; Dennis, 2008; Harfield, 2014; Martin, 2005;

violent actions of the Toronto Police during that weekend and the resulting effects of citizen-produced video evidence.

⁹ Eighteen-year-old Sammy Yatim was shot and killed by Toronto Police officer John Forcillo after he became aggressive on a Toronto street-car. The entire conflict was captured on the phones of community members passing by who later disseminated the content onto YouTube.

¹⁰ Twelve-year-old Tamir Rice was shot and killed by rookie Cleveland police officer Timothy Loehmann. Tamir was killed because the police believed he had been carrying a gun, despite the fact that the weapon was a toy BB gun. Rice was shot and killed less than 2 seconds after officer Loehmann exited his police cruiser.

¹¹ In July 2014, an individual recorded NYPD officers approaching Eric Gardner and accused him of selling loose cigarettes. After an ensuing scuffle, Gardner was placed in a chokehold for between 15 and 19 seconds during which time he repeatedly expressed that he could not breathe (roughly 11 times); he subsequently died as a result of his incapacitation.

Callana & Rosenberger, 2011; Barnard-Wills & Wells, 2012; Allen, 2008; Kearon, 2012).

Thus, this notion of a techno-fix may inspire members of the community to film the police, even if those individuals may have never directly had a bad experience themselves. As a result, with so much exposure, and little to no reforms in policing thus far, the effectiveness of citizen surveillance videos may not be as beneficial as they first appeared. A question that remains to be seen is concerned with the long-term effects of citizen surveillance and whether or not, or to what degree, any actual systemic change in the police can be implemented as a direct result of citizen surveillers. So despite the allure of citizen surveillance, it is still too early to tell how, or to what degree, it may actually prove beneficial. What citizen surveillance is at the time of this writing is something new and thought provoking. However, it is important to remember that, as Mawby argues, “visibility... does not necessarily equate with transparency” (Mawby, 1999, pg. 264). So despite the fact that citizen surveillance is thought to be an effective method in being able to increase the transparency of the police, it has not yet been shown to increase the accountability of the police or influence how the police act when a camera is present.

2.2 The increasing alignment of web 2.0 technologies and citizen surveillance

This section examines the developments in web 2.0 technologies that have both facilitated and innovated means of political activism. Largely, this alignment between citizen surveillance and activism is attributed to the notion that technology provides a key set of conditions to make things (more) possible, than perhaps they were thought of previously. As a result, what is currently known about citizen surveillance appears to be a resulting outcome associated with the *condition of possibility*. This adheres to the

reasoning that something (technology in this case) does not have explicit meaning on its own, but rather, can be imbued with meaning by those who use it (Foucault, 1970). Thus, there is still an aspect of *choice* with respect to whether or not someone will engage in citizen surveillance.

To provide context, web 2.0 represents a growing network of community individuals looking to take part in the production of knowledge (Fuchs, 2011; Doyle, 2011; Bird, 2011; Timan & Oudshoorn, 2012; Marwick, 2012). Correspondingly, Tim O'Reilly has provided arguably the best definition of "web 2.0":

Web 2.0 is the network as platform, spanning all connected devices. Web 2.0 applications are those that make the most of the intrinsic advantages of that platform, delivering software as continually-updated service that gets better the more people use it, consuming and remixing data from multiple sources, including individual users, while providing their own data and services in a form that allows remixing by others, creating network effects through an "architecture of participation", and going beyond the page metaphor of Web 1.0 to deliver rich user experiences (2007 pg. 17).

As a result, with the development of web 2.0 and the Internet as a platform to disseminate/provide access to knowledge, society has begun to see individuals using these technologies/networks for activist-oriented purposes (White, 2016; Bakir, 2010).

In early January 2014, Darren Baptiste spoke with the Toronto Star about a new mobile app he developed in response to the perceived increase of police-related violence. The app is called *CopWatch* and serves as a tool for anyone with a Smartphone or tablet to record the actions of the police and instantly disseminate it via YouTube. The app was designed for community members to primarily *observe* and *report* on questionable police-related behaviour. Additionally, he designed the app to be as user-friendly as can be, with the hope that community members, who already appear fluent in using

technology, can record more instances of the police as easily as possible. As a result, CopWtch serves as a reminder that community members are no longer limited to *just* the availability of technology, but the seemingly *unlimited* possibilities that go along with it (Andrejevic, 2005; David, 2010; Harfield, 2014). Thus, the alignment between citizen surveillance and web 2.0 technologies has facilitated new ways in which footage can be shared across the Internet while lacking a general or someone in charge of deciding what this footage is used for (Andrejevic, 2005; Reeves, 2012; Foucault, 1975; Marwick, 2012; Deleuze & Guattari, 1987).

This *lack* of hierarchy, or leaderlessness within citizen surveillance culture, suggests a different conceptualization of power than what panoptic-surveillance theory is founded on (this will be discussed in the second half of this chapter) (Newell, 2014). In turn, citizen surveillers are comprised of community individuals who have already begun to aim their gaze¹² towards the police without hesitation (Reeves, 2012; Hier, 2003; Haggerty & Ericson, 2000; Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). Unfortunately, despite the fact that citizen surveillers are hopeful that their actions can instill a sense of control over a police officer's action, it remains unknown how, or to what degree, citizen surveillance *can* or *cannot* provoke a change in how the police will act, or react, differently than when a camera is pointed in their direction. Thus, the theoretical assumption that citizen surveillance will instill a sense of disciplinary power unto the police is beyond the scope of this project, but should be considered in future studies.

¹² The notion of a "surveillant gaze" is a belief developed from Foucault's concept of the "medical gaze". It is the belief that power dynamics can be administered by those in a position of authority to harness aspects of power and/or the collection of information/knowledge (1975).

2.3 Characterizing citizen surveillance as a social movement

In this section, I examine how citizen surveillance should be characterized as a tool used by social movements (Mann et al., 2003; Marx, 2003; Bakir, 2010; Dennis, 2008; Reeves, 2012). This idea is attributed to citizen surveillers who make use of web 2.0 technologies and the Internet for the purpose of democratically voicing their displeasure of the police. In turn, this has sparked debate on how citizen surveillers can contribute to, and are a part of, a larger consensus-based assemblage motivated by social reform.

To provide context, Van Dijck examined the idea of *participatory culture* through an examination of TIME magazine's 2006 person of the year: "You" (2009). Van Dijck provided insightful commentary and recognized user-participation, and the millions of anonymous web users, who contributed their abilities to share, edit, remix and transform data in an era of web 2.0. Bakir expands on this examination of *You*, by emphasizing that participatory culture is comprised of "user-generated content, participatory media, citizen journalism, social video, mass self-communication and creative commons" (Bakir, 2010, pg. 3). The previously identified *participatory techniques* are all categorized under the larger title of amateur because they (often) lack the training, credibility, and certification that were previously required to report on or deliver news to the general public (Bakir, 2010; David, 2010; Mortensen, 2014; Mawby, 1999; Newell, 2014; Möller, 2010b). Accordingly, it appears as though anyone can engage in citizen surveillance if they have the tools and/or motivation to do so.

Bird alludes to this in her writing by theorizing that citizens are moving from consumers of information to "prosumers" (2011). To be a *prosumer*, one must be involved in the continual collection, exchange, and distribution of information (either

their own or the information of others) in the pursuit of new social developments or improvements to society as a whole (Bird, 2011; Fuentes, 2015). What these developments and improvements are is hard to say, as Bird remains ambiguous with her overall conclusions. While she suggests that citizen-contributed media will lead to a recaptured democratic identity, she does not offer insight as to who is engaging in this behaviour, how often people are doing this, or whether or not this is simply a trend among a few niche groups (Bird, 2011).

At the same time, Möller has become an active contributor in writing about the “era of the witness” (2010, pg. 113), and the power of the photograph. Specifically, he writes about how photographs and recorded footage has allowed people to become participants in situations they were not directly involved in or present at (2010; Harfield, 2014; Timan & Ourdshoorn, 2012). Through the dissemination of footage, one enables events to be relived over again regardless of where the event took place and whether one was there or not when the situation was unfolding (Anderson & Möller, 2013; Möller, 2010a; Mortensen, 2014; Mawby, 1999). In turn, innovating photographic/video technologies is believed to have affected how community citizens can “express their membership [in] a democracy” (Murray, 2010, pg. 6).

As argued by Bossewitch and Sinnrech (2012), and Braitch and Brush (2011), this interest in being able to exercise one’s democratic voice has been made possible by new forms of “do-it-yourself” (DIY) activism. DIY activists take it upon themselves to use the tools that are available to make sure that information can become publically accessible knowledge for anyone who seeks it (Andrejevic, 2005; Bird, 2011; Fuchs, 2011; Newell, 2014). However, a limitation with Braitch and Brush’s notion is that they lack the

empirical evidence to substantiate their claims regarding DIY activism. They do not move past under substantiated aspects regarding *who* is engaging in DIY activism or the reported motivations for why some individuals are doing this (2011).

Nevertheless, instances of political activism facilitated by citizen surveillance have ushered in an era that is characterized as the “end of forgetting” (Bossewitch & Sinnrech, 2012). As Dennis argues, citizen surveillance is showing early signs of new civic responsibilities by commenting on the fact that community members have already begun to change *how* they interact with both the police and other community members through the use and implementation of web 2.0 technologies (Dennis, 2008). His article makes interesting and insightful ideas regarding how citizen surveillance has brought upon a greater sense of responsibility, cooperation, and encouragement from all active participants of a situation (traits seen in other social movements) (Dennis, 2008; Fuentes, 2015).

So, in my ability to expand on the ideas of Dennis, Reeves, who characterizes citizen surveillance generally as *sousveillance*, does so by framing it as a new type of social movement by conducting case studies of events where citizen surveillance has occurred (2012). Not only does this advance the general knowledge about citizen surveillance, but it frames citizen surveillance as a way for community members to rally together and become more unified in being able to help fellow community individuals (Reeves, 2012). While Reeves offers a very insightful thought with respect to perhaps *why* citizens may be engaging in surveillance, his research can only go so far in being able to establish the motivations for how, or to what degree, it is tied back to the ways in which power may be harnessed. Reeves explains that:

New trends in ‘sousveillance’ – the methods, in which individuals carry out bottom-up surveillance, typically through new mobile technologies – have freed citizens to turn their gaze against the state, allowing them to capture and publicize police brutality and other offences. In fact, the widespread popularity of mobile surveillance devices has empowered citizens while it has simultaneously disciplined their conduct: nowadays everyone, including police officers, are under threat of constant surveillance by mobile phones and other devices equipped with recording software (2012, pg. 246).

Thus, as Hedley argues, now more than ever, “the solo video journalist creates *social moments* rather than decisive single frames” (Hedley, 2013, pg. 72, italics in original). However, in being able to examine *what* citizen surveillance users hope to accomplish, if anything, remains under substantiated, only that these individuals are creating *something*. Thus, scholars have not yet been able to offer a substantiated idea of *who* is engaging in citizen surveillance, or *why*, beyond a theoretical presumption. So despite the fact that citizen surveillance theory is progressing at an increasing rate, understanding citizen surveillance is so much more than just the recording and sharing of footage that contains questionable acts of state/police violence captured by those with no status or power. There is a need to understand *why* this is happening, *who* is engaging in this behaviour, and *what* their motivation is grounded in. The real world implications of being able to better understand why community members film the police, stands in the way of being able to accurately appreciate citizen surveillance as a model of surveillance grounded in civilian power/resistance to state/corporate power.

As Haggerty and Ericson (2000) and Hier (2003) stress, the development of technology being utilized within developing societies is shifting the very nature of how surveillance, power, and information is thought to exist in society. Thus, it is important to examine how people think about power and how they seek to shape it when investigating

one's motivation to engage in citizen surveillance. As a result, it is crucial to analyze the reported motivations of citizen surveillers by examining: his or her *logics* for resisting power; his or her *understandings* of power and the institutions in which they are embedded; and, his or her *reported* approaches to passive and active forms of resistance.

Thus, in being able to investigate how power is conceptualized among citizen surveillers, I reference Doyle's article, in which he refers to a new era of "surveillance 2.0" (2011). Despite a lack of evidence, *surveillance 2.0* appears to be characterized as a civilian-based surveillance system facilitated by not only inviting mass user-participation but also how this system is embedded with user-contributed knowledge. As a result, despite being under substantiated and largely theoretical, surveillance 2.0 appears to serve as a model of surveillance in which the lives and experiences of community individuals provides the basis for a new system of surveillance aimed at state/corporate bodies (2011). This is an important concept that will be revisited in my discussion chapter.

2.4 Theoretical Framework

To reiterate, in reviewing the literature/debated claims about citizen surveillance, scholars who have carried out their research/theory have done so by largely engaging with Foucaultian understanding of power/surveillance. Specifically, the aforementioned scholars/claims examine citizen surveillance by drawing from how Foucault framed surveillance/power as being operative from the top-down, and by extension, the architectural elements embedded in surveillance theory, including institutional powers that embody surveillance as a part of their function (or how power is *intended* to work). As a result, citizen surveillance and its association with the concept of power remains limited as scholars essentially frame citizen surveillance simply an inverse, or *bottom-up*,

reimagining of how surveillance serves as a mechanism for control/power. Furthermore, Foucault acknowledged that power is predominately manifested as a form of discipline, control, or sovereignty over those with less power, and thus difficult to resist/reverse. However, because Foucault did not examine resistance, agency, or the autonomous lives of those who reside in a surveillance system, his analysis does not reflect a complete conceptualization of how power may *actually* exist, and thus, the ways in which power is/can be reversible/resisted.

Thus, engaging in a purely Foucaultian framework would limit my ability to investigate the motivations of citizen surveillance as a means of resistance to the larger embodiment(s) of power one may reside under. Specifically, seeing as there are no citizen surveillance manuals, or historical texts/models regarding citizen surveillance, I would be limited in how I am able to answer my research questions should I use the genealogical methodology that Foucault incorporated. Specifically, my ability to investigate the role of power and how power is/can be reversible would be limited should I have examined citizen surveillance relying solely on Foucault.

By incorporating Deleuze and his ideas (specifically, the concepts of rhizomes, assemblages, and war-machines), I aim to compliment what Foucault tells us about power and contribute to an ongoing discussion that examines how networking systems and technologies have revisited ideas within surveillance theory. Thus, this study serves as a micro investigation of citizen surveillance that engages with the ideas of Foucault, but goes further by including Deleuze and reimagining power/surveillance as a living idea that develops alongside society (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Galič, Timan, & Koops, 2016). In turn, this has facilitated my ability to analyze the potential motivations one may

have when engaging in citizen surveillance and the larger system of power that a community individual operates in.

Thus, in being able to develop Foucault's ideas concerning power and surveillance with Deleuze, Galić, Timan and Koops stress that:

[O]bjects of study today require a different analysis, now [that] the power dynamics between institutions and individuals are no longer so delineated as they were in Foucault's analysis. Deleuze observed that Foucauldian institutions and their ways of disciplining no longer existed, or at least were shifting into other modes of surveillance and exercising power. Deleuze, partly in collaboration with Guattari, further developed the shift, already described to some extent by Foucault, from disciplinary societies towards societies of control (Deleuze and Guattari 1987; Deleuze 1992). Although the Panopticon is not explicitly discussed nor dismissed, these authors diverge from Panoptical thinking by instead proposing a series of new places of power to conclude that the socio-technical landscape has changed (Galić, Timan, and Koops, 2016, pg. 11)

Specifically, Galić, Timan and Koops write that:

Deleuze, although closely connected with Foucault, takes a fundamentally different direction in thinking about how and where discipline and control can be found and analyzed. They share with Haggerty and Ericson an attempt to find other places of analysis. Deleuze and Guatarri locate new places of surveillance in a physically and technologically changed environment, whilst Haggerty and Ericson look particularly at new combinations of humans and technology that exercise forms of surveillance (Galić, Timan, and Koops, 2016, pg. 10)

Furthermore, my study goes a few steps further by not only generating evidence to substantiate some claims written about citizen surveillance, but also by placing a greater emphasis on web 2.0, citizen journalism, participatory surveillance theory, the surveillant assemblage, and political activism.

2.4.1 Surveillance theory: Examining panoptic models of surveillance

So, before examining the association between Foucault and Deleuze, it is essential to begin with an examination of the panopticon. This is because the panoptic model is considered to be the foremost archetype used to examine themes of power and surveillance (Mathiesen, 1997; Galič, Timan & Koops, 2016; Wood, 2003; Welch, 2011). To begin, Jeremy Bentham envisioned the panopticon as the ideal institutional building as it allowed for a maximum amount of supervision over a specific population using minimal effort (Foucault, 1975). Thus, panopticism, the theory developed by Foucault based on Bentham's first conceptualization of this surveillance model, was theorized to signify how the constant monitoring of a subjected population by an omnipresent apparatus of power can turn a selected population into self-governed beings (1975). To be self-governing is to demonstrate certain behavioural characteristics decided by those in a position of authority (without the direct contact or intervention of said authoritative presence all the time) (1975). Thus, with respect to the idea of a panopticon prison structure, guards (the embodiment of power) would not necessarily have to be present in a given situation for the prisoners to act or behave in the desired way (1975).

More so, according to Patton, the type of power that exists in a panoptic setting operates from the top-down. Top-down power represents the ways in which individuals, groups, or institutions of power can control the actions of an objectified population (Patton, 1994). Control, again, is defined as the ability to influence or direct another's behaviour, molding and shaping them, over an unknown duration of time. Those at the *top* are thought to be in a position of power because of the embedded idea of dominance that a panoptic system is based on. Conversely, those at the *bottom* are thought to have little power because they have little to no knowledge regarding how power works, and

thus few, if any, resources to resist it. This was thought to result in little to no agency or freedom for the population being controlled. Freedom, in this regard, is the “capacity to choose one’s actions without external constraint” (Garland, 1997, pg. 197).

Consequently, the agency of individuals, or to act as an agent for one’s own life, is disrupted by the fact that their freedom is limited (Garland, 1997).

However, this suggests that power *may* be reversible in situations where a controlled group has the knowledge to resist the surveillance/power that currently exists. This suggests a top-down hierarchical model can be challenged if the governed population is able to recognize *how* they are being dominated. Subsequently, if one is able to identify and understand how power forms exist in a given situation, one is more able to challenge the hierarchical nature of that institution (Foucault, 1975; Garland, 1997; Mann, Nolan & Wellman, 2003; Bossewitch and Sinnrech, 2012). This is an integral idea regarding citizen surveillance and should be noted going forward.

Still, in situations where power is *not* reversible, a panoptic situation can turn a selected population into self-governed beings. This is a concept that is known as “soul-training” (Foucault, 1975). *Soul-training* represents the transformation of an objectified population into a group of docile individuals who have their lives controlled. As a result, those who are controlled are vulnerable to lose their agency and are thought to lose his or her ability to think and act independently (Foucault, 1975; Garland, 1997; Haggerty and Ericson, 2000). As a result, the modality of power that exists within panopticism is known as “disciplinary power” (Foucault, 1975). Foucault emphasized that discipline in and of itself is not power, but rather how power could be exercised over a person or group of people (1975; Patton, 1994). Patton goes on to say that panoptic structures are

embedded with disciplinary power as a part of its function and transforms the idea of surveillance into a “generalizable mechanism of power” (Patton, 1994, pg. 163).

However, as I previously discussed, in Foucault’s writing of the panopticon, his method was genealogy, or an analysis of historical texts/discourses. As a result, Foucault examined an aspirational idea for how power forms *could* exist. In turn, he examined the *design* of a panoptic model, but never a formal, living panopticon. As a result, while Foucault put forth very important ideas with respect to understandings of power, and concepts like surveillance, it is a partial understanding. This is because Foucault’s methodology did not consider sociological ideas like resistance or the autonomous nature of people. Rather, he was more concerned with examining the role of power as a part of an institution’s function.

Thus, in order to move beyond the current debates surrounding citizen surveillance literature, including my ability to better understand the motivations of a citizen surveiller, it is important to move beyond a purely Foucaultian analysis (though still incorporate his themes). This is so I can consider not only *how* power is thought to exist, but also the ways in which power may be challenged, resisted, or reversed. Thus, by engaging with Deleuze, I am able to compliment Foucault’s understanding of power/surveillance and go back to his idea that power is/can be resisted and/or reversible in a more networked surveillant system.

2.4.2 Linking rhizomes with surveillance theory

Thus, in building on the ideas presented by Foucault, I integrate the writings of Deleuze (1992) and his work with Guatarri (1987). Specifically, by engaging with Deleuze, I am able to frame citizen surveillance within the context of “rhizomes” (Deleuze & Guatarri, 1987). A *rhizome* serves as the metaphorical way of re-

conceptualizing how an idea, like power or surveillance, can be reimagined and given new meaning as society evolves. Essentially, by characterizing an idea as rhizomatic, Deleuze and Guatarri put forth the notion that *something* can change, be reimagined, and/or be given an alternative definition, based on understanding the people of a particular society. So, in framing the idea of power as rhizomatic, I am not suggesting a new system of power overall. Rather, by framing power as rhizomatic, I am arguing that power can be (re)characterized and (re)conceptualized based on the lives of those residing in that particular society. Thus, framing *something* as rhizomatic does not suggest a new beginning or an end, but rather the “middle” of a story (Deleuze & Guatarri, 1987). Accordingly, when describing power as rhizomatic, Patton suggests, taking lead from Deleuze and Guatarri, that community individuals can level the hierarchal nature of power when moving from a closed-disciplinary system of top-down power to a new open-system of control (1987; Patton, 1994).

Furthermore, as Deleuze and Guatarri write:

The rhizome is an antigenealogy. It is a short-term memory, or antimemory. The rhizome operates by variation, expansion, conquest, capture, offshoots...It is tracings that must be put on the map, not the opposite. In contrast to centered (even polycentric) systems with hierarchical models of communication and preestablished paths, the rhizome is an acentered, nonhierarchical, nonsignifying system without a General and without an organizing memory or central automaton, defined solely by a circulation of states. (1987, pg. 21)

By incorporating Deleuze to frame power as rhizomatic, my aim is to revisit the idea of power and how it has been affected by new networked technologies general and citizen surveillance specifically (1987). Accordingly, in using Deleuze, I characterize citizen

surveillance as an extension or offshoot of panoptic surveillance theory, and not merely a copy or inverse of Foucault's panoptic model.

Furthermore, in my ability to examine how individuals give meaning to citizen surveillance, I reflect on what Deleuze and Guattari argue, in that a genealogical method limits how a researcher can study contemporary ideas for which there is no historical discourse available (texts, structures, or models) (1987). Rather, Deleuze and Guattari contrast a genealogical methodology with that of a rhizomatic methodology. In turn, their goal is to use the idea of rhizomes to reveal alternative truths or realities about sociological ideas, like power, rather than engaging in an analysis that uses historical texts or discourses.

Thus, for the sake of this project, I am focusing on the heterogeneous realities of community members because as Deleuze argues, disciplinary societies, or societies built on hierarchal power are being challenged as society continues to develop (1987). More specifically, according to Deleuze, these challenges are a result of the "free-floating control that replaced the old disciplines operating in the time frame of a closed system" (1992, pg. 4). Thus, these new open-systems of control have facilitated new ways in which community members are thought to have an impact on how power can be manifested in society, and thus, something to be harnessed via forms of wireless mobile technologies and networked surveillance platforms.

Additionally, by applying Deleuzian ideas, I propose that citizen surveillance represents its own characteristics within surveillance theory and is not a tracing, copy, or simple inverse of Foucault's ideas of power/surveillance. I am essentially framing citizen surveillance as a rhizomatic offshoot of larger surveillance theory and that it should be

studied as such. This is because, as will be seen throughout the remainder of this project, citizen surveillance presents an alternative, but complimentary understanding to Foucault's understanding of how power/surveillance systems exist.

As a result, I postulate that a specific goal within citizen surveillance is to challenge the power of hierarchal systems/institutions. In this case, power is re-conceptualized as a modality of desire, rather than one of discipline or control (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). Specifically, desire is operationalized as, "the power to be or do certain things, which both the agent exercising power and the one over whom it is being exercised must be supposed to possess" (Patton, 1994, pg. 159). With respect to this new conceptualization of power, citizen surveillance is thought to offer individuals, who may have at one time lacked power, the ability to harness power themselves (Patton, 1994).

This is attributed to the development and proliferation of web 2.0 and wireless mobile technologies. Web 2.0 technologies have brought about new ways for knowledge to be collected and distributed throughout society. As a result, this is thought to affect how the power of the police may now be challenged and resisted in ways previously unseen (Doyle, 2011; Fuchs, 2011; Harfield, 2014). In turn, it would appear that by engagement in or experience with filming the police, a citizen surveiller is part of a larger assemblage aimed at challenging/resisting the hierarchal nature of power embedded within policing as an institution.

As Patton wrote, "assemblages consist of a multiplicity of heterogeneous objects whose unity comes solely from the fact that these items function together, that they 'work' together as a functional entity" (Patton, 1994, pg. 158). With respect to assemblages, citizen surveillers embody the idea that people can come together and unite

for a common goal (Deleuze & Guatarri, 1987; Patton, 1994; Ericson & Haggerty, 2000; Patton, 1994). This stems from the convergence of community-led beliefs, stemming from societal issues grounded in the arts, sciences, and social struggles of community members who are part of a larger society (1987).

Accordingly, Deleuze and Guatarri include another concept that is grounded in the idea of challenging hierarchal systems of power: a “war-machine” (1987). A *war-machine* is type of assemblage that “resists the operation of the state” (Patton, 1994, pg. 163). With state or corporate bodies (e.g. the police) often associated with having the most power in society, a war-machine (i.e. citizen surveillance) is the embodiment of civilian led assemblages aiming to challenge the power of the state and/or state officials.

Thus, while *surveillance* is believed to be defined as watching from a position of power, and *sousveillance* is characterized as an alternative process in which individuals who have traditionally lacked authority, are now able to aim the surveillant gaze towards those who are in a position of power and watch them right back (Marx, 2003; Mann et al., 2003), this era of citizen surveillance is characterized by a shift in the hierarchical nature that Foucault’s panoptic theory was grounded in. So, by examining the heterogeneous lives of those who film the police, I am able to more closely analyze the motivations/logics of a citizen surveillers objective to challenge state power.

The remainder of this section is to examine additional surveillance models that have developed since the time of Foucault’s analysis of the panopticon. By evaluating these models, my goal is to further develop citizen surveillance within the larger socio-political context of: 1) the innovation and impact of technology; 2) how these technologies have had an impact on the ways in which information flows through society;

and, 3) how citizen surveillers' desire for power reimagines it as seeing, interpreting, challenging, and/or resisting forms of hierarchal power (Haggerty & Ericson, 2000; Hier, 2003; Mann et al., 2003; Mann & Ferenbok, 2013).

2.4.3 Synopticism

So, to expand on the ideas of Foucault's interpretation of the panopticon, I want to introduce Thomas Mathiesen and his theory of a bottom-up surveillance model known as "synopticism" (1997). Mathiesen coined the term *synopticon*, or the theory of synopticism in his article, "The Viewer Society" (1997). Specifically, Mathiesen wrote *The Viewer Society* to examine how state or large corporate bodies could use modern mass media to facilitate a new era of disciplinary control. This new conceptualization of surveillance came at a time when TV news was mostly responsible for type of information that flowed in society and how people could obtain knowledge (1997).

Mathiesen envisioned new ways in which those at the top, or those with power, would be able to incite aspects of discipline and control the lives of those who watched/read the news (those at the bottom of the power spectrum) (1997). So, while panopticism is broadly characterized as *the few being able to watch the many* (top-down), Mathiesen characterizes synopticism as *the many being able to watch the few* (bottom-up) (1997). This suggests that those who are at the bottom are able to watch those at the top. Yet, in this model, power would still be manifested from the top-down because those at the top are still believed to be embodiments of power rather than those at the bottom. In this regard, power would be difficult to reverse/challenge because community members could watch the news, but cannot impact what information would be reported on (Mathiesen, 1997; Hier, 2003 Timan & Oudsshoorn, 2012)

Subsequently, Mathiesen, channeling Orwell, believed that mass media had orthodox qualities of being able to guide our consciousness (1997). Mathiesen went on to say, “that synopticism, through the modern mass media in general and television in particular, first of all directs and controls or disciplines our *consciousness*” (Mathiesen, 1997, pg. 230, italics in originals). Mathiesen theorized that a synoptic system would be grounded in state or large corporate bodies being able to instill aspects of soul-training unto community members by influencing how community members think about, and potentially internalize the information being presented via the news (1997). Thus, synoptic theory suggests that mass media has the potential to control those who consume the information. This incorporates the Foucaultian notion of discipline and that ultimately, by controlling what information is available to the rest of society, one can in turn control society (specifically by hindering certain information from being made available to the rest of society) (1997).

Mathiesen concluded his article by suggesting the fallibility of the Internet and World Wide Web (a new phenomenon at the time) as a means of being able to disseminate information to mass audiences. Mathiesen predicted that the commercialization of the Internet would be a bust and that TV and other News Media outlets (print or radio) would continue to serve as the dominant method of distributing information (1997).

However, in his evaluation of synopticism, Doyle argues that Mathiesen conceptualized his synoptic model too narrowly and did not consider how much of a role the Internet would eventually have in society (2011). As a result, Doyle along with others have re-operationalized synoptic theory more as a surveillant model grounded in the

desires of community members to *challenge* and/or *resist* state/corporate power. This is aided by members of the community who wish to administer their own forms of surveillance directed right back at those in a position of authority (Doyle, 2011; Timan & Oudshoorn, 2012; Fernback, 2013; Koskela, 2003; Hier, 2003; Bakir, 2011).

So, while Mathiesen wrote about the panopticon and synopticon as opposite sides of the same coin, other scholars have re-conceptualized synopticism as a rhizomatic offshoot (Haggerty & Ericson, 2000; Hier, 2003; Doyle, 2011; Fuchs, 2011). More specifically, the idea of a synoptic system, as argued by Haggerty and Ericson, is characterized as the “rhizomatic leveling of the hierarchy of surveillance, such that groups which were previously exempt from routine surveillance are now increasingly being monitored” (Haggerty & Ericson, 2000, pg. 606). Thus, new means of citizen surveillance suggests a new assemblage of community-led surveillance overall.

With respect to Doyle, he suggests that synoptic theory needs to be re-conceptualized, as there have been dramatic shifts in modern mass media, as well as the impact of the Internet (2011). This is facilitated by the development of wireless mobile technologies and web 2.0 as a platform for disseminating/accessing user-contributed content online (Doyle, 2011; Bakir, 2011; Fuchs, 2011; O’Rielly, 2007; Mawby, 1999). As Doyle wrote, “the synopticon is tied to a top-down, instrumental [way] of theorizing the media. It neglects resistance, alternative currents in media production and caption, the role of culture and the increasingly centrality of the Internet” (Doyle, 2011, pg. 283). Thus, drawing from Aaron Doyle’s reconceptualization of Mathiesen’s *Viewer Society* paper within a web 2.0 framework, this civilian led assemblage suggests the notion of a

sousveillant assemblage based on the revisited idea of surveillance from a citizen's perspective and intentions (a concept to be more closely examined in my discussion).

More so, to expand on the point made by Doyle, Fuchs argues that citizens today are using technological devices, in accompaniment with social media, as a means to “closely gain insights into the lives [and] secrets” (Fuchs, 2011, pg. 304) of the other. Fittingly, Gary Marx, a prominent counter-surveillance researcher, advocates that community individuals, who should already be *watching the watcher* right back, now have the means to do so (2003). According to counter-surveillance theory, if two people are watching each other, neither one will offer any information as it could be used against them (Fernback, 2013; Mann et al., 2003; Bakir, 2010; Ganascia, 2010; Wilson & Serisier, 2010). This neutralization of state power can then have an affect on how power is understood, how it is shaped, and who can have it. Methods of resistance then, or challenging the efforts made by those who wish to enact power over a given population, reimagines power as a modality of desire that falls more in line with Deleuze, than Foucault (Fuchs, 2011; Marx, 2003; Mann et al., 2003; Andrejevic, 2005; Doyle, 2011; Bakir, 2010; Bradshaw, 2013; Mawby, 1999; Thompson, 2005; Callanan & Rosenberger, 2011).

2.4.4 Lateral Surveillance

Furthermore, in examining the vast technological advancements since the time of Mathieson's paper, Reeves (2012) and Andrejevic (2005) theorize another model of surveillance, known as “lateral surveillance”. This model is one that lacks a strict hierarchy regarding who may watch/be watched (Marwick, 2012; Andrejevic, 2005; Reeves, 2012). Rather, lateral surveillance is thought to be a horizontalization of the surveillant assemblage discussed by Haggerty and Ericson (2000), who recognize the

convergence of technological innovations are being used to challenge, “what were once discrete surveillance systems...” (Haggerty & Ericson, 2000, pg. 606). Additionally, non-hierarchical models of lateral surveillance have been associated with aspects of citizen surveillance that include: “equiveillance” (Mann & Ferenbok, 2013), and, “social surveillance” (Marwick, 2012). The aforementioned models of lateral surveillance are examples of surveillance systems made up of community-led assemblages being (theoretically) equally capable of engaging in the surveillance of another person, regardless of his or her authority or status in society (Mann et al., 2003; Goldsmith, 2010; Weber, 2012).

Accordingly, the proliferation of interactive communication technologies and web 2.0 platforms has made it possible to engage in new forms of citizen-surveillance that were not as prevalent in the past (Andrejevic, 2005; David, 2010; Kiss, 2009; Bakir, 2010). Thus, it is important to note that one thing for certain is that technology “in itself is not a determinant of change, only a facilitator” (Uimonen, 1997, para, 5). Subsequently, a key factor regarding citizen surveillance is that there is still an aspect of *choice* with respect to whether or not someone will engage in citizen surveillance.

2.5 The Development of My Study

By engaging with both Foucault and Deleuze, I am able to analyze a citizen surveillers’ motivation from a sociological lens and reflect on how surveillance has changed as a result of new network technologies. This has moved away from the architectural elements of surveillance that Foucault previously examined. Thus, the purpose of this section then, is to briefly go over two projects that have explored aspects of citizen surveillance and the general use of technology to film/disseminate information for others to examine. While these studies do not explicitly reference Deleuze or his use

of rhizomes or assemblages, they nevertheless use the social constructivist philosophy of considering how humans give meaning to their behaviours and presenting alternative understandings of citizen surveillance.

To begin, Wilson and Serisier conducted a study aimed at examining the use of video by protestors, while conceptualizing their behaviour as a form of counter-surveillance (2010). The authors held 17 interviews with self-identified video activists in Australia. These participants spoke about his or her motivations for filming the police at protest events around Australia. Based on the interviews, the authors concluded that a method of video activism contributes to a large database of knowledge regarding violent instances of police. However, this information has left the authors to ask a follow-up question: so what? The authors conclude their study by addressing the fact that just because footage documented by community individuals is available, and that these video activists are recording footage to share with others, does not necessarily mean that anyone will do anything with it.

The authors write that while activists may engage in surveillance as a means to capture instances of violent policing, it should be accompanied by a larger benefit for the rest of society. What this benefit is remains unknown as the academic and practical implications of citizen surveillance are still in its infancy. Yet, what is clear is that from the thousands of citizen-produced videos that exist, there is a growing suspicion that community members are no longer passive when police officers engage in unwarranted or excessively violent acts. Thus, by speaking with individuals and utilizing his or her realities or lived experiences with the police, the authors are left with a better idea of why individuals are challenging the police by video recording their actions.

The other article that has generated empirical knowledge concerning the association between technology and citizen forms of surveillance (specifically sousveillance/lifelogging), is appropriately named, *A Day in the Digital Life: A preliminary sousveillance study*. In this article, Fletcher, Griffiths, and Kutar sought to better understand the implications of living in an intensifying digital society by studying their participant's use of wireless mobile technologies to "life-log" over the course of a 24-hour period (2011). This study was done in the hope of exploring how users perceive their own self-awareness in a surveillance system, and whether or not this could be used to better understand how one could engage in forms of surveillance when given both the tools and opportunities to do so (2011). In doing so, Fletcher et al. considered an aspect of citizen surveillance that is largely forgotten: the inherent lack of rules in using these technological devices to film the police or other community citizens.

The authors focus on the *open-control* nature of contemporary society by examining new methods that facilitate how information can be captured/disseminated/analyzed (Deleuze, 1992; Fletcher et al., 2011). As opposed to a closed disciplinary model that Foucault examined, Fletcher et al. embrace this changing interconnected world (2011). More so, like Deleuze and Guattari (1987) and Haggerty and Ericson (2000), Fletcher et al. focus on the rhizomatic nature of surveillance assemblages (though they do not discuss it by name) that has affected civilians being able to affect what kind of information flows in society by engaging in a type of surveillance themselves. More specifically, Fletcher et al., examine surveillance as not inherently good or bad, but relevant when considering how power is thought to be carried out or challenged by private citizens and the goals one may have in doing so (2011).

However, Fletcher et al. go on to say that until community members can fully comprehend how citizen forms of surveillance can be utilized in more guided ways (or with specific purposes), it may only serve as a means of sharing previously unknown or unseen footage, but nothing more. This is a sentiment shared with David Lyon, who back in 2001 was of the opinion that cameras in the hands of community members would have little impact on the ways in which community members interact with the state, aside from potentially offering a singular, brief, moment of resistance (in Bakir, 2010). However, the surge of web 2.0 technologies being used for activist purposes has suggested that this is no longer the case and should be taken more seriously.

In summation, while there is little empirical evidence to support the numerous claims being made by scholars, there has nevertheless been an intensification of theoretical presumptions regarding why community members engage in citizen surveillance. At the moment, the possible motivating factors that underlie citizen surveillance include the notion that it is associated with political activism (Wilson & Serisier, 2010; Bakir, 2010; Mann et al., 2003; Mann, 2005; Mann & Ferenbok, 2013). The political explanation behind citizen surveillance suggests that its users are motivated because of how they can serve as means of being able to act as a kind of oversight to institutions of power, like the police, in an attempt to increase a police officer's accountability for actions of wrongdoing (outside of other government-based watchdog agencies) (Mann et al., 2003; Marx, 2003; Andrejevic, 2005).

Another explanation for citizen surveillance has been linked to the idea of *empowerment*. Zimmerman and Rappaport define empowerment as:

[A] construct that links individual's strengths and competencies, natural helping systems, and proactive behaviours to matters of social policy and social change. It is thought to be a process by

which individuals gain mastery or control over their own lives and democratic participation in the life of their community (Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988, pg. 726).

Expanding on Zimmerman and Rappaport's definition, other scholars have theorized that citizen surveillance is a responsive technique in which a community members' desire *for* power is sought for in situations that he or she may have previously felt powerless in (such as in the victimization by police officers) (Bakir, 2010; Reeves; Lyon & Wood, 2012).

Citizen surveillance in this regard, suggests that its users interpret their actions as a method of resistance to state forms of surveillance and power. Thus, by examining this topic beyond a purely Foucaultian framework, I am able to consider how citizen surveillance appears to create a type of veillance which challenges how information can be shared, and power can be reversible and/or resisted (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987).

At the same time, there are other scholars who argue that citizen surveillance has more to do with the personal lives of the individual and less to do with political activism. First, egocentrism has been argued to be a rationale for engaging in citizen surveillance. This ties back to the notion that one's motivation to film the police/state bodies is associated with the purpose of solely posting it on one's Facebook page, Twitter feed, YouTube Channel or Instagram page for personal gain. Second, as argued by Andrejevic (2007) and Bakir (2010), the notion of celebrity expands on the egocentric nature mentioned previously. In this age of social media and videos *going viral* (willfully or not), the desire for one's 15 minutes of fame may be a result of posting footage/content that no one else may have access to.

In either case, in my ability to investigate the reported motivations of citizen surveillance, it is integral to examine those who experience or engage in surveillance

personally. So whether one's motivation is political, egocentric, self-empowering, or a means of protecting oneself or others, the fact is that citizen surveillance can facilitate a more transparent way to see into the lives of others (O'Reilly, 2007; David, 2010; Bossewitch & Sinnrech, 2012; Anderson & Möller, 2013; Bakir, 2010; Newell, 2014).

However, I want to reiterate that a lack of empirical evidence regarding citizen surveillance has resulted in this subject remaining a still theoretical, exploratory, and predominately underdeveloped area of research. Thus, my study is designed to better understand the *why* behind citizen surveillance. As a result, I have created secondary research questions that aim to reveal greater insight concerning one's motivation(s) to engage in citizen surveillance. Specifically, my secondary research questions ask:

- 1) *What is the association between advancements in technology and citizen surveillance?* This question is structured so that I am able to more closely examine how the Internet and web 2.0 technologies serve as a democratizing platform for civilians to engage in citizen surveillance. In doing so, I am able to explore the Foucaultian belief that knowledge is fragmented within systems of control/power, and revisit the idea that power is/can be resisted/reversible.
- 2) *Who can engage in citizen surveillance?* With respect to the notion that anyone can be a citizen surveiller, this question probes the idea that citizen surveillance is a war-machine, and that by carrying out citizen surveillance, one is more readily capable of expressing his or her role as a democratic member of society to not only harness power, but to challenge institutional powers, including the police.
- 3) *What are the techniques associated with engaging in citizen surveillance?* If we believe citizen surveillance is leaderless and non-hierarchical, this question

explores the variety of ways one can reimagine how citizen surveillance is subject to change over time and as society develops.

- 4) *How do citizen surveillers create meaning by engaging in surveillance?* This question interrogates Foucaultian and Deleuzian ideas concerning power, surveillance, control and resistance, and thus, the ways in which community members recognize citizen surveillance as: a power to be harnessed, a technique to challenge institutional power, and as an assemblage that mobilizes civilian discontent of state power/actors.

2.6 Chapter Summary

In this chapter I presented the contemporary ideas and debates that have been contributed to the development of citizen surveillance literature. Specifically, I examined citizen surveillance and its association with: the police, web 2.0 technologies, and social movements. Next, I introduced my theoretical framework and how incorporating both Foucault and Deleuze would allow me to develop the idea and contribute to the ongoing discussion of power and surveillance and their association with how technology and networking systems of surveillance have moved away from previous architectural elements of surveillance. I then presented the work of Wilson and Serisier (2010) and Fletcher et al. (2011) to further situate my study within the context of other scholars who examined citizen surveillance through an analysis of those who film the police or engage in surveillance themselves. I then recapped with the typographical information that has been written about citizen surveillance thus far, and how it led to the creation of my secondary research questions. In the next chapter, I present my methodology and explain its association with my theoretical framework. Specifically, how my theoretical framework influenced the methodology I chose to answer my research questions.

3. Chapter 3: Methodology

In this chapter, I present the methodological ideas I used to answer my primary and secondary research questions. I begin with my epistemology and reiterate how my theoretical framework was an appropriate lens to interrogate the ideas surrounding *power* and *resistance to power* through the concept of citizen surveillance. I then outline the procedures I used to both collect and analyze my data. Finally, I review the characteristics of those who participated in my study and the reliability/validity issues associated with qualitative research methodologies.

3.1 Epistemology

In looking to explore the motivations of a citizen surveiller, my epistemological position is grounded in being able to analyze how community individuals give citizen surveillance meaning. Specifically, I place emphasis on the fact that because society is made up of multiple realities, in speaking with human participants I would be able to reflect on their realities, stories, insights, and past experiences with the police to analyze/reveal potential motivations and rationales underlying citizen surveillance. In doing so, I take a lead from Garland (1997), who recognizes the benefit of merging sociological research methods to investigate/expand on the ideas of Foucault (specifically, the transition from architectural elements of surveillance theory to how networking systems have revisited and reimagined aspects of surveillance theory, including how one is able to assimilate him or herself within a larger surveillant system). This is attributed to Garland, who argues that each individual should be recognized as an autonomous subject. Thus, by including community individuals, I am able to evaluate how he or she utilizes democratic technologies/online platforms to film the police. In doing so, I have been able to analyze, give meaning to, and reflect on: the reported

motivations of a citizen surveiller; his or her logics for resisting power; his or her understandings of power and how it is embedded within the social structures/institutions around them, and; his or her reported approaches to both passive and active forms of resistance to these structures. So, in my ability to investigate the role of citizen surveillance specifically, I do so within the context of both sur- and sousveillance theory and key themes concerned with power, resistance, control, and desire. Again, I incorporate what Garland (1997) and O'Malley, Weir, and Shearing (1997) contend, in that it is not academically impure to expand on/examine the themes and ideas of Foucault by engaging in traditional sociological research. This is important given that a purely Foucaultian framework/analysis of data comprised from the experiences of community members would not allow me to answer my research questions sufficiently enough.

Specifically, what Foucault did not conceptualize in his examination of surveillance/power, is the sociological tendency to reflect on and consider the lives and lived experiences of those who are subjected to power or control. As a result, my study engages with Deleuze so that I am able to reflect on how networked technologies have impacted a community individual's ability to actually see, interpret, and resist power forms. Subsequently, ideas concerned with one's motivation and his or her agency in association with citizen surveillance. So, in order to answer my research questions, it is crucial for me to keep in mind that citizen surveillers are social beings and they give meaning to their actions by reflecting on his or her past actions or experiences with the police (Blumer, 1969).

So, to compliment how Foucault conceptualizes power and surveillance with Deleuze's use of rhizomes, I am able to apply the social constructivist belief that society

is comprised of social beings and that these beings are representative of multiple truths. By analyzing the realities, experiences, and insight of community stakeholders who have engaged in citizen surveillance, I am permitted to explore/analyze the reported motivations one may have when filming the police. So, while the term *community stakeholder* is wide-ranging and ambiguous (I define the term in greater detail shortly), he or she is one who seeks to bring about change and accountability to society in some capacity (Simonson, forthcoming). Specifically, by focusing on the truths and realities of community individuals I am permitted to analyze how those who engage in citizen surveillance, *think* about power and how they seek to shape/challenge power by filming the police.

However, in focusing on the truths of my participants, I am not suggesting that my findings/motivations represent a single ultimate *truth* about citizen surveillance. To reiterate, truth, in this regard, would suggest a single-ultimate reality that explains citizen surveillance and is applicable to all members of society (Loseke, 2008). Rather, I have used the stories and experiences of community stakeholders to compile a snapshot of information about citizen surveillance at this moment in time. More so, because I am basing my findings on an in-depth analysis of a small amount of data, I am less concerned with authenticating a single truth about citizen surveillance and more interested in being able to substantiate the knowledge that surrounds citizen surveillance at this moment in time.

3.2 Method of Data Collection: The Semi-Structured Interview

As I have briefly alluded to, my method of collecting data was through semi-structured interviews with community stakeholders. In using this data, I am afforded with a more grounded understanding of how citizen surveillance is given meaning. This

contributes to my ability to present a typographical (but non-exhaustive) catalogue signifying the potential motivations one may have when engaging in citizen surveillance. Again, due to the exploratory nature of this project, interviews permitted me to generate empirical data from the insights and realities of people who have engaged with or experienced aspects of citizen surveillance personally. However, before the interviews took place, I constructed an interview questionnaire (to be discussed shortly) to facilitate how my interviews would be carried out. This questionnaire was created as a guide so that my participants would be able to speak about a number of subjects relevant to the topic of citizen surveillance. In turn, this allows me to consider other aspects or potential factors that may have played a role in my participants' decision to carry out citizen surveillance (i.e. race, sex, income, or socio-economic status).

A total of 10 interviews took place with 11 interview participants. Demographic information about my participants was not actively collected, but there were instances in a few of the interviews where my participants spoke about/self-identified with how his or her demographic features were relevant in their ability to speak about citizen surveillance. More so, demographic information was not actively collected, as I was more concerned with the underlying, or latent information of my participants' responses. Manifest information would surely be useful in a different methodological study and should be kept in mind for the foreseeable future. However, as I discuss shortly, it is the information that lays at the foundation of my participant's responses that I was interested in analyzing.

Interviews were held between August 2014 and March 2015. The duration of the interviews ranged between 3 minutes and 58 minutes. Seven of the 11 interviews reached

40 minutes or more, and 1 interview was just shy at 37 minutes. With respect to my findings, which will be closely examined in the next chapter, participants will not be addressed by their name. Rather, they will be identified by a 6-digit number code (rather than a pseudonym). This is because after each audio recording, the information was uploaded and backed up securely onto my computer. When each file was transferred, it was embedded with a random 6-digit number (decided on by the software). This number makes no reference to any personal information about the interview, nor does it reference the date the interview took place, or the name of the participant.

3.3 The Interview Guide

With respect to the interview questionnaire, I have created 14 guiding interview questions that were used to touch on a number of ideas over the course of the interview. The questions begin very broad, and ultimately narrow down to aspects of citizen surveillance including: how citizen surveillance may be conceptualized, its relation to the notion of power, and its impact on the relationship between community individuals and the police. The questions that were used in the questionnaire are as follows:

1. How would you describe the relationship that currently exists between police and community members?
2. What does citizen surveillance mean to you?
3. What have your experiences been like with the police?
4. In what ways have those experiences with the police shaped what you feel you could or could not do while around them?
5. How do you understand your rights in a protest environment?
6. Have you ever seen the police engaging in acts of excessive force that some might categorize as police brutality?

- a. Can you give me examples?
 - b. What did you do? And;
 - c. If so, did you feel as if there is anything you could do to help the victim?
7. Have you ever used social media, including Twitter, Facebook or YouTube to voice your thoughts on the police? If so, which ones? How often?
 8. For what purpose would you ever video record the police using your phone, video camera or other wireless mobile technology?
 9. How have improvements in technology changed the ways in which you interact with the police?
 10. What do you believe could be a reason for recording police-civilian incidents?
 11. What could be a reason for sharing the footage of that incident online for potentially millions of people to see?
 12. What are your thoughts in respect to whether or not police officers should begin wearing a camera as part of their uniform?
 13. Should the police be held responsible for their actions?
 14. Is there anything else you would like to ask that hasn't already been covered/spoken about?

The questions I created gradually build a narrative around the perceived relationship one may or may not have with the police and a community members' ability to engage in a form of surveillance of the police. This was important to note, given that scholars are increasingly pursuing the notion that there is a crisis in the confidence community members have in the police and that citizen surveillance is a suitable remedy to repair this distrust (Ganascia, 2010; Reeves, 2012; Bakir, 2010). Additionally, I made sure to take

note of: how my participant's previous experiences with the police, or lack thereof, contributed to how he or she acts around the police now; the use of social media to share information about information/events and/or to raise awareness of them; the specifics of why one would share filmed/photographed content to a larger audience (specifically how web 2.0 technologies are used); civilian perceptions on surveillance, and if its something my participants have ever heard of or seen in their own lives; and lastly, their personal thoughts/insights on the merit of citizen surveillance in society.

Again, I want to stress that my findings have not lead to a definitive typology of citizen surveillance. This is because this study is an in-depth analysis on a small amount of data. Furthermore, the sample size is too small too generalize to the rest of society (Neuman, 2011). Additionally, my epistemological framework is grounded in analyzing multiple realities, rather than seeking one definitive truth about a citizen surveillers' motivation to film the police. Lastly, the purpose of my study was not to make grandiose or large claims about citizen surveillance. Rather, the purpose of my study is to offer a snapshot of how community members have already begun to characterize and give meaning to citizen surveillance behaviour at this point in time (Miller, 2012; Pals & Atchison, 2008).

So, while the responses of my participants do not contribute to a single explanation of citizen surveillance behaviour, they have nevertheless been used to investigate the academic and real-world implications of citizen surveillance for future studies to build on. So, what I am able to present, is a collection of themes relevant to why people are engaging in citizen surveillance and how community individuals can harness methods of surveillance at this point in time.

However, a limit with using interviews as my method of data-collection is that it could have lead some to dismiss the veracity of my findings due to self-report bias. Self-report bias, and thus self-report data, has issues with credibility, as the information is often taken at face value and regarded as true (Skolnick & McCoy, 1984; Newing, 2011). Consequently, my respondents may have: exaggerated a situation they found themselves in when responding to a question; answered a question specifically in a way that will portray themselves in a good light; or, possibly lie, worrying that their answers may either get them in trouble, or be favored by me as the researcher (Newing, 2011). However, it is important to note that under a constructivist epistemology, this should be a non-issue. This is attributed to the sense that all knowledge, including the information contributed by my participants is a form of representation of truth. Again, truths are in relation to how phenomena are experienced and then represented back to others who interpret them, in turn.

3.4 Method of Data-Analysis: The Critical Content Analysis

At the completion of my interviews, my method to analyze the data was that of a qualitative critical content analysis (thematic analysis). Previous research studies that have used a qualitative critical content analysis have been utilized to analyze the *what* of written or verbal text (Schilling, 2006; Elo & Kyngas, 2008; Beach, Enciso, Harste, Jenkins, Raina, Rogers, Short, Sung, Wilson, & Yenika-Agbaw, 2009; Krippendorff, 2004). Thus, I have used a critical content analysis, guided by a thematic analysis, to uncover the implicit themes, or patterns, that were dormant in the views, thoughts, and insights of my research participants' contributed information (Attride-Sterling, 2001; Elliott, Thomas & Ogloff, 2012; Krippendorff, 2004; White & Marsh, 2006).

Before going into the specifics of a thematic analysis (which I address next), I first want to differentiate between a critical content analysis (CCA) and a critical discourse analysis (CDA). Predominately, my decision to utilize a CCA was grounded in what I wanted to infer from my data and how I wanted to answer my research question (Beach et al., 2009; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). A critical analysis in general was appropriate for my study because of how I wanted to analyze and acknowledge how my participants were speaking about citizen surveillance. This is important when considering both the socio-political nature of my project/topic, and epistemological position to examine how my participants' lived experiences/realities have contributed to how they think about and give meaning to citizen surveillance (Beach et al., 2009; Krippendorff, 2004; van Dijk, 1993).

More so, while both critical *and* discourse analyses “take an explicit sociopolitical stance” (van Dijk, 1993, pg. 252), when studying issues of power, a CDA would focus on *what specifically* my participants would speak about (Fairclough, 1985). Alternatively, using a CCA permitted me to analyze the *underlying* aspects of my participants' responses and reveal a multitude of ideas with respect to citizen surveillance and its association with issues of power and control (van Dijk, 1993; Beach et al., 2009).

So, with respect to a CDA, Blommaert and Bulcaen differentiate it from a CCA as a form of analysis that stresses an examination of spoken or written dialect, which can produce new and greater understandings of power or inequality (2000). Additionally, Fairclough and Wodak describe the main features of a CDA as being able to examine the relationship between language and power relations, social problems, and how language itself can take on the form of social action (1997). Finally, Alvesson contends that a CDA

would be used to understand how people use *language* specifically to “accomplish things” (2002, pg. 67).

Thus, despite the aforementioned CDA theorists providing arguments for why using a CDA methodology could be used to study citizen surveillance, specifically by examining the hegemonic language that surrounds it (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000), I did **not** use it as the methodology to analyze my data. I did not conduct a CDA because my concern was not with *how* my participants spoke about citizen surveillance, or even the manifest content of *what* they were saying specifically (Beach et al., 2009). Rather, I wanted to examine the underlying beliefs that lay at the foundation of *how* they were discussing citizen surveillance (Beach et al., 2009).

With respect to a CCA, it is the latent ideas and underlying values of *what* people are saying that I wanted to examine (Krippendorff, 2004). More so, I was not looking at *what* my participants said, per se, but rather, the overall nature and attitude *derived* from what they were saying (White & Marsh, 2006; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Thus I did not focus on the pitch, tone, or what my participants said (or what they wanted to accomplish with *how* they were discussing citizen surveillance). Rather, I was interested in analyzing the latent content of how they were framing citizen surveillance and associating it with the underlying concept of power (White & Marsh, 2006; Hsieh & Shannon).

Subsequently, given that manifest content is information that is “physically present and countable” (Gray & Densten, 1998, pg. 420), latent content consists of the “unobserved content that cannot be measured directly but can be represented or measure[d] by one or more... indicators” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998, pg. 581). These indicators are referring to the use, and creation, of *themes*. As will be

discussed in greater detail shortly, themes (or thematic categories) have the ability to “capture something important about data in relation to the research question[s], and represents some level of response pattern or meaning within the data set” (Vausmoradi, Turunen & Bondas, 2013, pg. 402). These thematic categories were extrapolated from the unobservable data engrained in *what* my participants spoke about (Gray & Densten, 1998). With manifest content being concerned primarily with what my participants said about citizen surveillance (or what is noticeable in the transcribed text of the interviews), it was the latent content that I analyzed.

My goal to utilize the latent content was so that I could analyze the information that was not directly evident. What this means, is that by examining the latent content of my participants’ comments, I have a greater “understanding of a particular phenomenon from the perspective of those experiencing it” (Vaismoradi, Turunen & Bondas, 2013, pg. 398). By making use of latent content within an inductive-qualitative research project, I was able to produce greater meaning of my participants’ responses and substantiate how they gave that meaning to citizen surveillance.

As discussed by Hsieh and Shannon, “the goal of a directed approach to content analysis is to validate or extend” (2005, pg. 1281) the theoretical knowledge on an existing body of information (Krippendorff, 2004). So with CDA used predominately with a linguistic study/dataset, and with my method of data collection being interviews (and later transcripts), a CDA *could* have been applicable as an appropriate methodology (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000; Krippendorff, 2004; Beach et al., 2009). Still, despite the fact that both a CCA and a CDA may be used within a socio-political framework, ultimately, it is not the *role* of language or the *use* of language I was interested in (van

Dijk, 1993; Krippendorff, 2004). My goal was to analyze the latent meaning embedded in what community members are saying *about* citizen surveillance. This aided in my capacity to reveal motivations or rationales one may have when engaging in citizen surveillance and the larger socio-political dynamic of power through which they operate (Heish & Shannon, 2005; Krippendorff, 2004).

By examining the latent content of my participant's speech, I was able to uncover a diverse (albeit not exhaustive) list of factors/rationales that have contributed to a greater understanding of the motivations associated with citizen surveillance. More so, the larger thematic categories that I extrapolated from my data have been able to validate and confirm some scholarly claims I have previously discussed in my literature review (White & Marsh, 2006; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

3.5 Method of Data-Analysis: Thematic Analysis

In using a thematic analysis, I looked to analyze the responses of my participants and contribute to the knowledge about a growing social phenomenon (citizen surveillance as a legitimized response to police misconduct) (Attride-Stirling, 2001). Additionally, thematic analysis has been found to be most effective in projects that use a constructivist-led/inspired epistemological framework as well. This is so that the researcher can remain unbiased and take into account the multiple realities, or multiple factors, that may contribute to how an individual speaks about the issue at hand (Oleinik, 2011; Strijbos, Martens, Prins & Jochems, 2006; Finlay, 2008; Krippendorff, 2004).

When describing a thematic analysis, Floersch defined a theme as a “patterned response or meaning within the dataset” (2010, pg. 408). In other words, a theme represents a formalized understanding derived from the responses given by the research

participants and represent similar ideas or thoughts that go beyond simple intuition (Attride-Stirling, 2001; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; White & Marsh, 2006).

In turn, by conducting a thematic analysis the main objective for me as the researcher was to immerse myself in the data and elicit a deeper underlying meaning found within my participants' responses (Neuendorf, 2002; Gray & Densten, 1998; Elo & Kyngäs, 2007). As it relates to my project, it was beneficial to use latent content as, "there are no previous studies dealing with the phenomenon or when knowledge is fragmented" (Elo & Kyngäs, 2007, pg. 109). Consequently, breaking down how my participants spoke citizen surveillance allowed me to explore under substantiated areas of research. In turn, I have been able to develop ideas associated with: the motivations, logics, and reported approaches attributed to citizen surveillance (Gray & Densten, 1998).

More so, conducting a thematic analysis allowed me to be very flexible with how I was working with the data (White & Marsh, 2006). This enabled me to generate themes from: 1) existing theories of sur- and sousveillance theory; 2) the experience or knowledge of citizen surveillance theory; and, 3) previous empirical research (Krippendorff, 2004). Thus, I developed my thematic categories from the information of my participants, but took into account the knowledge that was already generated by previous scholars, which I have spoken about in my review of the literature (Graneheim & Lundman, 2004).

Accordingly, in order for me to let the data speak for itself, it was important to remain aware of my own bias from forming inherent or prejudiced expectations during the coding process. Due to the fact that a thematic analysis does not follow a scientific step-by-step approach, the researcher(s) (i.e. me in this case) are the only one(s) who may

code the data and infer the common or reoccurring ideas within the dataset (Elo & Kyngas, 2008; White & Marsh, 2006). Ultimately, the hope is to let the themes reveal themselves based on the repeated or intrinsic nature of the responses (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). My bias in this regard is associated with the liberal tendencies that may have influenced how I have come to understand my participant's comments. Specifically, how by engaging in citizen surveillance, one is *thought* to be free of previous institutional restraints that try to limit authoritative bodies from being surveilled. Thus, in presenting my thematic findings in the next chapter, I have interpreted my participant's comments being indicative of the idea that all individuals should have equal opportunity to engage in forms of surveillance regardless of his or her social status, race, or sex. Thus, in developing my themes, I take lead from my participants in framing citizen surveillance as an equal democratic right for all

3.6 Sampling

With respect to the general characteristics of the participants I recruited into my study, my primary goal was to locate community stakeholders from sub-culture groups, academic and legal circles, independent activist groups, and generally anyone else who has a critical outlook towards society (specifically with respect to the topic of surveillance and/or the police). Overall, the individuals I included in my study represent a group of individuals who are critical of the idea of power. Thus, seeing as my study is a situated socio-political examination of citizen surveillance, it was important to consider how the changing social conditions of society (web 2.0 ad networked technologies) have given meaning to a new phenomenon (citizen surveillance) (David, 2010; Wasburn, 1974; Krippendorff, 2004). Specifically, the communities that I sampled from discussed the ways in which they have attempted to challenge the policies, laws, and general

behaviours that already exist, through his or her use of, or support for, citizen surveillance.

Due to the fact that there were many potential groups/individuals to sample from, the sampling method I used for my project was purposive sampling. In using purposive sampling, I was able to speak with a limited number of individuals who either have knowledge, or experience in citizen surveillance (Neuman, 2011). Essentially, purposive sampling granted me the flexibility to recruit individuals from the previously identifiable community groups.

Considering the fact that I relied exclusively on nonprobability sampling, I cannot generalize my findings to the general population (Loseke, 2008). However, as I previously mentioned, due to my epistemological and qualitative framework, I am not concerned with inferring my results to the general population. Rather, my goal is to provide a snapshot of information at the time of this writing, and conduct an in-depth analysis of it.

3.6.1 Characteristics of my Participants

Before reviewing my findings in the next chapter, I will first provide a general description of the participants I did interview. This is done to authenticate his or her role as a community stakeholder and offer my project validity. More so, each participant's inclusion in my study was based on his or her direct involvement, interest, or passion about police use and potential abuse of authority. Specifically, I spoke with civil litigation lawyers, investigative journalists, novelists, self-identified activists, self-identified cop-watchers, university students, and finally community members who have become outspoken advocates regarding the need to make information more accessible to the general public. My conversations also included discussions on my participants'

insights, attitudes, values, and experiences regarding the police. This was to help identify potential motivation(s), or desires, to engage in citizen surveillance based on his or her previous relationship with the police. Subsequently, my participants explained to me how his or her past experiences with the police have had an impact on his or her new desire to film/take pictures of them. Thus, each participant identified his or her own relevancy to be included by discussing why: 1) they themselves have/would engage in citizen surveillance; or 2) why another community member would (or should) engage in citizen surveillance. Additionally, despite not taking into account my participant's demographic information, some brief demographic information is provided for participants in the next chapter. This was because in certain instances, it helped emphasize a point that he or she made about his or her own history with the police, or decision to engage in citizen surveillance.

In situations where a participant expressed that they have never engaged in citizen surveillance personally, they accompany that sentiment with an explanation or justification as to why. Among these reasons, some of my participants expressed: 1) that they did not have the technological means to film the police at the time; 2) the fact that they could have faced threats to their professional or personal lives should they have engaged in citizen surveillance activities; or, 3) racialized barriers that have limited or prevented them from filming the police, for fear that citizen surveillance would paint a target on their back for (future) prejudicial misconduct.

3.7 Reliability and Validity

With respect to issues of reliability and validity, my inclusion of certain community groups is representative of very specific niche group ideals. As a result, the responses to some of my questions may have been influenced by the beliefs and ideals of

other individuals/networks that he or she may associate with in his or her personal lives. Thus, a limit with qualitative research reliability is that the answers of my participants are not static and will likely change over time (Palys & Atchison, 2008). The responses of my research participants during this study may be considerably different should this study be repeated 10 years from now. For that matter, the responses of this study are likely to be different if this study were completed 10 years ago. Nevertheless, despite the limitations of qualitative research reliability, my goal of being able to offer a snapshot of the *present* is less concerned with authenticating a single truth about citizen surveillance as I have already mentioned (Neuman, 2011).

A final limitation with my preferred method was the coding process. Due to the fact that I was the lone researcher transcribing and coding the data, the interpretation of my data and the themes that were drawn out, were solely left to my own judgment (Duriau, Reger & Pfarrer, 2007). As I mentioned previously, coding is often done by two different researchers in an effort to test the reliability of the themes that were extrapolated from the interview transcripts (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006; Mauthner & Doucet, 2003; Neuman, 2011). As a result, I was as reflexive as possible and did my best to limit my personal bias of liberalism from entering the coding process and ascribing a different kind of meaning to my participants' comments. Being reflexive is acknowledging one's biases and/or preconceived notion in order to critically evaluate the data and gain new understandings (Finlay, 2008). As I was the sole researcher coding the data, I exhibited "reflection-in-action" (thinking while doing) (Finlay, 2008). This occurred as I examined the responses of my participants, transcribed the interviews, and coded the data, fully aware of my own intuition and assumptions with respect to what I *think* I would have

found (Finlay, 2008). Largely, I was mindful to link my theoretical framework and scholarly claims with the information that was produced by my participants to form my thematic categories (Finlay, 2008).

The themes that will be identified next in my findings are a result of my epistemological position and analytical framework (Krippendorff, 2004). Since I am complimenting Foucaultian themes of power/surveillance with Deleuze's rhizomatic understanding of power, my thematic findings are characterized predominately by looking at how surveillance technologies have become more accessible as a result of a growing networked society, and accessible by members of the community.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

An application for ethical approval was submitted to the Research Ethics Board (REB) at the university of Ottawa on June 3rd 2014. Ethics approval notice was granted on July 22nd 2014. The REB felt that the risk to participants was not great, and that no deception will be involved. The REB however, was concerned with the safeguarding of my participant's identities. I made assurances that all my participant's identities will remain anonymous. However, due to the delicate nature of the content that may be brought up, while the interview questions did not necessarily seek to reveal past criminal history, should something have been brought up detrimental to the security of Canadian citizens, their information would be reported. My goal with the interview questionnaire was to probe his or her respective views towards filming/interacting with the police. Additionally, all participants were given the option to stop the interview at any point if they had any worries, concerns, or felt uncomfortable. Again, all efforts were made to ensure anonymity of participation through the use of a 6-digit number assigned to each participant, that only the thesis supervisor and myself would have access to. The REB at

the university of Ottawa felt that I needed to protect my participant's identities because of the potential drawback of police reprisals. Thus, by concealing the identities of my participants, it gave them assurances that whatever information they disclosed could not be traced back to them.

3.9 Chapter Summary

As will be seen next in my findings, by utilizing a critical content analysis (thematic analysis) I have been able to closely examine how my participants have given meaning to citizen surveillance based on his or her previous interactions with the police. In turn, I have been able to identify themes, which have been used to generate a non-exhaustive typology of motivations/rationales associated with citizen surveillance. Specifically, my findings are comprised of empirical evidence that has been used to substantiate: the reported motivations of citizen surveillance, a citizen surveillers' logics for resisting power, a citizen surveillers' understandings of power and how it is embedded in societal institutions, and a citizen surveillers' reported approaches to both passive and active resistance of the power through citizen surveillance. So, while a critical discourse analysis would have been an appropriate methodology, seeing as I examined issues of power (specifically by analyzing *what* is being said and *how* it is said), ultimately, my goal with this project was to examine the *underlying themes* with respect to how my participants', as social beings, have given meaning to how citizen surveillance is understood (Floersch et al., 2010; Vaismoradi, Turunen & Bondas, 2013; Attride-Stirling, 2001).

4. Chapter 4: Presentation of Findings

This purpose of this section is to present the findings of my critical content analysis (thematic analysis). Specifically, this section examines how my participants have given meaning to citizen surveillance and the main themes/subject matter embedded within their responses. Subsequently, in presenting my thematic findings, I characterize these themes into potential motivations or rationales one may have when choosing to film the police. In turn, these thematic ideas/motivations contribute to a non-exhaustive typology of citizen surveillance behaviour that is briefly examined at the end of this chapter.

Furthermore, my findings are broken down into key subject areas and thematic ideas, so that I am able to analyze my participants' contributed information within the context of fundamental themes, such as: power, resistance, control, and desire (to be discussed in the next chapter). In doing so, I am able to more aptly consider how the idea of power, or resistance to power, lays at the foundation of my participants' decision to film the police. However, I want to reiterate that due to the exploratory nature of this project, the information in this chapter is an in-depth analysis on a small amount of data. Thus, I am not conveying that my findings represent a single authenticated truth about citizen surveillance. Rather, I am presenting my findings as a snapshot of potential motivations at the time of this writing. Again, the thematic information to be presented in this chapter is more closely examined in my discussion, and will be presented within the context of my theoretical framework.

4.1 Thematic Category 1: New civic duty/responsibility

The first and most prevalent theme I found among my respondents, is that they characterize citizen surveillance as a type of social responsibility and/or owed civic duty

to other community members. This sense of community cohesion was prominent among all my participants, regardless of his or her personal background, level of education, or personal experience with the police in both their personal or professional lives. Thus, framing citizen surveillance as a type of social responsibility suggests that community members are potentially more inclined to help other community members when witnessing a moment of transgression with the police. At the same time, this suggests that before the innovation of web 2.0 technologies, people who were able to witness events were unlikely to disseminate what happened, and thus, remain idle (for reasons that will be explained shortly).

One participant (150146) raised this idea and discussed the story of Kitty Genovese. In speaking about witnessing, participant 150146 argues that forms of civilian-surveillance could have potentially saved the life of this young woman who was mugged, assaulted, and eventually murdered outside a large apartment complex in New York in 1964.

All these people were hanging out in their apartment window watching and nobody, nobody phoned the police. And you wonder now would people still be doing the same thing or would they be hanging out the window photographing it and putting it on YouTube so that at least, they may not intend to be helping her but inadvertently they would be helping her just because some person that has a sense of responsibility would say ‘holy smokes did you see what I just saw?’... and then they would, you know report it to the authorities.

While participant 150146 places some blame on the lack of technology/technological capability community members had at their disposal at the time, the fact remains that nobody phoned the police or helped this woman from being attacked, so the element of choice still plays a role. The purpose of discussing Kitty,

according to participant 150146, is because community individuals who try to film the police are done with the intent of providing help to a situation that they would otherwise perhaps be passive in. Therefore by taking into account what happened to Kitty, participant 150146 is of the opinion that by engaging in citizen surveillance, one is able to increase his or her democratic participation by helping other community individuals. As a result, with more individuals turning to citizen surveillance, this could potentially result in greater community cohesion. In turn, this could potentially help future community individuals from potential situations of victimization or transgression.

Building on this, the idea of citizen surveillance is believed to have an impact on how misconduct of the police can be made known. One of my participants (134410) expressed to me that by engaging in citizen surveillance, one is able to reinvigorate how community members could become more involved and possibly less passive in a networked surveillance system that he feels is no longer limited:

The exercise in democracy is what we have at our disposal. We have a lot of tools at our disposal, but ultimately... it's for us to use them. So when we talk about social media, you know, great... it's a wonderful platform to raise awareness, to you know, maybe, distribute... this information to people who may not actively seek it

Similar to what participant 150146 said when she brought up the case of Kitty Genovese, what participant 134410 alludes to is that it is up to community members to make use of the tools we have at our disposal. By being aware of the power one has when equipped with a smartphone or mobile camera, whether one's intention is to directly help, or not, networked technologies can facilitate *new* ways for citizens to become more involved in his or her community and potentially help someone who needs it. This is in comparison to before when these technologies were not as prevalent or capable of doing

so. More so, by engaging in citizen surveillance, one is more readily able to raise awareness of a situation that would perhaps otherwise not be as widely known. Being able to document how a situation unfolded, and then sharing this information, according to participant 134410, is an instrumental new exercise in democracy.

Another participant (122745) expands on this notion by suggesting possible reasons that citizen surveillance can help someone in need:

I think that for this most part, [citizen surveillance] happens when people feel that their rights are being trampled on, or when they are witnessing an act in which someone else is having their rights trampled on... or that they believe that to be happening... I think they're doing it to prevent injustice. That is the overwhelming sense I get. People are doing it because it finally gives everyone a tool to expose injustice. And I think that's really powerful, I mean, I actually feel safer just having a smartphone in my pocket

This individual suggests that by potentially exposing or preventing an injustice, one is able harness a type of power and create a resistance that targets police abuse in unprecedented ways. Additionally, being in possession of a smartphone or mobile camera is thought to impart one with a type of power that comes if one is willing to become involved in a situation he or she may not have originally been a part of. In doing so, one is able to not only provide new types of evidence, but also generally give assistance to someone who cannot help him or herself.

In a situation shared by participant 130215, he recalled an event he found himself involved in when he came across a police officer harassing a woman who had a mental disability. Participant 130215 told me that if he:

[Had] a camera phone, or something of the sorts [he] would have been able to stay there, video record it, and at least have that as... another pair of eyes, in case some bad stuff went down.

Participant 130215's willingness to help this stranger was based on nothing else but to potentially aid in her protection and safety should something have happened to her. When I asked what happened, my participant told me that the police officer that was present, continuously threatened to arrest him if he did not vacate the area immediately. So, with few options, my participant, who told me he felt ashamed of himself for doing this, left the area. This resulted in my participant wondering whether he could have helped this woman had he been able to engage citizen surveillance.

The underlying principle of this idea is that citizen surveillance encourages community individuals to become less passive in a situation that they may otherwise be able to engage with. Through citizen surveillance, community individuals are able to document and attempt to increase the transparency of a potential closed-off situation. Thus, the allure of citizen surveillance is when one sees another citizen's rights and freedoms being questioned or thrown in disrepute, he or she can be an extra set of eyes and ears. Accordingly, my participants recognize the merit of citizen surveillance as a fundamental principle/motivating factor for them to engage with the police and offer a means of help. This theme is an essential component in my examination of my other thematic findings and will be more closely examined throughout the rest of this chapter.

4.2 Thematic Category 2: Distrust between community members and the police

The second most prominent theme found among the responses of my participants, is that citizen surveillance is conceptualized as a legitimate response to increased feelings of distrust in policing as an institution. As a result of this distrust, my participants characterize citizen surveillance as the most efficient method to increase the transparency of a police officer's actions. In turn, by engaging in citizen surveillance, my participants

believe that they can raise awareness of problematic issues that may exist within the institution of policing. Subsequently, citizen surveillance is thought to facilitate a new dialogue between community individuals and their desire to improve/challenge the policies that currently exist. Specifically: police training, reporting on police misconduct, and accountability for acts of police malpractice.

In discussing the role of citizen surveillance and the police, two of my participants expressed that despite the notion that the police may appear more oppositional now (given the increase of videos captured by community members), largely, based on their experiences, the police have always existed as an adversary.

Participant 210044 says that:

The police, by their definition, by their design, are adversaries of the public. I mean, they're there, to not serve and protect us, but you know, [to serve] the interest of a small segment of the population, and so that, automatically by design, put them as adversaries... to the general population, so nothing we're doing, is creating an adversarial role.

This is a sentiment shared by participant 154616 who says that police are and always have been a retaliatory governing body. This participant expressed that:

Police, in my experience have been, and are, retaliatory and even some police that... [I] had never met before like in Toronto, in Montreal, in Vancouver... even when they don't know me, they're still, you can sense that, a derision that they have towards you... it's quite distinct.

Accordingly, these participants feel that regardless of whether or not citizen surveillance videos frame the police as an inherent adversary to the rest of the community, it is something that they already are. As a result, my participants support the idea that citizen surveillance is nothing more than a tool that community members should have at their disposal. Subsequently, by engaging in citizen surveillance, one is able to increase the transparency of a situation and can dispute what a police officer that may

have been present, claimed. In doing so, the hope among my participants is that by engaging in citizen surveillance, police officers can be better held accountable in instances where they are shown to have abused their state powers/authority.

Another one of my participants (130215) went on to explain his support of citizen surveillance. With respect to increasing the accountability of police officers, his concern is that quite simply, the police should be held to a higher degree of responsibility. He attributes this to the role they serve in society, and because they carry guns and can use lethal force. Participant 130215 said:

As an ordinary citizen I don't have that liberty... but the police can use deadly the force, that is a power... that should have some checks and balances on it. So I think just based on... that alone, the fact that they have the discretion to kill you or not, videotaping and surveilling them is particularly important and I don't think they should have a problem with it.

Furthermore, participant 130215 expressed to me that a camera aimed at a police officer should not affect that officer's decision when or to what degree he or she begins to use force. He says, "their training basically tells them [when] to use force...", and that, "if [they] cannot do what it is [they] were trained to do, on camera, well then, perhaps [the] training should be questioned" (130215, 2014).

Participant 130215 went on to say that:

...You can imagine back when there was no... cellphones, no cameras readily available, so you can just imagine that a number of innocent people have probably ended up in jail, because the police officer said, well he assaulted me... I think that definitely with technology has allowed us to... engage in activism.

The appealing nature of citizen surveillance then, is that it can increase how an instance of *bad policing* can be observed and reported on. The desire to use citizen surveillance is because of how video evidence is thought to substantiate the experiences

of certain community members, whose voices may have gone unheard in the past. As a result, with so many new videos appearing every single day, and more cases of police violence appearing in the news/online, one of my participants suggests that innovations in technology (an aspect to be discussed shortly) have had a direct impact on not only the frequency of violent police actions coming to light, but *how* community individuals are changing their perceptions of the police as well.

As a result, this perceived distrust in the police, according to my participants, is a result of prominent historical and systemic issues that were at one time, not as widely known/seen by the general public. Now however, since the increase in user-shared content, these issues have become more visible and potentially identifiable to the rest of society. My participants identified prominent systemic issues with the police, and while not an exhaustive list, include instances of excessive or unwarranted physical force, the use of weapons in situations where there may have been potentially less aggressive means of dealing with a situation, or systemic racism, sexism, and/or profiling in specific marginalized/demographic communities.

Expanding on this point, participant 150146 brought up the fact that community members may perceive police to be a more rampant social problem now more than ever, because:

... the fact that people can access it more readily makes us think that it's more prevalent... but I don't think it really is... It probably was equally prevalent before we had the ability to know about every instance. I have no way of knowing, I don't know if anyone has a way of knowing.

Then, when I asked participant 103335 about how community members perceive their relationship with the police now, she responded by saying:

I feel like it's changing over time. I feel like the G20 was a huge watershed moment, that citizens have finally realized that issues with policing aren't one bad cop anymore but they're systemic. And that they're engaging now with police forces, looking at the systemic issues with them... and it's evolving fairly quickly.

As a result, because police departments do not actively make instances of misconduct publically available, some community groups/individuals are less aware than others of how frequent instances of police violence actually occur. Now, however, because police violence is being reported on in record numbers, community members are exposed to more instances of misconduct and believe police-violence is on the rise.

As a result, according to participant 103335, this perceived distrust is attributed to the combination of surveillance techniques (to be discussed shortly), web 2.0 technologies, and sensationalized cases of police misconduct that have gone viral. In turn, this has resulted in my participants saying that they are not only watching the police more than ever, but that new preconceived ideas of the police can influence other community individuals, who have never have had any experience (positive or negative) with the police personally.

This changing perception of the police is attributed to, as participant 103335 suggest, the Toronto G20 and other sensationalized cases of police malpractice that have recently occurred within Canada. She discussed the case of Robert Dziekanski and Adam Nobody (whom I have already spoken about in my literature review), as well as Ashley Smith¹³ and how the Windsor police dealt with Dr. Tyceer Abouhassan¹⁴ as other

¹³ Ashley Smith died by self-inflicted strangulation while under suicide watch at the Grand Valley Institution for Women. Her story brought to light the malpractice of the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) as well as the repeated instances of prison facility officials' excessive use of force against her.

significant moments that have impacted Canadian perceptions about the police. These cases, according to participant 103335, have progressed how the topic of police violence has become more distinct over the last 10 years.

In speaking about these cases, participant 095020 further commented that:

The problem in policing is that, it used to be that... citizens didn't fear the police... The idea of policing was they're here if you've got a problem, you go to the police, the police will help you. They were meant to protect and serve citizenry and... that's changed.

Participant 095020 went on to include the cases of Stacy Bonds¹⁵ and Sammy Yatim as other recent examples of bad policing in Canada. According to him, these have fueled the discussion on policing and issues with police accountability. Specifically, he spoke about how these cases have exposed the controversial and blatant poor decision-making by police officers. In turn, he believes this has had an impact regarding how community individuals perceive the police and the call for action to change how police misconduct is dealt with.

Participant 095020 also brought up that the fact that because this discussion is even happening, and these questions are being asked, is a telltale sign that public confidence in the police is diminishing. Participant 0095020 went on to say that even though Canada has had only a few sensationalized cases of police malpractice in comparison to the United States, he still sees a lack of transparency and accountability in how police are reprimanded for acts of misconduct. As a result, participant 095020

¹⁴ Former Windsor Police detective David Van Buskirk assaulted Dr. Abouhassan in 2010. The attack was unprovoked because the former police detective mistakenly thought the Doctor was another individual who had harassed his 12-year-old daughter.

¹⁵ While walking home one night in 2008, Stacy Bonds was harassed, assaulted, unconstitutionally arrested, incarcerated, and sexually assaulted by Ottawa Police officers. While incarcerated, Ms. Bonds was forced to the ground, pinned by officers and had her shirt and bra cut off with scissors. This was captured on the station surveillance camera, which was made available to the general public by the judge who oversaw the case.

believes that this surge in civilian-captured videos has resulted in a growing body of Canadian individuals/community groups, who not only distrust the police, but oppose and/or fear their presence altogether.

Still, it should be noted that in speaking with me, my participants stressed that they were not anti-police. Rather, as participant 130215 stated:

I know that it's a very special job they're doing, a very valid job... I would say it's primarily for... the aspect of having that extra set of eyes just to ensure that what they are doing is actually fair... with the community. I'll always go back to... that point... that they have the discretion to take... lives. I think that having that, they should be watched at all times. They should have no problem with that.

Participant 214217 went on to say:

[The police] have a very difficult job, it's not an easy thing that they do...and they would argue, and perhaps rightfully so, they don't need the added pressure of people filming their every move because they're making a lot of difficult decision and they need to be able to think clearly, and they need to be able to react quickly, and they won't always necessarily make the right call, but they would probably say that... people should pay deference to their decision making because they've been trained to do things and you can't always be 100% right or 100% wrong...

As a result, participant 214217 went on to say that the public should examine a police officer's action based on whether or not what the officer did was reasonable in the circumstances that he or she acted in. In either case, my participants agree on the fact that the police are a valued institution and that it is important we have faith in them.

So rather than be characterized as anti-police, my participants attributed their feelings/criticisms of the police more of an alignment with other concerned citizens who feel that citizen surveillance could vindicate those who *have* been transgressed. So, by engaging in citizen surveillance, a community individual's aim is to identify aspects of

policing that are in need of repair. So each time one of my participants provided a criticism of the police he or she also validated how the police provide a valuable asset to society.

Otherwise, as participant 103335 said:

If citizens lose confidence in the police... policing has then become ineffective, and so I think we scramble to hold police accountable because we want to feel safe. And we wanted to have confidence in them. And so, there's a need for them to be on the side of the citizen.

This comment adheres to the belief held by my participants that there needs to be a better system of accountability in place for the police. As a result, going back to the first theme I spoke about, by framing citizen surveillance as a new civic duty, it can potentially help facilitate the ways in which problematic areas/aspects in policing are more adequately dealt with. More on this point, participant 214217 said:

We should get to a point where [citizen surveillance] just becomes part of being a responsible citizen. So regardless of not having activist blood it's just something where if you're a citizen in a society, and you recognize that as far away from an activist as you are, you have an interest in there being accountability and living in a fair society and so if you have a chance to film something that's wrong, and how it to people and contribute to making sure that kind of thing doesn't happen again, than that just sort of becomes a basic civil responsibility.

Based on the comments of my participants, citizens may begin to feel safer, or more satisfied with the police, if they have a way to affect the system directly. While none of my participants feel that citizen surveillance is the final solution to fixing problematic aspects in some police departments, it is nevertheless viewed as at least a step in the right direction. Unfortunately, while citizen surveillance has emerged as an active response to resisting the power of the police, it appears to be contributing to the

idea that police violence is on the rise as well. Again, whether or not violent police encounters are actually increasing, is unknown and beyond the scope of this project.

However, given the potential methods of civilian resistance to unwarranted or excessive force, it appears as though community members find comfort in the fact that eyes and ears of citizen surveillers are potentially everywhere, fully capable of helping others should help be needed. This is based on the notion that with citizen surveillance videos appearing on the Internet every single day, community members, including my participants are arming themselves just in case something happens.

So despite all the positive benefits associated with this increase of citizen surveillance, we should keep in mind the potential ramifications that unrestrained citizen surveillance might lead to. Among others, an unhampered ability to film the police may not only lead to a desensitization of police violence, but potentially a disenfranchisement of policing as an institution. We are at a point in which citizen surveillance can have great reward, but severe penalties if we fall short of actual societal benefits (such as reforms in how police are trained, hired, disciplined, and managed). Thus, the effectiveness of citizen surveillance rests in how community members/groups look to provide a means of oversight of the police, and identify problematic aspects of police, with the hope that they can bring about new means of accountability outside of state-sanctioned watchdog agencies.

4.3 Thematic Category 3: Technology facilitates new forms of political activism

In the overview of my research project, I addressed how technological advancements have brought about new means of anonymity, speed, search-ability (the ability to find specific content based on a few key words), blurring the lines between

public and private (the changing limitations of who has access/knowledge of an event/situation that occurred in a self-contained situation), and the ability to reach a large(er) audience (which may be emphasized by the fact that people can now share content to other users in their social networks who may then share it to others). These innovations have facilitated how one is able to utilize technology to not only capture instances of police malpractice, but bring about new means of activism overall.

When asked about the association between technology and citizen surveillance, participant 210044 expressed that it has to do with:

The idea of justice, right? People don't want to see bad things, right?...Most people want to see justice being done, and I think that is what we can really count on and hope for, to continue on and if we can appeal to that, then that's really going to make a big difference... [with] more and more people being able to take part.

He goes on to say that technology has provided civilians with:

A good strong base, to do something different... Once people have more and more tools...[the] ability to do things positively... the better off our community is going to be, the stronger our community is going to be, and then it spirals into people realizing ok, the next step is going to be, this. The next step is going to be that... Those answers only come about, when people are active and engaged in doing something.

This participant believes that now more than ever, citizen surveillance can reach new and exciting feats of activism. Eventually, he believes that society will reach the point where sharing information about the police is as common as Tweeting what you had for breakfast, or Instagramming what you had for lunch. This idea stems from the belief that with people sharing so much information these days anyways, eventually, it can result in community individuals reporting on the lives of police officers/state officials as well. As a result, if one sees the police involved in a situation that appears to be

escalating, technology has facilitated activist methods that enable one to potentially do something about it.

Participant 122745 offers a similar view to participant 210044 by characterizing the smartphone as the surveillance camera of the 21st century. He openly spoke about how he has already begun to see “people using their handheld devices to take videos and photographs of the police doing their duty in public (122745, 2014). According to him, this can help reveal how an altercation was carried out. Technology then, is thought to facilitate how individuals who may have a disinterest in politics or activism, can engage in a form of activism nonetheless.

Furthermore, one crucial element in this association between technology and citizen surveillance then, appears to have to do with choice. As I quoted earlier, participant 134410 stated, with respect to advancements in technology, “these tools that we have are all around us, but it’s up to us to use them...” (134410, 2015). Thus, it is important to remember that technology does not bring about change in and of itself, but is a resulting outcome of how it is used, who is using it, and how it is given meaning. Participant 103335 emphasizes this point by characterizing citizen surveillance as a reflexive choice made by activists, including herself, who began using technological innovations for the purpose of mobilizing social discontent and raising awareness to under-reported activist events/causes. She contemplates that with the proliferation of negative/violent police-related videos being captured and shared day-after-day, citizen surveillance will ultimately result in an increase in community groups/individuals taking on the role of activist in some capacity. She went on to suggest that as more videos get passed around, community individuals will become aware of problematic issues in

policing and be ready to film the police should he or she witness or experience an escalating altercation him or herself.

In speaking about the role of technology and the rise of citizen surveillance, participant 103335 said:

I think its changing opinions... and I think that's been the major change. I think you've got people moving left as videos get passed around the Internet and become part of the mainstream like to our parents, to our aunts and uncles and cousins, who maybe aren't as politicized as we are, attending the protest. They can now experience some of what happens there.

With respect to technological innovations, participant 210044 discussed the appealing nature of new ways for one to engage in citizen surveillance. He said that, with respect to the using one's smartphone or mobile camera to record the police, "the nice thing is the camera doesn't even have to be on. It doesn't even have to be working... you just have to do it" (210044, 2015). Participant 210044 went on to say that "from the standpoint of the citizen using a recording device... they are empowered knowing that they have a way of doing something about a situation that is going on around them" (210044, 2015) and that:

It's a really great position for people to be in, to know that they don't have to sit down, and just keep taking and taking abuse, but they could actively, so something to stand up for their rights and I think that puts people in a good positive, powerful mental place.

This is a sentiment shared by participant 214217. When asked about what community members can do when they see a transgression by the police, he responded by instinctively saying:

...the only thing that can be done in this day and age, is, to try and capture it, right? On some sort of, I mean we all have cellphones and video cameras and stuff, and you see things go up on the

internet... and it creates a hubbub... and it creates...a ruckus, and then there's some sort of accountability that way...

Thus, a reason why citizen surveillance videos appear to be increasing at an intensifying rate is because of how it is thought to be the quickest and most efficient method in being able to share problematic cases of police wrongdoing. Consequently, the proliferation of civilian-based surveillance videos has a greater chance of being able to unify community members in their desire to take a stance against instances of bad policing. According to participant 214217, this is because of how video can cause its viewers to reflect on stories or events that they or other individuals in their personal networks may have experienced personally. By internalizing that people just like them are capturing these videos, one is able to use his or her own technologies and carry out citizen surveillance in the same way.

Participant 133609 B expressed her decision to film/disseminate information is based on:

I think accessibility to events like this and [to] media... if people aren't able to be here. I think it's important to be able to share that and have it accessible and regularly available online from the people who are here, who are protesting, and who are fighting for the cause. I think to have that voice and to be a voice for people who cannot speak.

More so, participants 133509 A and B spoke to me about how citizen surveillers make use of social media in being able to raise awareness to the information they upload. Participant 133609 A went on to say that "it's just easier to share... and I guess there's... less fear in sharing because of the whole...no faces behind the screen... so you have more confidence" in being able to record/share information (133609 A, 2015). This comment was supplemented by participant 133609 B who said, "the local is now

becoming the global and... solidarity within peaceful movement is important and accessible online” for those who are seeking it (133609 B, 2015).

In speaking with participants 133609 A and B, they expressed that by disseminating information online for others to access, they are able to increase the solidarity felt among community members fighting for the same cause. This way, one is able to turn social media into a platform for activism. In speaking with both participants 133609 A and B, who were recruited at a protest event in Ottawa, they made it well known that they use their smartphones to “spread awareness on... social media outlets, and... to people back home” (133609 A & B, 2015). The most important aspect of social media, at least to them, is to make information that may not have been previously accessible, accessible.

One final point on this subject is attributed to one of my participants who began a crowd-sourced project dedicated to tracking and documenting police misconduct in Canada. On this topic, he spoke about how:

Like in any large organization, and corporation and government and department, there’s always going to be problems... But the police, in particular, have duties that... they’re assigned, which gives them the right to suspend a person’s civil liberties through the power of arrest. So... with great power comes great responsibility. And if you don’t respect that, then democracy suffers. You know, civil liberty suffers; people’s confidence in their police, and then in institutions suffer...it’s exceptionally important in this society that when there’s police misconduct, that, it is dealt with in a timely manner, with an effective investigation, in a transparent way, and the results from that investigation is made public for everyone to understand.

I should note that the aforementioned group, *policemisconduct.ca*, unfortunately did not meet their fundraising goal and has since been shut down. My participant’s goal with this project nevertheless was to make use of technology and user-contributed content

to monitor, record, and archive Canadian incidents of police misconduct in the form of a publicly accessible website. More importantly, the website would be the result of Canadian donations (both money and information) that would see an entire nation contribute to a living database of knowledge directed at the issue of police misconduct.

Accordingly, the association between technology and citizen surveillance appears to innovate methods of grassroots activism for a more technological-oriented means of community-based surveillance, and political activism. Additionally, technology has impacted the ways in which community members are able to substantiate their personal stories and experiences of a situation, by providing this information to the rest of society. Thus, by engaging in citizen surveillance, my participants believe that technology, which may lack a specific activist-oriented purpose, can now be ascribed with activist beliefs/purposes.

4.4 Thematic Category 4: Citizen surveillance is conditional of one's reality

The previous theme examined how innovations in web 2.0 and information and communication technology have innovated forms of activism. However, in analyzing the responses of my participants, it became evident that technology, while a facilitating factor in the rising prevalence of citizen surveillance, is a key outcome associated with the condition of possibility. Thus, despite the fact that citizen surveillance has become more feasible because of technology, it is essential to consider another aspect of what makes citizen surveillance possible: who can engage in it. Thus, in order to further explore citizen surveillance, this section examines the reasons why my participants refute the idea that quite simply, anyone can be a citizen surveiller. As my participants expressed, there are social, economical, and racial factors that may potentially limit certain community

groups/individuals from engaging in citizen surveillance. As a result, it would appear that citizen surveillance is a condition of one's own privilege.

Participant 214217 touched on this when he shared his experience running a legal aid clinic for the street involved community while attending Osgoode Hall Law School. He spoke about the power imbalance that exists between the police and the street involved community:

[They] aren't aggressive, and aren't violent, and aren't doing anything wrong, even by the letter of the law, but the story I get time and time again is simply that cops know them and cops are bullies and cops will come and ticket them for no good reason and abuse them, both physically and verbally, and then come to court and tell a different story, and the power imbalance and such is that they simply get away with it.

This participant how the street involved community is experiencing abuse, both verbal and physical, at the hands of the police in certain parts of Toronto and the Greater Toronto Area. Sadly, because of their lack of authority, the street-involved communities are left with few options to really do anything about this injustice. So despite the allure and appealing nature of citizen surveillance, the unfortunate reality is that it simply may not be feasible.

More so, participant 214217 suggests that in addition to the power imbalance that exists, the fact is that citizen surveillance is still largely contingent to one's socio-economic status. This is tied back to the fact that equipment to engage in citizen surveillance is largely associated with having access to: a smartphone, a video camera, Internet connection, a data plan, an audio device, a voice recorder, and/or anything else that could potentially be used to record the police and/or disseminate the footage online/to others.

Similarly, another limiting factor that two of my participants spoke about is the association between citizen surveillance and racialized identity politics. Participant 210044 referenced aspects of race and the police throughout his interview. He expressed to me:

... the black community and some of the other communities, that I'm familiar with here, it's a negative relationship, it's not one of trust... there's a lot of fear... for most people, they don't think about it, but, a few of us, we think about it far too often...

Participant 210044 went on to say:

... when they start getting at you and you, you realize over time that there must be something wrong with me if police are constantly, up in my community. There must be something wrong with us around here that, you know, they're always, they need to be around...

Similarly, participant 130215 shared with me how his experiences with the police have caused him to internalize the unfortunate belief that he is the wrong skin colour. He shared the following with me:

...I was walking down the street, going to pay my rent, like anybody else would do, I don't think I was dressed in a particular way, I mean, I know the drill. If I dress in a particular way as a black male I'm going to be stopped. So I don't slap my hat, I don't have overly large clothing or anything like that...but I know the drill. If I were to wear something like that, I'm going to be stopped. So it's winter time, I have my coat, I have my toque, just walking down the street and 3 cop cars drive by, the third one stops, he comes out of his car and just yells at me. 'What is your name?' So right off the bat... I was taken aback. So in my mind I'm already targeted. And the answer is, I'm going to... give this man my name... because honestly, in my mind, like whatever I'm saying to you right now, probably is not going to end up really nice. I may end up in handcuffs.

After sharing a few more experiences with the police, he told me:

The thing is, I'm the wrong skin colour. That's the thing. I mean, if I was white I would have just walked away. But... that's the thing that always sticks out in my mind. I am the wrong skin colour, so even if I were to say you have no reason to stop me unless you suspect me of committing a crime... I can't.

Based on his confrontations with the police, participant 130215 has shown to be hesitant about what he can do around the police for fear of marking himself a target for potential abuse. Specifically, this participant, along with participant 210044, believes that based on the colour of one's skin, engaging with the police, especially with a camera can potentially escalate a situation.

As a result, the unfortunate reality is that for some marginalized individuals, or individuals of colour, citizen surveillance is not possible because it is thought to be too big of a risk. More so, the association between citizen surveillance and racialized identity politics suggests that even though the lawfulness of being able to film the police in public in Canada is considered legal, Participant 210044, stressed that:

... so there's the two things as to what your actual rights are and what your effective rights are... and... for most people, the important thing is what your effective rights are. It's like, yeah, you can be completely right and end up dead right, and... nobody wants that

So despite one's resolve and aspiration to film the police, it is offset by the fact that the presence of the police can likely change one's behaviour and overall demeanor. Expanding on this point, participant 103335 brought up that, "our rights aren't the same across all colours and all people, and all situations..." and that her "rights are going to be different because [she] move[s] through the world as a mostly white woman" (103335, 2014).

In both examples, participants 103335 and 210044 address that one's actual rights depend on a lot more than simply being a Canadian citizen, or living in Canada. Aspects

of race, gender, and/or socio-economic status are external factors that appear to have an impact in how one is able to move through society and/or engage in citizen surveillance.

So, with respect to who is able to engage in citizen surveillance, it appears as though there are cultural and systemic barriers that stand in the way for certain people or groups to actually film the police with little or no fear of repercussions. More so, what my participants have shown me is that in theory, while potentially anyone *could* engage in citizen surveillance, in reality, one's privilege, including aspects of socio-economic status, race, gender, or one's profession, can limit how one may carry out citizen surveillance. So despite that there have been significant technological advancements that have made it user-friendly to film the police, there are still a number of external factors that can affect the actual likelihood of being able to engage in citizen surveillance.

4.5 Thematic Category 5: Citizen surveillance is versatile and adaptable

In this section, I suggest that rather than characterize citizen surveillance exclusively as the ability to film/record a police officer up close, as it is often portrayed in the literature, citizen surveillers can adapt to their situation, environment, and circumstance. Essentially, it would appear that citizen surveillance is a versatile method if one chooses to film the police. So, subject to one's own situation and/or the technological tools available to him or her at the time, this section identifies an assortment of methods and techniques that my participants, as citizen surveillers, have implemented, or contemplated, when trying to film the police. Still, as this is an exploratory study, the techniques to be discussed are not a finite list, but are a glimpse of potential techniques used to engage in citizen surveillance at the time of this writing.

Participant 214217 expressed to me an alternative idea from filming up-close and while visibly seen:

I've had a dream of doing it with respect to my clients, you know to bring some accountability to...the way they deal with the street involved community...and the way that I would do it, to avoid all confrontation, and also to capture them you know, the most candid moments, would be to do it secretly... Because if you're doing it from a distance without the cops knowing that it's going on, it can't possibly be endangering anyone, or interfering with them, right? The situation's going to unfold the way it's going to unfold, you're not even part of it, you're just capturing it from a distance.

In this regard, participant 214217 suggests that by engaging in citizen surveillance in a way that does not draw any attention, it can lead to potentially gathering the only sort of evidence to shed transparency on what may have actually happened. Additionally, by filming secretly and while hidden, theoretically, one could monitor a situation and gather the necessary information about an event without directly affecting how the police impacted the outcome of the event. This participant went on to stress that by going out and filming at night, community individuals could potentially help an individual who has no other means of support.

Participant 214217 went on to say:

The real place where I think it's important is when it's one on one, and there's nobody there to substantiate what you're saying, other than your video, and it's in that case where the cop has the shot at taking your phone away and charging you with a throwaway charge and... then you're done. And it's funny because it's at the time when you need it most... when you might be, you know, the least likely to be able to do [citizen surveillance].

In this regard, by engaging in citizen surveillance without drawing attention to him or herself, a community individual could use the footage and raise awareness of the event, or alternatively, use it later in the development of a court case. This is a sentiment shared by participant 103335 as well. She spoke about the impact of video evidence from

third-party individuals who have brought to light the malpractice of certain police officers. She shared with me the following:

I think video evidence... is very interesting [because] I think it's made a significant change. If you look at old literature, it will always cite the phenomenon that cops were known to lie in court or that, cops were known to lie to protect each other, but there wasn't a lot a citizen could do because invariably the justice system trusted the justice system. I think video evidence has overturned that dynamic in a significant way. I think it started with Dziekanski... and then the G20 followed just after that.

After having been unconstitutionally detained during the 2010 G20 in Toronto, her confidence and trust in the police has been shaken to its very core. Participant 103335 supports citizen surveillance initiatives and stresses that the impact of video evidence can help those who have been transgressed. She expressed that:

It's a Dziekanski, or an Adam Nobody, or a Sammy Yatim. And those cases, or even Ashley Smith is a great example. Those cases without the video evidence couldn't capture the attention the way they do, they wouldn't spurn the conversations that they do, they wouldn't anchor a case in such a big way. And so, major changes will come from some of these videos.... The occasional video is so huge that becomes a bit of a watershed moment, a game-changing moment.

However, because of her experience with the police, she no longer has a desire to call attention to herself when dealing with the police outside a courtroom. Rather than relying on a fixed method to engage in citizen surveillance, this participant shared with me another technique she uses to engage in citizen surveillance:

Typically what I do in these situations is I whip out my cellphone, but not for the video function, I actually use the voice recorder, and simply describe everything that I'm seeing. Because well, it's less obvious than taking a video and less risky... if there was an altercation, ongoing that required video, I would do it, but if I see something that vaguely suspicious, but not arising to the level of ongoing incident then yeah I just describe it using words but record the description. I know that

video surveillance sometimes insights repercussions, and I'm not looking, especially because of my job, to get into another situation where I'm under police control, because that wasn't so great the first time.

In this regard, she prefers to describe what she is seeing by using her words, and records that description on her phone. Seeing as filming the police could potentially bring about repercussions (violent or otherwise), she is not looking to become involved in a way that will see her under police control again.

Similarly, another one of my participants makes use of his cellphone to record the audio of any interaction he has with a police officer. This method originated from a civil encounter participant 122745 had with a police officer after his neighbor's house was broken in to. He shared with me the following:

The police were just asking everybody questions. So I had my phone out, I just sat it down on my console, I hit audio record and I recorded the interaction between myself and the officer, just in case... I wasn't expecting anything bad to happen, I wasn't intending to provoke anything to happen, it was just in case. And as it turned out, it was a completely uneventful interaction, totally professional, and I deleted my recording afterwards because... there was no need to have it.

He made the decision to audio record his conversation with the police because 1) he could, and 2) he did not know what could/would happen during this encounter. Citizen surveillance, according to him, is nothing more than a method that genuinely brings feelings of safety around the police. As a result, this participant stressed that in carrying out citizen surveillance, one is enabled to document an encounter for no other reason than just in case. He went on to say:

I didn't see any reason to save mine. I certainly saw no reason to put in on Facebook, I mean, what am I going to say, here's a police officer asking me for my license, and here's me giving it to him,

like, who cares. You know? If he had gone crazy on me and started screaming at me or hitting me with his baton or something, for no reason, then, obviously it would be a different story.

In the case of participant 210044, the creator of the CopWatch mobile app, he shared with me his interest to create a mobile app used predominately for individuals to observe and report on questionable police behaviour. He expressed feelings of optimism by being in possession of a camera during an altercation with the police because it is:

A really great position for people to be in, to know that they don't have to sit down, and just keep taking and taking abuse, but they could actively do something to stand up for their rights and I think that puts people in a good positive, powerful, mental place. And when you're operation from positivity, and you know it gives you some calmness and I'm thinking about people in times of an emotionally tense situation, like... the police are, you know raiding a house or something like that, and that's you know, that a scary really high-tension environment. If you could bring any set of calm to the citizens experiencing that, if they could sit there and think to themselves, ok, I have something to respond to this, I can start filming, and that's going to help me, just the mere fact of them being able to think rationally and clearly from a position of power, will help them fair better in the situation, just clear thinking, and having your wits about you, instead of being just panicked...at the whim of the police.

With respect to using CopWatch specifically, or similar mobile apps for the purpose of filming the police, the point to draw from this is that people are arming themselves with technologies to observe the police. In using these devices, it would appear that one's desire to film the police is so that he or she can harness aspects of surveillance him or herself.

Alternatively, aside from techniques associated with the documentation of footage, some of my participants shared their techniques with respect to what they do after the footage is captured. One of my participants, who is the former operator of the Peterborough CopWatch organization, shared with me his process and rationale for

uploading footage on free space online. Specifically, social media has been signified as an essential platform for being able to raise awareness. He described to me what he would do with the footage after returning home from filming the police:

[It] goes onto my computer first and then it gets uploaded to Facebook, you know Peterborough CopWatch pages. I mean if I could do a dynamic website where it's just my own IP, I would, but I can't afford to do that, so it gets uploaded on a social media site. I don't really care for that methodology, however, it's convenient, you know, it worked for me at this point.

He goes on to say that he'd keep virtual copies for the purpose of ensuring it does not go away.

I want to be able to make sure I can get hands on it at some point. It doesn't really go any further than that. Like once it's been uploaded, it's been uploaded. I let it speak for itself as best I can. I don't put captions really, I don't try to influence people's decision on what it is, I just put it on and see if it penetrates at all.

Again, this stresses the idea that while online-based platforms may not inherently be an activist tool, they can be used for activist purposes nevertheless. It is up to community members to recognize this when disseminating their own footage, or looking to access footage that others have put online. Specifically, with respect to participant 154616, his goal in sharing footage was to facilitate a discussion on the actions of the police. In doing so, he wanted to make sure that footage like his did not go away. He simply wanted to share the footage as is and see if, and how, it was able to grab the attention of his community.

As participant 122745 said regarding the allure of social media as a platform to raise awareness:

... It's maybe leading to a... more evolved sense of social responsibility. Which would be great. I mean I think that's what social media should do ideally. It should not just be about sitting around looking at cat videos, it should be somehow, improving the world we live in.

Furthermore, as I stated previously, participants 133609 A and B are adamant supporters of sharing captured content from protest or activist events on as many social media websites as possible. These women make use of Instagram, Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube to ensure that their information is accessible for those who are looking for it. Participant 133609 B said the follow regarding her interest in sharing content online:

I think accessibility to events like this and media... if people aren't able to be here, I think it's important to be able to share that and have it accessible and regularly available online from the people who are here, who are protesting, and who are fighting for the cause. I think to have that voice, and to be a voice for people who cannot speak.

Participants 133609 A and B went on to say that because there is less fear in sharing information nowadays, they are able to take advantage of the anonymity that often comes with distributing content on the Internet. With people likely unaware of whom they are, they have more confidence in being able to share the information they capture so liberally.

However, as participant 210044 points out, even with a lack of technology, there are still methods of citizen surveillance that one is able to engage in. In these situations, participant 210044 advocates that community members should also:

...pay attention to the names that... you hear, read names off of badges if you can, if you can't get the name off of badges, write down the numbers of the squad cars that showed up at the scene because that ties them, just as tightly to the scene as reading their badge...that's very important... to collect that information

In this regard, even without the use of technology, participant 210044 argues that one should always keep in mind their ability to document information because it can be used later on. By taking note of who was present and what they did, one can still share his or her experience and follow up a little later on, and even file a complaint to the appropriate police department. Thus, if the primary goal of citizen surveillance is to observe and report on how a situation or altercation took place, one should try and gather as much information as possible in anyway that they can.

Accordingly, the techniques that my participants have used to engage in citizen surveillance suggest that its users are innovating an already versatile idea. As a result, it would appear that as technology continues to advance, citizen surveillers could develop even newer ways to interact and/or gather information about the police. In turn, this has the potential to bring about new challenges to the institution of policing, given the increasing transparency of policing that may result.

4.6 Thematic Category 6: Citizen surveillance induces new feelings of empowerment

Overall, my participants spoke about how by engaging in citizen surveillance, they are permitted to engage with the police in more active ways than in the past. Thus, it would appear that my participants find a certain comfort in the fact that they can now capture a police officer's conduct on film. By being able to film what a police officer says or does, providing community individuals with the belief that they no longer have to serve as submissive subjects to police misconduct. Rather, community individuals perceive they are able to reclaim a sense of autonomy if being mistreated or mishandled by the police (or when seeing someone else mistreated). Thus, my participants felt that by

filming those in a position of power, there appear to be feelings of experiencing empowerment.

This can be seen in participant 214217, who expressed:

There's the social conscious activist who is doing it for the greater social good, and then there's the gang member who's using it sort of as a weapon, against the cops. But I would say in both cases it's accomplishing a goal... because regardless of whether somebody is using it as a threat or whatever, the fact is the minute the cameras rolling people on both sides of the coin are [going] to act in a more... responsible manner because they know it can be reviewed later on.

This is important to note as it frames citizen surveillance as a facilitator for new types of resistance to the power of the police. By harnessing forms/aspects of power, community individuals may feel a degree of empowerment stemming from his or her ability to reverse, or challenge, the dominance of the police that may exist during an altercation. This was evident in my conversation with participant 130215. He said that:

I recognize that something wrong is going on there, and I need to do something about that. And with a camera you are armed with a lot of power...

More so, participant 130215 went on to say:

I am allowed to [film] and record you and if you have any doubts in your mind that you as a police officer think that I cannot take pictures of you, get your supervisor here, and we'll settle this ting right away... And I would do that... even though I know that my skin colour can aggravate a police officer based on their experience and thoughts, but the fact that if I have this camera in my hands, watching them, that makes them, very conscientious of what they're doing...

Empowerment in this regard, is thought be a resulting effect of citizen surveillance in that it helps an individual (regain) aspects of their agency that may have been lost (or non-existent) during a stressful confrontation. This suggests a certain level of autonomy may be reclaimed, especially in police-related altercations when one may

have otherwise been ignored or victimized in. My participants however, do not yet know what can happen as result of this empowerment, only that it is something he or she experienced.

4.7 Thematic Category 7: Citizen surveillance users challenge hierarchical power

Overall, my participants hope that by filming the actions of the police, they can reveal the misconduct of certain police officers/actions. This suggests that citizen surveillance is perceived as a means of resistance against aspects of hierarchical power embedded in the institution of policing. This resistance is facilitated by new means of civilian oversight concerned with a police officer's potential use, or abuse, of his or her power, and actually being able to do something to document it/contest it.

Thus, aside from aspects of empowerment, my participants discussed how citizen surveillance is thought to enable a means of self-responsibilization, which in turn brings about a reclamation of one's agency and autonomy. Participant 095020 said:

It's a very normal, natural response if you can protect yourself with your phone because... there have to be swift and severe consequences for police misconduct. And only when the public sees that there are severe and swift consequences, then they will start to regain their trust in the police and they might not do it as much.

Participant 095020 went on to suggest that because video has the potential to both save a life and/or vindicate the life of another individual, it should be used as often as possible. This further frames citizen surveillance as a means of resistance against the power of policing. Through this resistance, community surveillers are able to exercise his or her surveillant abilities in our larger democratic and networked society. Participant 095020 suggests that:

Somebody standing on the side of the road, filming what a police [officer] is doing, is not interfering with a police investigation... But I think, just the fact that we're having this discussion... is problematic. Right? We live in a democracy, and the police don't get to tell citizens who are... invoking their democratic right to assemble... or the freedom to use their camera... whatever they want, the police don't get to interfere

Accordingly, aiming one's phone/camera at the police, audio recording what the police say, and generally asking questions about a police officer's badge number is within our democratic rights as Canadians (to a degree). If the police are unwilling to provide his or her information, citizen surveillance serves as a potential method to obtain it. Thus, by challenging the institutional power embedded within policing, a citizen surveiller can become outspoken and more engaged in wanting to identify the problematic/systemic issues within policing that, according to my participants, have existed for far too long.

4.8 Chapter Summary

To review, it appears as though citizen surveillance signifies a new form of civic responsibility facilitated by a community-led coalition of wanting to identify/rectify instances of bad policing. This suggests that community members have an interest in not only protecting him or herself, but to help other members of his or her community as well. This is augmented by the perceived distrust community members may have in the police. Thus, the reported approaches to both active and passive forms of resistance appear to be either prompted by anti-police views, or, alternatively, the intent of looking to repair systemic issues within policing as an institution. So, while technology has facilitated new techniques to engage in citizen surveillance, one's decision to engage in citizen surveillance appears to still be a condition of his or her own reality and privilege.

5. Chapter 5: Discussion & Analysis:

This section is to provide a more in-depth analysis of the thematic information I previously introduced in my findings. Thus, in using the information generated by my participants, I am able to develop Foucaultian and Deleuzian ideas concerned with power, resistance, control, and desire. Accordingly, this chapter goes on to consider alternative understandings of these themes within a framework that utilizes both sur- and sousveillance literature and the ideas that contribute to the ongoing development of citizen surveillance. Specifically, how one's motivation(s) to engage in citizen surveillance suggests that there is an underlying *desire for power*, but also a *resistance to power*.

This reconsideration of power within citizen surveillance culture suggests the following ideas, all of which will be discussed over the course of this chapter: engaging in citizen surveillance is done with the intent of leveling the power of an institution generally, and by challenging/resisting the power(s) of a police officer specifically; advancements in web 2.0 technologies can facilitate how members of the community can engage in innovative forms of activism through the recording and dissemination of previously unknown/hidden police practices; and, one's decision, ability, and/or interest to film the police suggests community members are looking to exercise their democratic voice and engage in <http://25logicalreasonstovotefordonaldtrump.com/#.V-xWFKaA3tU>.mailto as part of a larger community/social movement.

So, in framing *surveillance* as rhizomatic and that it is susceptible to change given the technological, sociological, and political setting of the time, I aim to compliment Foucault's understandings of how *power* is intended to work by applying the idea of citizen surveillance. Additionally, by engaging with Deleuze's conceptualization of

rhizomes, assemblages, and war-machines, I move beyond the prominent theoretical notion that citizen surveillance is simply an inversed mechanism for control/discipline. Rather, with my study being as a micro investigation of citizen surveillance grounded in in-depth interviews, I postulate a new understanding of how power may exist among citizen surveillers: the desire to resist/challenge institutions of power. Thus, I incorporate the Foucaultian idea that power is/can be reversible, and that resistance can serve as a form of offence.

To reiterate, my participants' contributed knowledge has allowed me to typify citizen surveillance in the following ways: 1) a new practice that unifies community discontent of the police, which in-turn frames citizen surveillance as a civic duty; 2) a resistant action to the power of the police, which has resulted from a perceived distrust of them; 3) a method for those who are anti-police to target and put pressure on how the police act; 4) individuals who yearn to bring about greater accountability/transparency to the institution of policing overall; 5) an activist response grounded in racialized identity politics experienced by marginalized community groups; and, 6) a new method for self-protection and a way in which one is able to increase his or her own empowerment against the power of the police.

5.1 Citizen surveillance of the Police

This section elaborates on the ideas presented by my participants who characterize citizen surveillance as a mechanism of harnessing power exercised by those who have little to no authority/status in society. Additionally, based on my participants' comments, citizen surveillance is imparted with value because of how it facilitates new participatory surveillance-tactics by embracing the democratization of networked technologies. In turn, this facilitates innovative ways for one to establish his or her

membership to a democratic system. Accordingly, those who film the police are thought to serve as a sort-of community-established oversight to harmful police practices and add to the existing agencies that already look to provide oversight of the police.

To provide context, one of the fundamental ideas Foucault discussed with respect to the idea of power, is that it is essentially a function embedded in the make-up of social institutions (1975). With respect to the institution of policing specifically, officers are granted with powers that regular citizens are not. In turn, the police not only represent an embodiment of power, but a symbolic representation of top-down power as well. This is attributed to the idea that because police have disciplinary powers, they are able to control/influence the actions of those at the bottom (community citizens). Accordingly, this is indicative of the Foucaultian idea that if one lacks power, it is derived from the fact that they lack knowledge about how power works, and are left with few, if any, resources/means to resist it.

However, citizen surveillance appears to facilitate an innovative way in how *knowledge* can now be acquired. In turn, engaging in or experiencing citizen surveillance, community individuals are granted with the ability to capture/monitor the actions of a police officer. This captured footage is then presumed to, but has not definitively been shown to, bring about a greater possibility that police officers are held responsible for his or her misconduct or wrongdoings. Accordingly, it appears as though citizen surveillance serves as a way in which members of the community can *challenge* the power of the police by being able to call attention to aspects of policing that they perceive to be broken or damaged. The goal, ultimately, is to hold those officers accountable and restrict

institutions from abusing their powers (Bakir, 2010; Bradshaw, 2013; Goldsmith, 2010; Kearon, 2012; Reeves, 2012).

As a result, based on the comments of my participants, citizen surveillance *appears* to have influenced the ways in which community individuals *think* about the police in his or her community, and thus, how he or she *associates* with them. More so, citizen surveillance looks to be intensifying the dialogue that surrounds problematic issues within policing as an institution. Thus, when asked about how community members perceive their relationship with the police, participant 103335 responded by saying:

I feel like it's changing over time. I feel like the G20 was a huge watershed moment, that citizens have finally realized that issues with policing aren't one bad cop anymore but they're systemic. And that they're engaging now with police forces, looking at the systemic issues with them... and it's evolving fairly quickly.

Furthermore, participant 103335 spoke about the impact of video evidence from citizen surveillers who have brought to light the malpractice of certain police officers.

She shared with me the following:

I think video evidence... is very interesting [because] I think it's made a significant change. If you look at old literature, it will always cite the phenomenon that cops were known to lie in court or that, cops were known to lie to protect each other, but there wasn't a lot a citizen could do because invariably the justice system trusted the justice system. I think video evidence has overturned that dynamic in a significant way. I think it started with Dziekanski... and then the G20 followed just after that.

As a result, it looks as though citizen surveillers are imparted with a sense of power by being able to generate new tangible forms of information/knowledge.

Accordingly, one's motivation to film the police may be grounded in his or her ability to

use this as evidence in an attempt to hold a police officer accountable for his or her wrongdoings in a public capacity. With respect to accountability, generally, it may include, “a public explanation of how and why something happened, and, if the explanation is not sufficiently exculpatory, the resignation, firing or punishment of those who were (or should have been) in charge” (Keenan, 2015, para, 16).

Thus, as participant 214217 emphasized, regardless of the specific *power* that a citizen surveiller has, filming the police, in any capacity, permits one to exercise a legitimate response to instances of police misconduct. Participant 214217 told me:

There’s the social conscious activist who is doing it for the greater social good, and then there’s the gang member who’s using it sort of as a weapon, against the cops. But I would say in both cases it’s accomplishing a goal... because regardless of whether somebody is using it as a threat or whatever, the fact is the minute the cameras rolling people on both sides of the coin are [going] to act in a more... responsible manner because they know it can be reviewed later on.

Ultimately, my participants believe that by filming the police, citizen surveiller can have an impact on previously unseen/unknown police-related incidents becoming more visible/known. In turn, this does two things: 1) citizen surveillance facilitates a greater discussion on problematic issues within policing; and, 2) the ability to push this discussion into the spotlight by procuring and disseminating new forms of tangible evidence generated by community individuals.

Going back to the Foucaultian idea that power *can* be reversible if one has the knowledge to do so, by engaging in citizen surveillance my participants believe they are instilled with the ability to impact/challenge the power *of the police*. This frames citizen surveillance as a type of offense that can only be done after one is able to personally harness a type of power him or herself. So, with community individuals now being able

to record what a police officer is saying or doing, a citizen surveiller is hopeful increase the transparency of the police and reveal a greater amount of knowledge concerning (potentially problematic) police practices. In turn, this increased transparency is hoped to reveal specific issues and problematic areas within the institution of policing that are in need of repair. Subsequently, citizen surveillance is perceived as being advantageous because of its assumed long-term ability to identify, target, and (optimistically) improve problematic issues within the institution of policing.

So, despite the fact that my participants' comments have slight undertones of being anti-police, I do not believe it is something they actually are. Rather, I believe my participants support the idea that, quite simply, the police should be held to a higher standard of accountability, given their status and role in society. Again, considering the power imbalance is such that the police are afforded with powers/weapons that the average community member is not, my participants suggest that by utilizing technology for surveillance purposes, they are able to harness a type of power to do something about problematic issues within policing. This may include being able to ultimately bring about changes in how a police officer is held accountable, or, changes in policy with respect to how police misconduct is reported on or investigated. Thus, an apparent motivation for citizen surveillers is that they aim to *identify and potentially alleviate* problematic issues within policing that have gone on far too long. Still, as will be seen in my conclusion, citizen surveillance is not without its flaws, and that there is a concern that filming the police with little restraint will result in community members being at risk of hindering and not helping their relationship with the police.

Furthermore, in addressing Foucault's idea that surveillance/power systems serve as mechanisms to instill disciplinary control, it should be noted that based on comments made by my participants, it appears as though one's motivation to film the police stems from his or her attempt to influence an officer's actions/decisions. Specifically it appears as though my participants believe citizen surveillance can instill a sense of authority of limiting/preventing an officer from engaging in unnecessary/aggressive acts of force or dominance. However, as I previously mentioned, the association between citizen surveillance and aspects of disciplinary power, though discussed in theory, has not been empirically tested. As a result, despite the fact that this is an interesting indicator for how *some* individuals may contemplate citizen surveillance, it is still too early to tell, if at all, whether or not a civilian is able to induce disciplinary power through citizen surveillance. Additionally, it remains to be seen whether or not citizen surveillance is able to exert any kind of influence on a police officer's actions when a camera is present, in any way.

Nevertheless, based on my data, regardless of whether or not one is able to induce aspects of disciplinary power at the moment, it appears as though a citizen surveiller is motivated by the fact that he or she is able to act as a type of oversight towards a police officer's behaviour. In turn, this facilitates how the actions of a police officer can be more closely examined and deliberated on, than ever before. So, with respect to the usefulness of a citizen surveillance video overall, there is a need to further research both the long term and immediate effects of citizen surveillance.

5.2 Citizen surveillance and Web 2.0 Technologies

This section further examines the notion that citizen surveillance is a condition made possible because of key technological advancements and an opportune socio-political climate for change. To reiterate, the condition of possibility adheres to the

reasoning that, in this case, technology does not have meaning itself, but rather, is ascribed with certain meaning(s) by those who use it (Foucault, 1973; Blumer, 1969; Fuentes, 2015). So, with respect to one's ability to engage in citizen surveillance, it would appear that developments in web 2.0 and information and communication technologies have brought about new ways for one to engage in political activism.

Subsequently, by way of Deleuze framing power as rhizomatic, new open systems of control has challenged the closed-disciplinary systems that Foucault examined. This has resulted in citizen surveillers reimagining the ways in which surveillance can be harnessed/directed. Also, taking into account that smartphones are in the hands of community individuals exceeding 4 billion people globally (Bakir, 2010) indicates that citizens are no longer hindered by previous restraints to do something when he or she sees, hears, or experiences instances of bad policing. Rather, it appears as though wireless mobile technologies are being used for activist-oriented purposes. Fittingly, my participants' reported motivations, or logics when engaging in citizen surveillance, is grounded in how he or she believes they are imparted with a form of power that enables new feats of resistance, by filming the actions of the police.

When asked about the association between technology and citizen surveillance, participant 210044 expressed that it has to do with:

A good strong base, to do something different... Once people have more and more tools...[the] ability to do things positively... the better off our community is going to be, the stronger our community is going to be, and then it spirals into people realizing ok, the next step is going to be, this. The next step is going to be that... Those answers only come about, when people are active and engaged in doing something...

He goes on to say that technology has provided civilians with:

The idea of justice, right? People don't want to see bad things, right?...Most people want to see justice being done, and I think that is what we can really count on and hope for, to continue on and if we can appeal to that, then that's really going to make a big difference... [with] more and more people being able to take part.

More so, in speaking about the role of technology and the rise of citizen surveillance, participant 103335 said:

I think its changing opinions... and I think that's been the major change. I think you've got people moving left as videos get passed around the Internet and become part of the mainstream like to our parents, to our aunts and uncles and cousins, who maybe aren't as politicized as we are, attending the protest. They can now experience some of what happens there.

Participant 210044 expressed that, "from the standpoint of the citizen using a recording device... they are empowered knowing that they have a way of doing something about a situation that is going on around them" (210044, 2015) and that:

It's a really great position for people to be in, to know that they don't have to sit down, and just keep taking and taking abuse, but they could actively, so something to stand up for their rights and I think that puts people in a good positive, powerful mental place.

Thus, while citizen surveillance may have originally appeared as an innovative method to record the actions of the police in the past (i.e. Rodney King), according to participant 150146, the novelty is over and people recognize that citizen surveillance can be a part of everyday life. So while Lyon (2001) wrote about his skepticism of placing cameras in the hands of community members, the prevalence of web 2.0 and prominence of sharing user-contributed content has likely modified this thinking (Bakir, 2010; White, 2016).

So, in being able to reflect on the association between web 2.0 and citizen surveillance, I want to integrate the theoretical concept of "surveillance 2.0" (Doyle,

2011). To reiterate, *surveillance 2.0* is a convergence of web 2.0 technologies that incorporates new means, methods, or models of surveillance (Doyle, 2011). Specifically, based on how my participants have given meaning to the idea of citizen surveillance and understandings of power, I surmise that surveillance 2.0 represents a model of surveillance that lacks a strict hierarchy (with respect to who can be a watcher, who can be watched, and who is able to direct where the surveillant gaze is positioned). This system is leaderless, but grounded in the knowledge/experience of community individuals, rather than state/corporate bodies of power. In this regard, surveillance 2.0 appears to incorporate a civilian-led assemblage comprised of user-contributed/generated content. Thus, surveillance 2.0 provides its users with a model of power that can contribute to new revelations of surveillance altogether.

One example of a surveillance 2.0 system is seen in participant 210044's creation of the CopWatch mobile app. This app was designed so that community individuals can both observe and report on problematic police issues in a public capacity. In doing so, it enables community members to converge his or her information into a larger databank of community-generated knowledge. As participant 122745 said regarding the allure of social media as a platform to raise awareness:

... It's maybe leading to a... more evolved sense of social responsibility. Which would be great. I mean I think that's what social media should do ideally. It should not just be about sitting around looking at cat videos, it should be somehow, improving the world we live in.

Additionally, participant 133609 B said the follow regarding her motivation to share content on social media:

...if people aren't able to be here, I think it's important to be able to share that [knowledge] and have it accessible and regularly available online from the people who are here, who are protesting,

and who are fighting for the cause. I think to have that voice, and to be a voice for people who cannot speak.

Ultimately, in being able to associate the concept of citizen surveillance with the theoretical idea of rhizomes, I believe that the idea of power overall can be more readily studied as a tangible/observable method of surveillance now more than ever. As technology continues to advance, the idea of power will continue to transcend across societies and take on new forms/manifestations. With respect to Haggerty and Ericson (2000), it appears as though citizen surveillance represent a new assemblage of community individuals being able to watch or monitor those in a position of power outside of government or state-sanctioned watchdog organizations. Accordingly, my participants believe they are able to not only harness a type of power but also contribute to the development of an evolving non-hierarchical democratic model of surveillance altogether. Thus, web 2.0 technologies have permitted community individuals to both capture and disseminate footage more independently, than they could have recently. At the same time, it is important to note that community individuals are still working within a system in which media corporations are heavily involved in amplifying what is predominately shared and/or promoted on social media websites. More so, something to note for future directions of citizen surveillance, is how police forces are working to neutralize citizen surveillance through arresting citizen surveillers and the incorporation of body cameras to dispute civilian-based accounts of what may have happened during an altercation.

5.3 Citizen surveillance and social movements

Given the truths/realities offered by my participants, it has become clear that citizen surveillance represents an alternative and contemporary aspect of surveillance

theory, and is not merely as a copy or inversed system of what Foucault presented. So, based on the information generated by my participants, I am able to revisit Foucaultian ideas concerning power, and place a greater emphasis on citizen surveillance, which appears to represent a set of beliefs/actions *for the people* and not state/social institutions.

So, despite that Foucault presented a significant amount of insight concerning systems/ideas of power and surveillance operating from the top-down, he did not examine community individuals/groups and their ability to resist disciplinary systems of control. Rather, Foucault's analysis was focused on historical discourses and how power is thought to exist. He postulated that freedom was limited/hard to resist in the models of power/surveillance and did not consider the lives of those individuals who reside within disciplinary systems of power.

Ultimately, as Deleuze suggests (1983), and reiterated by Haggerty and Ericson (2000), citizen surveillance reimagines traditional theory of power/surveillance. This is attributed to the idea that citizen surveillance has characteristics indicative to that of a "war-machine". Again, a war-machine is a type of assemblage that resists the operations of the state (Patton, 1994). Subsequently, what my participants have led me to consider, is that by describing citizen surveillance as a new civic duty and/or civic responsibility grounded in community individuals helping one another, citizen surveillers are driven by the desire to identify, combat, prevent, and/or resist the seemingly unrestrained powers embedded in policing and engage in new civilian-based methods of surveillance (Dennis, 2008; Reeves, 2012; Andrejevic, 2005; Fernback, 2013; Marx, 2003; Mann et al., 2003). However, the strength of citizen surveillance will only be made evident in instances where its users are active in their resolve to help those in need. As Mann argues, the

strength of citizen surveillance will be from its numbers. With X amount of people being able to record Y amount of situation, the “one-to-many versus one-to-one mapping helps” (Mann, 2005, pg. 635), establish how power may be manifested as an offensive tool, and thus, how hierarchal power may be re-negotiated.

To restate a situation participant 130215 shared with me, he recalled an event in which he came across a police officer harassing a woman who had an obvious mental disability. Participant 130215 told me that if he:

[Had] a camera phone, or something of the sorts [he] would have been able to stay there, video record it, and at least have that as... another pair of eyes, in case some bad stuff went down.

Participant 130215 went on to say that:

...You can imagine back when there was no... cellphones, no cameras readily available, so you can just imagine that a number of innocent people have probably ended up in jail, because the police officer said, well he assaulted me... I think that definitely with technology has allowed us to... engage in activism.

Furthermore, participant 210044 went on to similarly frame citizen surveillance as a way for members of the community to reclaim a sense of agency in situations where his or her voice may have gone overlooked in the past:

If you could bring any set of calm to the citizens experiencing [a tense situation], if they could sit there and think to themselves, ok, I have something to respond to this, I can start filming, and that's going to help me, just the mere fact of them being able to think rationally and clearly from a position of power, will help them fair better in the situation, just clear thinking, and having your wits about you, instead of being just panicked...at the [sight] of the police.

More so, participant 095020 framed citizen surveillance as an exercise in democracy, and that if a community member desires to film the police carrying out his or her duties, he or she should be allowed to. Thus, by being able to document rare cases of

bad policing, participant 095020 believes that community members can become directly involved in supervising the police, that at one time was not likely to occur. He expressed to me:

It's a very normal, natural response if you can protect yourself with your phone because... there have to be swift and severe consequences for police misconduct. And only when the public sees that there are severe and swift consequences, then they will start to regain their trust in the police and they might not do it as much.

More on this point, participant 214217 said:

We should get to a point where [citizen surveillance] just becomes part of being a responsible citizen. So regardless of not having activist blood it's just something where if you're a citizen in a society, and you recognize that as far away from an activist as you are, you have an interest in their being accountability and living in a fair society and so if you have a chance to film something that's wrong, and how it to people and contribute to making sure that kind of thing doesn't happen again, than that just sort of becomes a basic civil responsibility

With this in mind, participant 122745 is of the opinion that:

I think that for this most part, [citizen surveillance] happens when people feel that their rights are being trampled on, or when they are witnessing an act in which someone else is having their rights trampled on... or that they believe that to be happening... I think they're doing it to prevent injustice. That is the overwhelming sense I get. People are doing it because it finally gives everyone a tool to expose injustice. And I think that's really powerful, I mean, I actually feel safer just having a smartphone in my pocket.

Accordingly, going back to the idea of a war-machine, it appears as though through citizen surveillance, community individuals can come together and revitalize his or her “democratic social responsibility, aiming to restore a traditional balance that the institutionalization of Bentham’s Panopticon itself disrupted” (Mann et al., 2003, pg. 347 in Bakir, 2010, pg. 21). So, unlike Foucault’s analysis of panoptic models, which

emphasized disciplinary control, my participants have revealed the ways in which citizen surveillance, as a war-machine, provides community individuals with a method to harness power themselves and challenge the seemingly unrestricted power of institutions. In turn, citizen surveillers have the capacity to converge their knowledge and challenge the ways in which power can be: manifested, realigned, and/or potentially resisted between oneself and institutions of power.

Subsequently, rather than frame the idea of a war-machine as a metaphorical way in which community individuals can resist the operation of state power, citizen surveillers represent the ways in which power is thought to be acquired in a literal sense. This has resulted in the idea that even those who have no power (attributed to their low social status) can nevertheless carry out aspects of surveillance that at one time was not seemingly possible.

More so, in taking lead from Haggerty and Ericson (2000), my findings expand on the idea of a “surveillant assemblage”, by reimagining it within the context of citizen surveillance specifically. Accordingly, this assemblage is comprised of the heterogeneous lives of community members who now readily make use of his or her smartphones and wireless mobile technologies to record the actions/words of those in a position of power and disseminate this content online for millions to see.

Thus, it appears as though one’s motivation to engage in citizen surveillance is tied back to a community member’s ability/interest/desire to harness forms of power him or herself and in an attempt to help others. In turn, new forms of citizen surveillance have challenged the notion that those who are in a position of power, and who were thought to be exempt from being watched, can now be monitored in ways not previously seen.

Alternative to what Foucault presented, this suggests that citizen surveillance may not essentially be driven by discipline or control (although may still be a factor in this preliminary stage). Rather, a reported logic to resist this power is by acting on *new desires* and engaging with the police with powers that he or she *previously did not have*. Now, going back to the idea of a war-machine, those who were/are concerned with a police officer's potential use and abuse of power can now engage in forms of activism through online-based platforms, and disseminate content to a global audience.

So, despite the fact that citizen surveillance literature has been drawn from Foucaultian ideas of power/surveillance, I take lead from surveillance scholars who utilize Deleuze and frame surveillance as democratizing, than one of control or discipline. This is attributed to the fact that now more than ever community individuals are seeking out new, network technologies to challenge/resist the potential misconduct of the police and surveillance systems currently in place. This suggests that citizen surveillance has more to do with community individuals looking to reclaim a sense of autonomy through harnessing power him or herself, than it does with inherently trying to control a police officer's actions by filming them (though this still may be a factor/motivation).

5.4 Typographic information about citizen surveillance

To reiterate, it would appear that my participants (despite differences in age, gender, race, or socio-economic status) characterize citizen surveillance as: 1) a new practice that enhances community cohesion, which in turn frames citizen surveillance as a new civic duty; 2) an action that has resulted from a perceived distrust of the police; 3) a method for those who are anti-police, to target the police and put pressure on how they act; 4) individuals who yearn to bring about greater accountability/transparency to questionable instances of police misconduct; 5) an activist response to racialized identity

politics felt by marginalized community groups towards the police; and, 6) a new method for self-protection and being able to increase one's own empowerment to challenge police power. So, despite that my study is only representative of a small body of Canadian citizens, I am able to consider many potential values, experiences, insights, and overall opinions regarding how citizen surveillance is changing and challenging policing as an institution.

5.5 Chapter Summary

Overall, in my ability to investigate the motivations of citizen surveillers, I have incorporated Deleuzian theory and constructivist ideas to compliment Foucaultian ideas of power/surveillance. This has enabled me to generate a non-exhaustive typology of motivations one may have when engaging in citizen surveillance (see above). These motivations are representative of the social experiences, and interpretation of these experiences, felt by my participants.

More so, in my examination of citizen surveillance, I have been able to further develop concepts like rhizomes, assemblages, and war-machines. Specifically, these ideas represent the theoretical ways in which power can be reconceptualized by considering how community individuals are able to engage in the surveillance of the police. By framing citizen surveillance within the context of these concepts specifically, I have been able to consider both the real-world implications and academic significance of citizen surveillance as a legitimate means of surveillance, power, and method to resist hierarchical bodies of power (again, the idea of resistance as offence). What is clear enough from my study is that citizen surveillance is not going away anytime soon. With every new incident of violent policing captured on camera, it raises the likelihood that people will continue to engage in citizen surveillance. So in using the stories and

experiences of my participants, my goal, as well as theirs, is to study citizen surveillance in an effort to reveal problematic areas of policing that are in need of repair. While systemic changes may not be visible for generations, citizen surveillance is at least a step in the right direction.

Chapter 6 – Conclusion & Recommendations

The world has changed since George Holliday filmed Rodney King's assault back in 1991. The prominence of a growing citizen surveillance culture has been facilitated by a number of societal developments, including: the dominance of the Internet as a tool for democratizing knowledge; web 2.0 platforms to channel activist-oriented ideas into a living data base of knowledge; and, wireless mobile technologies which are already being characterized as the surveillance camera of the 21st century. Subsequently, citizen surveillance has been shown to be an effective tool not only to observe and report on problematic issues of the police, but how power can be tangible, and that surveillance is something to be harnessed as well.

So, in my ability to investigate the theoretical ideas deliberated by both sur- and sousveillance scholars, it was important for me to analyze data generated from the firsthand experiences of those who have engaged in or experienced citizen surveillance specifically. In doing so, I have been able to substantiate the following areas of research: the reported motivations of a citizen surveiller; a citizen surveiller's understandings of power forms, and how power is embedded within certain societal institutions (like the police); a citizen surveiller's logic in resisting power; and, a citizen surveiller's reported approaches to both active and passive forms of resistance.

Accordingly, in my exploration of citizen surveillance, I incorporated Foucaultian ideas of power/surveillance taken from his analysis of panoptic models and top-down systems of power/surveillance. However, because he did not analyze a formal panoptic model, Foucault examined historical discourses/institutions to deliberate how power is thought to occur. Thus, engaging in a purely Foucaultian analysis, while interesting and contributes to being able to understand concepts such as power and surveillance, would

lead to a partial understanding of citizen surveillance. Specifically, what Foucault does not consider, are the truths concerned with how people may actually see, interpret, and resist, ideas of power within a surveillance system.

So, in my ability to expand on the ideas put forth by Foucault, I engaged with the ideas of Deleuze and how he believes power can be better understood if it is framed as a *rhizome*, rather than as a fixed system of control/discipline. This is taken from Deleuze's belief that society is made up of multiple realities, which leads to the formation of "multiplicities" (Deleuze & Guatarri, 1987). In turn, these multiplicities form assemblages that represent a collection/convergence of ideas regarding how *power, or surveillance*, can change as society continues to develop. Thus, Deleuze reimagines power as something that is thought of and/or challenged as society develops and evolves. So, with respect to investigating the potential motivations of a citizen surveiller, it was important to compliment Foucault's understanding of power systems with Deleuzian ideas that society is a constantly evolving system. This allowed me to push forward and interrogate the very idea of how power, and resistance to power, can be conceptualized within the context of citizen surveillance. Specifically, by examining power/resistance within a surveillance framework that allows community participation specifically, I have been able to investigate the motivations of those who engage in citizen surveillance independent of other watchdog institutions or surveillance systems.

Accordingly, in taking the lead from Garland (1997) and O'Malley, Weir, and Shearing (1997), I designed a study that permitted me to investigate the scholarly claims/debated issues in both sur- and sousveillance literature by applying Deleuze (who is more of a symbolic interactionist than Foucault) and the larger ideas of social

constructivism to Foucaultian understandings of power/surveillance. By engaging in the sociological method of interviewing community members, I have been able to reflect on how power is understood and embedded in the motivations of my participants when filming the police. In turn, this has allowed me to generate a non-exhaustive typography of motivations associated with citizen surveillance. However, this typography is representative of many realities and does not suggest a single truth behind citizen surveillance. More so, due to the exploratory nature of citizen surveillance, the main concern of my study was to provide a snapshot of information at this moment in time, rather than being able to offer a single authentic truth or single reality about citizen surveillance.

As a result, it appears as though citizen surveillance serves as a method in which members of the community *reconceptualize* how power forms exist, and thus, how one may form a potential resistance to this power using networked technologies to renegotiate their role in a growing surveillant society. So while Foucault discussed power as a modality of control or discipline, in using the ideas of Deleuze, it appears that my participants propose another conceptualization regarding how power may take form: desire. Specifically, by engaging in citizen surveillance, my participants use new web 2.0 technologies to harness a type of to promote police accountability outside of existing police watchdog agencies.

As a result, the concept of *assemblages* has been updated within the context of a growing culture of citizen surveillance. As Haggerty and Ericson predicted, new means of technologies would bring about a larger more democratized surveillance system, and one that invites participation from all members of the community regardless of his or her

status/authority (2000). Additionally, I have been able to apply the notion of a civilian-based surveillant-assemblage to the underdeveloped concept of *surveillance 2.0*. Doyle theorized that surveillance 2.0 would likely be the resulting outcome of converging surveillance theory and web 2.0 technologies to bring about a new democratized system of surveillance. Specifically, how new forms of citizen surveillance represents a resistance-based assemblages that recognizes community individuals being able to use wireless mobile technologies and web 2.0 platforms to mobilize their discontent of the police. This suggests that citizen surveillance is characterized as a non-hierarchical system of surveillance that invites mass user-participation, while remaining leaderless and lacking a general.

Furthermore, the Deleuzian concepts of rhizomes and war-machines have been further developed within the context of civilian led assemblages aiming to revolutionize the idea of citizen surveillance. By being able to have an effect on what sorts of information are made available, citizen surveillers are thought to reverse/challenge the top-down conceptualization of power embedded within the institution of policing. In turn, this has affected what kinds of knowledge can now be made available for the general public to examine (specifically, the malpractice of certain police officers and the evidence/knowledge to challenge this malpractice). Ultimately, it appears as though citizen surveillance has evolved from a knee-jerk response to record all police officers in the line of duty, to an exercise of individual/community resistance against institutions of power, including the police.

Unfortunately, with so much footage readily available, one has (or is likely going to be) exposed to more instances of violent police behaviour in the upcoming years.

Amid the growing number of uploaded videos, citizen surveillance does not appear to be going away anytime soon. As a result, there is a need to further investigate the under developed areas of citizen surveillance.

Therefore, future studies on citizen surveillance should keep in mind the following debated areas of research: to begin, I mentioned a few times during this project whether or not, or to what degree, citizen surveillance can enact disciplinary power. So, despite the fact that my participants have not been shown to effectively induce disciplinary control over a police officer via citizen surveillance, does not mean that other community member's experiences are the same. Thus, future research on citizen surveillance would benefit from examining this idea more in-depth with a larger sample of community participants. Again, given both my sample size and the specific responses of my participants, I am not able to authentically discuss the effects of citizen surveillance as a form of disciplinary power myself. Nevertheless, given its highly debated theoretical premise, it is an important idea worth exploring in future citizen surveillance projects.

Additionally, it is important for future citizen surveillance studies to consider the growing market and impact of *newer* technologies. *Newer* forms of technology may include forms of wearable-tech (including Google Glass and Smart Watches) as well as the use of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) or Drones. These technological developments have the potential to develop even more innovative forms of citizen surveillance. In turn, these new technologies have the potential to further affect/influence how community individuals perceive and/or interact with the police.

Ultimately, future studies on citizen surveillance would benefit from further qualitative studies (including focus groups, larger scale in-depth interviews, and general field research/observations). Additionally, future studies engaging with citizen surveillance theory would benefit from a greater inclusion of groups such as: Black Lives Matter, the Network for the Elimination of Police Violence, and the Black Action Defense Committee to name a few. This is so that researchers could explore the role of citizen surveillance and its association with privilege. While my study does not explicitly go into the association between citizen surveillance and racialized identity politics, I have been able to reveal that for some, this is indicative of his or her ability to film the police. Thus, by incorporating marginalized individuals or organizations, future studies have the opportunity to reveal even more knowledge concerned with citizen surveillance and aspects of gender, socio-economic status, race, and other forms of privilege.

References

- Adams, S. (2013). Post-panoptic surveillance through healthcare rating sites: Who's watching whom? *Information, Communication & Society*, 16(2), 215-235.
- Allen, A. L. (2008). Dredging up the past: Lifelogging, memory and Surveillance. *University of Chicago Law Review*, 75, 47-74: U of Penn Law School, Public Law Research Paper No. 07-33. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1010936>
- Anderson, R. S., & Möller, F. (2013). Engaging in the limits of visibility: Photography, security and surveillance. *Security Dialogue*, 44(3), 203-221.
- Andrejevic, M. (2002). The work of being watched: Interactive media and the exploitation of self-disclosure. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 19(2), 230-248.
- Andrejevic, M. (2005). The work of watching one another: Lateral surveillance, risk, and governance. *Surveillance & Society*, 2(4), 479-497.
- Andrejevic, M. (2007). *ISpy: Surveillance and power in the interactive era*. Lawrence, Kan: University Press of Kansas.
- Attride-Stirling, J. (2001). Thematic networks: An analytical tool for qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 1(3), 386-405.
- Babović, B. (2000). Police brutality or police torture. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 23(3), 374-380.
- Bailey, J., & Kerr, I. (2007) Seizing control?: The experience capture experiments of Ringley & Mann. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 9(2), 129-139.
- Baker, B. (2008). Paradoxes of policing and protest. *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism*, 3(2), 8-22.
- Bakir, V. (2010). *Sousveillance, media and strategic political communication Iraq, USA, UK*. New York: Continuum.
- Bandes, S. A. (1999). Patterns of injustice: Police brutality in the courts. *Buffalo Law Review*, 47(3), 1275-1378.
- Barnard-Wills, D., & Wells, H. (2012). Surveillance, technology and the everyday. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 12(3), 227-237.
- Bauman, Z., & Haugaard, M. (2008). Liquid modernity and power: A dialogue with Zygmunt Bauman. *Journal of Power*, 1(2), 111-130.

- Bauman, Z., & Lyon, D. (2013). *Liquid surveillance: A conversation*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Bay-Cheng, S. (2014). 'When this you see': The (anti) radical time of mobile self-surveillance. *Performance Research*, 19(3), 48-55.
- Beach, R., Enciso, P., Harste, J., Jenkins, C., Raina, S., A., Rogers, R., Short, K. G., Sung, Y. K., Wilson, M., & Yenika-Agbaw, V. (2009). Exploring the "critical" in critical content analysis of children's literature. In K. M. Leaner, D. W. Rowe, D. K. Dickinson, M. K. Hundley, R. T. Jamenez & V. J. Risko (Eds.), *58th yearbook of the national reading conference* (pp. 129-143). Oak Creek, WI: National Reading Conference.
- Berg, B. L. (1995). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, Mass: Allyn and Bacon.
- Berg, B. L. (2004). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2012). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Berger, A. (1998). *Seeing is believing: An introduction to visual communication* (2nd ed.). Mountain View, Calif.: Mayfield Pub.
- Bird, C. M. (2005). How I learned to stopped dreading and learned to love transcription. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11(2), 226-248.
- Bird, S. E. (2011). Are we all producers now? Convergence and media audience practices. *Cultural Studies*, 25(4-5), 502-516.
- Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 29, 447-466.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism; perspective and method*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Blyth, M. A., Wright, P. C., & Monk, A. F. (2004). Little brother: Could and should wearable computing technologies be applied to reducing older people's fear of crime? *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing*, 8, 402-415.
- Bossewitch, J., & Sinnreich, A. (2012). The end of forgetting: Strategic agency beyond the panopticon. *New Media & Society*, 15(2), 224-242.
- Bradshaw, E. (2013). This is what a police state looks like: Sousveillance, direct action and the anti-corporate globalization movement. *Critical Criminology*, 21, 447-461.

- Bratich, J. Z., & Brush, H. M. (2011). Fabricating activism: Craft-work, popular culture, gender. *Utopian Studies*, 22(2), 233-260.
- Brucato, B., (2015). Policing made visible: Mobile technologies and the importance of point of view. *Surveillance & Society*, 13(3/4), 455-473.
- Brunson, R. K., & Miller, J. (2006). Young black men and urban policing in the United States. *British Journal of Criminology*, 46(4), 613-640.
- Bryman, A. (1988). The Nature of Qualitative Research. In *Quantity and quality in social research*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Burnard, P. (1991). A method of analyzing interview transcripts in qualitative research. *Nurse Education Today*, 11, 461-466.
- Burnard, P. (1994). Searching for meaning: A method of analyzing interview transcripts with a personal computer. *Nurse Education Today*, 14, 111-117.
- Callanan, V. J., & Rosenberger, J. S. (2011). Media and public perceptions of the police: Examining the impact of race and personal experience. *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy*, 21(2), 167-189.
- Careless, J. (2015). Video Evidence. Retrieved July 8, 2015 from: http://www.cba.org/CBA/practicelink/leadership_technology/video_evidence.aspx
- Carley, K. (1993). Coding choices for textual analysis: A comparison of content analysis and map analysis. *Sociological Methodology*, 23, 75-126.
- Carroll, W. K. (2002). Social Movements. In D. Baer (Ed.), *Political sociology: Canadian perspectives*. Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press.
- Cascio, J. (2005). The rise of the participatory panopticon. Retrieved July 7, 2015 from: <http://www.worldchanging.com/archives/002651.html>
- CBC News (2015). Angry crowd confronting officer during LCBO arrest caught on video. Retrieved December 16, 2015 from: <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/lcbo-arrest-sheridan-mall-1.3346092>
- Chan, J. (1996). Changing police culture. *British Journal of Criminology*, 36(1), 109-134.
- Copblock.org. (2015). *Transparency & education through these smartphone apps*. Retrieved August 1, 2015 from: <http://www.copblock.org/apps/>
- Curtis, J., & Grabb, E. (2002). Involvement in the Organizational Base of New Social Movements in English Canada and French Canada. In D. Baer (Ed.), *Political sociology: Canadian perspectives*. Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press.

- Dahan, M., & Bentman, M. (2014). *The Democratization Paradox: Citizen Oversight of Parliament and its Unintended Consequences*. Proceedings Culture, Technology, Communication 2014, University of Oslo, Norway, 13-27
- David, G. (2010). Camera phones images, videos and live streaming: A contemporary visual trend. *Visual Studies*, 25(1), 89-98.
- Davidson, C. (2009). Transcription: Imperatives for qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(2), 35-52.
- Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscript on the societies of control. *October*, 59, 3-7.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2004). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. London: Continuum.
- Dennis, K. (2008). Viewpoint: Keeping a close watch – the rise of self-surveillance and the threat of digital exposure. *Sociological Review*, 56(3), 347-357.
- Doyle, A. (2011). Revisiting the synopticon: Reconsidering Mathiesen's 'the viewer society' in the age of web 2.0. *Theoretical Criminology*, 15(3), 283-299.
- Duriau, V. J., Reger, R. K., & Pfarrer, M. D. (2007). A content analysis of the content analysis literature in organization studies: Research themes, data sources, and methodological refinements. *Organization Research Methods*, 10(1), 5-34.
- Easton, K. L., McComish, J. F., & Greenberg, R. (2000). Avoiding common pitfalls in qualitative data collection and transcription. *Qualitative Health Research*, 10(5), 703-707.
- Elliott, I., Thomas, S. D. M., & Ogloff, J. R. P. (2012). Procedural justice in contacts with the police: The perspective of victims of crime. *Police Practice and Research*, 13(5), 437-449.
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2007). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107-115.
- Erbentraut, J. (2015, April 10). These apps are helping people document police abuse. Retrieved April 11, 2015, from: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/04/10/police-abuse-apps_n_7036442.html
- Ericson, R. V. (1989). Patrolling the facts: Secrecy and publicity in police work. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 40(2), 205-226.
- Ernest-Jones, M., Nettle, D., & Bateson, M. (2011). Effects of eye images on everyday cooperative behaviour: A field experiment. *Evolution and Human Behaviour*, 32(3), 172-178.

- Essen, A. (2008). The two facets of electronic care surveillance: An exploration of the views of older people who live with monitoring devices. *Social Science & Medicine*, 67, 128-136.
- Evans-Cowley, J. (2010). Planning in the real-time city: The future of mobile technology. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 25(2), 136-149.
- Fairclough, N. L. (1985). Critical and descriptive goals in discourse analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9, 739-763.
- Farrar, T & Ariel, B. (2013) Self-awareness to being watched and socially-desirable behaviour: A field experiment on the effect of body-worn cameras on the police use-of-force. *Police Foundation*, March, 2013.
- Fereday, J. & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 80-92.
- Fernback, J. (2013). Sousveillance: Communities of resistance to the surveillant environment. *Telematics and Informatics*, 30, 11-21.
- Ferreira, V. (2015). Who watches the watchmen? As citizen-recorded videos of interactions go viral, police warn of 'trial by YouTube'. Retrieved November, 10, 2015, from: <http://news.nationalpost.com/news/canada/who-watches-the-watchmen-as-citizen-recorded-videos-of-interactions-go-viral-police-warn-of-trial-by-youtube>
- Finlay, L. (2008). Reflecting on 'reflective practice'. *Practice-based Professional learning Centre*, The Open University, 1-27.
- Fletcher, G., Griffiths, M., & Kutar, M. S. (2011). A day in the digital life: A preliminary sousveillance study. Working Paper Series. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1923629>
- Floersch, J., Longhofer, J. L., Kranke, D., & Townsend, L. (2010). Integrating thematic, grounded theory and narrative analysis: A case study of adolescent psychotropic treatment. *Qualitative Social Work*, 9(3), 407-425.
- Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1975). *The birth of the clinic; an archaeology of medical perception*. New York: Vintage Books.

- Freshwater, D., Fisher, P., & Walsh, E. (2015). Revisiting the panopticon: Professional regulation, surveillance and sousveillance. *Nursing Inquiry*, 22(1), 3-12.
- Fuchs, C. (2011). New media, web 2.0 and surveillance. *Sociology Compass*, 5(2), 134-147.
- Fuchs, C. (2011). Web 2.0, prosumption, and surveillance. *Surveillance & Society*, 8(3), 288-309.
- Fuentes, M. A. (2015). Performance constellations: Memory and event in digitally enabled protests in the Americas. *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 35(1), 24-42.
- Galič, M., Timan, T., & Koops B-J. (2016). Benthan, Deleuze, and beyond: An overview of surveillance theories from the panopticon to participation. *Philosophy & Technology, Online First Article*, 1-29.
- Ganascia, J. (2010). The generalized sousveillance society. *Social Science Information*, 49(3), 489-507.
- Garland, D. (1997). 'Governmentality' and the problem of crime: Foucault, criminology, sociology. *Theoretical Criminology*, 1(2), 173-214.
- Gillham, P. F., Edwards, B., & Noakes, J. A. (2013). Strategic incapacitation and the policing of occupy wall street protests in new york city, 2011. *Policing & Society*, 23(1), 81-102.
- Goldsmith, A. J. (2010). Policing's new visibility. *British Journal of Criminology*, 50, 914-934.
- Goggin, G., & Clark, J. (2009). Mobile phones and community development: A contact zone between media and citizenship. *Development in Practice*, 19(4-5), 585-597.
- Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*, 24, 105-112.
- Gray, J. H., & Densten, I. L. (1998). Integrating quantitative and qualitative analysis using latent and manifest variables. *Quality and Quantity*, 32, 419-431.
- Haggerty, K. D. (2004). Ethics creep: Governing social science research in the name of ethics. *Qualitative Sociology*, 27(4), 391-414.
- Haggerty, K. D., & Ericson, R. V. (2000). The surveillant assemblage. *British Journal of Criminology*, 51(4), 605-622.

- Harfield, C. (2014). Body-worn pov technology: Moral harm. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*, 33,(2), 64-72.
- Hassan, C., Krieg, G., & McAfee, M. (2016). Police union calls for law enforcement labor to boycott Beyonce's world tour. Retrieved February, 20, 2016, from: <http://www.cnn.com/2016/02/19/us/beyonce-police-boycott/>
- Hedley, D. (2013). Social moments in solo videojournalism: Conveying subjective social reality through editorial vision and video. *Digital Journalism*, 1(1), 64-81.
- Hier, S. P. (2003). Probing the surveillant assemblage: On the dialectics of surveillance practices as processes of social control. *Surveillance & Society*, 1(3), 399-411.
- Home Office (2012). Policing by consent. Retrieved October, 14, 2014, from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/policing-by-consent>
- Hoonard, D. (2012). *Qualitative research in action: A Canadian primer*. Don Mills, Ont.: OUP Canada.
- Hsieh, H., & Shannon, S. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- Huxley, A. (1932). *Brave new world, a novel*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Doran &.
- Kearon, T. (2012). Surveillance technologies and the crisis of confidence in regulatory agencies. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 13(4), 415-430.
- Keenan, E. (2015). Bill Blair's version of g20 'accountability' leaves plenty of questions. Retrieved September, 1, 2015, from: <http://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2015/09/01/bill-blairs-version-of-g20-accountability-leaves-plenty-of-questions-keenan.html>
- Kelsey, D., & Bennett, L. (2014). Discipline and resistance on social media: Discourse, power and context in the Paul Chambers 'Twitter Joke Trial'. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 3, 37-45.
- Kiss, S. (2009). Cell Phones and Surveillance: Mobile Technology, States, and Social Movements. In S. Hier (Ed.), *Surveillance power, problems, and politics*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Koskela, H. (2003). 'Cam era' – The contemporary urban panopticon. *Surveillance & Society*, 1(3), 292-313.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Lee, A. (2015). Integrating subjects: Linking surveillance experiences to social patterns using ethno-epistemic assemblages. *Surveillance & Society*, 13(3/4), 385-399.
- Leung, L. (2009). User-generated content on the internet: An examination of gratifications, civic engagement and psychological empowerment. *New Media & Society*, 11(8), 1327-1347.
- Loftus, B. (2010). Police occupational culture: Classic themes, altered times. *Policing & Society*, 20(1), 1-20.
- Loftus, B., & Goold, B. (2011). Covert surveillance and the invisibilities of policing. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 12(3), 275-288.
- Locke, J. (2010). *Eavesdropping an intimate history*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Loseke, D. R. (2008). *Thinking about social problems: An introduction to constructionist perspectives*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers
- Lyon, D. (2002). *Surveillance society: Monitoring everyday life*. Buckingham [England: Open University Press.
- Lyon, D. (2007). *Surveillance Studies: An Overview*. Cambridge, UK: Polity
- Lyon, D. (2008). Biometrics, identification and surveillance. *Bioethics*, 22(9), 499-508.
- Lyon, D., & Wood, D. M. (2012). Security, surveillance, and sociological analysis. *Canadian Sociological Association*, 49(4), 317-327.
- MacLean, L. M., Meyer, M., & Estable, A. (2004). Improving accuracy of transcripts in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14(1), 113-123.
- Mai-Duc, C. (2014). Cleveland officer who killed Tamir Rice had been deemed unfit for duty. *LA Times*. Retrieved June 15, 2015, from <http://www.latimes.com/nation/nationnow/la-na-nn-cleveland-tamir-rice-timothy-loehmann-20141203-story.html>.
- Manjoo, F. (2009, June 25). The revolution will not be digitized: How the Internet helps Iran silence activists. Retrieved November 9, 2014, from http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/technology/2009/06/the_revolution_will_not_be_digitized.html
- Mann, S., Nolan, J., & Wellman, B. (2003). Sousveillance: Inventing and Using Wearable Computing Devices. *Surveillance & Society*, 1(3), 331-355.
- Mann, S. (2005). Sousveillance cyberlogs: A 30-year empirical voyage through ethical, legal, and policy issues. *Presence*, 14(6), 625-646.

- Mann, S., & Ferenbok, J. (2013). New media and the power politics of sousveillance in a surveillance-dominated world. *Surveillance & Society, 11*(1-2), 18-34.
- Martin, B. (2005). The beating of Rodney King: The dynamics of backfire. *Critical Criminology, 13*, 307-326.
- Marwick, A. E. (2012). The public domain: Social surveillance in everyday life. *Surveillance & Society, 9*(4), 378-393.
- Marx, G. T. (2003). A tack in the shoe: Neutralizing and resisting the new surveillance. *Journal of Social Issues, 59*(2), 369-390.
- Mateescu, A., Rosenblat, A., & Boyd, D. (2015). Police body-worn cameras. *Data & Society Working Paper Series*, 1-40.
- Mathiesen, T. (1997). The viewer society: Michel Foucault's 'panopticon' revisited. *Theoretical Criminology, 1*(2), 215-234.
- Mauthner, N. S., & Doucet, A. (2003). Reflexive accounts and accounts of reflexivity in qualitative data analysis. *Sociology, 37*(3), 413-431.
- Mawby, R. C. (1999). Visibility, transparency and police-media relations. *Policing and Society, 9*, 263-286.
- Mayer-Schönberger, Viktor. *Delete: The Virtue of Forgetting in the Digital Age*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2009.
- Mazerolle, L., Antrobus, E., Bennett, S., & Tyler, T. R. (2013). Shaping citizen perceptions of police legitimacy: A randomized field trial of procedural justice. *Criminology, 51*(1), 33-63.
- McCarthy, T. (2014). Cleveland officer who fatally shot Tamir Rice judged unfit for duty in 2012. Retrieved December 4, 2014, from: <http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2014/dec/03/officer-who-fatally-shot-tamir-rice-had-been-judged-unfit>
- McLean, J (2016). Serious police discipline cases often handled in secret: Star investigation. Retrieved January, 11, 2016, from: <http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2016/01/11/serious-police-discipline-cases-often-handled-in-secret-star-investigation.html>
- McLellan, E., MacQueen, K. M., & Neidig, J. L. (2003). Beyond the qualitative interview: Data preparation and transcription. *Field Methods, 15*(1), 63-84.
- Mead, G., & Morris, C. (1934). *Mind, self & society from the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.

- Millberry K. & Clement, A. (forthcoming). Policing as spectacle and the politics of surveillance at the Toronto G20. In Margaret E. Beare and Nathalie Des Rosiers (eds.) *The State on Trial: Policing Protest*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Miller, J. (2012). Grounding the analysis of gender and crime: Accomplishing and interpreting qualitative interview research. In Gadd, Karstedt & Messner (eds). *The Sage Handbook of Criminological Research Methods*. Los Angeles: Sage, 49-62
- Möller, F. (2010a). Rwanda revisualized: Genocide, photography, and the era of the witness. *Alternatives*, 35, 113-136.
- Möller, F. (2010b). Photography after empire: Citizen-photographers or snappers on autopilot? *New Political Science*, 32(4), 501-513.
- Morales, S. (2015). Toronto police caught on camera obstructing filming of arrest. Retrieved October, 27, 2015, from: <http://globalnews.ca/news/2302646/toronto-police-caught-on-camera-obstructing-filming-of-arrest/>
- Mortensen, M. (2014). Who is surveilling whom? Negotiations of surveillance and sousveillance in relation to wikileaks' release of the gun camera tape collateral murder. *Photographies*, 7(1), 12-37.
- Mortensen, T. B., & Keshelashvili, A. (2013). If everyone with a camera can do this, then what? Professional photojournalists' sense of professional threat in the face of citizen photojournalism. *Visual Communication Quarterly*, 20, 144-158.
- Murray, K. H. (2010). Police legitimacy and policing public protest. 36, the *Working Paper Series*.
- Neuendorf, K. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Neuman, L. (2011). Social Research methods: *Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Toronto: Pearson, Chapter 4.
- Newell, B. C. (2014a). Crossing lenses: Policing's new visibility and the role of 'smartphone journalism' as a form of freedom-preserving reciprocal surveillance. *Journal of Law, Technology, and Policy*, 1, 59-104.
- Newell, B. C. (2014b). Technopolicing, surveillance, and citizen oversight: A neorepublican theory of liberty and information control. *Government Information Quarterly*, 31, 421-431.
- O'Connor, C. D. (2008). Citizen attitudes toward police in Canada. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 31(4), 578-595.

- O'Malley, P., Weir, L., & Shearing, C. (1997). Governmentality, criticism, politics. *Economy and Society*, 26(4), 501-517.
- O'Reilly, T. (2007). What is web 2.0: Design patterns and business models for the next generation of software. *Communications and Strategies*, 65(1), 17-37.
- Oleinik, A. (2010). Mixing quantitative and qualitative content analysis: Triangulation at work. *Quality and Quantity*, 48, 859-873.
- Öngün, E., & Demírag, A. (2014). Are we digital masters or captives? A critical evaluation of panoptic versus synoptic effect of surveillance in social media. *Journal of Media Critiques*, 1, 27-42.
- Ortiz, E. (2015). *George Holliday, who taped Rodney King beating, urges others to share videos*. Retrieved September 18, 2015 from: <http://www.nbcnews.com/nightly-news/george-holliday-who-taped-rodney-king-beating-urges-others-share-n372551>
- Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen eighty-four, a novel*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Palys, T., & Atchison, C. (2008). Research Decisions: *Qualitative and Quantitative Perspectives*. Toronto: Thomson Nelson, Chapter 1.
- Patton, P. (1994). Metamorpho-logic: Bodies and powers in a thousand plateaus. *Journal of British Society for Phenomenology*, 25(2), 157-170.
- Phillips, T., & Smith, P. (2000). Police violence occasioning citizen complain. *British Journal of Criminology*, 40(3), 480-496.
- Poisson, J., & McLean, J. (2015). Peel police's sexual-harassment records revealed. Retrieved November 18, 2015 from: <http://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2015/11/30/peel-polices-sexual-harassment-records-revealed-records.html>
- Poland, B. D. (1995). Transcription quality as an aspect of rigor in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1(3), 290-310.
- Poland, B., & Pederson, A. (1998). Reading between the lines: Interpreting silences in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 4(2), 293-312.
- Rankin, J. (2012). *James Bishop suing Toronto police and YMCA over 'violent' arrest*. Retrieved October 13th, 2013, from: http://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2012/07/07/james_bishop_suing_toronto_police_and_ymca_over_violent_arrest.html
- Reeves, J. (2012). If you see something, say something: Lateral surveillance and the uses of responsibility. *Surveillance & Society*, 10(3-4), 235-248.

- Reilly, P. (2013). Every little helps? YouTube, sousveillance and the 'anti-Tesco' riot in Stokes Croft. *New Median & Society*, 0(0), 1-17.
- Reiss Jr, A. (1968). Police brutality – Answer to key questions. *Trans-Action*, 5(8), 10-19.
- Roulston, K. (2010). Considering quality in qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative Research*, 10(2), 199-228.
- Roulston, K., deMarrais, K., & Lewis, J. B. (2003). Learning to interview in the social sciences. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9(4), 643-668.
- Rubinstein, D., & Sluis, K. (2008). A life more photographic: Mapping the networked image. *Photographies*, 1(1), 9-28.
- Schilling, J. (2006). On the pragmatics of qualitative assessment: Designing the process for content analysis. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 22(1), 28-37.
- Sewell, G., & Wilkinson, B. (1992). 'Someone to watch over me': Surveillance, discipline and the Just-In-Time labour process. *Sociology*, 26(2), 271-289.
- Shifman, L. (2013). *Memes in digital culture*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Simon, B. (2005). The return of panopticism: Supervision, subjection and the new surveillance. *Surveillance & Society*, 3(1), 1-20.
- Simonson, J. (Forthcoming). Copwatching. *California Law Review*, 104, 1-57.
- Smith, G. (2009). Why don't more people complain against the police? *European Journal of Criminology*, 6(3), 249-266.
- Sousveillance Network. (2009). *Sousveillance network: Surveying the emergent global sousveillance society*. Retrieved August 8, 2014 from: <http://www.sousveillance.net/about>
- Stenning, P., Birkbeck, C., Adang, O., Baker, D., Feltes, T., Gabaldón, L. G., Haberfield, M., Machado, E. P. & Waddington, P. A. J. (2009). Researching the use of force: The background to the international project. *Crime, law and Social Change*, 52(2), 95-100.
- Stratton, M., Messier, S., & Rankin, H. (2014) Panel discussion: Does body worn video help or hinder de-escalation. Retrieved February 5, 2014, from: <http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/gazette/vol76no1/discussion-debat-eng.htm>
- Strijbos, J., Martens, R. L., Prins, F. J., & Jochems, W. M. G. (2006). Content Analysis: What are they talking about? *Computers and Education*, 46, 29-48.

- Taylor, S., & Bogdan, R. (1984). *Introduction to quantitative research methods: The search for meanings* (2nd ed.) New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Terrill, W., Paoline III, E. A., & Manning, P. K. (2003). Police culture and coercion. *Criminology*, 41(4), 1003-1034.
- Thompson, J. B. (2005). The new visibility. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 22(6), 31-51.
- Timan, T., & Oudshoorn, N. (2012). Mobile cameras as new technologies of surveillance? How citizens experience the use of mobile cameras in public nightscapes. *Surveillance & Society*, 10(2), 167-181.
- Trottier, D. (2013). Crowdsourcing CCTV surveillance on the Internet. *Information, Communication & Society*. 17(5), 609-626.
- Tsekeris, C., Katerlos, I. (2012). Web 2.0, complex networks and social dynamics. *Contemporary Social Science*, 7(3), 233-246.
- Uimonen, P. (1997). *Internet as a Tool for Social Development*. paper presented at the annual conference of the Internet Society, INET 97, Kuala Lumpur, 24-27, June. <http://www.net4dev.se/uimonen/INET97.htm>
- Vaismoradi, M., Turunen, H., & Bondas, T. (2013). Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nursing and Health Sciences*, 15, 398-405.
- van Dijck, J. (2009). Users like you? Theorizing agency in user-generated content. *Media, Culture & Society*, 31(1), 41-58.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 42, 249-283.
- Verde Garrido, M. (2015). Contesting a biopolitics of information and communications: The importance of truth and sousveillance after Snowden. *Surveillance & Society*, 13(2), 153-167.
- Vertesi, J. (2015). The problem with police body cameras. Retrieved June, 1, 2015, from: <http://time.com/3843157/the-problem-with-police-body-cameras/>
- Wasburn, P. (1974). Political sociology in the United States: A case study of theoretical change and continuity. *Human Relations*, 27(4), 321-337.
- Wasserman, H. M. (2009). Orwell's vision: Video and the future of civil rights enforcement. *Maryland Law Review*, 68, 600-661.
- Watson, C. (2005). Discourse of 'indiscipline': a Foucauldian response. *Emotional and*

- Behavioural Difficulties*, 10(1), 55-65.
- Weber, K. (2012). Surveillance, sousveillance, equiveillance: Google glasses. Working Paper Series. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2095355>.
- Weitzer, R. (2002). Incidents of police misconduct and public opinion. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 397-408.
- Welch, M. (2011). Counterveillance: How Foucault and the Groupe d'information sur les prisons reversed the optics. *Theoretical Criminology*, 15(3), 301-313.
- White, M. D. & Marsh, E. E. (2006). Content analysis: A Flexible methodology. *Library Trends*, 55(1), 22-45.
- White, M. (2016). *The end of protest – A new playbook for revolution*. Toronto: Knopf Canada a division of Random House of Canada.
- Wilkinson, B., & Lippert, R. (2012). Moving images through an assemblage: Police, visual information, and resistance. *Critical Criminology*, 20, 311-325.
- Wilson, D., & Serisier, T. (2010). Video activism and the ambiguities of counter-surveillance. *Surveillance & Society*, 8(2), 166-180.
- Witherspoon, P. (2014). Police body cameras in Missouri: Good or bad policy? An academic viewpoint seen through the lens of a former law professional official. *Missouri Policy Journal*, 2, 35-40.
- Wood, D. (2003). Editorial. Foucault and panopticism revisited. *Surveillance & Society*, 1(3), 234-239.
- Wright, D., Rodrigues, R., Raab, C., Jones, R., Székely, I., Ball, K., Bellanova, R., & Bergersen, S. (2015). Questioning surveillance. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 31, 280-292
- Zerbisias, A. (2014, January 28). Cop Watch app records police-citizen interactions. Retrieved February 5, 2014, from: http://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2014/01/28/cop_watch_app_records_policecitizen_interactions.html
- Zimmerman, M. A. & Rappaport, J. (1988). Citizen participation, perceived control, and psychological empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 16(5), 725-750.

Appendix A

Letter of Information

Title of the study: *Harnessing Power: A thematic exploration of sousveillance and the desire to watch the watchers in a brave new world of surveillance.*

Principal Investigator (Student): Mr. David Schwartz
M.A. Student
School of
University of Ottawa
Ottawa, ON

Co-investigator/Thesis Supervisor (Supervisor): **Dr. Michael Kempa**
Associate Professor
School of
University of Ottawa
Ottawa, ON
(613) 562-5800 ext. 2572

Invitation to Participate: I am invited to participate in the abovementioned research study conducted by *David Schwartz* and his Thesis Supervisor *Michael Kempa, PhD*.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of the study is to examine surveillance from the point of view of everyday community members. This form of community surveillance is known as sousveillance and is a new way for Canadian citizens to, among other things, record the police when they are committing acts of excessive physical acts of force on community members. The goal of this project is to identify the motivations of community members engaging in this behaviour.

Participation: My participation will consist essentially of conducting a single interview session that should last approximately 1 hour during which I will answer questions regarding my experience(s) with sousveillance/community surveillance. The interview session will be audio-recorded. Inclusion in this study will be based on a first-come, first-serve basis. The interview session will be conducted solely in English. Participation in the study will be based on the following: one's involvement with either a sub-culture or counter-culture movement; a journalist who has written about citizen involvement who have experience regarding this growing phenomenon of sousveillance; and finally, community members who have photographed or video recorded a police officer engaged in an altercation with a citizen.

Benefits: Through the contribution of participant's insights and experiences regarding sousveillance, the abovementioned research will be the first to offer a typology of sousveillance users. Participation in this research study will contribute information to better understand the

motivations of sousveillance users. Participation will also lead to uncover how sousveillance users think, and whether or not sousveillance users think about their contribution to society, if at all, as a positive experience.

Risks: Participation in this study will entail that personal information will be volunteered regarding opinions and experiences with the police, social media and social networking be used. Sharing this information may cause exposure in the sense that personal details are being shared. There are assurances from the researcher that every effort will be made to minimize these risks. Participation in the study will allow the ability to speak freely and honestly about the police. Withdrawal from the study may occur at any time should one no longer feel comfortable providing this information.

Confidentiality and Anonymity: The information being shared will remain strictly confidential. The contents of the information to be shared will be used only for the purpose of this study and in an effort to draw out explicit and principal themes gathered from the interview. The audio recordings, transcribed transcripts and interview data will be kept alongside a separate document containing the list of participant names which have been coded and given a pseudonym to protect anonymity. No information will be gathered that would allow research participants to be identified through their name, address, social insurance number, personal health number, date of birth, place of residence or any unique personal characteristics. More so, there will be no probing for past criminal activity. The topic of past criminal activity may be spoken about, but purely at the discretion of the participant. Plans for future criminal involvement should not be spoken about as the audio-recording device that captures the information may be seized under the Canadian Evidence Act.

Conservation of data: All information will be safeguarded via a user-name and password protected data-stick USB drive that only the primary researcher and thesis supervisor will have access to. The data will be kept in a lock and key cabinet, located in the research supervisors' office, located at the University of Ottawa campus, alongside the only digital copy that contains the names of the participants and the coding key for how the names will be changed/used within the research (to be held on a separate USB stick, but alongside the other items). The data will be conserved for a period of 5 years before it will be permanently deleted.

Voluntary Participation: You are under no obligation to participate and if you choose to participate. You may refuse to answer questions that you do not want to answer.

Information about the Study Results: Participants will be afforded the ability to review their transcript in its entirety after the interview has been transcribed. If you have any questions or require more information about the study itself, you may contact the researcher or his/her supervisor at the numbers mentioned herein.

If you have any questions with regards to the ethical conduct of this study, you may contact the Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, Tabaret Hall, 550 Cumberland Street, Room 154, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5, tel.: (613) 562-5387 or ethics@uottawa.ca.

Please keep this form for your records.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

becoming a sousveillance user. More so, my participation in this study will offer information regarding how (potential) sousveillance users think, and whether or not they view their contribution to society as a positive thing, if at all.

Confidentiality and Anonymity: The information I share will remain strictly confidential. The contents of the information to be shared will be used only for the purpose of this study and in an effort to drawing out both the explicit, as well as, underlying themes gathered from the interview. I have been made assurances that the audio recordings, transcripts and interview data will be kept alongside a separate document containing the list of participant names, which have been coded and given a pseudonym to protect anonymity. No personal information will be gathered that would allow myself or other research participants to be identified through our name, address, social insurance number, personal health number, date of birth, place of residence or any unique personal characteristics. More so, I will not be asked to speak about my past criminal activity, should it exist or not. The topic of past criminal activity may be spoken about, but purely at the discretion of myself. My anonymity will be guaranteed within the limits of the law, but information may be collected with respect to the Canada Evidence Act should I mention plans for future criminal activity.

Conservation of data: My information will be safeguarded via a user-name and password protected USB drive that only the primary researcher and his thesis supervisor will have access to. The data will be kept in a lock and key cabinet, located in the research supervisors' office, located at the University of Ottawa campus, alongside the only digital copy that contains the names of the participants and the coding key for how the names will be changed. (to be held on a separate USB stick, but alongside the other items). The data will be conserved for a period of 5 years before it will be permanently deleted.

Voluntary Participation: I am under no obligation to participate and if I choose to participate, I can withdraw from the study at any time and/or refuse to answer any questions, without suffering any negative consequences. If I choose to withdraw, all data gathered until the time of withdrawal will be destroyed and deleted.

Acceptance: I, _____, agree to participate in the above research study conducted by David Schwartz of the (Department of Criminology, in the Faculty of Social Sciences, at the University of Ottawa), wherein the research is under the supervision of Professor Michael Kempa.

If I have any questions about the study, I may contact the researcher or his supervisor.

If I have any questions regarding the ethical conduct of this study, I may contact the

Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, Tabaret Hall, 550

Cumberland Street, Room 154, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5

Tel.: (613) 562-5387

Email: ethics@uottawa.ca

There are two copies of the consent form, one of which is mine to keep.

Participant's signature:

Date:

Researcher's signature:

Date:

Appendix C

Interview Guide

1. How would you describe the relationship that currently exists between police and community members?
2. What does citizen surveillance mean to you?
3. What have your experiences been like with the police?
4. In what ways have those experiences with the police shaped what you feel you could or could not do while around them?
5. How do you understand your rights in a protest environment?
6. Have you ever seen the police engaging in acts of excessive force that some might categorize as police brutality?
 - a. Can you give me examples?
 - b. What did you do? And;
 - c. If so, did you feel as if there is anything you could do to help the victim?
7. Have you ever used social media, including Twitter, Facebook or YouTube to voice your thoughts on the police? If so, which ones? How often?
8. For what purpose would you ever video record the police using your phone, video camera or other wireless mobile technology?
9. How have improvements in technology changed the ways in which you interact with the police?
10. What do you believe could be a reason for recording police-civilian incidents?
11. What could be a reason for sharing the footage of that incident online for potentially millions of people to see?

12. What are your thoughts in respect to whether or not police officers should begin wearing a camera as part of their uniform?
13. Should the police be held responsible for their actions?
14. Is there anything else you would like to ask that hasn't already been covered/spoken about?