

**Social Media as an Outlet for Community Response and Dialogue Following the
2011 Vancouver Stanley Cup Riot**

Eathan Lindsay

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

Department of Criminology
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Ottawa

© Eathan Lindsay, Ottawa, Canada, 2014

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research is dedicated to my mother, Patricia, without whose love and constant motivation, pursuing this research project would never have been possible.

I am sincerely grateful to my supervisor, Dr. Valerie Steeves, for her valuable feedback, unfailing guidance, and patience, as well as her inspirational enthusiasm for academia. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Dr. Jennifer Lavoie, without whose early mentorship I would not have considered pursuing this research project.

I would also like to acknowledge the support and financial assistance received from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the University of Ottawa.

Additionally, I express my deep admiration and appreciations to my fellow colleagues at the University of Ottawa, from whom I have received more helpful advice than I could ever have imagined, and to the close friends who stuck by me even when I would periodically disappear into periods of solitary reading and writing.

I also extend a deeply indebted “thank you” to Nescafe for support of a more unique, yet nonetheless essential kind.

And lastly, to God, in whom all things are possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	p. iv
Chapter 1: Introduction	p. 1
Chapter 2: Literature Review	p. 7
2.1 Collective Violence and Riotous Contexts	p. 7
2.2 Social Media and Collective Violence	p. 12
2.3 Community Identity and Online Spaces as Virtual Communities	p. 23
2.4 Crowd-Sourced Policing, Cyber Vigilantism, and Cyber Harassment	p. 26
2.5 Behavioural Norms and the Growing Privatization of Public Space	p. 30
2.6 Punishment and Vengeance	p. 33
2.7 The Law and Order Ideology or the “Get Tough” Approach	p. 37
2.8 The Threat of Victimization	p. 39
2.9 Culpability and Due Process	p. 41
Chapter 3: Methodology	p. 43
3.1 Theoretical Model for Analysis	p. 43
3.2 Methodological Approach	p. 49
3.3 Data Sources	p. 51
3.4 Data Collection Procedures	p. 52
3.5 Sampling Method	p. 53
3.6 Stages of Qualitative Content Analysis	p. 54
3.7 Criteria of Selection and Inclusion	p. 55
3.8 Methodological Limitations	p. 58
3.9 Ethical Considerations	p. 60
Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Discussion	p. 62
4.1 Constructing Communities	p. 63
4.2 Community Image Maintenance and the Communication and Enforcement of Community Behavioural Norms	p. 67
4.3 Crowd-Sourced Policing	p. 83
4.4 Cyber Vigilantism	p. 103
Chapter 5: Conclusion	p. 116
References	p. 124

ABSTRACT

The 2011 Vancouver Stanley Cup riot (VSCR)—one of the most significant sports-related public disorder events to occur in Vancouver in recent decades—was the first sporting riot in North America that was characterised by the use of social media (McCann, 2011). Given this significant influence, this research uses qualitative content analysis to explore how persons posting on Facebook pages dedicated to the VSCR in the six months following constructed the meaning of the event and its participants. Using the insights of social identity theory, the findings suggest that online discussions of this event centred on an understanding of communities and community membership which was reflected in individuals’ attempts to reassert specific community identities as “law abiding” and “peaceful”, primarily accomplished through the identification, othering, and derogation of riot participants. The findings further suggest that the VSCR was constructed as damaging to the reputations of particular communities and their members resulting in the need for community repair, while its participants were constructed as deviant and threatening “others” who were deserving of punishment, vengeful conduct, and strict police treatment.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

While rioting and other forms of collective violence have occurred for centuries (Marx, 1970), it has only been within the last two decades that these events have become organized through, influenced by, or responded to via internet-based communication technologies (Boyd & Ellison, 2008), of which one type has been social media. The range of social media forms that are presently available permit individuals to—almost instantaneously—document, distribute information about, and respond to the criminal acts committed during riots (Schneider & Trottier, 2012). From mobile forms of communication such as Blackberry Messenger (Baker, 2012b), to the microblogging tool Twitter (Brown, 2012; Comunella & Anzera, 2012), and to media sharing sites such as YouTube (Newnham & Bell, 2012; Poell & Borra, 2011), emerging social media platforms have not only facilitated the modernisation of riotous events (Jurgenson, 2012; Panagiotopoulos et al., 2012), but also their transformation in the twenty-first century (Baker, 2012a; Greer & McLaughlin, 2010), providing a new space for individuals to organize and incite collective disorder, deliberate about the various issues that both influence these events and emerge following them, organize community outreach initiatives in response, and for law enforcement to distribute emergency information during these events.

As the term is used herein, “social media” may be understood as web-based applications such as weblogs and social networking sites that enable social interaction and the creation and exchange of user-generated content (Eisenlauer, 2013, p. 6). This social interaction is known among academics as “computer-mediated communication” (CMC), referring to communication that takes place between individuals through computer-based means such as the internet, mobile text messaging, instant messaging, email interactions, and video-conferencing (Pantelli, 2008, p. 3). Social media “outlets” provide a way for individuals to upload content such as images and

video and to make such content available to numerous other users (Kear, 2011, p. 37). Some outlets such as Facebook also have tools for creating “pages” around specific shared interests such as music, photography, or celebrity fandom (Kear, 2011, p. 37); these pages may also be created in response to specific issues or events. Users reading comments posted by others can signify their support or agreement by clicking on a “like” icon.

Social media outlets first appeared on the internet in 1994 to facilitate the broadcasting of content from “many to many” (Murthy, 2012, p. 1062), but it was not until 2003 that they began attracting the membership of millions and were subsequently created in larger numbers (Boyd & Ellison, 2008). It is primarily for this reason that within the social sciences and humanities, the study of these outlets is a relatively new area of scholarship (Murthy, 2012). Facebook is one of many social media outlets that has gained prolific popularity within the last decade. This outlet was founded in 2004 as an exclusive online community service for Harvard University students, yet witnessed exponential growth when it expanded its membership to all Internet users in 2005. Today, it is the world’s largest and most popular social media outlet (Schroeder et al., 2013) with more than one billion active users (Ljepava et al., 2013; Wagner, 2013) in 127 countries (Kirmayer et al., 2013) who make over 60 million status updates per day (Eisenlauer, 2013).

The explicit aim of Facebook is the support of social ties, permitting users to create, manage, and maintain ties of so-called “friendship” with other individuals (Eisenlauer, 2013, p. 29). Despite this aim, the information that users choose to disclose in their “profile” is largely a matter of personal preference. While they may be genuine in their inclusion of personal details—first and second name, photo, gender, places lived, relationship status, birthdate, past and current schools and employers, connections, contact information, political and religious views, leisure activities, and preferred forms of entertainment—they may list some of these details yet not

others, fabricate certain details, or make certain details viewable only to particular users (Eisenlauer, 2013, p. 32). It is for this reason that identity management—the ability of users to be selective in the presentation of facets of their identity—defines most social media (Eisenlauer, 2013).

Facebook is also one of the most widely used forms of social media in riotous contexts (Schneider & Trottier, 2012; Wain & Joyce, 2012), and it was used both during and following the 2011 Stanley Cup riot in Vancouver, British Columbia. The 2011 Vancouver Stanley Cup riot (“VSCR”) was a low-intensity instance of collective violence (McPhail & Wohlstein, 1983) that occurred on June 15, 2011 during the final game of the Stanley Cup Finals. Consistent with its practice of hosting large public events and in response to growing enthusiasm from the media (City of Vancouver, 2011), with the assistance of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the City of Vancouver set up fan zones known as “Live Sites” where crowds could gather to watch the game (McCann, 2011, p. 4). Yet with only minutes left until the game’s end, many of the 55,000 fans estimated to have gathered at the Live Sites—in addition to several of the 100,000 other people wandering the streets nearby—began throwing bottles at game screens and engaging in small-scale fights. This behaviour quickly escalated to include looting of local businesses, damage to property, assault of bystanders and police, and the vandalism, overturning, and setting of cars ablaze (Furlong & Keefe, 2011; McCann, 2011).

In a matter of hours, this instance of collective violence became the most significant sports-related public disorder event to occur in Vancouver since the Stanley Cup riot of 1994 (McCann, 2011), temporarily altering Vancouver’s reputation as a tranquil, beautiful, and welcoming city (City of Vancouver, 2011). In due course, an estimated \$1.1 million in property damage resulted, over one hundred individuals were injured, and 106 participants were

immediately charged, although upwards of one thousand people were estimated to have participated (McCann, 2011). This event marked Vancouver's fourth and Canada's eleventh major sporting riot within the last eighty years, and was the eighth time a riot has ensued in connection with the Stanley Cup (City of Vancouver, 2011).

In contrast to the strikingly similar riot of 1994, the VSCR was defined by the reaction to it on Facebook (Schneider & Trottier, 2012). While the riot was occurring, some participants were publicising their involvement on the site, using it largely as a "celebratory tool" (Furlong & Keefe, 2011, p. 124) and others were capturing photos of participants which were later posted to Facebook to assist police investigators identify suspects. Post-riot clean-up campaigns were also organized, in which hundreds volunteered (McCann, 2011). In the days following the riot, group sites (pages) were created on Facebook where individuals discussed and debated issues related to the riot including youth deviance, the riot's causes and consequences, "appropriate" punishments for riot participants, and the response of police to the wrongdoing. Given the popularity of these Facebook pages, McCann (2011) calls the VSCR "the first North American social media sports riot" (p. 7).

This thesis explores the comments made on three Facebook pages dealing with the VSCR in the six months following the riot. I conducted a qualitative content analysis, rooted in social constructionism, to examine how individuals who participated in the discussion of this event on these pages (referred to herein as "posters") constructed the meaning of the VSCR and its participants. I also use social identity theory to explain the various behaviours that posters performed on social media through their commentary following the VSCR.

In light of the growing popularity and affordances of social media (Boyd & Ellison, 2008; Kear, 2011) and the influence of these technologies within the context of collective violence (Bremmer, 2010; Myers, 2000; Tonnevold, 2009; Tonkin et al., 2012; among others), this research aims to add to current literature that explores how citizens are increasingly adopting social media as outlets through which to respond to criminality in their communities (Schneider & Trottier, 2012). Specifically, it examines how these technologies have introduced new opportunities for community-based coping behaviours following the VSCR, which reflects recent literature positing that social media outlets have enabled users to distribute information about instances of collective violence and openly discuss issues related to these events (Baker, 2012a; Baker, 2012b; Cavanaugh & Dennis, 2012; Greer & McLaughlin, 2010; Kelly & Gill, 2012; Petray, 2011; Schneider & Trottier, 2012; Tonnevold, 2009; among others). This exploration of Facebook within the context of the VSCR will delineate some of these relevant issues, in addition to illuminating the ways in which the riot itself and its participants were constructed by community members through social media. As such, this thesis seeks to contribute to the existing stream of literature that examines the use of social media as a tool for community response and dialogue following instances of collective violence.

The thesis addresses the following research questions:

- (1) How did persons who participated in discussions on social media of the 2011 Vancouver Stanley Cup riot construct the meaning of the riot?
- (2) How did persons who participated in social media discussions construct the identities of people who committed criminal acts during the riot?

This thesis is organized as follows. Chapter two includes a review of the literature within the disciplines of criminology, psychology, political science, communications, and legal studies on rioting and collective violence, social media, and the use of social media within riotous contexts. It begins by outlining the understandings and features of rioting, collective violence, social media, and computer-mediated communication and then delineates scholarly understandings of community identity and virtual communities. Next, the meaning and significance of three online activities—“crowd-sourced policing” (Schneider & Trottier, 2012, p. 57), cyber vigilantism, and cyber harassment—are examined. This is followed by an exploration of the literature addressing behavioural norms and the “privatization of public space” (Papacharissi, 2010, p. 39), punishment and vengeance, the law and order or “get tough” (Sasson, 1995, p. 9) ideology, the threat of victimization, and culpability and due process.

In chapter three, I outline my methodological approach, describe the theoretical model adopted for analysis, address some of the methodological limitations and issues regarding reliability and validity, and briefly discuss the ethical considerations that arise when doing research on publically accessible online commentary. In chapter four, I describe and discuss my research findings. Interestingly, uses of the pages for vigilante response were limited. Instead, the pages were used to reinforce collective community identities and to redefine conceptions of social citizenship within the context of the violence. The conclusion, in chapter five, revisits the research questions and discusses the significance of this research, especially given the ongoing development of social media. Here, I also situate my findings within the relevant stream of collective violence-related inquiry.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Currently, there is extensive academic literature that focuses on either collective violence and riotous contexts in general or the connection between collective violence and the use of social media in particular, with both streams of research, considered separately, quite voluminous. This chapter provides an overview of the literature within the disciplines of criminology, psychology, political science, communications, and legal studies on rioting and collective violence, social media, and the use of social media within riotous contexts. This chapter also explores the various concepts that became central to understanding how persons constructed the meaning of the VSCR and the identities of those who committed criminal acts during this event. Research examining online spaces or “virtual communities” (Porter, 1997, p. 5), the emergence of “crowd-sourced policing” (Schneider & Trottier, 2012, p. 57), and cyber harassment were especially valuable in this regard. An examination of these important concepts is entailed in this review of literature. First, I present the major arguments and conclusions reached by scholars whose principle focus is rioting and collective violence. Next, an overview of past research that has examined social media and their use within riotous contexts will be given, after which the significance of community identity, online communities, crowd-sourced policing, cyber vigilantism, and cyber harassment will be considered. Literature relevant to the other various themes that emerged from the Facebook commentary will then be presented.

2.1 Collective Violence and Riotous Contexts

Rioting—in both an historical and contemporary sense and in its many forms—can be both traumatic and progressive. While it can, on the one hand, alter citizen perceptions of safety, exacerbate community-police tensions, heighten racial polarization, and threaten entire

economies, it can also influence change in local governments and usher in opportunities for reform if structural concerns stimulating the violence are remediated (Ribiero, 2012; Vrouva & Dennington, 2011). As Torrens and McDaniel (2013) highlight, these differing outcomes may be due to the fact that many types of rioting are possible, each with different motivations and dynamics. Within past literature, the forms of rioting examined have included those in reaction to perceived racism and discrimination (Briggs, 2012; DiPasquale & Glaeser, 1998; Thompson, 2000), socio-political-economic concerns (Bauman, 2012; Comunella & Anzera, 2012; Wain & Joyce, 2012), police misconduct (Bridges, 2012; Durodié, 2012; Klein, 2012), and food shortages (Bush, 2010; O'Brien, 2012), as well as rioting by students and youth (Kaplowitz & Campo, 2004; Leonard, 2010; Newburn, 2012; Ruddell et al., 2005; Tonnevold, 2009), prison inmates (Boin & Rattray, 2004; Spiegel, 2007), and sports fans (Russell, 1995; 1998; 2004).

It is, however, the ever-present risk of *sporting* riots that has been a significant and persistent concern of governments, civil authorities, the military, and officials in the sports industry (Russell & Arms, 1998). This is perhaps due to their relatively unpredictable nature, potential for rapid escalation, and the tendency for participants of sporting riots to have a predisposition towards or past history of violent confrontation (Stott et al., 2008). During these events, anonymity is also substantially increased while self-awareness is diminished and individuals may wrongly perceive that their actions will be “favourably received” by other fans that might applaud their participation in the violence (Russell, 1995, p. 98), especially when such violence is used to restore self-esteem following a loss (Branscombe & Wann, 1992). In response to these concerning features, efforts to prevent and control riotous behaviour at sporting events have included banning alcohol, segregating rival fans, raising admission prices to discourage inappropriate behaviour (Russell, 1995), and—with specific regard to Vancouver’s preparation

for the Game 7 Stanley Cup playoff—removing potential projectiles and burnable objects, installing CCTV cameras, implementing bag checks and pat downs, and increasing private security and police presence (City of Vancouver, 2011). Although Wilkinson (2009) shows that several legal conceptions have been put forth, “rioting” in these instances broadly refers to unlawful assemblies of twelve or more persons (Paulson, 2009, p. 560) whom act violently towards others and purposefully destroy or vandalise property (McPhail & Wohlstein, 1983, p. 581). In addition to public demonstrations and political protests of which aggression is a central feature, rioting is therefore an example of “collective violence” in which two or more persons in a group setting engage in “one or more” violent behaviours (McPhail & Wohlstein, 1983, p. 580).

While rioting is most often the result of prior organization, it may be unexpected and largely spontaneous in nature (White, 2006), although this possibility of spontaneity has been subjected to criticism (Rudé, 1981; Thompson, 2000). It is perhaps for this reason that rioting is often framed within political commentary and the mainstream media as “anarchic” (Farrar, 2012, p. 75) and may be understood as “wild and loose festivity” (Paulson, 2009, p. 560) offering opportunities for criminality in the form of thievery, pillaging, and violence—many times by formerly law abiding individuals who simply become entangled in the current pandemonium. Indeed, one of the most alarming elements of rioting is how individuals with little to no prior criminal involvement often become relegated to “hooligans” involved in violence or “scavengers” who almost instinctively loot local businesses within these contexts (Baker, 2012a, p. 40; Durodié, 2012, p. 350). Wain and Joyce (2012) have referred to such individuals as “opportunists” who participate out of excitement or curiosity (p. 131). Treadwell et al. (2013) carry a similar view, arguing that riots present a rare opportunity for individuals to satisfy their consumerist greed and that looting during riots, specifically, is a product of “objectless

dissatisfaction” (p. 1). This potential for near-reflexive engagement in criminality within riotous contexts is indicative of Gustave Le Bon’s (1896) view of barbarianism; as he argues, in an organized crowd, “a man descends several rungs in the ladder of civilisation. Isolated, he may be a cultured individual; in a crowd, he is a barbarian—that is, a creature acting by instinct” (p. 13).

Attempts at understanding the Vancouver Stanley Cup riot (VSCR), specifically, may be accomplished by using terminology and expressions advanced in riot-related literature. Marx (1970) has been highly influential in this regard; in his seminal work, he coins the term “riots in celebration” (p. 31) to describe spontaneous instances of collective criminality following social occasions and sporting events. During these events, the moment at which violence will begin and the extent to which it may escalate is unknown. Adang (2011) has expanded upon this concept; a similar form of collective violence—“crowd violence not linked to a clearly identifiable trigger” (p. 63)—is characterised, simply, by violence that emerges almost spontaneously rather than due to any shared ideology or grievance. Elsewhere, Leonard (2010) describes a variant of these concepts known as “recreational rioting” (p. 38), referring to rioting as a form of entertainment or sociality rather than as a calculated reaction to injustice or oppression. This concept of recreational rioting closely resembles—and may, perhaps, be an extension of—Presdee’s (2000) “carnivalesque criminality” (Biressi & Nunn, 2003, p. 287), whereby a celebration of “doing wrong” takes place so that violence is reduced to a “trivial act of instant enjoyment” (Presdee, 2000, p. 65). In Presdee’s (2000) view, spontaneous eruptions of carnivalesque criminality may be considered riots.

Despite the contributions of these scholars to riots that are largely unprompted, “erratic”, “aimless” (Bagguley & Hussain, 2008, p. 17), or “issueless” (Marx, 1970, p. 21) in nature, Thompson (2000) argues that rioting for the thrill of lawlessness or violence is extremely rare in

comparison to those that are rational, instrumental expressions of individuals' discontent with societal issues, such as economic marginalization, political inequality, or racial discrimination. In her view, the VSCR would be an anomaly. Thompson's (2000) position on this matter is supported by the past findings of Rudé (1981), who demonstrates that riots, far from consisting of spontaneous deviance, typically have a clear purpose, with violence directed against specific targets: to protest governmental actions, officials in positions of authority, or the socially affluent, or to secure food and other resources of scarce supply. Bjork (2013), too, argues that "flash-point" rioting (p. 30) is rare; disturbances seldom start from nothing. As Horowitz (2001) maintains, this view of riotous behaviour as carefully planned and patterned rather than random and sporadic is echoed by a number of social science researchers.

Generally, it therefore seems that scholars of riotous behaviour carry largely diverging views as to whether riots can erupt spontaneously. Nevertheless, as one of the most common streams of inquiry in riot-related literature, social scientists from varying disciplines have, since the late 1960s, attempted to identify the precipitating factors associated with the occurrence of rioting (Russell & Arms, 1998; Wilkinson, 2009). Aside from socio-political-economic concerns, many of these scholars have pointed to alcohol consumption (White, 2006); authoritative or institutional breakdown (Boin & Rattray, 2004; Useem, 1998); the confrontational styles of police towards crowds, especially if in riot gear (White, 2006); and intergroup hostility (Durrant, 2011) as potential explanations. Although less prevalent in *current* literature, explanations rooted in evolutionary theory and the natural sciences have also been forwarded (Blumer, 1951; Durrant, 2011). Elsewhere, other researchers highlight various personality measures such as physical aggression, impulsivity (Russell & Arms, 1998), a lack of self-consciousness, psychopathy, extroversion, and low intelligence (Russell, 1995) as alternative explanations, while others argue

that, during riots, individuals' behaviour is largely influenced by the group milieu *itself*—that is, the social context (Adang, 2011; Allport, 1924; Bagguley & Hussain, 2008; Branscombe & Wann, 1992; Le Bon, 1986; Neville & Reicher, 2011; Reicher, 2011; Turner & Killian, 1987).

Ultimately, as Russell (1995) and Reicher (1984) argue, explanations for riot participation are largely based on generalization and speculation; there exists no known common feature or “magical collective identity” encompassed by all participants (Bagguley & Hussain, 2008, p. 12). Similarly, participation is generally evenly distributed across income, occupational, and educational divisions, thereby disconfirming scholarly hypotheses that participation is strictly determined by socio-economic marginality (Mason & Murtagh, 1985). Moreover, although King and Waddington (2013) contend that rioting may be more *likely* in communities with “disaffected young people” (p. 2), participation is also divided among age levels; racial oppression, discrimination, a desire for excitement, testosterone, and economic frustrations can prompt individuals of all ages to engage in riotous behaviour (Russell, 1995). This is not to say that certain riotous events draw more participation from youth, however; during the 2011 UK riots, for instance, more than half of the participants were between the ages of 18 and 24, while nearly a quarter were under 17 (Tester, 2012).

2.2 Social Media and Collective Violence

Due to the advanced capabilities offered by social media and the ease with which individuals may now connect to one another using them, numerous academics have closely examined their use within the context of rioting and other forms of collective violence. As will be illustrated, past research that has examined this relation has largely fallen within five broad streams of inquiry: (1) the use of social media to coordinate instances of collective violence or to

intensify riotous behaviour (Bremmer, 2010; Myers, 2000; Newnham & Bell, 2012; Razsa, 2013; Tonnevold, 2009; Vrouva & Dennington, 2011; among others); (2) the over-emphasis placed on social media in inciting collective violence (Fuchs, 2012); (3) the use of social media to facilitate positive responses from community members following a riot (Furlong & Keefe, 2011; McCann, 2011; Schneider & Trottier, 2012; Tonkin et al., 2012); (4) the use of social media for collective sense making during instances of community unrest following violent criminality (Brown & Billings, 2013; Coffey & Woolworth, 2004; Heverin & Zach, 2012; McCann, 2011; Panagiotopoulos et al., 2012; Schroeder et al., 2013); and (5) the use of social media to facilitate riot-centred dialogue, often in the form of “cyber rioting”, “citizen journalism”, or “mediated crowds” (Baker, 2012a; Baker, 2012b; Cavanagh & Dennis, 2012; Greer & McLaughlin, 2010; Kelly & Gill, 2012; Petray, 2011; Tonnevold, 2009; among others). Given its objectives, this research seeks to contribute to this fifth prominent stream of literature.

Highlighting their effectiveness within instances of violent political protest, Wolfsfeld et al. (2013) have commented that social media are a highly efficient mobilization tool; by allowing information and images to be conveyed on a much broader scale, they permit the motivation and eventual participation of third parties in the conflict. In fact, Jurgenson (2012) holds that the dissemination of networked information to produce massive gatherings of individuals—thereby merging the digital and physical realms—has become “the new normal” (p. 83). Razsa (2013) carries a similar view. Based on the theory that “seeing is believing” (p. 1), in commenting that “Image making...has become immanent to activist networks” (p. 13), Razsa (2013) argues that digital media in the form of picture and video content are being embraced within the spheres of political activism and rioting to depict physical confrontations with police and the frequent violation of protesters’ rights so as to evoke the emotional support of uninvolved citizens. Similar

conclusions have been reached by Comunella and Anzera (2012) and Tufekci and Wilson (2012); these authors find that, during the “Arab Spring” political protests, the dissemination of protest-related images and information on Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, online blogs, and personal websites greatly enhanced the probability that people would participate.

This use of social media to mobilize individuals against collective goals and produce citizen movements has been facilitated by the “mass communication of the self”—a form of communication made possible by social media outlets—whereby self-generated messages created by individual users have the potential to reach global audiences (Fenton & Barassi, 2011, p. 182). The work of Bremmer (2010) is largely based upon this concept. Bremmer (2010) argues that recent advances in communication technology—the internet and social networking, most notably—have permitted a continuously widening circle of people to conveniently share ideas, thus operating as valuable tools for citizens to “build alternative sources of power” (p. 1). Illustrating his ideas, Bremmer (2010) sites recent protests in Columbia and Myanmar throughout the last several years that have been largely coordinated through Facebook and the 2009 Iranian protests that were organized using Twitter.

In examining the use of mobile telecommunications, short internet videos, and the social media outlet *Skyblog* during the Paris riots of 2005, Tonnevold (2009), too, demonstrates the significant role that social media can play in inciting debate and facilitating further rioting. During this event, young riot participants used these technologies to create tension between authorities and youth as a whole by precipitating an “us versus them” mentality (pp. 95-97). Specifically, due to the ease with which online blogs can be maintained, content presented through these “alternative channels” challenged the way that events were presented in the mainstream, mass media and offered a method of communication among youth that was

independent from traditional outlets, thereby bypassing their gate-keeping capacities and permitting a flow of information that was predominantly riot-supportive in nature (p. 96).

Similar insights into other instances of collective violence are addressed in the literature. During the 2011 UK riots, both Vrouva and Dennington (2011) and Wain and Joyce (2012) argue that social media intensified the violence by allowing participants to disseminate information about police activities and mobilize support via Facebook, Twitter, and Blackberry Messenger. Research conducted by Briggs (2012) adds a more detailed understanding to these authors' conclusions. Briggs (2012) finds that riotous behaviour ensued after a photo of police standing over the body of a deceased suspect was posted to Facebook, after which online forums, Facebook, and Blackberry Messenger were used to coordinate acts of vehicle arson and vandalism, inform others of the businesses that were available to loot, and invite others to participate in looting.

Elsewhere, in their analysis of the 2010 London student protests, Newnham and Bell (2012) note that Facebook was used to organize protestors and plan protest routes, Twitter to provide updates on police movements and the current location and status of protestors, and YouTube to upload footage of "police brutality" in order to gain support from uninvolved or otherwise ignorant citizens. Howard and Hussain (2011), in writing of the Arab Spring political protests in Egypt and Tunisia, note that these same social media outlets—Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube—were used by citizens not only to express anger and frustration, debate issues of gender inequality, and discuss government corruption and policy alternatives, but also to build extensive networks of displeased citizens and organize political action. As they describe, the internet and social media "helped to turn individualized, localized, and community-specific dissent into a structured movement with a collective consciousness about both shared plights and

opportunities for action” (Howard & Hussain, 2011, p. 41). The findings of these many researchers help to shed light on Allport and Postman’s (1947) theory of social networking and the spread of rumor-like information within riotous contexts. As a fundamental principle, these authors argue that “rumors to incite, accompany, and intensify the violence” are a central element of most riots (p. 193).

While an extensive amount of research examining the effectiveness of social media in inciting or intensifying collective violence has been conducted, there exists a significant dichotomy among researchers, with some scholars highlighting their effectiveness while others discuss the absence of any such influence. Fuchs (2012), specifically, holds an opposing perspective in contrast to much of this earlier mentioned literature. In highlighting that politicians and the mass media wrongly advanced the understanding that social media had “caused” the 2011 UK riots, Fuchs (2012) argues that blaming social media for stimulating or orchestrating collective violence is merely a reductionist technique whereby a focus on technology replaces a focus on actual social problems. Fuchs refers to this over-emphasis as “technological determinism” (p. 386); by ignoring the embedded nature of technology in society and the fact that humans—rather than technology—arouse unrest, Fuchs maintains that “social problems are reduced to the level of technology” (pp. 386-387). In Fuchs’s view, social media and other communication technologies do not cause riots; rather, discontented individuals seek out these technologies to achieve their goals. Thus, instead of blaming social media for the UK riots and other instances of collective violence, blame should be redirected to the violent conditions that exist within society, which social media, at most, merely enhance.

Tonkin et al. (2012), too, are skeptical of social media’s influence within riotous contexts. After extensively examining the topics and content of 600,000 messages sent by Twitter users

during the 2011 UK riots, these authors reveal little evidence that this social media outlet was used to incite rioting or to promote other illegal activities during this event. Rather, these authors detail how various uses of Twitter both during and following the riots had *positive* implications. Users utilized hashtags¹ such as “#RiotWombles” and “#BroomArmy” to organize clean-up initiatives comprised of large groups of volunteers and, by developing the hashtag “#OperationCupOfTea”, other users encouraged community members to stay indoors and drink tea, thus establishing a sort of self-imposed curfew (p. 51). Additionally, campaigns were set up to raise money and awareness for individuals significantly affected by the events, such as one initiative that raised £30,000 (\$45,000) to assist in repairing local businesses and another that used the hashtag “#SomethingNiceForAshraf” to raise awareness of a Malaysian student named Ashraf Haziq who was assaulted and robbed by a group of young riot participants (pp. 51-52).

Adding to this body of literature is research by McCann (2011). In his review of the VSCR, McCann (2011) briefly discusses how social media were used by local citizens to organize a clean-up campaign in which hundreds participated as well as by bystanders to transmit photo and video evidence of riot participants to police, thereby contributing to the recovery and investigatory phases of the riot. Furlong and Keefe (2011) and Schneider and Trottier (2012) reach similar conclusions. These authors find that ordinary citizens present during the riot assisted in the investigation—Furlong and Keefe (2011, p. 124), in fact, argue that citizens essentially became “vigilantes”—by recording instances of criminality using photo and video capabilities on their cellular phones for later sharing with police so that participants could be identified and charged (Furlong & Keefe, 2011; Schneider & Trottier, 2012). Moreover, much of

¹ Twitter defines a “hashtag”, characterised by the “#” symbol, as a tool used to mark key words in a user message (or tweet). Twitter users insert this symbol in front of particular words or phrases to categorise their tweets, to make them easily searchable by others, and to participate in the Twitter discussion revolving around these key words.

this content was posted to social media outlets and circulated throughout the web, allowing others to view and share the material and identify participants even while the riot was still underway. Ultimately, Schneider and Trottier (2012) argue that Facebook emerged as a form of collective governance among citizens as well as a tool for surveillance by police in response to the VSCR.

The research conducted by McCann (2011), Furlong and Keefe (2011), and Schneider and Trottier (2012) offer valuable insights into the ways in which social media were used both during and following the VSCR, thus providing an initial basis upon which additional research may build. However, notwithstanding the significance of their scholarly contributions, these authors fail to closely examine how social media were used as tools for interactive community response and how these outlets served as a space for the valuable exchange of ideas to take place among online users. While also taking into account that numerous other works have focused upon social media within riotous contexts, an opportunity therefore exists for research to be conducted that would examine the *content of discussion* emerging on social media as a response to a riot. As will soon be addressed, this particular area, aside from Kelly and Gill's (2012) input, has been relatively unaddressed in the literature and such an analysis, with the exception of Schneider and Trottier's (2012) work, has not yet been conducted of a Canadian sporting riot.

Although not specifically focused upon riotous behaviour or instances of collective violence more generally, Heverin and Zach (2012) undertake a close analysis of the vital role that social media play for collective sense-making during times of community disorder. As these authors detail, the flow of crisis-related information has shifted in recent years, from being primarily disseminated by police departments and government agencies in a one-way communication model to now being communicated between members of the general public through such social media outlets as Facebook and Twitter. Heverin and Zach's (2012) findings

suggest that information sharing dominates early communications as individuals attempt to use social media to construct a meaningful picture of the events taking place, after which they are used to re-establish a sense of “normalcy” (p. 44).

Such findings parallel those reached by Panagiotopoulos et al. (2012), who highlight that Twitter was both an effective method of emergency communication during the 2011 UK riots and a successful tool for community recovery in the days following. Specifically, Twitter was used to control social disorder, as police immediately dispelled rumours relating to criminal activity and kept citizens updated on legal actions in progress. Furthermore, because citizens used Twitter to organize community support initiatives and praise those who participated in those events, the recovery stage of the riots was greatly accelerated and simplified. Echoing many of these findings are those reached by McCann (2011), who describes that the Vancouver Police Department (VPD) used Twitter extensively during the VSCR to disseminate information to those caught within the commotion. Predominantly, the VPD sent messages regarding the gradual escalation of crowd violence in the downtown, road closures, and the temporary cessation of Vancouver *SkyTrain* arrivals into particular areas. Messages were also sent encouraging people to remain calm and disperse for emergency services. Altogether, Twitter was a reliable and valued emergency communication device within the context of the VSCR, with almost all of the VPD’s messages being re-transmitted multiple times by other Twitter users (McCann, 2011).

Within this fourth stream of literature that addresses social media’s relation to instances of community disorder, Coffey and Woolworth’s (2004) research focus and resulting findings are perhaps most similar to those in this project. These authors examine how, in the days following a man’s murder by a group of youth, a web forum established by a local newspaper provided online participants with a space to share their thoughts and discuss controversial issues such as

retributive justice and capital punishment, gun control, police responses to young offenders, media reporting of crime, and the criminal justice process. As Coffey and Woolworth discover, while the forum's intentions were to understand why the incident took place, discuss how similar incidents may be prevented in the future, and express sympathy for the victim and his family, the forum instead became an outlet through which community members could dispel their outrage and frustration, with only five percent of online participants actually expressing any sort of sorrow or compassion for those affected. In due course, quite volatile topics arose for discussion as assailants and their families became the subjects of overwhelming criticism while online participants dually expressed their own extreme political and social viewpoints.

The last prominent theme of social media and collective violence related literature—the use of social media to facilitate riot-centred dialogue—has been greatly contributed to by a number of researchers. Previously discussed by Heverin and Zach (2012) and Panagiotopoulos et al. (2012), the use of social media to document events as they occur is reflective of Greer and McLaughlin's (2010) concept of “citizen journalism”—the spontaneous news reporting of extraordinary events by ordinary people (p. 1044). In exploring this new form of journalism during the 2009 G20 Summit protests, these authors contend that its emergence, largely facilitated by the growth of social media, has fundamentally altered the way news is generated, disseminated, and consumed in contemporary culture, permitting everyday individuals to become producers of news content and subsequently creating an unprecedented number of spaces with which to broadcast such information (Greer & McLaughlin, 2010).

In her analysis of the 2005 Paris riots, Tonnevold (2009, p. 92) demonstrates that social media facilitated the emergence of “cyber rioting” for the reason that although the riots were occurring in the streets, intense debates regarding them were happening via the internet. Baker

(2012b) offers similar insights with her assertion that social media outlets often operate as a “collective action space” against riot participants (p. 175). Following a riot, they may connect citizens from various geographies by being used to mobilize support on important socio-economic-political issues or to coordinate cleanup efforts, thereby engendering a sense of “social cohesion” (p. 175). For the reason that this social cohesion is produced through the virtual arena rather than through traditional means of communication, the individuals involved are participating in a variant of “push-button activism” (Petray, 2011, p. 923) and are commonly referred to as a “mediated crowd” (Baker, 2012a, p. 41), also described by Cavanagh and Dennis (2012, p. 376) as a “mediated assemblage”. These types of online gatherings demonstrate that individuals may adopt social media as outlets for discussion following instances of collective violence, thereby establishing a basis for a closer exploration of this discussion to delineate the issues being deliberated and to identify the emergent themes present in users’ commentary.

Within this stream of literature, Kelly and Gill’s (2012) research aligns quite closely with that herein. These scholars explore the dialogue that took place on a Facebook page entitled *Make Rotis NOT Riots*, created following the 2011 UK riots to enable uninvolved citizens to share their concerns with the cause of the riots, comment on the behaviour of its participants, and to generally “make sense” of the collective violence (p. 64). Kelly and Gill discover that this forum allowed for a range of factors precipitating the riots to be discussed, focusing primarily upon community unrest that stemmed from pervasive unemployment, the government’s inability to adequately provide for citizens, and a long-standing discontent between young people and police. While Kelly and Gill’s exploration of social media comments closely resembles the approach adopted in this research, there are key differences. Whereas Kelly and Gill examine user comments according to how they reflect the predetermined issues of consumer culture; law, order

and punishment; racial discrimination; and masculinity, this research analyses comments so as to allow prominent themes to *emerge*, thereby following an inductive approach (Elo & Kyngas, 2008). Most evidently, whereas Kelly and Gill utilize a case study of the 2011 UK riots, this research focuses upon the 2011 VSCR—a distinctly Canadian riotous event.

The differences between my research and that of Schneider and Trottier (2012) are perhaps more difficult to delineate, complicated by the fact that these authors begin with a similar intention: to understand how social media have enabled citizens to respond promptly to riotous events such as the VSCR. Schneider and Trottier’s concept of “crowd-sourced policing” (p. 57) became central in this research and was examined as one of four prominent discourses² that emerged from the Facebook commentary; this concept is explored later in this literature review. Through qualitative analyses of official police documents and the *Vancouver Riot Pics: Post Your Photos* Facebook page, these authors examine (1) how posters participated in crowd-sourced policing in responding to VSCR participants and (2) how police are increasingly adopting social media as tools for social control. While Schneider and Trottier pair their examination of Facebook commentary with official documents that review police performance during the riot, in this research, focus is placed solely on the former. This analysis of Facebook is also expanded considerably in this research as three Facebook pages, rather than one, are examined. As such, a broader analysis of Facebook is undertaken here, permitting a multitude of themes to emerge rather than the few which these authors detail. Lastly, to emphasize the significance of poster commentary, this research disregards many of the concepts that these authors focus on such as police surveillance tactics and authorities’ use of social media for investigative purposes.

² Hirt (2007, p. B-3) defines discourse as the formal expression of thought “on a selected subject”. In this thesis, “discourses” refers to the four major thematic elements, or subjects, that emerged from posters’ commentary.

2.3 Community Identity and Online Spaces as Virtual Communities

Much of the literature discussing online gatherings of individuals (Jurgenson, 2010), mediated assemblages (Cavanagh & Dennis, 2012), and social cohesion (Tonnevold, 2009) among users alludes to the existence of something more than a mere group dynamic. With ever increasing frequency, the internet and social media are being adopted to facilitate communication within the spheres of social, political, and economic life (Williams, 2007). While some individuals simply use these technologies to assist with the demands made in their existing “real” lives, these technologies are becoming so entrenched in modern culture that many are using them for upwards of five to six hours a day (Williams, 2007, p. 60). As Williams (2007) discovered in his analysis of the social media outlet *Cyberworlds*, it is perhaps for this reason that dedicated, active users of social media frequently identify as belonging to a virtual *community*, as—aside from sharing an online geography—they may share certain regulations or behavioural norms, a common language or terminology, and a common belief system.

Many scholars (Coffey & Woolworth, 2004; Frank et al., 2011; Huey et al., 2012; Schutt, 2012) understand online spaces to be *communities of interest*, composed of individuals who share a common interest in a select topic or on human interaction itself (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). These types of communities, of which Facebook is one example, differ from locational communities such as neighborhoods or townships with physical, geographic features (Anderson, 2010). Yet others have firmly denied this classificatory scheme, such as Lockard (1997) who argues that online social formations can never replace the traditional functions of locational communities, Healy (1997) who views online spaces as devoid of diversity as they could never be representative of the world’s entire population, and Oldenburg (1999) who views online spaces as nothing more than a “third place” where individuals frequent for friendship (p. 16).

In Rheingold's (1993) view, however, online social formations are often so meaningful and enthralling that referring to online spaces as virtual "communities" is not unwarranted. Williams (2007) supports this contention, highlighting that online spaces may, indeed, exist as communities that supplement failing social relations in the real world, suspend traditional social constraints, and allow citizens of the internet—or "netizens" (Huey et al., 2012, p. 89)—to adopt alternative social practices and standards. Williams (2007) ultimately criticises scholars that use traditional community ideals against which to evaluate online social formations, arguing that expecting online social spaces to mirror offline communities is "the product of one-dimensional thinking" (p. 65). As he states, "The central point to be made is that those who spend significant amounts of time interacting with others online, who live a large part of their lives in 'virtual' spaces...consider themselves to be part of a community" (p. 65).

Hence, then, the issue underlying this scholarly debate is whether academics recognize the existence of virtual communities, prompting some (Illum et al., 2010; Plant, 2004; Williams, 2007) to attempt to conceptualise this concept. Perhaps the most encompassing definition of a virtual community is that proposed by Balasubramanian and Mahajan (2001), who define it as any online space that exhibits (1) an aggregation of people; (2) interaction in cyberspace; (3) rational members; (4) processes of social exchange; and (5) a shared interest amongst members. Essential to this understanding are three features of virtual communities identified by Preece (2001): people, computer systems, and a shared interest.

Scholars examining virtual communities have noted that individuals can experience an online equivalent to the "sense of community" (SOC) (McMillan & Chavis, 1986, p. 6) that is experienced in traditional locational communities (Blanchard & Markus, 2004; Koh & Kim, 2003; Tonteri et al., 2011). The term used in the literature to illustrate this feeling of belonging is

“sense of virtual community” (SOVC), understood, simply, as individuals’ experience of community within a virtual environment (Tonteri et al., 2011, p. 2215). SOVC is derived from the seminal work of McMillan and Chavis (1986), who conceptualised SOC as “the feeling members have of belonging to a community, the belief that members matter to one another and to the community, and a shared faith that their needs will be met through their commitment to the community” (Tonteri et al., 2011, p. 2216). These authors assert that SOC is composed of four elements: (1) membership, referring to a sense of identification which creates a distinction between those who belong in a community and those who do not; (2) influence, referring to members’ view that the community “matters” to them and them to it; (3) integration and fulfillment of needs, denoting the sense that a shared set of values is possessed by community members; and (4) a shared emotional connection, based on members’ shared recollection of past events (Anderson, 2010, pp. 7-8).

After exploring this concept within virtual communities, Sanders and Olsen (2012) found that a sense of community can, without doubt, exist online. In fact, their research suggests that SOC is significantly higher within virtual communities in comparison to locational communities and that virtual communities can be just as important to a person as their membership within locational communities. This may be due to the fact that members are drawn together by a common interest and make the *conscious choice* to belong to virtual communities, such as those developed around fitness, fandom, or personal blogging (Sanders & Olsen, 2012). Chua (2009) and Schutt (2012) have produced similar findings; these authors assert that the interactions that take place within virtual communities may be so meaningful that it is not uncommon for a collective identity to emerge among users who begin to view these communities as sources of membership and attachment.

2.4 Crowd-Sourced Policing, Cyber Vigilantism, and Cyber Harassment

Aside from offering new fora for community membership, the internet has also provided numerous avenues through which online users can respond to real and perceived wrongdoing in ways that were traditionally reserved for professionals in the criminal justice system. This participation in what is known as “crowd-sourced policing” (Schneider & Trottier, 2012, p. 57) is a relatively new phenomenon that emerged in response to a growing lack of public confidence in conventional policing (Prior, 2010). Today, it exists as an internet-based form of civilian policing (Schneider & Trottier, 2012), enabling ordinary citizens to, with ever-increasing frequency, identify problems of crime and disorder and develop solutions to them (Prior, 2010). Crowd-sourced policing has been greatly enhanced in recent years by social media outlets such as Facebook and Twitter, leading Schneider and Trottier (2012) to conceptualise this activity as the process by which citizens unaffiliated with law enforcement utilize social media to engage in “pseudo-police work” and participate in a criminal justice-centred discourse (p. 62). While citizen motives for participating in crowd-sourced policing are varied, Huey et al. (2012) describe that individuals are often drawn to participate in order to seek justice, because of direct past exposure to victimization, due to perceived inadequacies of law enforcement or concerns about future criminality, or merely to assist authorities.

Despite its significant advantages and the frequent successes that result from its use, participation in crowd-sourced policing is not universally perceived by law enforcement as an acceptable activity (Huey et al., 2012). While some internet users can gather information and detect “evidence” of past criminal activity with great expediency, often outpacing even law enforcement, much of the pseudo-police work done by civilians is of little value to police organizations (Huey et al., 2012). Criminal justice agencies have also expressed a disapproval of

crowd-sourced policing for the reason that it may progress to cyber vigilantism, which undermines the legitimacy and ideals of traditional policing (Sharp et al., 2008). These activities are, in fact, often wrongly conflated as the transgression of accepted behavioural norms may lead citizens to engage in either (Johnston, 1996). Among the key distinctions between these activities is the use or threat of violence. While with vigilantism, alternatively known as “DIY justice” (Hil, 1998, p. 1), citizens employ actual or threatened physical force when responding to deviant conduct, no physical force or threat thereof is necessary when citizens participate in forms of civilian policing (Hil, 1998) such as crowd-sourced policing.

While attempts at defining the term “vigilantism” have been fraught with difficulty—mainly because the concept of the vigilante has changed considerably throughout history (Juliano, 2012) and is often imbued with different meanings (Boisjoli, 1987)—the most detailed definition of the term is that provided by Dumsday (2009), who understands vigilantism as:

...the organized use of violence or threat of violence by an agent or agents who are not willingly accountable to the state, for the purpose of controlling (preventing and/or punishing) criminal or noncriminal but still deviant actions; which violence or threat of violence is directed specifically against the perpetrators or alleged perpetrators of those actions, in accordance with the vigilante’s own system of minimally defensible values, the motivation for which must include what the vigilante perceives to be a concern for justice or the good of the community. (p. 58)

While the internet has facilitated the emergence of both crowd-sourced policing and cyber vigilantism, it has also introduced the problematic issue of cyber harassment (Beran et al., 2012), with increases in the rates of this abusive online conduct being documented since the early 2000s

(Jones et al., 2013). It is perhaps due to this steady increase that cyber harassment has, in recent years, been identified as a “modern pervasive problem” (Brown et al., 2006, p. 38), a “problem of significant magnitude” (Kowalski & Limber, 2007, p. S29), and as an “emerging public health problem” (David-Ferdon & Hertz, 2007, p. S1) within academia, and why online spaces have been described as a “fertile ground” for offensive conduct (Manuel, 2011, p. 223).

To date, there has been little scholarly consensus about what to even call such behaviour, with terms such as “cyber victimization” (Lipton, 2011, p. 1108), “cyber violence” (Cesaroni et al., 2012, p. 199), and “cyber aggression” (Slonge et al., 2013, p. 31), used in the literature. And while, perhaps aside from “cyber bullying”, “cyber harassment” is the most commonly used term, consistency has yet to be achieved among researchers in how cyber harassment is defined (Law et al., 2012). Nevertheless, by drawing upon the contributions of several scholars, an encompassing definition of the activity can be proposed: the wilful use of electronic forms of communication (Fanti et al., 2012) such as mobile phones and social media (Beran et al., 2012) to engage in intentional acts of aggression (Low & Espelage, 2013), intimidation, or humiliation (Mark & Ratliffe, 2011) against others, occurring when individuals post rumours or aggressive comments about, send insulting messages to, air embarrassing photos of, or publicise personal information about other individuals online without the victim’s prior consent (Manuel, 2011). Specifically, five acts constitute cyber harassment: “flaming” (sending offensive, rude, or vulgar messages), “cyber-stalking” (making intimidating threats of harm towards another person), “outing” (posting personal, private, or embarrassing details about a person), “exclusion” (intentionally attempting to exclude a person from an online community), and “denigration” (posting harmful, cruel, or untrue statements about a person) (Cesaroni et al., 2012, p. 201).

Now, while one might argue that cyber harassment is somewhat less serious than its offline counterpart (after all, victims have the option of simply turning off their electronic devices or deactivating an online account), moving offline does not stop others from continuing to post hurtful messages that may damage one's reputation or affect one emotionally. In fact, for numerous reasons, it has been suggested that the costs of cyber harassment for victims far outweigh those produced by offline harassment (Sticca & Perren, 2013). For one, because cyber harassment has the potential to reach a much larger audience, the impact upon the victim is often greatly compounded (Manuel, 2011). Secondly, cyber harassment can occur through both visual and written content, which is difficult and often impossible to remove once posted on the internet (Manuel, 2011). Thirdly, cyber harassment can happen quicker—in fact almost instantaneously (Sticca & Perren, 2013)—and more covertly, with some individuals remaining unaware that they are the subject of harassment for quite some time (Manuel, 2011). Due perhaps to the impersonal nature of online communication and the absence of social cues (Runions et al., 2013), cyber aggressors also feel less regret, concern for, and sympathy towards those that they victimize, which may result in aggressors feeling more brazen and powerful while their victims feel more isolated and helpless (Mark & Ratliffe, 2011). Lastly, cyber harassment can be perpetrated without physical contact and from a position of privacy and relative anonymity—aggressors may be in a different city, province, or even country—meaning that victims may never learn where the harassing remarks made about them originated (Mark & Ratliffe, 2011).

Cyber harassment is unique and differs considerably from “face-to-face” harassment for the reason that it allows a similar diffusion of responsibility as that witnessed among riot participants during riotous events. Just as riot participants may feel less personally responsible for their actions due to the large number of people engaged in the same activities (Bohstedt, 1994;

Levy, 1989), abusers may feel significantly less responsible for engaging in verbal harassment if numerous others are participating as well (Kwan & Skoric, 2013). Cyber aggressors may also perceive their behaviour as appropriate or morally justified (Fanti et al., 2012), particularly when it is used as a method of retaliation (Mark & Ratliffe, 2011).

One of the most severe forms of cyber harassment is a social shaming technique that resembles a sort of “cyber manhunt” known as the “human flesh search” (Cheung, 2009, p. 275). The human flesh search refers to the process whereby internet users collectively search for the demographic and geographic details (Cheong & Gong, 2010) of individuals that have been deemed by the online community to have engaged in immoral behaviour (Ong, 2012). This form of cyber harassment, widely perceived as justified by its participants, often draws the participation of thousands who progressively provide pieces of information until a comprehensive picture of a perceived wrongdoer emerges (Cheung, 2009). While several communication avenues have been used for the human flesh search, social media platforms have played a key role, facilitating the creation of users’ texts and the vast circulation of these texts with the intention of publicly shaming particular deviant individuals (Cheong & Gong, 2010).

2.5 Behavioural Norms and the Growing Privatization of Public Space

Much of citizens’ participation in crowd-sourced policing, cyber vigilantism, and cyber harassment has, arguably, been facilitated by the few restrictions placed on online user behaviour (Davis, 2005) and the fact that social boundaries for acceptable face-to-face communication are frequently disregarded online (Kahne et al., 2011; Papacharissi, 2004). Participation in these activities may be associated with the fact that the internet is perceived to be an avenue for free communication that is relatively free from control (Davis, 2005). It is, in essence, a “public

space”, understood as a place where individuals can express themselves, deliberate with others, solve problems, and occasionally converge on a respective common ground or consensus (Davis, 2005, p. 126). Many view the internet as one of these characteristically public spaces, permitting the convenient exchange of information and providing people with a voice that would not be heard less they be wealthy or powerful (Hand & Sandywell, 2002). Although public space is desirable, however, scholars (Davis, 2005; Olesen & Lassen, 2012; Papacharissi, 2010) argue that it has become a near implausible concept over time to the point that much of what passes as online public space is largely private in reality, either accessible only by a few interested parties or governed by an individual or group. As the literature posits, the boundaries around what is considered “private” are quickly eroding (Lange, 2007) as the public and private are beginning to “overlap in both theory and practice” (Papacharissi, 2010, p. 27). This has led Papacharissi (2010) to coin the phrase “privatization of public space”, maintaining that “it is no longer possible for the public sphere to exist in public space as a distinct entity” (p. 39).

Facebook has become a central player in the privatization of seemingly “public” space by limiting the accessibility of its service and by placing various restrictions on users’ conduct. One of the ways that it has engaged in privatization is by seeking to restrict anyone younger than 13 from using its service (Wagner, 2013), although this act of regulation has not been particularly effective (Boyd et al., 2011). Facebook also regulates the activity of its users by making clear the types of expression that are acceptable and those that are not through its list of “community standards” which restricts violence and threats, encouragement of self-harm, bullying and harassment, hate speech, graphic content, nudity and pornography, and the publishing of names and identities so as to protect the interests of the global population that uses its service (Facebook, 2014). These standards are, too, infrequently abided by and content containing these

elements is not always removed. In addition to overt standards, there are also unspoken, or understood, rules for interaction with others. According to Bryant and Marmo (2012), these unspoken behavioural standards are likely possessed by the majority of Facebook users, whether they choose to abide by them or not. In general terms, these “rules”—whether explicitly articulated or inferred through practice—exist to provide social media users with guidelines for appropriate interaction with others.

These regulatory processes and standards of conduct establish a set of behavioural norms on Facebook, which guide how individuals ought to behave in particular group situations (Fehr & Fischbacher, 2004). In most cases, rules governing users’ participation conform to generally agreed upon behavioural norms that govern behaviour in the physical world (Marlin-Bennett & Thornton, 2012). Similar to the regulation processes on Facebook, behavioural norms may be either formal or informal. Behavioural norms may also form the basis of a system of values and may either be descriptive of what the majority of people do or prescriptive whereby a group defines the behaviours that are expected of its members (Bicchieri, 2006). As Becker (1973) would maintain, given the importance of behavioural norms for human cooperation, it is not surprising that the Facebook community would attempt to make and enforce a set of standards for its users. As he asserts, “all social groups make rules and attempt, at some times and under some circumstances, to enforce them...specifying some actions as ‘right’ and forbidding others as ‘wrong’” (1973, p. 1). The findings of McLaughlin et al. (1995), who note that the existence of rules to guide appropriate behaviour is a hallmark of an online community, are consistent with this assertion. Baym (1998) advances a similar argument, asserting that, in addition to new forms of expression, online relationships, and public identities, rule-making and behavioural expectations constitutes one of the four facets of an online community. These findings suggest

that behavioural norms underscore the privatization processes found on Facebook, with users' conduct being governed by particular rules and prohibitions that are either explicitly articulated or implicitly understood.

2.6 Punishment and Vengeance

Vidmar (2001, in Johnson, 2009) has argued that real or perceived violations of behavioural norms typically result in negative emotional reactions, producing a desire for punishment on the part of both victims and the public. This contention has been echoed by Kugler et al. (2013), who suggest that citizens desire punishment for actions that they find morally objectionable. Arguably one of the most succinct yet encompassing understandings of “punishment” in these contexts is that proposed by Greenawalt (1983) who defines it as a principle of the legal system that involves agents of authority directing an “unpleasant consequence” towards offenders who have breached established rules of behaviour, accompanying condemnation by the state and the community (pp. 344-345). Despite the specificity of this definition and the fact that violated behavioural norms are often met with desires for punishment, the *role* of punishment in modern society is seldom entirely obvious (Broderick, 1993) as it likely does not serve any one, single motive (Carlsmith & Darley, 2008). For some, punishment may be used to reassert social order and moral authority while, for others, it may serve as a method of “getting back” at offenders. Two different schools of thought have emerged from this debate: the utilitarian approach proposed by Bentham (1962) and the retributive approach proposed by Kant (1952) (Cederblom, 1995).

From a utilitarian standpoint, society ought to benefit from the imposition of punishment; criminal penalties should either prevent or lessen the probability that offences will be committed

by the offender or would-be offenders in the future (Carlsmith & Darley, 2008; Frase, 2005). One element of utilitarian punishment is incapacitation, which affects the future behaviour of the offender by rendering additional offences more difficult to commit. Incarceration, capital punishment, strict supervision, and deportation are methods of incapacitation (Carlsmith & Darley, 2008). General and specific deterrence are other elements. The former punishes one person so as to deter others from committing a similar crime, while the latter seeks to deter an offender from reoffending once the sentence is completed (Carlsmith & Darley, 2008). “Norm reinforcement” is a fourth element of the utilitarian approach, which holds that seeing others punished highlights society’s condemnation of the offender’s conduct and leads others to internalize community norms (Greenawalt, 1983, p. 351).

In contrast, the retributive standpoint asserts that punishment serves the sole purpose of giving offenders what they deserve (Steverson, 2011) so as to restore the equilibrium that was disturbed by the offender’s actions; imposing a punishment restores the situation to balance (Escamilla-Castillo, 2010; Greenawalt, 1983). From this approach, the future effects of punishment are irrelevant as the primary goal is to give offenders their “just deserts” (Carlsmith, 2006, p. 437). From a retributivist view, society has both a right and a duty to punish those deserving punishment; failure to deliver “deserved” punishment sends the message that the violated behavioural norms are unimportant (Ward & Salmon, 2009). Those who employ such statements as “an eye for an eye” or “let the punishment fit the crime” operate from this retributive standpoint (Carlsmith & Darley, 2008, pp. 197-200; Massaro, 1991, p. 1891). These statements highlight that proportionality is a central element of retributive punishment (Roebuck & Wood, 2011); offenders should be punished in proportion to the seriousness of the harm caused and the offender’s degree of blameworthiness. From the retributivist standpoint, it is

morally impermissible and fundamentally unfair to punish an offender more than he or she deserves (Frase, 2005; Roebuck & Wood, 2011).

One *public* form of punishment (Benson et al., 2011; Massaro, 1991) that may serve either utilitarian or retributive purposes depending on its form is shaming. Shaming refers to the processes through which individuals attempt to invoke shame in an offender by publicising his or her criminal conduct to induce within them an unpleasant emotional experience (Levi, 2003). All shaming sanctions rely on some degree of community involvement, either through citizens' ridicule of an offender or their expressions of disapproval (Levi, 2003). Early shaming punishments involved devastating humiliation and degradation and took the form of public denouncement, banishment, restraint and display, the wearing of signs, whipping, and mutilation. These shaming tactics were largely abandoned in the mid-1800s in favour of incarceration (Massaro, 1991), yet re-emerged in the 1970s when American judges began revealing the criminal history of offenders, advertising offenders' names in newspapers, and affixing bumper stickers to the vehicles of those convicted of drunk driving (Steverson, 2011). To date, shaming punishments are the subject of much controversy, perhaps for the reason that little empirical evidence exists to validate their effectiveness (Steverson, 2011).

Shaming punishments may take either of two forms: reintegrative or disintegrative. The first, *reintegrative* shaming, communicates shame to an offender in a positive and respectful way so as to encourage him or her to desist from criminality. In this utilitarian form of shaming, the offender is regarded as a good person who merely behaved in a bad way (Braithwaite, 2000). *Disintegrative* shaming, however, is more disrespectful in nature, carries the view that the offender is a bad person, and allows the offender to obtain a master status as such (Braithwaite, 2000)—hence being referred to as “stigmatizing” shaming in some literature (Harris, 2006, p.

328). Disintegrative shaming shames offenders in a way that does not serve a utilitarian purpose. It may, in fact, worsen offending behaviour, indicated by findings that societies which degrade and humiliate offenders have higher crime rates than those which employ reintegrative shaming tactics (Braithwaite, 2000; Tittle et al., 2003). Today, disintegrative shaming punishments often involve the publishing of offender information through mediums such as newspapers, billboards, and local television stations (Steverson, 2011).

Some authors (Allen, 1982; Ho, 2002; Zdaniuk & Bobocel, 2012) contend that distinguishing punishment from a concept with which it is often coupled—vengeance—is a complicated and perhaps impossible task. Vengeance, defined as the infliction of harm, damage, discomfort, or injury upon a person judged responsible for a real or perceived wrong (Zdaniuk & Bobocel, 2012), is a powerful human desire and much a part of daily life (Friedman & Singh, 2009). For many, vengeance *is*, in fact, justice as justice often involves exacting vengeance upon an offender (Ho, 2002). Indeed, the similarities between punishment and vengeance often results in their conflation; both are unpleasant, both are inflicted due to a past wrong committed, and both express a degree of condemnation from others (Allen, 1982).

Despite these similarities, literature has asserted that particular factors distinguish these concepts. Firstly, whereas the harm imposed during punishment is intended to serve a utilitarian purpose or to restore a balance, with vengeance, harm is sought as a method of retaliation and vindictiveness (Gerber & Jackson, 2013). Secondly, whereas with punishment, moral boundaries exist with respect to proportionality, no such boundaries exist with vengeance (Zdaniuk & Bobocel, 2012); here, “the seriousness of the offence does not necessarily limit the harshness of the punishment” (Gerber & Jackson, 2013, p. 63). Thirdly, emotions occupy a far greater role in vengeance than in punishment; those perceiving harm often hold feelings of resentment, anger,

and hatred towards wrongdoers (Holroyd, 2010) and emotional pleasure results from seeing the offender suffer (Gerber & Jackson, 2013). This is perhaps indicative of why, lastly, vengeance involves a desire to inflict suffering upon an offender so as to demean them while elevating the person desiring vengeance to a *superior*—rather than an equal—position (Zdaniuk & Bobocel, 2012). This research further proposes a fifth distinction between these concepts, holding that because judicially-recognized punishments such as imprisonment, deportation, community service, or financial penalties, for instance, are inflicted by an established authority in accordance with specific legal safeguards (Allen, 1982), any harms desired by posters that were outside the purview of the state—such as hopes that riot participants be physically assaulted—constitute desires for vengeance.

2.7 The Law and Order Ideology or the “Get Tough” Approach

Trends in assigned punishments throughout the past several decades have led to the widely accepted conclusion that the United States and the United Kingdom are becoming more punitive in their responses to crime (Garland, 1997; Hogan et al., 2005; Johnson, 2009; Monterosso, 2009), indicated by the introduction of mandatory sentences, the expansion of prisons, and the emphasis on incapacitating offenders rather than reforming them. These societies are generally regarded as possessing a punitive culture that has extended from the judiciary and political sphere to the police as well as the public (Garland, 1997). In the past, certain factors limited the extent to which this punitive culture gained momentum in Canada, and Canadian criminal justice policies diverged considerably from those of the United States and the United Kingdom (Webster & Doob, 2007). Recent literature, however, suggests that this punitive approach has begun, if only slightly, to emerge in Canada (Webster & Doob, 2007).

In the face of rising pressure to adopt more punitive responses to criminality (Webster & Doob, 2007), Canada has witnessed an increase in the imposition and length of prison sentences (Pratt, 2002; Roberts et al., 2003; Young and Hoyle, 2003), has introduced mandatory minimum sentencing, and has increased maximum sentences for a number of offences (Webster & Doob, 2007). These policies suggest that the “tough on crime” movement (Garland, 1997, p. 194) that is so well engrained in the criminal justice systems of the U.S. and U.K. has begun to permeate the Canadian judiciary (Webster & Doob, 2007). In addition, this movement has gained momentum among citizens, with responses of the Canadian public to many offences—vandalism, petty theft, murder, fraud, sexual assault, armed robbery, and drug dealing, specifically—being either equally punitive or more punitive than responses of the American public (Kugler et al., 2013).

Garland (1997) has argued that whenever a state adopts this type of “tough on crime” approach by showing punitive force against offenders, a “law and order” ideology is reflected (p. 194); this may involve imposing three-strikes legislation or indefinite sentences, using “zero tolerance” policing, referring young offenders to adult court, increasing the austerity of prison sentences, or flourishing the power to sentence offenders to life imprisonment, boot-camps, super-max prisons, or capital punishment over rehabilitative alternatives (Garland, 1997; Hogan et al., 2005; Monterosso, 2009; Savelsberg, 2002; Webster & Doob, 2007). This law and order ideology is further reflected through views that criminals are not only dangerous, but essentially different from the law abiding. This old-style view of the “alien other” entails an understanding of offenders as belonging to a distinct social group with attitudes that differ markedly from “ours” (Garland, 1997, pp. 195-196; Monterosso, 2009, p. 17). Accordingly, offenders are characterised as “predators”, “beasts”, or as “evil” members of a treacherous “underclass”; are frequently depicted as threatening, violent individuals for whom there are few solutions; and, as

such, are excluded as enemies of the “law abiding” population (Garland, 1997, p. 198; Pickett et al., 2013, p. 215). This law and order ideology is further illustrated each time individuals support increasing police powers or frame youth as the central cause of crime and disorder (Presdee, 2000) through a demonization or, as Dennis (1999, p. 115) refers to it, “monsterization” process.

2.8 The Threat of Victimization

Central to the law and order ideology and underlying this monsterization of criminal offenders are judgements of risk, concerns of victimization, and, most prominently, the fear of crime, as these perceptions regularly trumpet calls for more criminalized behaviours, increased police strength, and harsher criminal penalties through “improved” legislation (Rimke, 2010). Understanding the dynamic of fear of crime has long been a concern for scholars of criminal justice (Franklin & Franklin, 2009). However, since the work of Liska et al. (1988) who first highlighted the issues with conceptualizing fear of crime as one broad construct, researchers such as Rader (2004) have suggested that a reconceptualization of research into the fear of crime is necessary. This research endeavour has produced a body of literature that is composed of three distinct yet closely related concepts that are argued to operate in tandem with one another (Loewenstein et al., 2001): fear of crime, perceived risk, and “constrained” behaviours (Rader, 2004, p. 689). Together, these components encompass the multi-dimensional construct known as the “threat of victimization” model (Rader, 2004, p. 689), which has received extensive support in the literature (Alper & Chappell, 2012; Chadee & Ng Ying, 2013; Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987; LaGrange & Ferraro, 1989; Robinson et al., 2003; Russo et al., 2011; Shippee, 2012).

Literature examining the fear of crime has progressed significantly in recent decades (May et al., 2010) and is at present noticeably more voluminous than research into the other

components of threat of victimization (Russo et al., 2011). This concept refers to an *emotional* response to crime (Shippee, 2012), described as the degree to which someone worries about being criminally victimized (Alper & Chappell, 2012). This fear may stem from visible crime and disorder in one's surroundings that would cause many rational individuals to be fearful (Franklin & Franklin, 2009) as well as knowledge of the victimization of others (Cook & Fox, 2011). Considerable support has been lent to this latter influence; Skogan and Maxfeld (1981), Akers et al. (1987), and Box et al. (1988) all found that fear of crime was heightened in those who had heard of others' victimization compared to those who had not. However, while fearing crime to a certain degree is neither irrational nor unique in our present culture (Jackson, 2006), the social consequences that result from this fear are often numerous and far-reaching, with four of the most common being heightened interpersonal distrust, decreased social interaction or withdrawal, reduced community cohesion, and increased support for a punitive law and order ideology (Hinkle, 2013; Jackson, 2006). Indeed, these consequences have been noted by scholars, with some asserting that they may be "detrimental" if "taken to extremes" (Alper & Chappell, 2012, p. 346; Cook & Fox, 2011, p. 684).

Perceived risk refers to a *cognitive* self-assessment of the likelihood of victimization relative to crime frequency in a particular area (Alper & Chappell, 2012) and a resulting appraisal of one's vulnerability (Shippee, 2012). This concept is typically examined in terms of *safety from* crime rather than *worry about* crime (May et al., 2010). Like the fear of crime, individuals may believe that they have an increased risk of victimization if community crime and disorder is visible (Franklin & Franklin, 2009). A third construct comprising the threat of victimization in the literature involves the *behavioural* responses taken by individuals to guard against crime. These constrained behaviours include both avoidance behaviours such as staying home and

defensive behaviours such as purchasing a gun (May et al., 2010); both one's fear of crime and one's perception of risk has an influence upon these behavioural responses (Rader et al., 2007). Documented avoidance behaviours that individuals use in response to the threat of victimization include restricting movement to particular areas in their neighborhood, avoiding venturing out at night and if necessary only with a companion, not talking to strangers, and not venturing into areas perceived as "dangerous" (Williams et al., 1994, p. 325). Interestingly, some have found that the adoption of such safety precautions often produces more harm than good, amplifying individuals' concerns about being victims of crime such as assault or robbery (Ferguson & Mindel, 2007; Pickett et al., 2013; Rountree, 1998; Rountree & Land, 1996).

2.9 Culpability and Due Process

However, as Hampton (1990) asserts, while accusing and condemning others for particular types of conduct are things that many of us do, individuals may not be fully aware of what they are doing when they judge others as *culpable* for a criminal offence. The term "culpability" is used to denote the degree of moral blameworthiness that an individual receives for a criminal action or some other bad state of affairs (Loewy, 1988; Moore, 1997). Determining why an individual's conduct warrants the attachment of culpability, or blame, is one of the first steps in assigning criminal responsibility to him or her. Under most circumstances, this equates to culpability being attached based on the accused's choice and "individual freedom" to perform criminal actions (Wishart, 2013, p. 80). Under these conditions, culpability depends upon morally defective choices, with blame being assigned to rational actors who *choose* to perform wrongful acts (Moore, 1997), such as choosing to engage in vandalism or assault. As Simester and Smith (1996) otherwise state, fault is made out whenever an individual deliberately chooses bad goals over good ones. It is largely for this reason that the degree of culpability on the part of the

wrongdoer typically corresponds to the amount of resentment others feel towards him or her (Staihar, 2010).

Under Canadian law, the degree of punishment that an individual deserves for a crime is to be proportional to their degree of culpability for committing it so that their suffering does not exceed the harm that resulted from their conduct; the more culpability one is assigned, the more punishment they deserve, and vice versa (Henham, 2000). This “principle of proportionality” is well-established and recognized not only within Canada, but also by the majority of other democratic countries as an element of due process (Andreescu, 2011, p. 113). These “due process rights” (Macdonald, 1987, p. 247), as they are now regarded, are more than mere legal rules, which often change with statutory reforms and case precedents (Roberts & Zuckerman, 2010). Rather, they are intended to protect those accused of crime from unreasonable government conduct and to maintain the fairness of the criminal justice system (Galligan, 1996; Levy, 1991); help us appreciate the values of liberty, security, and democratic accountability; and ensure that criminal cases are dealt with justly (Roberts & Zuckerman, 2010). As such, they have come to encompass the basic tenets applicable not only within the judicial process but also within the Canadian legal system more generally (Evans, 1991) and are formally inscribed under the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* as essential to Canadian law (Roach, 1999). Three doctrines applicable to individuals’ due process rights pertain to the application of punishment by a trial judge rather than autonomous citizens (May, 1986; Crombag et al., 2003); the necessity that evidence be presented to prove guilt *beyond reasonable doubt* (Zuckerman, 1989); and perhaps most well-known, that accused persons be considered innocent until they are proven guilty of an offence (Tadros & Tierney, 2004).

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Theoretical Model for Analysis

This project is rooted in a social constructionist perspective. Due to its central concerns with social exchange (Burr, 2003) and citizen interaction (Au, 1998) and its ability to illuminate the ways in which people describe and understand the world they live in (Gergen, 1985), social constructionism—often used interchangeably with the term “social constructivism” in the literature (Liu & Matthews, 2005)—was adopted as the primary theoretical framework to guide this research. Specifically, key contributions to this framework were found in Donileen Loseke’s (2003) exploration of the social constructionist perspective. Loseke (2003) examines the construction of meaning; the categorization of social conditions, people, objects, and events; and the development of personal and collective identities within the context of claims-making and the development of social problems.

Social constructionism holds as its basic assumption that human life is characterised by meaning (Loseke, 2003). Rather than inherently residing within anything, this meaning is *socially created*, attached by individuals to entities such as events, conditions, objects, and other people. Individuals construct meanings within the general context of their social groups through language—writing, speech, gestures, symbolism, and imagery—making meaning highly susceptible to environmental influence (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Poerksen, 2011). Moreover, meaning is continually modified as a result of individuals’ interactions with others (Andrews, 2012). There therefore exists no “true” meaning in the world, as communication practices affect the range of potential meanings that certain entities—events, conditions, objects, and people—can have (Keaton & Bodie, 2011, p. 192). It is for this reason that social constructionism is

regarded as an *interpretive* approach as it is concerned with how individuals make sense of, or interpret, the social world (Loseke, 2003). At the same time, however, Loseke explains that social constructionism is often understood as *subjective* for the reason that it is sensitive to the different meanings applied to particular issues; while spanking children may be defined by some as acceptable punishment, to others, it may be child abuse (Loseke, 2003). Ultimately, emphasis is placed not on the objective, physical world, but on the ways in which we *understand* this world.

These interpretive and subjective features of social constructionism highlight another of its key assumptions: that behaviours, conditions, and individuals exist as problematic only for those who define and construct them as such (Loseke, 2003). Rather than being concerned with how the world *is*, social constructionism therefore focuses on how individuals *believe* the world is, and the understandings that result from this constructed meaning. In Loseke's view, the central process that influences these understandings is *categorization through typification*—the drawing of connections between people, objects, and conditions in our social world and the “typical”, pre-existing images or “types” that we have of these entities in our heads (p. 115). Types of any entity do not exist until they are constructed by individuals, and the meanings we attach to particular entities—the way in which we categorize them—encourage us to act towards those entities in very particular and predictable ways (Loseke, 2003). It is with this understanding that Loseke illustrates the processes of constructing an offender and a victim; after categorizing an individual as an offender, citizens often direct towards this individual their rage, hatred, and condemnation while directing towards the victim their sympathy.

This process in which individuals use categorization through typification to construct meaning is reflective of Stuart Hall's (1997) theory of representation. In Hall's (1997) view, representation involves drawing associations between mental concepts and language to say

something meaningful about—to describe, portray, or otherwise refer to—the people, events, experiences, and objects in our social world (Hall, 1997). People use *mental concepts* to represent properties and features of entities, processes, and phenomena, such as using the concept of “delinquent” to represent a youth who is involved in crime or the concept of “age” to represent the number of cumulative years since an individuals’ birth (Berg, 2004, p. 16). In this respect, representations can be formed not only for tangible entities, but also for abstract concepts without physical properties (McCotter, 2001). Hall’s (1997) theory of representation posits that meaning is constructed through this associational process of linking our mental concepts with language; without this process, interpreting our social world in meaningful ways would be impossible.

According to the *constructionist* approach to representation, which can be distinguished from the reflective and intentional approaches, meanings continually change and are never entirely fixed as meaning does not exist within the world itself but through the language system that we use to represent mental concepts (Hall, 1997). While this approach to representation recognizes that different people interpret the world uniquely, it also maintains that communication, understanding, and shared meanings are made possible because people *within the same social group* make sense of people, events, experiences, and objects in roughly similar ways (Hall, 1997). This constructionist approach to representation excellently illustrates the subjectivity that characterises the creation of meaning (Lindgren, 2005); because making sense of the world is, in effect, an experience unique to specific individuals and social groups, this approach makes the same assumptions as those who adopt a social constructionist perspective.

While the assumptions embedded within social constructionism and constructionist representation provided the context through which to approach the data, this research drew upon elements of social identity theory when examining the responses of posters to the VSCR and its

participants. This social psychological theory became central in the research due to its concerns with individuals' perceptions of belongingness, or membership, within a group and its potential to offer explanations for both inter-group dynamics and individual behaviour from the perspective of this group membership (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Brown, 2000).

Social identity theory understands a “group” as a collective of persons whom identify with one another, see themselves as similar along certain dimensions, and hold similar perspectives *in contrast* with members of opposing “out-groups” (Stets & Burke, 2000, p. 228). The theory, developed by Henri Tajfel and John Turner (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; 1986) is built upon the assumption that people classify themselves as well as others into social categories, from age, gender, religious affiliation, and ethnicity to place of residence, behavioural tendencies, and the like. This social classification serves two functions. Firstly, it allows individuals to mentally segment and order the social environment of which they are a part by assigning specific—prototypical—characteristics to others. Secondly, it enables the individual to define and thereby locate him- or her-self within that social environment (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

Before delving further into a discussion of social identity theory, a brief overview of the concept upon which it is based—social identity—is, indeed, necessary. Social identity is defined as the part of an individual's self-concept (a sense of “who one is”) that is derived from his or her membership within social groups, accompanied by the value and emotional significance attached to that membership (Tajfel, 1981, p. 255). It is often conceptualised as the “social glue” that determines peoples' relation to and actions on behalf of their group (Van Vugt & Hart, 2004, p. 586) and has been associated both with positive benefits (namely group cohesion, greater well-being, and improved citizenship behaviours) and negative consequences (social competition, intergroup prejudice, and derogation) (Amiot & Sansfacon, 2011). Fundamentally, social identity

theory acknowledges the importance of *positive* social identities, asserting that individuals strive to achieve and maintain a positive self-evaluation as determined by the judgements of both themselves and of others (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

According to social identity theory, while individuals derive much of their identity from such personal, idiosyncratic characteristics as interests, skills, and behavioural tendencies (Ashforth & Mael, 1989), through social classification, the social groups to which they belong contribute predominantly to the development of their identity (Stets & Burke, 2000). In this sense, the theory recognizes that an individual's self-concept consists of both a social identity (who one is as a group member) and a personal identity (who one is as a unique individual) (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Group memberships are, however, emphasized as significant for individual identities (Wilkins, 2007) as individuals derive a sense of who they are from the social categories to which they belong—student populations, fan clubs, or entire nations, for instance (Colman, 2008). Because these social identities must be perceived as positive in order for individuals to maintain feelings of self-efficacy, competence, and overall self-worth (Stets & Burke, 2000), threats to the overall status of one's group may result in members feeling less optimistic about themselves or their group and will be countered by attempts to enhance the evaluation of their in-group relative to the out-group (Jetten et al., 1996; 1998). These threats may come from accusations of similarity between the in-group and the out-group (Brown, 2000), causing people to resort to upward comparisons so as to distinguish themselves from and become superior to out-group members (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1994; Brown, 2000). While attempts to maintain a positive group identity may also involve highlighting the variability within a group through such statements as “Even if some of us are poor, we're not all poor” (Doosje et al.,

1995), attempts to achieve *intergroup differentiation* are central in social identity theory (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1994).

Social identity theory therefore attempts to explain how self-perceived membership in a group may influence behaviour, holding that individuals attempt to maximize the differences between the “in-group” within which they see themselves as belonging and the opposing “out-group(s)” in response to threatening circumstances, thus resulting in the perception of significant differences between themselves and “others” and favoritism towards fellow in-group members (Greene, 2004). This process produces a situation in which “we” or “us” are pitted against “them” (Jetten et al., 2004, p. 862), with these effects being obtained even when assignment to a group is completely arbitrary and the labels applied to the groups are socially meaningless, as with the experimental case of a “blue group” that was contrasted with a “red group” (Gaertner et al., 1993). As such, these differences often do not exist or are significantly exaggerated, as evident in the two methods for achieving intergroup differentiation: “out-group derogation” and “in-group favoritism” (Hewstone et al., 2002, p. 575). Through the former method, group members exaggerate the negative features of out-group members so as to elevate their group to a superior position. As numerous authors suggest, under certain circumstances, this derogation may be paired with outright prejudice, hostility, and the demeaning treatment of out-group members (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Brown, 2000; Colman, 2008; Greenwald & Pettigrew, 2014; Jetten et al., 2004). Through in-group favoritism, group members exaggerate the favourable qualities of the group within which they are self-proclaimed members.

As Bobowik et al. (2014) contend, from individual efforts to maintain a positive personal identity to collective responses aimed at changing the evaluation of one’s group, social identity theory offers valuable insights into the various mechanisms that individuals employ to cope with

identity threat and protect the vulnerable self-concept. These “identity management strategies” (Bobowik et al., 2014, p. 113) similarly reflect the methods that Erving Goffman identified to accept, avoid, reduce, and deny stigmas. In his seminal work, Goffman describes stigma as “an attribute that is deeply discrediting” and, further, as a characteristic that reduces the bearer “from a whole and usual person to a tainted, discounted one” (Goffman, 1963, p. 3). As others assert, because stigma connotes an undesired differentness, it thus leads to a social identity being highly devalued (Link & Phelan, 2001). Goffman maintained that stigma may often spread from one individual to others as a result of simple association, producing a situation where those who carry no identifiable stigmata are marked with a negative social identity and afforded a transferred, or courtesy, stigma; some researchers refer to this phenomenon as “stigma by association” (Pryor et al., 2012, p. 224). For Goffman (1963), this contagion effect may ultimately exacerbate the problems created by the original stigma, particularly when those who view the stigma as socially damaging employ strategies to counter the stigma’s transferability. Accordingly, to avoid this “stigma at a distance”, affiliated individuals—friends, family, acquaintances, and community members—may deny the stigma’s applicability to them, challenge public understanding about the stigma’s existence, sever social ties that may threaten their social identity, or socially exclude stigmatized persons (Bobowik et al., 2014; Hannem, 2012; Meisenbach, 2010).

3.2 Methodological Approach

This research seeks to add to the nascent literature exploring how community members use social media to respond to an instance of riotous behaviour. Specifically, this research examines the discussion on Facebook amongst posters in the six months following the Vancouver Stanley Cup riot (VSCR). Since the intention is to obtain a rich description and an in-depth understanding of the *meaning* of the VSCR and its participants as constructed by posters, the

research is qualitative in nature (Wainwright, 1997), chiefly concerned with providing an understanding of the social world from the perspective of those within it (Labuschagne, 2003).

The strength of the qualitative approach lies in its detailed descriptions of situations, events, and interactions; the frequent analyses of written documents; and the use of direct quotations to reveal individuals' emotions, thoughts, experiences, and perceptions (Labuschagne, 2003). Rather than requiring a large, random sample of data, qualitative research only requires as much data as is necessary to identify consistent themes or patterns, which involves the *purposeful selection* of data for analyses (Dobrovolny & Fuentes, 2008). These foci contrast with those of the quantitative approach, which values the quantification, comparison, and statistical aggregation of data through standardised measures. With this approach, emphasis is often placed on testing a theory (Labuschagne, 2003); as such, experimental research designs are commonly adopted whereby variables are removed from their natural setting, controlled, and examined so as to determine causal relationships, after which observations are quantified to determine statistical probabilities and predict particular outcomes (Duffy, 1985; Labuschagne, 2003). These objectives were not the intentions of this research, however, which did not seek to engage in manipulation (Corner, 1991), measurement in terms of frequency or quantity, or to generalize the findings beyond the sample (Labuschagne, 2003; Dobrovolny & Fuentes, 2008).

I employed a qualitative content analysis (QCA) to explore the themes within posters comments. QCA is broadly defined as a technique for the systematic and subjective interpretation of text data through the classification process of coding and the identification of themes or patterns (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). I sought to attain a condensed description of the VSCR by classifying segments of user-generated text into smaller content-based categories (Elo & Kyngas, 2008). These categories represented both manifest and latent content, with the former attuned to

interpretive analyses of content that appeared explicitly in the text and the latter sensitive to the deep, underlying meaning being conveyed in specific messages (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Given this sensitivity to both types of content, Hsieh and Shannon (2005) assert that QCA moves beyond simply counting words to focusing on the characteristics of communication and the contextual meaning of text through intense, systematic analyses.

The applicability of QCA to this research lay largely in its recognized advantage of permitting a means to analyse data accumulated over long periods of time (Berg, 2004), as the present research sought to examine commentary occurring over a six month period from June 15, 2011 to December 14, 2011. Another benefit of QCA rests on the fact that it permits the analysis of large volumes of text data because explicit coding instructions and precise categories allow for only one researcher, in most circumstances, to code the material (United States General Accounting Office, 1989). QCA is also extremely efficient for examining communication (Abrahamson, 1983) and patterns of web-based content (Kim & Kuljis, 2010). Lastly, because QCA is systematic and the task of devising categories is rigorous, this method allows researchers to gain deep, significant insight into the issues that they are investigating (United States General Accounting Office, 1989).

3.3 Data Sources

Facebook pages were selected for analysis based on two criteria. First, the pages needed to have meaningful discussion of the VSCR and its participants so as to assist in answering the two research questions, which were, again, “*How did persons who participated in discussions on social media of the 2011 Vancouver Stanley Cup riot construct the meaning of the riot?*” and “*How did persons who participated in social media discussions construct the identities of people*

who committed criminal acts during the riot?” A preliminary search for VSCR-centred pages produced seven data sources that met this criterion. Secondly, there needed to be a sufficient number of messages on the pages so that emergent themes could be drawn from posters’ comments. For the reason that four of these Facebook pages contained less than 15 comments, the pages *Report Canuck RIOT Morons (RCRM)*, *Vancouver Riot Pics: Post Your Photos (VRP)*³ and *Post Riot Clean-Up: Let’s Help Vancouver (PRCU)*—each of which contained more than 2000 comments—were selected for analysis. These pages were also selected because they were very popular among online users. Each page was “liked”, or supported, by anywhere from 15,000 to 90,000 users and their value following the VSCR for assisting police in the identification of participants was recognized by numerous online news outlets including the *Vancouver Sun*, the *Vancouver Observer*, the *National Post*, *The Globe and Mail*, *The Guardian*, *The Seattle Times*, and the *Huffington Post*.

3.4 Data Collection Procedures

I began by accessing the three Facebook pages *RCRM*, *VRP*, and *PRCU*⁴. Given the vast amount of commentary on any given Facebook page, older messages are often hidden or “collapsed” so that only the most recent messages are displayed; this feature was present amongst these pages. The next step in collecting the data was therefore to “expand” each poster comment left since the page was created. Although this research restricted its analysis to poster comments left in the six months following the VSCR, commentary up until March 20, 2013 (the date on which the data was collected) was obtained in case the scope of the research was later expanded.

³ It is important to note that the page *Vancouver Riot Pics: Post Your Photos (VRP)* was removed from Facebook approximately one year after the comments from this data source were collected.

⁴ In order for comments to be posted on these pages and for comments to be viewed, individuals must be registered users of Facebook. Therefore, within this research, these data sources were accessible chiefly for the reason that I, the researcher, am a registered Facebook user.

Lastly, the stream of commentary on each page was printed so that a hard copy of this data would be available if the pages were later removed from Facebook.

3.5 Sampling Method

Despite Lombard et al.'s (2002) assertion that content analysis is both *necessary* and *fundamental* for research examining mass communication, Stemler (2001) has identified two problems that researchers using this methodological approach might encounter. Issues may either arise with unsuitable records that deviate too widely from the material required for analysis or with samples of text that match the data required for analysis yet are simply “uncodable” because they are incomplete or contain missing passages (p. 2). To resolve these issues, this research employed purposive sampling—a form of non-random sampling that involves the researcher making an informed decision as to what sources of data are most appropriate for inclusion in the sample (Neuendorf, 2002). Moreover, because 7,260 poster comments were included in the preliminary review, purposive sampling was necessary to reduce this extensive amount of data to a collection that was more manageable; as Elo and Kyngas (2008) assert, such a sampling method is necessary when the data is too extensive to be analysed in its entirety.

Specifically, purposive sampling was utilized in this research for three selection process: (1) to select Facebook pages that were specifically created in response to the 2011 VSCR; (2) to consider only those pages that contained enough comments for analyses; and (3) to analyse only those messages that contained meaningful discussion about the VSCR, its participants, or its broad impacts (as opposed to messages that contained unrelated content). Once the preliminary review of the data had been conducted, purposive sampling was used to disregard comments that failed to illuminate any of the preliminary codes, or themes, as well as those that were so closely

tied to photos that they would be difficult to understand without providing a detailed explanation of the photo itself. Comments were also disregarded if they were made repeatedly by the same poster with the same content; in these cases, only the first comment was examined. Through the use of purposive sampling, a sample size of 1315 comments was attained from the 7,260 that were included in the preliminary review; the length of these comments ranged from 1 to 142 words, with the average length of each comment being between 35 and 40 words. Ultimately, because purposive sampling involves these various forms of subjective judgement on the part of the researcher, this method was only appropriate for the reason that this research did not aim to make a generalization to any population beyond the sample (Nesbary, 2000).

3.6 Stages of Qualitative Content Analysis

This QCA proceeded from an inductive approach for the reasons that categories, or themes, were enabled to emerge from the data itself and specific messages were examined for the purpose of making general interpretations of the data as a whole (Elo & Kyngas, 2008).

Following this approach, the research began with the formulation of two broad research questions (Franzosi, 2008), after which the data was reviewed to obtain an overall sense of the text (Elo & Kyngas, 2008). Samples of text were then selected for analysis and read word for word (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) while short memos, or “jottings”, were made; these jottings highlighted exact words from the text that captured important thoughts and concepts (Van den Hoonaard, 2012, p. 68). Thirteen coding themes representing emergent categories were then formulated from these memos and definitions were developed for each category:

- Punishment;
- Vengeance;
- Cyber Harassment;
- Due Process;

- Privatization of Public Space;
- Value of Social Media;
- Behavioural Norms;
- Law and Order;
- Reputation;
- Victimization;
- Culpability;
- Human Flesh Search⁵; and
- Community Identity and Membership

Hsieh and Shannon (2005) have noted that the ideal number of categories is between ten and fifteen to remain broad enough to sort large amounts of text yet specific enough to avoid coding each and every comment present in the data. Next, the coding process was implemented, and the results of this process were interpreted (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) using hermeneutical techniques—processes of text interpretation through the reduction of data to its most concise units (Scherl & Smithson, 1987). This systematic method permitted a “second-level narrative” to emerge from the data (Borland, 1991, p. 63).

3.7 Criteria of Selection and Inclusion

Whenever content analysis is used, explicit rules must be established before coding begins and must be followed accordingly throughout the coding process. As Berg (2004, p. 268) asserts, these rules are known as “criteria of selection”, and serve to maintain the reliability of the research being conducted. Criteria of selection must be both sufficiently exhaustive so as to account for the variation of message content and rigidly applied so that comparable results can be attained by other researchers. Before the data in this research was coded, strict criteria of selection that defined the characteristics of messages that were significant were established. As

⁵ Human Flesh Search is defined on page 30 above as the process whereby internet users collectively search for the demographic and geographic details (Cheong & Gong, 2010) of individuals who have been deemed by the online community to have engaged in immoral behaviour (Ong, 2012).

an example, the “Punishment” theme highlighted comments in which posters suggested a specific punishment or declared their hope for a specific punishment to be handed down to riot participants, as well as comments that discussed punishment in a more general manner. This theme also included comments from those stating that, even as uninvolved citizens, they may be “punished” financially through increased taxes to account for the damage. Similar criteria were established for each subsequent theme.

The “Cyber Harassment” theme included comments involving the exchange of insults or violent threats; comments that degraded individuals by stating that they would be sexually assaulted in prison; and comments from posters declaring that they have sent or have enticed others to send messages to specific individuals. Comments illustrating the “Privatization of Public Space” theme included those in which posters recognized that these pages were being moderated or had been created by an individual or group; that a set of standards existed for acceptable discussion on these pages and therefore that some sort of regulation was present; that comments were being or could be deleted; and that posters could be banned from future activity upon the pages. The “Value of Social Media” theme reflected comments that discussed Facebook’s use for purposes of constructing understandings of community, for community image maintenance and/or the communication and enforcement of community behavioural norms, for crowd-sourced policing, or for cyber vigilantism. The “Behavioural Norms” theme included comments in which posters either discussed the “rightness” or “wrongfulness” of particular actions (or inactions) or in which posters expressed their disapproval towards others for violating norms of expected behaviour. Comments that were coded under the “Law and Order” theme included those that othered riot participants or called for excessively punitive punishments (Garland, 2000); those that criminalized youth by framing them as the central cause of crime and

disorder or as monsters to be feared (Presdee, 2000); and those that advocated for less stringent constraints on police conduct (Sasson, 1995) or increased police powers (Kohm, 2009).

Comments to which the “Reputation” theme applied included those discussing the influence of the VSCR on the reputations of Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, the Vancouver Canucks, hockey in general, or the employers or schools of riot participants. Also included were comments from posters who attempted to defend the reputations of these entities. The “Vengeance” theme included comments from posters who (1) *suggested* that police or bystanders do something to physically harm riot participants; (2) *stated* that they would have personally done something to punish riot participants had they been present; (3) *hoped* for a specific negative consequence other than a punishment recognized by the courts to befall riot participants; or (4) otherwise *discussed* a desire for vengeance against riot participants. Comments coded under the “Due Process” theme included those in which posters discussed the due process rights held by riot participants and alleged offenders more generally, whether such rights were supported or discounted. The “Victimization” theme included comments that discussed the risk posed by riot participants to property, bystanders, and other citizens and comments in which posters voiced their concerns of personal safety. “Culpability” reflected comments that attributed blame to certain individuals or groups for having contributed to the riot as well as comments that stated certain individuals were *not* to be blamed. The “Human Flesh Search” theme highlighted comments that were written with the intentions of identifying particular individuals by name or of publicising other personal or demographic details of individuals perceived as deviant. The thirteenth and final theme, “Community Identity and Membership”, included comments from posters stating that they are from, currently live in, or have a connection to a particular city,

province, state, district, or country, as well as comments in which posters attributed such connections to others.

3.8 Methodological Limitations

The theoretical framework and methodological approach adopted in this research do not escape criticism. Firstly, as an anti-realist perspective (Andrews, 2012), social constructionism again maintains that there exist no “true” or objective meanings of events or people as meanings are influenced by individual experience, individuals’ communication with others (Keaton & Bodie, 2011, p. 192), and membership within particular social groups (Au, 1998). Given these assumptions, a potential threat to the validity of the research exists in that while the findings obtained offer valuable insights into the research questions posed, these findings reflect simply *one* subjective interpretation of the data and the research therefore presents only some of the many possible constructions of the VSCR and its participants. Otherwise stated, it is recognized herein that a uniform understanding of the VSCR and its participants was not held by all posters on the pages as the social constructionist perspective limits how knowledge of these entities can be generalized to different actors.

Relatedly, the ways in which posters—who are assumed in this research to be members of either locational communities or communities of interest—responded to the VSCR and its participants may not be indicative of how members of other communities respond to other riotous events or instances of collective violence. It is therefore assumed that the findings herein are highly context-specific, which limits the generalizability of the findings and, again, threatens the external validity of the research. This difficulty in generalizing results is a recognized feature of qualitative research methods, which value uniqueness, rich description, and sensitivity to context

rather than generalization to a larger population (Corner, 1991). Adopting a qualitative research approach also introduces issues for reliability in that reproducing the project may be a difficult undertaking. It is for this reason that this chapter has clearly delineated the data collection procedures, criteria for selection, sampling method, adopted theoretical framework, and stages followed throughout the research process to ensure credibility (Ezzy, 2002) and enhance the potential for other researchers to obtain comparable findings.

In addition, criticism may also be directed at the validity of the findings obtained in this research with respect to the specific content of posters' comments. For the reason that individuals construct meaning using various systems of communication—from writing and speech to visualization and gestures—Hall (1997) argues that there is an ever-present imprecision about language whereby the meaning we interpret as readers is often *not* the intended meaning attributed to the text by the writer. A methodological limitation that takes into account this assertion exists in the research in that particular qualities of communication—such as tone or elements of parody—could not be deciphered through posters' written text. As an example, this may have meant that while certain comments may have reflected punitive sentiments, such as those in which posters voiced their support for harsh punishments, such comments may have been made solely in jest. In light of this limitation, the research sought only to explore comments *as they appeared* on the pages rather than exploring the characteristics of communication that lay beneath posters' comments.

In terms of the reliability of the findings obtained herein, threats may originate from having only one coder throughout the data analysis process. In content analysis, ensuring inter-rater reliability involves determining the similarity with which two or more researchers categorize the same material by comparing and examining the extent to which they agree (United

States General Accounting Office, 1989). However, complications arise when this test of reliability is applied to QCA, as well as many other qualitative methods more generally, as researchers cannot always be expected to identify the same themes in text or to interpret accounts in the same manner (Armstrong et al., 1997). In light of this issue, transparency was maintained by documenting the steps taken at each point of the data analysis process—from the creation of themes, to the words that highlight them, to their interpretation—as well as by keeping the data in an organized and easily retrievable form (Armstrong et al., 1997).

3.9 Ethical Considerations

Prior to engaging in any data collection procedures, confirmation was obtained from the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Ottawa that the research did not require ethics approval. Despite this fact, procedural safeguards were taken to maximize the confidentiality of those who posted commentary upon the pages. Aside from posters' names which were limited to a "first name only" basis and the specific identifying features that posters themselves publicised on the pages, the research neither took note of nor discussed features such as race, hair colour, or the location from which messages were sent. However, that many of the identifying features of Facebook users are already publicly visible, combined with the retention of information that characterises the internet (Schutt, 2012), ensuring confidentiality with any certainty was a difficult undertaking for this research. Another ethical consideration that arose pertained to the nature of the research itself. The data analysis process resulted in the researcher's exposure to instances where individuals openly discussed their participation in the VSCR. This stood as an ethical issue for the reasons that such exposure would not have occurred had the research not been undertaken in the first place (Israel, 2004). As Palys and Lowman (2000) advise, these circumstances often obligate researchers to remain committed to the law by providing such

information to authorities. Fortunately, considering the time elapsed since the riot as well as the vast number of individuals to whom such comments have been made visible, one can only assume that those who announced their involvement have been held accountable, thus reducing the gravity of this ethical issue.

CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings of a qualitative content analysis of user comments posted on three Facebook pages that were created in response to the 2011 Vancouver Stanley Cup riot (VSCR). These pages included *Report Canuck RIOT Morons (RCRM)*, *Vancouver Riot Pics: Post Your Photos (VRP)*, and *Post Riot Clean-up – Let’s Help Vancouver (PRCU)*. At the time the data was collected and analysed, *RCRM* contained 2613 comments, *VRP* contained 2641 comments, and *PRCU* contained 2006. These pages were selected because they were the most popular of the online sites that purportedly focused on responding to and identifying people who committed unlawful acts during the riot. Although they collectively constitute a convenience sample, the reach of these pages is evidenced by the fact that a total of 132, 330 individuals used the Facebook “like” function to indicate their support for the pages.

RCRM, *VRP*, and *PRCU* were each created by Facebook users within twenty-four hours of the VSCR. The purposes of *VRP* and *PRCU* were clearly articulated in the description of these pages, with the former aiming to “post ... riot [pictures]” and the latter intending to “show the world what the Real Vancouver is”; many of the posters’ comments aligned with these purposes. The description provided on *RCRM* was, simply, “Vancouver Riots after Canucks Lose Game 7”; however, this page also became an active site where posters sought to identify riot participants, harass these individuals, and make suggestions of punishment.

In this chapter, I argue that the people who posted on these pages (the “posters”) grounded their comments in claims of community harm and the need for community repair. Rather than being merely a vehicle to identify people who broke the law during the VSCR, the pages became sites where posters sought to remediate a shared community identity. My findings

suggest that the posters' sense of community served as a catalyst for problem-focused coping behaviours whereby community members attempted to counter the problem or threat to their collective identity posed by the riot (Bachrach & Zautra, 1985). These behaviours are indicative of the processes underlying social identity theory, which assumes that individuals employ various strategies to cope with a threatened social identity and restore positive in-group status (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), and, further, suggest that posters attempted to circumvent the potential of stigma by association, or "stigma at a distance".

My discussion is divided into four sections. First, I demonstrate how the posters situated their claims within their belonging to specific communities, defined by either shared geography or shared interests. Second, I show how posters made attempts to reaffirm the positive image of both types of communities by applauding and prescribing prosocial behaviour of members of the community and censuring and prohibiting antisocial behaviour of those "others" who were deemed as not belonging to the community after having failed to live up to the collective standard of behaviour. Third, I show how posters often situated their comments within a criminal justice-centred discourse by discussing issues that centered on law and order, punishment, the threat of victimization, culpability, and principles of due process. Lastly, I demonstrate how many posters' comments exhibited elements of cyber vigilantism by going beyond identification and involving either the harassment of riot participants or expressed desires for vengeance.

Constructing Communities

Although the original intention of the pages was to identify people who broke the law during the riot, all of the pages served as spaces for posters to vilify and/or defend riot participants and to articulate a communal understanding of community, community identity, and

community response to wrongdoing. This focus on the communal coalesced around “locational” communities such as Vancouver, British Columbia, and Canada or “relational” communities of interest such as hockey fans and Facebook users (Anderson, 2010, p. 7; Bell et al., 2004, p. 178). Whether posters (1) stated their proud (or embarrassed) affiliation with Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, or the community of hockey fans; (2) proclaimed that, due to their residence in another region, they were not involved in the VSCR; or (3) expressed their sympathies or posted apologies or encouraging words for residents of Vancouver, British Columbia, or Canada, it became apparent that a sense of community was either adopted by posters who proclaimed their own membership or attributed to other individuals through such statements as “your vancouver”⁶ (Stephanie, *PRCU*).

For example, a large portion of posters identified with particular physical localities, often framing Vancouver as “my city” or “our city”, British Columbia as “my province” or “our province”, or Canada as “my country” or “our country”. They also frequently stated that they loved their city, province, or country. Kitty’s (*PRCU*) remark, “I love my home—Vancouver”, was typical of posters, while Laura’s (*PRCU*) comment was especially suggestive of the community identification taking place upon the pages: “...Seems like now more than ever people have a strong sense of belonging to the community. It is inspiring to see how many people identify Vancouver as their city...”. Anderson (2010) argues that these types of claims in which someone identifies with a geographical location are strong markers of membership in a community as they indicate that a community “matters” to its members (pp. 7-8). In like vein, Puddifoot (1995) suggests that these statements illustrate citizens’ perceived sense of belonging, affiliation, and emotional connectedness with a particular locational community. That Vancouver,

⁶ Comments were copied directly as they were composed by posters on the pages, thus often including spelling errors and the misuse of capitalization for such terms as “Vancouver”, “British Columbia”, and “Canada”.

British Columbia, and Canada were often perceived as being “mine”, “ours”, or “theirs” further reflects the way in which posters constructed a strong sense of community and belonging (Colombi & Senatore, 2013, p. 49).

Consistent with Puddifoot’s (1995) assertion that distinctiveness in terms of certain physical or social characteristics is a key element of community identity, many posters highlighted that Vancouver was unique in comparison to other communities. For example, many said that the city was beautiful, made Canada proud during the 2010 Winter Olympics, and was well-regarded as an attractive place to live. Sayaka (*PRCU*) commented that Vancouver was a “world class city” while Surely (*PRCU*) referred to it as “...One of the most beautiful places on earth...” and many others constructed it as “clean”, “great”, “wonderful”, “amazing” and the “best” city in the world. This accentuating of positive features of a specific element that constitutes one’s self-concept—here, the poster’s membership within the locational community of Vancouver—is consistent with social identity theory, which suggests that a threat to group integrity must be negated so that members of the community may “still feel good about themselves” (Dietz-Uhler & Murrell, 1998, p. 26). It was clear that the events associated with the riot challenged that positive self-definition. In Andrew’s view (*RCRM*), “Just like the Olympics made us look better as a country, the actions of a few people have caused us as a country to be a laughing stock...” and, as Kristina (*VRP*) commented, “Vancouver is the best place on earth and some criminals tried and succeeded to make many hate us including ourselves...” In response, posters constructed Vancouver as better than other cities, illustrating their favoritism for their own community and the way in which they made positive evaluations of the communities with which they identified, thereby exhibiting behaviours that are consistent with social identity theory (Michinov et al., 2004; Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

Social identity theory also suggests that members of a community under reputational threat produce more positive evaluations of the group with which they identify (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). This was exemplified on the pages through the commendatory terms that posters used when discussing Vancouver and its citizens. For example, Alexis (*PRCU*) wrote “...when I get asked where I come from, I am always so proud to say I was raised in Vancouver!! It really is a first class city full of people who care...” and Terry (*PRCU*) wrote “...It makes me proud to be live in the world most beautiful and cleanest cities in the world as well as be a Canadian. Oh Canada!” Other posters reproduced these positive evaluations while vilifying riot participants, as illustrated by Ada’s (*PRCU*) comment: “Despite what the thugs and hooligans did to our beautiful city, VANCOUVER is still the best city in the world and the province of BRITISH COLUMBIA...” By reaffirming a positive sense of identity as members of the Vancouver community, these responses help re-establish a sense that the posters see themselves as living up to a socially specified conception of “goodness” (Cohen & Sherman, 2007, p. 787).

Other posters situated their comments within a sense of belonging to a community of interest centering on hockey fandom. On *PRCU*, for instance, many posters self-identified as Vancouver Canucks fans through such comments as “We are ALL Canucks!” (Adele), “We are proud of our Canucks” (Kati), “...WE LOVE... OUR CANUCKS...” (HeartworksPoetry) and “...Show our love for... Our Canucks!!” (Lori). Although this commentary allowed fans to communicate their commitment to, pride in, and love for the Vancouver Canucks, as will be seen, it also served the dual purpose of permitting posters to distinguish themselves from riot participants who were “not true fans” and therefore not members of the hockey community.

Members of both types of communities—locational and interest-based—used the pages to redefine their communities as ones that respected law and order. For example, users frequently

commented that Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, and hockey fans value law abiding behaviour and a respect for authority:

“...we’re supposed to be civilized and law abiding” (Alex, *VRP*);

“...this type of behaviour is not acceptable in our country” (Stephanie, *RCRM*);

“...What do these violent acts say about our country? We were not raised to be like this...” (Wayne, *RCRM*).

This strong rejection of “unlawful” behaviour illustrates how posters “othered” those who stepped outside of community norms to re-establish the identity of the community and its members as “good”. As Michelle wrote, “...our only redemption for this is for the *good citizens* of Vancouver to show how much we *detest* this behaviour in a meaningful way...” (*RCRM*, emphasis added). This rejection also enabled posters to preserve the positive status of particular locational communities and communities of interest whose reputations were significantly damaged following the VSCR.

Community Image Maintenance and the Communication and Enforcement of Community Behavioural Norms

Reputation

A number of posters clearly felt that the VSCR significantly damaged the reputations of the locational communities of Vancouver, British Columbia, and Canada and the institutions, organizations, and citizens residing within them. There were several posters who wrote that the VSCR blemished the city’s reputation by saying that Vancouver will be remembered in the future as a city plagued by collective violence; that all Vancouverites and Canadians had been

humiliated by the behaviour of only a few; and that even the post-secondary institutions and employers of riot participants would now be brought into disrepute. Many posters saw this loss of community reputation as shameful. One user even wrote that the VSCR made him want to renounce his Canadian citizenship so that he would have less in common with the riot participants (Mike, *VRP*). Others wrote that the VSCR was especially embarrassing for Vancouver considering that the city had hosted the Winter Olympics just one year earlier and, just four months prior to the event, was voted the world's most livable city for the fifth straight year (Economist Intelligence Unit, 2011)⁷. As such, concerns about reputational damage to the city as a whole was a central feature of the discussion of the event on the pages.

The strong sense of community identity in the statements “*our history*”, “*our citizens*”, “*our neighborhood*”, “*our home*”, and “*our nation*” was frequently linked to calls for retaliation. For example, Eric (*RCRM*) wrote “You treaded on my City....MY birth town.....now its personal...” and, as Brendan (*VRP*) wrote, “you’ve trashed my city, now i want to trash you.” Carpenter (2007) suggests that these types of retaliatory desires are common among community members, who will often retaliate against perceived wrongs even if the material benefit of doing so is minimal. As these comments indicate, posters’ strong sense of attachment to Vancouver was often linked to calls for vengeance—many of which involved physical violence—against those who harmed the city’s reputation.

Accordingly, for many posters, the destruction caused during the VSCR was reputational—the image of Vancouver, British Columbia, and Canada had been maligned—and therefore called for steps to reassert the image of these communities as made up of law abiding

⁷ An annual survey by the Economist Intelligence Unit (2011)—in which Vancouver received an overall rating of 98.0 percent in the categories of Stability, Healthcare, Culture and Environment, Education, and Infrastructure—corroborated these statements made by posters.

citizens who reject the behaviours exemplified by riot participants. Some attempted to defend the reputations of community members by maintaining that only a small percentage of Vancouverites were involved in the riot, such as Sheila (VRP) who wrote “Everyone is so quick to criticize the whole city of Vancouver ... 99.9% of those living in the lower mainland were NOT involved and are also disgusted.” Others such as Heidi extended these defensive responses by attempting to reassert the reputations of those residing beyond Vancouver; in her words, “...Not all *British Columbians*, or *Canadians* act in the manner you may be witnessing...” (PRCU, emphasis added). Research suggests that these types of defensive responses whereby individuals attempt to alter particular conditions of an event and reject information that conflicts with their existing views are adaptive mechanisms of rendering the event less threatening to their community image and sense of self-worth, thereby serving to protect a group’s sense of integrity (Correll et al., 2004; Sherman & Cohen, 2006).

In addition, a number of posters who self-identified as residents of Vancouver derogated riot participants in a way that “othered” them and made them part of an out-group. For example, in response to comments such as “vancouver you made a bad name for yourself” (Cori, PRCU) and “...proud to be canadian ...NOT” (Ron, RCRM), many drew a distinction between themselves (the predominantly law abiding members of the in-group) and the riot participants (the criminal law breakers who, through the law and order process of othering, became members of an out-group). Members of the community of hockey fans similarly othered riot participants to protect the integrity of their community. For example, some wrote that the riot was caused by “thugs”, “Bandwagon Jumpers”, “criminals”, and “hooligans” rather than fans. Posters often simultaneously insulted riot participants by calling them names such as “scumbags”, “goons”, “bozos”, “faggots”, and “imbeciles”. In viewing this as a strategy for harm reparation following

the VSCR, this othering can be explained in two ways. First, by defining and vilifying an out-group, users reaffirmed their own self-worth by reminding out-group members that they somehow occupied a “better” or more highly-regarded position than them (Sherman & Cohen, 2006, p. 203). Second, this in turn enhanced the integrity of the in-group more generally and helped to reassert the reputations of these communities as law abiding and non-violent. As Gerber and Jackson (2013) note, devaluing an offender in this manner may serve to protect the general identity of the in-group.

Opposition to riot participants’ behaviour was often paired with comments that illustrated posters’ shame and embarrassment over the resulting reputational damage. As Bonnie explained, “I was born in Vancouver but at [the] moment the fact just [makes me want] to hang my head” (*VRP*). Cole wrote “I’m ashamed to say I’m from van[couver]. They’ve disgraced our city” (*VRP*). And Sue wrote, “Born and raised in Vancouver, and I’m embarrassed...” (*PRCU*). Colton (*RCRM*), another poster, associated his embarrassment in relation to the VSCR with being both Canadian *and* a hockey fan, illustrating the riot’s effect upon community identity in both a locational and relational sense. These comments are reflective of social identity theory, which maintains that threats to people’s group identification may result in them feeling less positive about themselves or their membership within a group (Dietz-Uhler & Murrell, 1998) and may lead members to mentally dissociate themselves from the group with which they once identified (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), as Cole did. In addition, the personal humiliation and reputational damage elicited by the VSCR demonstrates that our reputation and how others perceive us affect “the very core of our identity” (Sanders & Olsen, 2012, p. 356).

Rather than expressing their embarrassment, other posters responded to the negative constructions of Vancouver, British Columbia, and Canada by reaffirming the reputable nature of

these regions. Sherman and Cohen (2006) argue that because social features such as citizenship within a specific region or dedication to a sports team constitute an important element of community identity, people respond defensively to threats to such collective aspects of the self just as they do to threats on a more individual level. Following the September 11th terrorist attacks, for instance, some Americans responded by embracing their citizenship unwaveringly or by defending the United States' foreign policies (Sherman & Cohen, 2006). Similar defensive responses arose on the pages following the VSCR, illustrated by the way in which posters contested statements that riots in Vancouver are a regular occurrence. In Tara's words, "...bad things happen everywhere. Even in your own cities and towns... its not like Vancouver is one big crazy fecking riot every day..." (VRP). Other posters active on this page voiced similar opinions, arguing that rioting is "a common phenomenon" (Buffy) that "happens all over the world" (Rachelle) and that, for this reason, the VSCR "doesn't represent" Vancouver, British Columbia, or Canada (Kim).

Notwithstanding the significant effects that the riot had in a reputational sense, others who self-identified as Vancouverites, British Columbians, or Canadians projected an overwhelmingly positive image of these locational communities and the pride they took in this self-identification, aligning with Sherman and Cohen's (2006) findings that individuals often perform particular defensive behaviours in response to events that threaten their self-integrity. Expectedly, those residing in these regions most fervently affirmed a positive community image. For some, this involved voicing their commitment to these communities as highlighted by Sue's proclamation, "I'm proud to be Canadian, British Columbian, and from Vancouver..." (PRCU). This was further apparent among those who commented "proud to be Canadian" (Laura, Sam, PRCU; Dave, Theresa, Kimberley, VRP), "proud to be a Vancouverite" (Allyson, Vrginia, PRCU), and

“I call Vancouver home ... and forever will” (Retty, *PRCU*). In understanding these comments as strategies for protecting and enhancing their positive social identity, this pronounced pride in one’s identification with these communities reflects how posters internalized their group membership as being an important aspect of their self-concept. It is this defining of oneself as belonging to a particular in-group that would have enabled posters to distinguish themselves from riot participants, who were categorised as belonging to an out-group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Despite the prevalence of these types of comments, posters’ attempts to re-establish a positive community image following the VSCR were not restricted to reputational defense or expressed commitment to their communities, but also included the communication and enforcement of community behavioural norms.

Communication of Behavioural Norms

Discussion on the pages also frequently centred upon standards of acceptable and expected citizen behaviour and the perceived “rightness” or “wrongfulness” of particular actions. Such comments most often revolved around the existence and enforcement of particular behavioural norms, understood as non-codified expectations that prescribe what behaviours individuals *ought* and *ought not* engage in (Myers et al., 2009). For example, Michelle (*VRP*) wrote “...every city should come together and stand for what is right and wrong...” while MaryJane (*RCRM*) commented “...this behaviour is NOT acceptable in Canada! It is NOT the Canadian way!...” In addition to reflecting posters’ support of community behavioural standards, this commentary indicates that a shared set of values existed among individuals, which is a key feature of community identity and membership (Anderson, 2010; Fyson, 1999; McNamara et al., 2013).

It has been argued that people's compliance with the law often stems from an accepted societal norm dictating that, simply, individuals should commit to law abiding behaviour. Such behaviour is based upon the notion that citizens' compliance with the law is "the right thing to do" (Jackson et al., 2012, p. 1052). Due to the very existence of this social standard, individuals are led to obey the law not because they agree with the rules set by agents of authority—although they certainly may—but because they accept that not doing so would mean committing a social *wrong* (Jackson et al., 2012). The posters in my sample consistently and vehemently asserted that particular behaviours were socially "wrong" or otherwise unacceptable by stating that they were "disgusted" or "appalled" at the behaviour of riot participants, which was viewed not only as "criminal", but "despicable", "horrible", "deplorable", "horrendous", "disgraceful", "disrespectful", and simply "unacceptable in Canada". Some also wrote that the behaviour of riot participants "over losing a hockey game" was "out of touch" in comparison to citizens of other nations who riot over the violation of human rights, political issues, or food insecurity. In this way, the actions of deviant individuals were used to re-establish and affirm the behavioural expectations (McMillan & Chavis, 1986) of both the locational and interest-based communities constructed on the pages. Moreover, these comments exemplify how posters engaged in problem-focused coping methods associated with social identity theory following this event. After constructing riot participants' behaviour as threatening to their group integrity and subsequently othering them as members of an out-group, the "law abiding" members of locational and interest-based communities made attempts at enhancing their in-group status by directing criticism towards out-group members who transgressed accepted behavioural norms while communicating their strong intolerance for riotous behaviour.

In addition to riot participants, bystanders, too, were criticised for their behaviour. Margaret (*RCRM*) and Bond (*RCRM*) saw the reluctance of bystanders to intervene as “sickening” and “disturbing” respectively, while numerous other posters viewed bystanders’ presence as supportive and inciting of riot participants’ behaviour. Posters’ responses also extended beyond the context of those directly or indirectly involved in the VSCR to include criticism about other posters’ comments. In Trevor’s (*VRP*) view, that posters were making harassing, homophobic, and hateful remarks towards riot participants and those suspected of associating with them was unacceptable and, as Michael (*RCRM*) commented, directing “vile racism” toward those perceived as culpable indicated that posters were “stooping to the level of [those] people.” These comments indicate posters’ attempts to draw the line between acceptable and unacceptable citizen behaviour through the condemnation of behaviours that should not be engaged in. Posters’ open objection to particular behaviours during and following the VSCR may have served as an attempt to modify the future behaviour of riot participants or to make fellow community members aware that particular anti-social behaviours—in this case, the failure to stop riot participants and discriminatory remarks—would not be tolerated. In Toni’s (*VRP*) view, rather than affecting Vancouver’s reputation, the VSCR and comments from posters who responded to it therefore “...demonstrated what we don’t accept in our city”.

For some posters, the rejection of riotous behaviour was paired with calls to “stand up” and “protect” Vancouver. This was reflected through such comments as “...We must strive to ... stand for what is right in our communities...” (Chris, *RCRM*), “...every city should come together and stand for what is right and what is wrong...” (Michelle, *VRP*), and “This is our city and we have the right to stand up and protect it. Let’s show these losers that we mean business and we will not put up with this type of behaviour!!!!” (Robert, *VRP*). As these comments

indicate, for many of the posters, belonging to locational communities entailed a responsibility to either publicly denounce the criminal behaviour exemplified by riot participants or endorse prosocial values and behaviours collectively accepted as “right”. These comments further reflect how shared values existed among certain posters and illustrate the strong sense of community that drew posters to come together for the purposes of enforcing behavioural norms.

Fehr and Fischbacher (2004) have explained that public demand and support for particular behavioural norms often arises when the actions of individuals cause adverse consequences or elicit negative responses from other people. This is perhaps for the reason that, because behavioural norms are viewed as non-negotiable and self-evident, a lack of tolerance towards them who violate them typically results (Pagliaro et al., 2011). That citizens endorsed particular norms was an apparent element of the Facebook commentary and well-reflected by the way in which posters communicated the immense value that they placed on certain pro-social behaviours. Mike (*PRCU*) communicated the importance of proper parenting with his comment “...Its important that we all teach our children morals, values and respect!!!”, Alex (*VRP*) discussed individuals’ obligation to respect the law by writing “...we’re supposed to be civilized and law abiding...”, and Theresa (*VRP*) wrote that “...A true Canadian stands up against anyone who seeks to damage and destroy!” These comments illustrate that behavioural norms are not only descriptive of what the majority of people do, yet may also be *prescriptive* of behaviour (Bicchieri, 2006) as posters communicated the actions that they perceived as important for others to engage in. Tuckman (1965) argues that this establishment of member-generated norms is important not only for a community’s construction but also for their continued existence. That the values being endorsed—proper parenting, law abiding behaviour, and commitment to one’s community—are intended to positively effect society in a general manner is reflective of research

by Bettencourt and Hume (1999), who suggest that community members typically view behavioural norms as most important for their *collective* identity and less so for their personal identity.

Citizens' lack of tolerance for those who violated accepted behavioural norms was further reflected in the way that riot participants frequently became the target of aggression and ostracism from posters who were dissatisfied with their behaviour. This was reflected in comments such as "Utterly disgusted [at] these lowest scum of society bottom feeders !!!!!!!!!!!" (Lori, *RCRM*), "Idiot!!!! Such losers!!!! So disgusted by his actions!!!" (Nathalie, *RCRM*), and "evil nasty little gangsters ... what they are doing is wrong..." (Gillian, *RCRM*). Such findings are supported by literature which has found that those who publicly violate behavioural norms are often subjected to ridicule (Fry, 2006), with those conveying this treatment typically feeling justified in their aggressive behaviour (Mullen & Skitka, 2006; Skitka & Mullen, 2003). Moreover, that norm violators were further classified as members of a deviant out-group by both Lori and Gillian while these posters criticised their behaviour as unacceptable in the eyes of the law abiding again reflects the process of social identity theory whereby an in-group, through favourable comparisons with an out-group, attempts to acquire intergroup distinctiveness and thereby maintain a positive sense of integrity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). This also illustrates the process by which informal sanctions are imposed upon those who violate behavioural norms. Although there exists some scholarly debate (Bicchieri, 2006), most authors have argued that behavioural norms are solidified not through legal forces but through informal responses from citizens (Stout, 2006) ranging from mere gossip to open censure and exclusion (Bicchieri, 2006).

Conversely, a number of posters *commended* those who engaged in behaviour that they viewed as worthy of praise. In response to photos of volunteers cleaning up the downtown

following the riot—many times with young children by their side—posters wrote “...this is how proud canadian fans SHOULD act!” (Mary-Ann, *PRCU*), “...excellent mother teaching her young the right thing to do!” (Coady, *PRCU*) and “This just shows what a true human being is made of...” (Morgan, *PRCU*). Others referred to this volunteerism as “fantastic”, “amazing”, and “wonderful”. The presence of these comments is supported by literature which suggests that those who adhere to behavioural norms often earn respect for the reason that their socially desirable behaviour demonstrates that they are “good” community members (Pagliaro et al., 2011, p. 1118) who are willing to disregard their own desires to behave in ways that are socially appropriate in the eyes of others (Barreto & Ellemers, 2000; Jetten et al., 2004; Sherif, 1966). These plauditory comments also reflect social identity theory for the reason that group members who conform to expectations of the in-group regularly receive praise from fellow members, as such conformity enhances and affirms the in-group’s positive status (Abrams et al., 2014).

Privatization of Public Space

Similar methods of enforcing community behavioural norms were reflected through the manner in which much of the commentary was accompanied and influenced by posters’ announcements of what communication practices were and were not permitted on these pages. For the reason that Facebook is largely recognized as a public space for “free” communication (Tierney, 2013, p. 18), particular types of commentary thereby called into question the notion of this outlet as genuinely “public”. For example, comments on the *VRP* page suggested that being a member of this virtual community of interest necessarily involved adherence to certain behavioural standards; comments illustrating this “privatization of public space” (Papacharissi, 2010, p. 39) were absent or infrequent in the other data sources. In essence, as Dawn (*VRP*)

explained, there existed boundaries of “acceptable” commentary and, as a result, there were certain conditions that influenced posters’ participation on this page.

The way in which this enforcement of community behavioural norms occurred amongst posters varied considerably, with some suggesting that certain comments be deleted or certain users be banned and others making it clear that particular discriminatory remarks would not be tolerated. Marlin-Bennett and Thornton (2012) have argued that internet users who are unsatisfied with the current rule system in place regularly exercise some degree of voice to create rules by complaining about activity within the site or by appealing to site owners or administrators⁸. This assertion was reflected in the data findings. After Taylor (*VRP*) asked that “joke” pictures be deleted, Fiona (*VRP*) suggested that comments made by those who “can’t control themselves” be deleted and those who posted them be banned from future participation on the page⁹. The fact that such comments were made only after the behaviour provoked disapproval reflects Sternberg’s (2012) contention that certain online behaviours are deemed inappropriate only after receiving significant opposition from others. In addition, these comments suggest that a sense of community was present among posters as community members who voice unlikeable opinions often become the focus of hostile reactions by other members (Pinto, 2006).

Many posters active on the *VRP* page communicated which behaviours were not permissible within this online community, reflecting the process of norm reinforcement under social identity theory (Abrams et al., 2014) whereby members define the boundaries of their

⁸ The terms “administrator” and “page administrator” are used in this thesis in reference to an individual who has some degree of control over particular pages within a website, thus able to delete comments, ban posters, and perform various other authoritative or regulatory duties.

⁹ It is also significant to note that, after learning of negative posts made about sexual preference and race, Rhonda (*VRP*) commented that the poster who posted them “...should be banned”, immediately after which a page administrator commented “he was just banned” (*VRP*). It cannot be confirmed, however, whether both Rhonda and the administrator were referring to the same poster and if the administrator did, indeed, ban the poster in question as a result of Rhonda’s request.

normative system and reinforce their own commitment to normative expectations (Pinto, 2006). This norm reinforcement likely enabled posters to reclaim and maintain the positive status of the locational and interest-based communities with which they identified. Puddifoot (1995) suggests that this drawing of boundaries between acceptable and unacceptable citizen behaviour reflects individuals' sense of community identity, often performed in an attempt to enhance cooperation and cohesiveness amongst community members, to maintain positive social relations, and to permit individuals some sort of influence within their community. Posters' participation in this norm reinforcement is significant given that, under social identity theory, deviant conduct on the part of in-group members is counterproductive to the in-group's attempt to achieve and maintain a positive social identity (Pinto, 2006). This suggests that, just as posters communicated which behaviours were unacceptable by members of locational communities so as to regain a positive social identity, posters on *VRP* similarly enforced a set of behavioural standards so as to counteract the antisocial verbal conduct of particular posters and enhance their positive status as a prosocial interest-based community.

Michael's (*VRP*) comment excellently illustrated how ordinary posters may accept responsibility for enforcing community behavioural norms by performing rule-making duties; as he wrote, "...some posters here have been very homophobic and negative for some reason and it will not be tolerated. GET IT?" In addition, making racist and hateful remarks were viewed by some as unacceptable as were posting doctored photos of the riot or individuals so as to portray the riot in a fabricated way or to present uninvolved individuals as riot participants. That certain posters other than the page administrator(s) communicated such behavioural standards is again consistent with the findings of Sternberg (2012), who argues that website visitors, despite being perceived as having lower status and authority than page administrators, often function as "rule-

makers” (p. 166). These rule-making behaviours reflect the process under social identity theory known as “group structuring”, whereby members establish or redefine a set of behavioural norms to guide others’ behaviour, in the process becoming aware of both what to expect from others and what others expect from them (Pinto, 2006, p. 23). As Pinto (2006) explains, this establishment of community behavioural norms is dependent upon the occurrence of intra-group deviance.

It was evident by the commentary that an authoritative presence governed this page and that, in addition to *posters* that communicated rules for appropriate online interaction, so too did page administrators. Analyses revealed that one of the page administrators who self-identified as “Mod-X” seemed to both *create* a set of behavioural standards by saying that discrimination and bigotry would not be tolerated and *enforce* them by banning posters who violated these standards. An additional illustration of this rule enforcement was seen in the way that one poster was lightly chastised for the format of her posts. In response to a user that was consistently writing in capitals—according to the rules of “netiquette” (Scheuermann & Taylor, 1997, p. 269), it was so understood that she was yelling—the page administrator wrote “enough with the Capslock...” (VRP). These findings are supported by literature which suggests that in some virtual communities, the same individual or group of individuals fulfil the role of both rule-maker and rule-enforcer; there is no distinction between the two (Sternberg, 2012). Plummer et al. (2009) argue that the presence of such an authority structure that can be trusted to maintain order is an important element of sense of community identity.

For the reason that their main focus is *preventing* the violation of standards, Sternberg (2012) argues that rule-makers typically “remain in the background of ordinary community affairs with a less visible presence” than rule-enforcers, “whose activities are more readily and routinely apparent to the general population” due to their focus on *reacting* to the violation of

standards (pp. 167-168). However, if the administrator(s) on VRP is viewed as both a rule-maker and a rule-enforcer—as mentioned, “Mod-X” performed functions attuned to both roles—his or her active interaction with other posters illustrates that rule-makers may not always remain hidden as Sternberg suggests. Nevertheless, that commentary by page administrators was again infrequent on *PRCU* and absent on *RCRM* reflects the findings obtained by Sobkowicz and Sobkowicz (2012) that moderation within social media outlets is relatively rare so as to permit various forms of user expression.

While the enforcement of behavioural norms was certainly present within this virtual community of interest, it was not agreed upon by all posters, with many openly voicing their objection to the processes whereby this seemingly “public space” (Davis, 2005, p. 126) became subjected to forms of “privatization” (Papacharissi, 2010, p. 39). Some expressed their opinion that certain posters were being banned for simply disagreeing with the posts made by the page administrator(s) or the majority of posters or for making comments that others misinterpreted as offensive. There was also one poster who wrote that the internet, unlike television, should never be subjected to censorship (Billy, *VRP*). These findings reflect those of Marlin-Bennett and Thornton (2012), who argue that although the phenomenon of rule emergence and a certain degree of governance can be found within all social media outlets, the rules governing participation within these outlets are open to both interpretation and contestation. Ultimately, the enforcement of community behavioural norms upon the *VRP* page by both page administrators and posters demonstrates the privatization of what merely *appeared* to be a public space, as online spaces are truly public only when they are not governed by individuals who deprive others of the equal opportunity to participate (Davis, 2005).

The Value of Social Media for Community Image Maintenance and the Communication and Enforcement of Community Behavioural Norms

Following the VSCR, the pages *RCRM* and *PRCU* came to serve as excellent avenues through which posters could reaffirm the positive image of particular locational communities. This was an apparent feature of the commentary, even among those who resided outside of Vancouver and British Columbia in areas such as Saskatoon, Calgary, Ontario, the United States, and Switzerland. Despite this geographic distance, the reaffirmation of a positive community image was evident by posters who used these pages to show genuine support for Vancouver, British Columbia, and Canada, and made encouraging and uplifting comments for residents of these regions. Exemplifying this, Darryl from Calgary applauded the riot clean-up by commenting "...huge props for the great job you have done ... Well done!" (*RCRM*) while Weibel from Switzerland simply wrote "Vancouver is a very nice city, with helpful people" (*PRCU*).

The valuable role of social media for both the communication and enforcement of behavioural norms was also a prominent feature of the pages. In response to the VSCR, posters openly censured, demeaned, and ostracized individuals for particular behaviours that they found unacceptable; applauded behaviours that they supported; and prescribed behaviours that, in their view, citizens were expected to demonstrate. The enforcement of behavioural standards took place largely through the communication of behavioural norms, as select posters communicated the value of law abiding behaviour while denouncing citizen violence and was further reflected in the privatization processes on *VRP*, upon which posters denounced expressions of homophobia, racism, harassment, and hate. Broadly, these various methods of attempting to maintain prosocial behaviour among community members illustrates the sense of community identity that was

present upon the pages as posters' responses reflected their adopted sense of influence—members' perception that their membership within a community is important enough that they can make a difference and effect change within it and amongst fellow community members (Anderson, 2010; Plummer et al., 2009). More specifically, posters' attempts to lessen the occurrence of discriminatory commentary either on their own terms or by appealing to page administrators rather than simply ignoring such content exemplifies posters' emotional commitment to the *VRP* virtual community (McMillan & Chavis, 1986).

Crowd-Sourced Policing

Law and Order

In addition to being used to construct a positive community image and to discuss particular community-based behavioural standards, posters' commentary following the *VSCR* excellently illustrated the process by which virtual communities of interest composed of ordinary citizens may identify issues of crime, disorder, safety, and security and develop (what they view as) potential solutions to them. In this regard, practices consistent with crowd-sourced policing emerged on the pages. Many of the comments illustrating crowd-sourced policing were made by posters who made reference to punitive punishments for particular parties; called for increased police powers; othered riot participants; or constructed youth as dangerous wrongdoers with a propensity for criminal involvement or as monsters beyond redemption. Literature suggests that such themes in posters' comments illustrates the presence of a "law and order" ideology (Dahrendorf, 1985; Garland, 2000; Gordon, 1990; Sasson, 1995), which advocates a "get tough" approach to crime, the easing of legal restraints on police conduct, seemingly limitless resources

for law enforcement (Sasson, 1995), and which also involves the criminalization of youth (Presdee, 2000) and the othering of offenders (Kohm, 2009).

Posters that othered riot participants most often did so by suggesting that they were “not true Vancouver Canucks fans” or, more generally, “not true *hockey* fans”, while some were more creative in the othering process by stating that participants were “animal psychotic sociopaths”, “violent animals”, “antiestablishment hooligans”, “degenerates”, “not normal”, “terrorists”, or “less than human”. Some posters, such as Beverly (*RCRM*) and Tam (*PRCU*) extended this act of othering by suggesting that riot participants were neither true Canadians nor true Vancouverites, respectively, and one individual made this distinction very clear by asserting that the “real fans” and the “real vancouverites” should not be placed “[in] the same group” as riot participants (Catherine, *VRP*). This process of othering involved distinguishing those who belonged in locational communities and communities of interest from those who did not—of drawing a distinction between “we as a totality of people who are clearly set apart from *them* who are conceived as a *not us*” (Wiesenfeld, 1996, pp. 337-338, emphasis in original). Moreover, this drawing of a distinction between law abiding citizens and criminally-involved individuals involved perpetuating the notion of a “deviant other”, which solidified the existence of an out-group to which downward social comparisons could be made.

Fundamentally, this othering enabled community members to maintain their identity as law abiding by outcasting those who violated the law, as illustrated by the way in which Patti (*PRCU*) categorised riot participants as a completely different type of citizen than hockey fans; in her words “...those are not call[ed] hockey fans, those are call[ed] Criminals!!!!...” Bonnie (*VRP*) further advanced this construction of riot participants as “not belonging” by stating “Those rioters are NOT Canadian we call them a**holes! They don’t belong anywhere!...” The drawing of

boundaries in this manner is an excellent illustration of community identity; as Puddifoot (1995) asserts, community members' perception of others' belongingness is a key element of their own identification within a community. The presence of these comments is also supported by Fyson (1999), who argues that individuals often use membership not only to unite around a common issue, but also as a tool with which to scapegoat those perceived as deviant. In accordance with social identity theory, this othering reflects the emergence of a social identity upon the pages for the reason that individuals belonging to the in-group of law abiding citizens perceived themselves as vastly dissimilar from the opposing out-group (Jackson et al., 1996). These downward social comparisons may be performed by the in-group in an attempt to gain a status that is superior to the out-group (Dietz-Uhler & Murrell, 1998), as exemplified by Jonathan's comment that "...true Canuck fans have *much more class*" than riot participants (*PRCU*, emphasis added).

The punitiveness that underlies the law and order ideology was reflected in poster comments that either suggested young offenders be tried as adults, that they be charged with domestic terrorism, or that they be given punitive sentences. Comments illustrating other punitive ideals ranged from being rather vague—such as "...big crimes should do hard times..." (Lisa, *RCRM*), participants should be "...prosecuted to the full[est] extent" (Dwayne, *RCRM*), and "...Our courts need to be harsh..." (Derek, *RCRM*)—to being more specific such as "Bringing back the death penalty wouldn't be so bad in this case" (Geoff, *RCRM*), "They should all be shot dead. 1st offence or not..." (Sheldon, *VRP*), "...burn them at the stake..." (Dawn, *VRP*), or "Lock him up and throw away the key!" (Lisa, *RCRM*). One poster even suggested that riot participants be beheaded or sent before a firing squad.

In many cases, the VSCR was used as a catalyst to discuss punitive punishment on a general scale, providing posters with a context to deliberate about what they perceived as

“appropriate” responses to criminality. This further illustrates how crowd-sourced policing became a prominent feature of posters’ commentary. Without referring to the VSCR in any way, one poster argued that “...Our justice system is too lax...” (Sandy, *RCRM*), another wrote that it “...would be nice to see chain gangs...” (Owen, *PRCU*), and yet another advocated for bringing an American-style punitive punishment north of the border by commenting “Bring the 3 strike rule to canada” (Doug, *VRP*). As Hogan et al. (2005) contend, this type of citizen endorsement of more severe punishments for offenders is indicative of public support for the law and order ideology.

In addition to highlighting the strong indignation that posters had for riot participants and the fact that posters adopted some control for dealing with crime and disorder, these punitive sentiments reflect what Garland (2000, p. 8) sees as the re-emergence of “expressive justice”. While punitive punishments were once widely criticised and deemed unsuitable within the modern penal system, support for punitive punishments has reappeared within the last thirty years, leading to the re-introduction of expressive justice in the form of chain gangs, corporal punishment, and the death penalty (Garland, 2000). That posters voiced their support for such punitive forms of punishment following the VSCR reflects the growing trend of the Canadian public favouring the harsh treatment of offenders (Kury, 1999), with citizens demanding longer prison sentences and more rigorous conditions during confinement as well as punishments that are often stronger than that even allowed by law (Kury, 1999), such as the death penalty which Canada formally abolished in 1976 (Kugler et al., 2013).

Poster comments calling for increased police powers—such as those suggesting that riot participants be tear gassed, tazered, beaten up, or even shot at mass or that police use water cannons, fire hoses, rubber bullets, horses, or police dogs to control them—were also common on

the pages. It is significant to note the number of posters that advocated for giving police more aggressive and, at times, shocking options for crowd control that, by both Canadian and American standards, would constitute either excessive force or police misconduct (Micucci & Gomme, 2005; White & Kane, 2013). In Charles' (*VRP*) view, "...the police should have started open firing into the crowds..." and, in suggesting that police physically assault riot participants, Dorrie (*PRCU*) wrote that police should have "...beat the bastards a little harder". The presence of these comments should not be disregarded, as police misconduct represents an egregious violation of authority and community trust (Skolnick & Fyfe, 1993 in White & Kane, 2013) that reduces the likelihood that citizens will provide information to authorities (Micucci & Gomme, 2005), frequently constitutes a violation of citizens' constitutional rights, and has far-reaching consequences that range from criminal prosecution and civil litigation to community disorder and irremediable harm to police legitimacy (Skolnick & Fyfe, 1993 in White & Kane, 2013). Nevertheless, as controversial as they may be, posters suggested these police actions as potential methods of "crime control" during the VSCR.

The criminalization or "monsterization" (Dennis, 1999, p. 115) of youth was a final element of the law and order ideology that was present upon the pages. While twenty-four was the average age of riot participants (McCann, 2011)—leading posters to refer to them as "nasty little gangsters", "children with no dignity", and "disrespectful kids"—youth in *general* became the focus of many. A number of posters were unspecific in their discussions and thereby made reference to youth that were uninvolved in the riot, such as Taralynn (*VRP*) who commented that "young people are losing it", Diane (*VRP*) who maintained that youth "have no respect for other people's possessions", and Berne (*VRP*) who asked "what's wrong with the younger people these days?" These types of comments illustrate the process through which youth were demonized

following the VSCR, broadly labelled as misbehaving, criminally-involved wrongdoers regardless of whether or not they participated in the riot. This generalized image of *all* young people as unruly and deviant may have been partly due to the overrepresentation of youth participants in the VSCR (McCann, 2011) and, more specifically, in the photos posted upon the pages.

Punishment

As discussed, following the VSCR, posters turned to the pages to express their support for a law and order ideology that involved advocating punitive responses such as capital punishment, three strikes legislation, and chain gangs. In addition, they also embraced the pages as a way to declare their hope for a specific punishment to be handed down to particular parties, to discuss punishment in a general manner, as well as to suggest specific punishments, again participating in a form of crowd-sourced policing whereby autonomous citizens unaffiliated with law enforcement participate in a criminal justice-centered discourse. These various methods of referencing punishment in response to the VSCR through social media reflect Garland's position that the condemnation of criminality and the language of punishment are no longer limited to debate between criminological experts or professionals but are, rather, increasingly becoming a focus of public sentiment (Garland, 2000).

Posters that hoped for specific forms of punishment typically hoped for prison, financial penalties, or community service, with some also hoping for deportation. Some were unspecific in the value or preference that they placed on particular punishments, such as Stacey (*RCRM*) who hoped that riot participants get "suitable punishment for their actions" and Linda (*PRCU*) who simply hoped that participants are "caught and charged". Others hoped that the court system

“does NOT treat this [riotous behaviour] lightly” (Kelly, *RCRM*). Those discussing punishment in a more general manner contributed to the commentary by making such posts as “Have fun in jail” (Geoff, *RCRM*), “our laws allow for a life term if convicted” (Darren, *PRCU*), and “...Nathan ... deserves to have the book thrown at him...” (Vince, *RCRM*).

There were also several posters who commented that, even as uninvolved citizens, they and others may be “punished” financially to account for the damage incurred by riot participants, such as Darlene (*RCRM*) who asserted “...that’s our taxes, our education, our medical, our seniors, our special needs, all being taken away to pay for this...” Posters asserted that taxes for citizens would increase to fund repairs to public property in the downtown and to replace police cruisers that were set ablaze during the riot, and that store owners would be forced to replace stolen items should replacement costs not be covered by insurance. In Patrick’s (*VRP*) view, taxpayers would ultimately “foot the bill” for the VSCR’s review and for the processes involved in investigating the riot, as well as for identifying, prosecuting, and sentencing participants. These comments illustrate that many individuals recognized the extent to which the riot would impact community members on a personal level rather than solely having broad effects upon their locational communities and relational communities of interest in the form of damaged tourism or a damaged reputation. It is this perceived personal impact that posters’ animosity towards riot participants may have originated, leading to many of the responses that emerged on the pages.

Commentary that referenced punishment frequently highlighted the process through which individuals participate in community-based coping behaviours following a real or perceived threat to their collective status (Bachrach & Zautra, 1985). This was most apparent among posters who *suggested* specific punishments such as disintegrative shaming, imprisonment, community service, or a financial penalty in the form of a fine or wage

garnishment, aligning with Wehmhoener's (2010) assertion that individuals often suggest punishments using the internet as a means of correcting perceived societal deviance. Many posters were quite creative in this regard and significantly invested in suggesting potential punishments for those who transgressed the behavioural standards of their communities. This was exemplified by those who suggested that riot participants perform community service each weekend for a year (Mike, Edna, *VRP*); make personal apologies to business and vehicle owners who had their property damaged or stolen (Ben, *VRP*); be banned from attending all future sporting events in Vancouver (Jason, *VRP*) or be required to have special supervision for such attendance (Eva, *PRCU*); be prohibited from being in places where large groups are gathering (Sarah, *PRCU*); have their university scholarships revoked (Kristie, *PRCU*); have their vehicles repossessed to pay for damages (Norma, *RCRM*); or be ordered to wear a sign or shirt detailing their participation in the riot, make televised apologies, or have their names and photos published in the news media as methods of disintegrative shaming (Debbi, Nina, Gillian, Lisa, *RCRM*; Phil, Megs, Jenny, *VRP*; Jean, *PRCU*). A number of posters were also disturbed by the presence of bystanders who remained in the riot zone to take pictures and cheer on participants and responded by suggesting punishments for these individuals as well, the most common of which was some sort of financial penalty.

However, there were several posters who suggested punishments that seemed based more on passion than reasoned decision-making, reflecting findings that communities' attitudes towards crime and punishment are often based more on emotion than rational consideration (Carlsmith & Darley, 2008; Ho et al., 2002). This was exemplified by the many posters who suggested punishments for completely uninvolved parties, such as parents of riot participants and the Vancouver Canucks organization. In failing to consider that their suggestions would punish

multiple parties—including the players comprising the team, the city and province that the team resides in, and Vancouver Canucks fans who were not involved in criminal wrongdoing during the VSCR—Johnny (*VRP*) suggested that the Canucks organization be relocated to Quebec City and renamed while Andrew (*VRP*) suggested that the team be banned from the Stanley Cup playoffs the following year. In addition, aside from suggestions that riot participants be made to participate in drug and alcohol programs, banned from future sporting events, given travel restrictions, or be given suspended sentences (these punishments are, arguably, not entirely inappropriate given the offences committed), users also suggested punishments that were largely devoid of rationale such as deportation, visitation to a morgue, corporal punishment through caning, and even execution. That several different methods of punishment were referenced in this manner illustrates that prison may not always be the “go-to” punishment suggested by community members (Roberts & Hough, 2002, p. 5).

Taken as a whole, these recommendations indicated that posters were very much in favour of a “just deserts” or retributive perspective on punishment. Many argued that the punishment of riot participants was justified on the sole basis that their wrongdoing during the VSCR merited punishment, illustrating that, in posters’ view, punishment was “an end in itself” (Carlsmith, 2006, p. 437). As Rita (*RCRM*) commented, “...The bible says ‘An eye for an eye’. I didn’t make the rules! You break them...you need to pay! End of story!” Due to this focus on delivering harm for harm and “getting even” with riot participants, there was little attention paid to the broader benefits of punishment, such as the deterrence of riotous behaviour should a similar event occur in the future. This suggests that posters cared most about retributive justice and assigning sentences while showing little desire for utilitarian goals. In addition, these recommendations of punishment illustrate how commitment to a group and sense of community

identity may act as a basis for collective action (McNamara et al., 2013) whereby individuals attempt to correct a situation that dissatisfies them or which they feel is damaging to their self- and group integrity (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1994). Given the assumptions of social identity theory, it is likely that suggesting punishments for wrongdoers in this manner again enabled the in-group to reaffirm their intolerance of riotous behaviour and re-establish their positive, law abiding status while simultaneously eschewing those who broke the law during the riot from their communities.

Threat of Victimization

While riot participants often provoked community concern in terms of the financial responsibility that may be bore by uninvolved individuals, posters also discussed how participants provoked a sense of unease associated with the threat of victimization to property, bystanders, and other citizens. In this way, the criminal justice-centered discourse that partly defines crowd-sourced policing was further represented upon the pages. Drawn from Rader's (2004, p. 689) seminal work on the topic, "threat of victimization" was applied to the data for the reason that this construct represents an expansive paradigm that encompasses the fear of crime, the perception of risk, and the precautionary behaviours adopted by individuals to protect against crime—three closely related yet distinctly different phenomena (Brunton-Smith, 2011; Ferraro, 1995; Lewis & Salem, 1986; Mesch, 2000; Rountree, 1998) and each of which were present among the poster comments.

Whether or not posters' constructions were warranted or exaggerated, commentary revealed that riot participants were viewed as posing a significant threat to others. There was an employer who vowed to "protect" her business and employees by terminating any employees that

participated in the VSCR (Lorna, *RCRM*), a poster who questioned whether riot participants might exhibit the same aggressive behaviour at work “if they get angry enough” (Steph, *RCRM*), and another who wrote of a man that was “pummeled unconscious” while trying to stop riot participants. Additionally, Sim (*PRCU*) referred to downtown Vancouver as a “war zone”, Andrew (*RCRM*) wrote that the riot participants could have killed someone if the vehicles they had set ablaze exploded, and some posters on the *VRP* page wrote that their family members in other provinces and countries were worried about their safety (Chanelle, Diana, Claudia). These comments illustrate how some posters, in constructing riot participants as menacing, adopted pseudo-policing roles to deliberate about the risk that these individuals posed to others and communicate strategies for risk avoidance. Literature suggests that these judgements of risk, modified behavioural patterns, and senses of fear and unease are rational and common responses to the actual incidence of crime (Balkin, 1979; Breakwell, 2007), and may reduce community trust, leading citizens to endorse more punitive punishments such as those discussed previously.

Elsewhere, posters’ discussions of fear demonstrated how perceptions of crime in locational communities may diminish senses of community identity and produce negative evaluations of a community and its members (Conklin, 1971). For example, Diana (*VRP*) discussed that Vancouver, which was once voted the “best city in the world” to her became overnight the “scariest city in the world”. A similar negative evaluation was made by Tamara (*RCRM*) who explained that the actions of riot participants made her feel the same emotions she experienced after being sexually assaulted as a child, writing “...I am scared of human decency ... People don’t feel safe with guys like this on the streets...” Although the crimes being committed during the VSCR primarily included looting, vehicle arson, physical assault, and vandalism rather than sexual assault (Furlong & Keefe, 2011; McCann, 2011), that riot

participants' behaviour produced these emotions for Tamara is supported by the literature. As Rountree (1998) argues, the trauma caused by violent victimization may create a "spillover effect" whereby victims begin to fear several forms of criminal victimization in addition to the form already experienced (p. 364). Moreover, past violent victimization may heighten individuals' perceptions of neighborhood disorder, which consequently increases fear of many forms of crime even if the probability of victimization is low (Myers & Chung, 1998; Rountree, 1998).

The threat of victimization in relation to the VSCR extended well beyond Vancouver and Canada, with vacationers, too, expressing their concerns of safety and security. Christian (VRP) wrote that he would not feel safe wearing a Boston Bruins jersey when visiting Vancouver (it was so understood that this was due to his perceived risk of being victimized as a fan of the "rival" team) and James (VRP) stated that he would never vacation in Canada due to "the constant fear of a riot". Posters' constructions of these communities as dangerous and uninviting challenged dominant perceptions of Canada as a safe country in which to live and visit (Welsh & Irving, 2005) and lent support to those who argued that the VSCR negatively impacted the image of Vancouver and Canada. That prospective vacationers who identified less strongly with Vancouver and Canada than those residing within these regions voiced these concerns is consistent with literature which suggests that the fear of crime is mitigated by a strong sense of community membership and identity (Hartnagel, 1979; Lewis & Salem, 1986; Riger et al., 1981; Rountree & Land, 1996).

Despite the existence of literature supporting vacationers' constructions of Vancouver and Canada as dangerous following the VSCR, Markus (VRP) attempted to contravene these constructions by presenting arguments that *downplayed* the threat of victimization. As he wrote,

“I know the riots were weird to all you foreign folk but this is the most safe city to walk around in bruins jersey or not. Anybody from any city can come down here at any time and walk through cracktown and have nothing to worry about. Not like some other cities I’ve recently visited.”

In distinguishing between his own community and others’, Markus’ comment highlights the process through which community members attempted to affirm their positive social identity and maintain group integrity following the VSCR by repeatedly attributing positive characteristics to their own communities while dismissing negative characteristics (Brewer, 2007; Jetten et al., 2004). Furthermore, this defensive response illustrates Markus’ understanding of Vancouver in terms of the specific social relations that characterise members of this locational community, argued by Puddifoot (2003) to indicate a sense of community identity.

Due Process

This understanding of one’s locational community and its features was also manifested in posters’ discussions of the value that Canadians place on citizens’ rights, centering primarily on principles of due process. Despite the prevalence of comments in which punishments for riot participants were hoped for, discussed, or suggested, there were posters who expressed their support for due process, many times while criticising others for failing to follow suit. Numerous posters responded to the VSCR with comments that conflicted with these standards which have been long-established in the Canadian justice system and, in response, select posters again participated in a criminal justice-centered discourse by emphasizing their importance. Many times, posters’ defence of these principles illustrated their dual attempt to further distinguish themselves from the out-group of riot participants, as illustrated by those who encouraged posters

to avoid behaviours that would make them “just as bad as the rioters themselves” (Toby, *RCRM*) or “no better than the rioters” (Jim, *VRP*). Upon the pages, three due process principles emerged for discussion: the requirement of evidence, the application of punishment, and the presumption of innocence.

A number of posters active on the pages criticised those who advocated for particular punishments without having sufficient evidence to prove individuals’ involvement in the riot. Zuckerman (1989) has discussed the necessity of evidence in considerable depth, arguing that “...no person may be convicted unless the prosecution has proved his guilt *beyond reasonable doubt*...” (p. 123, emphasis added). This principle of evidence beyond a reasonable doubt is essential to the presumption of innocence, and is acknowledged as such by the Canadian Judicial Council (2004). That many posters assigned responsibility to those whom they largely *believed* to be involved in the riot without having confirmed evidence of such involvement is therefore significant. It is likely that these assumptions of guilt were primarily if not solely based off of pictures that could have been interpreted in several different ways, as Giselle (*RCRM*) alluded to through her comment, “A lot of pictures have been posted that are misrepresenting of the situation ie one kid stopped vandals and took their sticks and is now being accused as a vandal himself”. For instance, some pictures on the Facebook pages depicted individuals standing in front of burning vehicles; while these individuals could have been taking pictures to assist police, attempting to put out the fires, blocking others from further vandalising the vehicles, or attempting to move people from harm, the common assumption among posters who responded to such photos was that these individuals were somehow complicit in the riot.

A second violation of due process to which posters responded pertained to the application of punishment upon riot participants. In any Canadian criminal case, responsibility for passing a

sentence lies with the trial judge, regardless of whether there is a jury or not (May, 1986).

Understood in different terms, this principle of due process posits that autonomous citizens are not in a position to decide upon what they view as “suitable” punishments for offenders; this responsibility lies solely with justice officials (Crombag et al., 2003, p. 335). Despite this, there were numerous users who suggested specific punishments for riot participants as discussed earlier, ranging from imprisonment, community service, and financial penalties to corporal and capital punishment. On certain occasions, these comments elicited swift responses from others who maintained that riot participants should be dealt with by the judicial system rather than enraged citizens. Such comments were made by Melanie (*PRCU*), who asserted “It’s not up to fans to dole out punishments. The courts do that...” as well as Esté (*PRCU*) who wrote “...letting the fans think about the punishment for the offenders? last time i checked [it was] the court of law, not that of public opinion that got to make that choice...”.

Notwithstanding the significance of these aforementioned principles, one of the most important principles in Canadian criminal (and civil) law maintains that, when an allegation is made against an individual, the opposite is to be presumed true until the person making the allegation proves otherwise (May, 1986). This principle is enshrined in the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* as the presumption of innocence and is an integral component of numerous international human rights treaties including the *European Convention on Human Rights* and the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* (May, 1986; Roberts and Zuckerman, 2010). Despite the existence of such a well-established and essential doctrine in law, there were several posters who seemed to immediately judge individuals as guilty of participating in the VSCR, to which others responded with criticism and subsequent commentary. For instance, Nicola (*VRP*) asserted that “in Canada you are innocent until proven guilty”, Gulp (*VRP*) argued

that “It is not anyones place to make assumptions”, and Thomas (*RCRM*) explained that “we must remain civilized and presume innocence until proven guilty”. These comments are significant as they illustrate that although the VSCR was perceived as significantly damaging to the social identities of many, particular posters were still unwilling to neglect their respect of due process—a hallmark of the Canadian community—in favour of swift judgement. Many posters emphasized the importance of their collective identity as Canadians in respecting this principle of due process, such as Shannon (*PRCU*) who wrote “Just remember ‘offenders’ are innocent until proven guilty in canada...”. Others spoke of how their embarrassment in relation to the VSCR was associated not with reputational damage but with these premature judgements of fellow community members, such as Ryan (*RCRM*) who wrote “If im embarrassed about my country for anything its how judgemental the people in it are.”

Posters’ comments regarding the importance of due process reflected the process under social identity theory whereby community members attempt to uphold a uniform belief system so as to maintain a positive social identity, often by pressuring other members to conform to normative expectations (Kruglanski et al., 2002). As Kruglanski et al. (2002) assert, the existence of widely varied characteristics within a group—consisting of diverse viewpoints, opinions, and attitudes that differ largely from the majority—may undermine the value of the community for individual members. This aligns with literature positing that member similarity is the “common denominator” across almost all definitions of a community (Weisenfeld, 1996, p. 339). Moreover, that posters defended these due process principles again demonstrates the association of positive characteristics to one’s in-group so as to avoid attracting a negative group evaluation (Brewer, 2007). This was illustrated by Gulp (*VRP*), who made it clear that Canadians value individual rights and the fair conduct of our criminal justice system by writing “before you all

grab pitchforks, give your head a shake and realize that the same country you're fighting to seek revenge for has established its reputation for its liberty, freedom and right to a fair trial."

Culpability

A central theme of the commentary on the pages—to which, as mentioned, many users responded with criticism—centred upon the attribution of blame to certain individuals or groups for having contributed to the riot. These declarations of culpability reflected crowd-sourced policing by resembling the process through which justice officials, in considering the “wrongfulness” or particular actions or inactions, determine the moral blameworthiness of those charged with a criminal offence (Loewy, 1988). Expectedly, posters constructed VSCR participants as being the most culpable subjects. Many attributed responsibility to these individuals with messages such as “guilty” (Jeremy, Rod, *RCRM*) and “they are completely and solely responsible” (Anita, *VRP*). Other posters provided detailed explanations as to why riot participants should be considered culpable; comments rested on such arguments as their criminal conduct was a choice, they were instigators of the violence, the riot was planned and deliberate as riot materials such as signs and shirts enticing others to riot were brought to the game, they were mature enough to know the nature of their actions, and they failed to leave after being instructed by police to do so. In one posters’ view, the riot participants were members of an organized “group of anarchists intent on violence” and were to blame not only for the VSCR, but also for past disturbances during the 2010 Winter Olympics and the Toronto G20 Summit (Marke, *PRCU*).

Aside from riot participants, bystanders to the VSCR were recipients of some of the most intense blame, being constructed by posters as contributors to the violence and therefore as “part

of the problem” (Angie, *VRP*; Denise, *RCRM*). These individuals were blamed for failing to stop the behaviour of riot participants; for further encouraging the behaviour of and providing an audience for riot participants, thereby “adding fuel to the fire”; and for blocking the access of emergency personnel. Posters’ comments in this regard paralleled the findings of McCann (2011), who argued that bystanders to the VSCR served as “cheerleaders” for riot participants (p. 7). Many posters were, in fact, so disturbed by bystanders’ presence that they viewed these individuals as possessing equal or commensurate culpability as riot participants. This was reflected by comments in which posters argued that bystanders were “just as guilty” (Danielle, *PRCU*) and “just as much as a problem” (Tess, *RCRM*) as riot participants and “...almost as culpable as the thieves and looters...” (Christina, *RCRM*). As a result, a number of posters constructed bystanders as accomplices and argued that they, too, ought to be punished, exemplified by Andrew’s (*VRP*) comment that “those watching and not doing anything at the time should have some sort of punishment as well...”.

It is significant to note that posters held bystanders culpable for not intervening; some argued that if they had, the riot would not have escalated to the point that it did. This commentary is both supported and contested by the literature. Russell and Mustonen (1998) found that those who intervene in a hockey riot to restore order are “an effective force in crowd control” as their actions can quiet wrongdoers and minimize the early stages of a disturbance before it escalates to wide scale collective violence (pp. 337-339). At the same time, however, these claims of culpability may also be questioned by decades of literature suggesting that bystander intervention is largely determined by the total number of bystanders; the more bystanders that are present during an emergency event, the less likely it is that any one individual will intervene (Darley & Latané, 1986; Latané & Darley, 1970; Levine & Crowther, 2008; Rutkowski et al., 1983). These

research findings therefore add both support and doubt to comments made by posters; although there was a low likelihood of bystanders intervening during the VSCR given the vast number of individuals present in the downtown, the VSCR may have been more quickly controlled if more individuals had, indeed, intervened.

Although many posters assigned blame to riot participants and bystanders, a significant amount of blame was also assigned to non-participating parties. Friends of riot participants who knew of their involvement yet failed to report them to police were viewed as possessing the same culpability as riot participants. Police were blamed for not making their presence known prior to the riot, not being prepared with riot gear, and for failing to intervene earlier. Vancouver city politicians and those who prepared the public viewing Live Sites were blamed for inviting “tens of thousands of people into the downtown core”, for not utilizing the entire VPD force that evening, and for not learning from the 1994 VSCR. Mothers and fathers as well as families more generally were blamed for inadequate child rearing, specifically by Chelsea (*VRP*) who urged people not to blame “Vancouver” but to question who raised the riot participants to behave as they did. The Mayor was blamed for his “incompetence”, “blind faith”, “lack [of] awareness”, and “gross oversight”, and for neither having a safety plan nor “preparing for the worst case scenario”. According to social identity theory, this identification of those perceived as deviant may have been performed so as to heighten the integrity and positive social identity of the in-group (Hamilton & Rauma, 1995; Yamagishi, 1995) by demonstrating that certain individuals were being denounced for their behavioural transgressions. Lastly, certain posters even placed blame upon the Canadian criminal justice system, arguing that the system is not punitive enough and therefore communicated the message that individuals could engage in riotous behaviour and not face strict punishment for doing so.

Despite the prevalence of these accusatory comments, many posters maintained that blame should *not* be placed upon particular individuals or groups. While the blamelessness of the Canucks' organization was asserted by Ron (*PRCU*) most posters contending that particular parties were not to blame asserted the blamelessness of police or of uninvolved fans, arguing that culpability rests solely upon riot participants—those who actually committed offences during the VSCR. Some posters argued that culpability in relation to the riot should not rest on any one individual, such as Kimberley (*PRCU*) who contended that any time thousands of fans gather and consume alcohol during an emotionally-charged event, “you’ve got a riot.” Another poster, in asserting the blamelessness of individuals that unwillingly became embroiled in the disturbance, wrote,

“...People live downtown and were trying to get home; others had hotel rooms and couldn’t get to them; others were trying to get to the SkyTrain to leave and [were] being blocked by the police; others had parked but the streets were not driveable. NO ONE STUCK DOWNTOWN should be considered complicit in the crimes that were committed.” (Gabriel, *PRCU*).

The Value of Social Media for Crowd-Sourced Policing

The valuable role that the pages served for crowd-sourced policing in the six months following the VSCR was reflected in the ways that posters discussed Facebook’s use for investigative purposes or highlighted the increased probability of riot participants being identified, charged, or punished due to their publicised riot involvement on the site and use of Facebook as a “celebratory tool” (Furlong & Keefe, 2011, p. 124). These relational communities of interest were also frequently used by posters to participate in pseudo-policing activities,

reflecting the long-established principle of policing advanced by Sir Robert Peel that “the public are the police”, whereby average citizens are encouraged to adopt policing roles in response to crime in their communities (Boisjoli, 1987, p. 120).

While being used for numerous other methods of crowd-sourced policing, many posters that openly expressed social media’s value wrote about the value of the pages for identifying riot participants and holding them accountable, such as Robyn (VRP) who commented “...pages like this are the modern day version of Wild, Wild West ‘Wanted’ posters...” and Nette (VRP) who thanked page administrators for “...putting this page together so that the ones responsible may be caught more easily!!” Other comments clearly emphasized this value for crowd-sourced policing such as those in which posters stated that Facebook, which was a “New age crime stoppers”, was being used by regular, “tech savvy folks” for “CSI work” and for “crowd-sourcing justice”. It was also quite common for posters to, perhaps without realizing it, *imply* this value. Some joked at the fact that photos of participants posted to Facebook would make excellent mug shots, would result in swift convictions, or that the police could, as a result, “kick down doors” and make arrests. Others were pleased that riot participants were being “tagged”; some used these pages as a platform through which to request that posters send photo and video evidence to the VPD or CrimeStoppers; and several others asked “who knows” riot participants, thereby implying that there is an identification value to Facebook.

Cyber Vigilantism

Desire for Vengeance

Scholars contend that vigilante activity, illegitimate because it too often resembles retributive justice, may result from citizens’ adoption of police responsibilities through crowd-

sourced policing and civilian policing more generally (Sharp et al., 2008). Otherwise stated, a very thin line exists between these two courses of citizen action, neither of which is entirely supported by the state (Sharp et al., 2008). Upon the pages, vigilantism in its internet-facilitated form—cyber vigilantism—became a third prominent discourse of the commentary, and was largely apparent through the manner in which posters expressed desires for vengeance against riot participants. A desire for vengeance is defined in the literature as a yearning to inflict mental, physical, or financial discomfort of varying degrees of severity upon a person judged responsible for a real or perceived injustice (Allen, 1982), with the fundamental goal being to “get even” or return “like for like” with the wrongdoer (Gollwitzer & Denzler, 2009, p. 840; Sievers & Redding Mersky, 2006, p. 243). Durkheim once argued that such a desire parallels the anger and outrage that results from the shock of norm violation (Hartnagel & Templeton, 2012), with Zdaniuk and Bobocel (2012) adding that resentment and hatred, too, often accompany this desire. Much of the commentary on the pages following the VSCR illustrated these emotions, with a desire for vengeance being a common response among posters who perceived riot participants as deserving of retaliation.

While vengeful comments included non-violent desires that riot participants suffer emotional hardship, be evicted from their parents’ homes, or be terminated from their jobs, physically violent retribution was a key concentration of many. Some *suggested* that bystanders assault riot participants while others *discussed* the opportunities for assaulting riot participants in more general terms, and still others *stated* that they would have assaulted riot participants had they been present during the VSCR. Others *hoped* that riot participants would be sexually assaulted in prison; face severe physical discipline by their parents; or become victims of vigilante justice, police brutality, or even arson. Posters expressing a desire for vengeance were,

therefore, generally aggressive and wrathful in their responses, indicated by such comments as “id like to smash the shit out [of] this porker...” (Jay, *RCRM*), “someone should of dragged his face across the street [and] made him lick up the mess!” (Lucy, *PRCU*) and evidenced by Kahl’s opinion that riot participants “deserve to be curb-stomped” (*VRP*). These comments are consistent with social identity theory, with research suggesting that instances of criminality may produce desires for vengeance as individuals respond to the potential of a threatened social identity by expressing aggression (Fischer et al., 2010). Demonstrating this, Fischer et al. (2010) argue that the 2005 London terrorist attacks led to retaliatory attitudes and widespread citizen support for vengeance when questions arose regarding the social identities of Londoners and residents of the United Kingdom. The demeaning comments that posters directed towards riot participants may have been easier to make considering that vengeance is often a method through which individuals communicate their low regard for offenders (Gerber & Jackson, 2013).

That the threat of physical violence was an underlying element of these vengeful comments reflects the cyber vigilantism that was present upon the pages. Even if these comments are viewed simply as the products of emotionally-charged community members, posters employed verbal threats of violence—a key element of vigilantism (Dumsday, 2009; Johnston, 1996)—in two ways: by exhibiting signs of *desiring violence* against riot participants through suggestions and hopes for vengeance, and by expressing *intent to inflict physical harm* through statements of how they would enact vengeance against riot participants if given the opportunity. Cyber vigilantism therefore became a key discourse among posters expressing a desire for vengeance as such threats of violence were *directed at perpetrators of deviant actions* and *voluntarily made by autonomous citizens who were not willingly accountable to the state*, thereby

illustrating four of the six components of vigilantism proposed by Johnston (1996) and four of the seven proposed by Dumsday (2009).

In a similar way that posters' suggestions of punishment were largely devoid of rationale, many posters' desires reflected one of the main features of vengeance proposed by Crombag et al. (2003): an "absence of evident gain or usefulness" (p. 334). Unlike the desire for justice, a desire for vengeance is rarely rational. Rather, it is more personal and meant to restore comfort to those feeling anger for a real or perceived wrong (Ho et al., 2002). Consequently, in the process of expressing a desire for vengeance, posters made comments that seemed rooted more in emotion than prudence by writing of their support for violent responses to riot participants that would never be considered legitimate responses by Canadian law enforcement or justice officials. In addition to hopes that riot participants be sexually assaulted in prison, this was illustrated by posters' comments that they would have "choked" (Mike, *RCRM*) or "cracked [the] skull[s]" of riot participants (Scotty, *RCRM*), as well by Rita's hope that officers set ablaze the vehicles and belongings of riot participants (*RCRM*).

Such comments highlighted the absence of proportionality between participants' conduct and posters' responses. Paralleling the standard of judicial punishment (Zdankiuk & Bobocel, 2012), a number of scholars have argued that vengeance should be approximately proportional to the quality and quantity of harm inflicted when an offence was committed (Bies & Tripp, 1996; Crombag et al., 2003; Frijda, 1994; McLean Parks, 1997; Tripp et al., 2002; among others), although this has been contested in other literature (Gerber & Jackson, 2013). In this way, there exists a sort of moral boundary amongst scholars about what vengeful conduct is considered acceptable and what is not. However, the fact that posters discussed desires for vengeance that were far from proportional to the damage caused by riot participants suggests that the boundaries

between legitimate punishment and vengeance were quite porous—in some instances, perhaps non-existent—upon the pages. The comment discussed earlier by Lucy (*PRCU*)—that a riot participant be dragged through the streets—was one example, as was that made by Tammy (*RCRM*), who hoped not only for the imprisonment and termination of one riot participant, but also that he be sexually assaulted in prison and subsequently deported. Whether these comments represented genuine actions that posters desired to take against riot participants or simply enraged discussion that lacked sincerity, that posters responded to breaches of institutionalised values by expressing a desire for vengeance illustrates the cyber vigilantism that was present upon the pages (Johnston, 1996; Shotland & Goodstein, 1984). Sederberg (1978) refers to this motivator of vigilantism stemming from a desire for vengeance rather than a desire to preserve social order as “vigilante vengeance” (p. 297).

Human Flesh Search

Boisjoli (1987) has argued that vigilante behaviour ranges from simply being watchful and vigilant to participating in extralegal activities by taking the law into one’s own hands. An example of this latter method—disregarding the traditional legal process by taking personal responsibility for meting out punishment—is participation in the human flesh search, which invites online users to hold deviants accountable through naming and shaming tactics (Schneider & Trottier, 2012) and is argued to be a form of “online vigilante justice” for the reason that it involves the humiliation and harassment of individuals (Ong, 2012, p. 127). Posters’ participation in the human flesh search upon the pages was largely a reflection of “spontaneous vigilantism” (Sederberg, 1978, p. 287; Shotland & Goodstein, 1984, p. 17), whereby citizens attempt to punish deviant individuals that have either been “caught in the act” or whose deviant activity has been detailed through communication between community members who hear details of the incident

from third parties (Johnston, 1996, p. 222). Spontaneous vigilantism occurs among groups—Shotland and Goodstein (1984) argue that “no one individual carries out the entire act alone” (p. 17)—and for this reason, responsibility for the vigilante activity is diffused. This group participation was reflected in Ashton’s (*VRP*) comment: “I’m noticing some reasonable progress ... There’s still a TON to ID ... keep it up, citizens!”

In response to photos of suspected riot participants and comments from individuals that were associated with them, several posters began identifying particular individuals by name or publicising their personal or demographic details on the Facebook pages. Within days, many suspected riot participants were recognized and identified including Zac, Kyle, Dustin, Kirk, Matthew, Brock, Sean, and Christine. Once these names were provided, posters began searching for and posting other details of these individuals and even the personal details of their “friends”. The workplace, school, and current residing location of Tyrone and Jamie—both of whom made comments which posters viewed as supporting the involvement of a riot participant—were publicised on the *RCRM* page. Soon, birthdates, employer addresses, work positions, schools and colleges attended, graduation dates, current and former locations of residence, and phone numbers were publicised upon the pages, either to assist police or so that others could use this information to perform acts of vigilantism. Often times, this information was used to send hateful messages to those suspected of participating in the riot as well as their employers, even if these individuals’ involvement had yet to be confirmed. On the *RCRM* page, two posters even threatened to participate in the human flesh search by saying that they would search for the personal information of a poster who defended the due process rights of an individual suspected of participating in the riot.

Aligning with Cheung's (2009) description of the human flesh search, fragments of information were provided in a gradual process: from the publication of photos, to the naming of perceived wrongdoers, and ultimately to the release of demographic and personal details. These published details were quite sensitive and potentially threatening for the individuals to whom they belonged, as reflected in comments from posters such as "Visions Electronics...Port Coquitlam...aka find LOSER HERE!!!" (Debra, *RCRM*), "Ashley [Surname] Food Service Worker at Sunridge Place Went to Cowichan Secondary School 2006 Lives in Duncan, British Columbia From Lake Cowichan, British Columbia" (Elijah, *RCRM*), "Thisjackass works here: RiteTech Construction Ltd. 428-55A St. Delta, B.C. V4M3M1 Phone 604-690-7483 FAX: 604-948-1237..." (Rick, *RCRM*), and "...Christine [Surname]...her # is 778 978 0415 she is in surrey right now" (Sugar, *VRP*). Because of the specificity of these published details including addresses and phone numbers, the threat of physical violence—again a key element of vigilantism (Dumsday, 2009; Johnston, 1996)—was an ever-present reality. This threat was, in fact, so pronounced that the family of one riot participant who attempted to set fire to a police cruiser during the riot chose to flee their home due to threats generated after their address appeared online through the human flesh search process (Ryan, 2011; Woo, 2012).

This identification of perceived wrongdoers reflected social identity theory through the manner in which posters, as a group of virtual community members, cooperated to perform this problem-focused coping behaviour following the riot. Literature suggests that this participation in the human flesh search served to functions. First, by identifying the select individuals believed to be responsible for the riot, the in-group of law abiding citizens was able to avoid the broad label of deviant being attached to the entire community and thereby to maintain its positive group status. Secondly, by attributing certain failures to forces external to that community and by

directing derogation towards those now viewed as belonging to the out-group, members were able to counter the threat that the VSCR posed to their identification with their communities (Dietz-Uhler & Murrell, 1998) and enhance their self-esteem (Oakes & Turner, 1980; Jackson et al., 1996; Lemyre & Smith, 1985).

While literature suggests that the identification of deviant individuals in this manner serves to manage the prosocial beliefs and behaviour of members of a social group (Hamilton & Rauma, 1995; Yamagishi, 1995), posters' commentary suggested that this type of public identification served more of a punishment function. Specifically, this publication of particular details reflected the disintegrative shaming method of punishment (Braithwaite, 2000) whereby offenders are stigmatized as "bad people" and become recipients of humiliating treatment (Harris, 2006, p. 328). This was well exemplified by posters on the *RCRM* page that paired the human flesh search with derogation by making such comments as "BROC [Surname] = Ultimate DoucheBag" (Samantha), "Dustin [Surname]... Expose this son of a bitch!!!" (Wilbur), and "I went to school with Zach and I can guarantee u that is him. What a fuckin loser." (Nick).

Cyber Harassment

While derogation was frequently coupled with the human flesh search, there were numerous instances in which derogation became the primary element of posters' commentary on the pages. Rather than complimenting existing posts with compelling commentary, many posters used the pages solely as outlets through which to direct insults at riot participants, indicated by simple comments such as "Imbeciles" (Denise, *RCRM*) and "lil prick" (Quentyn, *RCRM*). Even when comments did begin with thought-provoking discussion, they often ended with an insult, as reflected in Katie's (*VRP*) comment: "...Everyone completely embarrassed Vancouver and are

making us the joke of the globe. Karma's a bitch you dumb ass rioters". Indeed, the exchange of insults—a behaviour known in the cyber context as "internet banging" (Patton et al., 2013, p. A54) or, more commonly, "flaming" (Davis, 2005, pp. 62-63)—was perhaps the most recurring response of posters to riot participants. "Idiot", "loser", "moron", "jerk", and "stupid" were common insults directed towards riot participants, as were more vulgar terms such as "asshole", "dumb ass", "fuck up", "fuckhead", "bitch", "dick", "douchebag", "piece of shit", and "bastard", among others. These insults demonstrate how riot participants became the recipients of intense cyber harassment in the months following the VSCR, again illustrating how posters disregarded the traditional judicial process to disseminate their own forms of punishment and further highlighting the cyber vigilantism that was present upon these pages (Wehmhoener, 2010).

Verbal attacks such as these are significantly more common online than in the physical realm (Joinson, 2003), with numerous scholars (Ho & McLeod, 2008; Joinson, 2003; Juliano, 2012; Kahne et al., 2011; Law et al., 2012; Papacharissi, 2004; Sobkowicz & Sobkowicz, 2012; Tyler, 2002) contending that this is due to the absence of face-to-face communication which reduces individuals' social accountability and anxiety about possible negative social sanctions from others. As Nelson (2003) summarizes succinctly, online, "I can say anything I want. It's impersonal. Face to face is a little intimidating" (in Li, 2007, p. 1779)¹⁰. Davis (2005) builds upon this, arguing that internet users can also conceal particular aspects of their identity such as age, gender, real name, or employer, thereby remaining relatively anonymous and free to engage in aggressive communication practices. Sanders and Olsen (2012) go so far as to suggest that membership within virtual communities—which often produces feelings of anonymity and, thus, unaccountability—can heighten this participation in flaming and cyber harassment.

¹⁰ After attempting to consult the URL that Li (2007) provided for Nelson's (2003) online article, entitled *School Bullies Going High Tech*, the URL was met with a "Not Found" error message.

Further illustrating how the out-group was openly demeaned and derogated, cyber harassment was also reflected in the manner through which some posters made attempts at humiliating riot participants in front of others (Davis, 2005). A very common method in this regard was for posters to criticise certain articles of clothing being worn by riot participants, such as Nadine (*RCRM*) who wrote “i hope he went and looted some new jeans...those are soooooo 1990’s”. Despite lacking much evidence to support their claims, others made comments about riot participants’ intelligence, financial affairs, appearance, family members, and anatomy that were, arguably, quite offensive. For instance, Hailee (*VRP*) wrote “...the people that did this dont have half a brain...”, Olga (*RCRM*) commented “...probably people who have nothing else better to do with their lives than collect welfare...”, and Kurt (*RCRM*) wrote “he looks like the offspring of a redneck farmer that had sex with a pig”. Additionally, Craig (*RCRM*) commented “...I’m sure your crackhead Mummy is proud” and Sue (*RCRM*) wrote “I see a bunch of young men overcompensating for [having] tiny penises...”.

In addition to demonstrating how downward social comparisons were made to riot participants belonging to the out-group, these comments illustrate the ways in which riot participants were further othered from the communities of law abiding citizens. While intentional harassment of this nature may have served the purpose of making riot participants aware of the extreme animosity posters held towards them, it may have, again, been a harm-reparation strategy used by members of locational communities and communities of interest. Devaluing offenders through harassment, again by distinguishing “them” from “us”, would have further enhanced the integrity of those who were uninvolved in the riot (Gerber & Jackson, 2013) and assisted in protecting the general identity of these communities. Hardin (1995) has drawn a connection between this behaviour and community membership; as he explains, “...to belong means to

lessen concern for those who are excluded or, worse, to be overtly hostile to them” (p. 29).

Justification for this verbally aggressive behaviour can also be found in the social identity theory literature, with Brewer (2007) maintaining that in-group/out-group differentiation provides a basis for intergroup prejudice and hate, particularly when similarities to the out-group on particular dimensions threatens the identity of the in-group.

Schrock and Boyd (2011) argue that cyber harassment may involve both public and private communications, ranging from harassing behaviours that other online users can see to direct insulting messages sent to individual users. In this light, a final reflection of cyber harassment was reflected by the way in which posters employed intimidation tactics by sending private messages to suspected riot participants. Regardless of whether posters had already sent private messages of their own, the participation of others was always enlisted for these acts of cyber vigilantism. For instance, Vincent (*RCRM*) wrote “Send him a message!!!! i did...”, Christine (*VRP*) wrote “let’s all fill up his message space...”, Rod (*RCRM*) commented “Let’s all email him and let him know what we think...”, and Mandy (*RCRM*) asserted “everyone needs to look up his name and message him...”. On one occasion, sending an intimidating message simultaneously involved issuing threats of physical violence, excellently illustrating the presence of a cyber vigilantism discourse; as Gary (*RCRM*) stated, “...send him a lil message to keep his fuckin head up....and watch his fuckin back”.

Posters also employed intimidation by writing of the possibility of riot participants being sexually assaulted in prison. Comments of this nature were particularly frequent on the *RCRM* page, with posters making such comments as “...his ass is already exposed for the butt fawk raping he will get in jail” (Terry), “...that huge chain around his neck will give Mr Big something else to hold on to whilst he makes him ‘squeal like a little pig’” (Fi), and “...at least his cell mate

will have some tittys to play with...” (Gary). These types of comments are, certainly, quite disturbing, and indicate that posters employed vulgar language and harassment in a very unsympathetic and calculated manner when responding to the behaviour of riot participants. Sobkowicz and Sobkowicz (2012) maintain that exposure to these types of uncensored perspectives is particularly common on social media due to the absence of observable judgement from others.

The Value of Social Media for Cyber Vigilantism

Taking into account this subjection of riot participants to cyber harassment, as well as community members’ participation in the human flesh search and expressed desires for vengeance, analyses suggest that the pages served as valuable outlets through which posters could dispel and discuss their desires for citizen justice. For many, the desire to “get even” with riot participants on their own terms seemed to outweigh their hopes that riot participants be held accountable by legitimate authorities of criminal justice, which illustrated posters’ strong commitment to and investment within their communities in that they were willing to adopt personal responsibility for administering punishment. The cyber vigilantism discourse that eventually emerged from posters’ commentary demonstrated what many understood to be “the power of social networking” (Clinton, *VRP*) and “the power of social media” (Derek, *RCRM*). That Facebook was adopted as a cyber vigilante tool following the VSCR was perhaps best captured through Glenn’s (*PRCU*) comment that riot participants will “have their day in the court of social media... vigilantism is done with a ‘send’ button now...”.

While a number of comments reflecting cyber vigilantism might have been particularly bothersome—such as those that employed abusive language or vivid imagery and those which

centered upon discussions of sexual assault in prison—that such comments were present is, again, not unsupported by literature. Numerous scholars (Baek et al., 2011; Ho & McLeod, 2008; Law et al., 2012; Tyler, 2002; among others) have asserted that such uninhibited conduct online is a common feature of internet-based discussion due to the absence of face-to-face contact that would ordinarily make people aware of emotional responses (Davis, 2005), increase attention to standards of acceptable behaviour (Papacharissi, 2004), and hinder people from conveying unpopular or deviant sentiments (Sobkowicz & Sobkowicz, 2012).

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

This research project centered on an exploration of how Facebook was used as an outlet for community response in the six months following the 2011 Vancouver Stanley Cup riot (VSCR). Paired with a purposive sampling method, three Facebook pages that were created in response to this event were selected and 1315 comments from posters on these pages were subjected to a qualitative content analysis that searched for both manifest and latent themes in the texts. As stated previously, comments were analysed so as to illuminate the following research questions: (1) *How did persons who participated in discussions on social media of the 2011 Vancouver Stanley Cup riot construct the meaning of the riot?*; and (2) *How did persons who participated in social media discussions construct the identities of people who committed criminal acts during the riot?* Analyses indicated that much of the commentary on the pages *Report Canuck RIOT Morons (RCRM)*, *Vancouver Riot Pics: Post Your Photos (VRP)*, and *Post Riot Clean-up – Let's Help Vancouver (PRCU)* reflected the processes that underlie social identity theory, which again asserts that individuals attempt to maximize the differences between the “in-group” to which they belong and an opposing “out-group” (Greene, 2004) so as to achieve and maintain a positive self- and group evaluation (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) following instances of reputational threat (Brown, 2000; Stets & Burke, 2000). Congruent with this theory's subsequent assumption that in-group members behave in ways that will enhance feelings of self-efficacy, competence, and overall self-worth (Stets & Burke, 2000), the discussions that ensued on these pages suggest that posters' comments, while illustrative of the significant and far-reaching effects of the VSCR and its participants, dually exemplified their attempts to reassert the “law abiding” and “peaceful” image of particular communities.

With respect to the first question that guided this research, commentary upon the pages suggested that the VSCR was constructed as an event that significantly damaged the reputations of locational communities and communities of interest, described by posters as an “embarrassment” that left community members “ashamed”. Resulting claims of reputational threat were associated with posters’ description of the VSCR as an instance of collective criminality during which once-fellow community members were relegated to “violent animals”, “anarchists”, and “terrorists” who presented a misleading and distasteful image of Vancouverites, British Columbians, Canadians, and hockey fans. Accordingly, the VSCR impaired many posters’ positive identification with these communities, often resulting in comments whereby individuals reconstituted their once proud membership as, now, a stigmatizing burden. That posters felt shame and embarrassment in relation to this reputational damage highlights how stigma may emerge as a direct result of the actions of unknown individuals, showcasing the presence of stigma at a distance which came to burden both locational communities and communities of interest. Despite these overwhelmingly negative constructions of the VSCR, many also constructed the event as helping to solidify the existence of behavioural standards for community members by defining which behaviours are “appropriate” and which are not and delineating what prosocial behaviours community members *ought* to exemplify.

Drawing into focus the second question that guided this research, the most common response amongst posters on the pages was to construct riot participants as criminally-involved wrongdoers who were fundamentally and characteristically different from those who chose not to participate in the VSCR. Accordingly, riot participants were described using predominantly negative terms and often constructed as “not true” Vancouverites, Canadians, Vancouver Canucks fans, or hockey fans more generally by virtue of their riotous behaviour. In this respect,

riot participants were “othered” and outcast as members of an out-group in contrast with an in-group composed of “law abiding” members of locational communities and relational communities of interest. Consistent with the assumptions of social identity theory, this drawing of a distinction between those who belonged and those who did not provided a basis for posters to direct derogation and hostility towards riot participants (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Brown, 2000; Colman, 2008; Greenwald & Pettigrew, 2014; Jetten et al., 2004). As expressed by posters, given that riot participants’ actions had wrongly presented entire communities and their members as deviant and were shameful given their occurrence in Canada, riot participants were depicted on the pages as very much deserving of this resulting demeaning treatment.

Much of this commentary reflected the culpability, or moral blameworthiness, that community members attributed to riot participants, with the most commonly advanced argument being that participants made a rational and immoral decision to become involved in criminal behaviour. It is, however, worth noting that this culpability did not rest solely on riot participants, with many arguing that bystanders, caregivers, police, and political authorities or institutions were also deserving of blame. In light of this culpability, riot participants were constructed as deserving of punishment, with such discussions highlighting the existence of a “just deserts” sentiment among posters. Given the vast array of punishments that were discussed, three forms, or typologies, of punishment emerged on the pages. The first typology—punishments that are regularly imposed under Canadian law—was reflected through comments in which posters discussed imprisonment, financial penalties, and community service. The second typology—punishments that are not imposed under Canadian law—included corporal and capital punishment. The third—“creative” punishments—centered upon discussions of disintegrative shaming sanctions, verbal apologies, military service, psychological counselling, banishment

from future sporting events, deportation and other forms of punishment for which their appropriateness is questionable in light of the offences committed. These discussions that coalesced around punishment frequently extended from a crowd-sourced policing discourse to cyber vigilantism, specifically among posters who participated in cyber harassment and the human flesh search.

This cyber vigilantism discourse was also reflected in the way that riot participants were constructed as deserving of vengeful conduct by posters who strongly condemned their behaviour. While non-violent desires for vengeance were expressed by a number of posters, findings suggested that desires for physically-violent retribution were most common, particularly among posters who exhibited signs of desiring violence against riot participants and those who expressed intent to inflict physical harm, with both types of retaliatory responses indicative of the strong emotional reaction that posters had towards riot participants. This moral outrage was often paired with commentary regarding the importance of strict police treatment towards riot participants, with a number of posters openly endorsing reduced constraints on police conduct and police responses that reflected a law and order ideology towards crime control. It was also apparent from posters' commentary that riot participants were constructed as threatening on the basis of their aggressive behaviour, provoking fear amongst individuals, causing individuals to perceive a significant amount of risk in their communities, and leading some to adopt precautionary behaviours in response to the event.

Despite these prevailing constructions of riot participants as deviant and threatening "others" who were deserving of derogation, punishment, vengeance, and strict police treatment, a number of posters emphasized their membership within the Canadian community by constructing participants as deserving of respect for due process. The resulting constructions of riot

participants as innocent until proven guilty, guilty only with the presence of implicating evidence, and deserving only of punishments imposed by a court of law originated from posters who voiced opposition to the cyber vigilante processes that were occurring on the pages. Again, this commentary illustrated the process underlying social identity theory whereby community members attempt to uphold a uniform belief system by pressuring others to conform to normative expectations so as to maintain a positive social identity (Kruglanski et al., 2002), and exemplified how posters attributed positive characteristics to their in-group by demonstrating that respect for due process is a valued principle within the Canadian community.

It was clear from the commentary that although the primary foci of the pages was the VSCR and, more specifically, upon responding to and identifying those who committed unlawful acts during this event, these pages facilitated the discussion of a number of other issues amongst posters. One of the most common issues revolved around the communication and enforcement of behavioural norms, within both locational communities and communities of interest. In response to the antisocial behaviour demonstrated by riot participants and the discriminatory verbal practices of fellow posters, many individuals used these pages to re-establish norms of acceptable citizen behaviour and to reaffirm what they perceived as “right” and “wrong” actions. While discussions in this regard frequently involved prescribing particular socially expected behaviours to community members, it most often took the form of *prohibitory* statements whereby posters made it clear what socially inappropriate behaviours would not be tolerated by others. Verbal behaviours that were deemed inappropriate upon the pages yet repeatedly expressed—such as discriminatory remarks on the *VRP* page—were frequently subjected to processes of privatization whereby these comments were deleted by page administrators and those who posted them were publicly chastised or banned from further participation.

Punitive sentiments towards criminality were another issue that arose for discussion, primarily among posters who used the VSCR as a catalyst through which to deliberate about what they viewed as “appropriate” responses to offenders in a general sense. Accordingly, a number of individuals highlighted their support for punitive punishments, punitive policing practices, and reduced constraints on police conduct, with such discussions suggesting the presence of a law and order ideology amongst posters. A third prominent topic of discussion facilitated by the pages pertained to the importance of respecting principles of due process. This topic was deliberated amongst posters who, again, voiced their opposition to the comments made by others in which punishments for riot participants were suggested and riot participants were judged as “guilty” before being presumed innocent or without sufficient evidence to determine their culpability.

In addition, the various values of social media for responding to criminality emerged for discussion upon the pages. With respect to the crowd-sourced policing discourse, posters repeatedly highlighted Facebook’s value as an identification and investigative tool that could be used by police organizations following the VSCR, referring to the social media outlet as an extension of Crime Stoppers and on one occasion as a modern version of “Wanted” posters. These discussions were often closely entwined with the cyber vigilantism discourse as posters commented that they, too, as community members, could use Facebook to identify riot participants through the human flesh search or to dispel their own conceptions of “justice”.

Lastly, and most importantly, *RCRM*, *VRP*, and *PRCU* facilitated the discussion of community membership and belonging and the construction of a positive understanding of particular communities even amidst the largely negative constructions and viewpoints of other posters. Many of these comments, again, reflected the process whereby in-group members

attempt to re-establish and maintain a positive social identity following circumstances that threaten the reputation of their group (Brown, 2000; Stets & Burke, 2000). The most common form of commentary in this regard was for posters to make comments that reflected reputational defense by constructing Vancouver as “world class”, or “amazing”, British Columbia as “beautiful”, or “the best place on earth”, and Canada as “peaceful”. Others proclaimed the pride they had in their community membership, saying that they were “proud” to be Canadian or British Columbian, to live in or be from Vancouver, or to be Vancouver Canucks fans. These findings suggest that posters used the Facebook pages following the VSCR to strengthen collective identities, and, more specifically, to reinforce *locational* community identities by situating their comments within the context of communal repair, demonstrating a particularly intriguing aspect of interaction in virtual space.

In due course, the commentary on these pages suggested the potential value of Facebook in enabling community members to participate in collective, problem-focused coping behaviours in response to the VSCR through discussions that advanced different conceptions of community and community identity. This was further reflected through the various thematic elements embedded in the posts, including the importance placed on maintaining the image of the poster’s community, the communication and enforcement of community behavioural norms, crowd-sourced policing, and cyber vigilantism. Underscoring each of these were processes underlying social identity theory that ranged from perceptions of riot participants as vastly dissimilar “others” in comparison to “law abiding” community members and attempts at enhancing the evaluation of one’s own in-group, to verbal expressions of aggression in response to threatened social identities and criticism and derogation directed towards out-group members. Goffman’s concept of stigma by association was closely interwoven within these responses, exemplified

through the manner in which the social identities of locational communities and communities of interest were stigmatized “at a distance” as a result of the VSCR and its participants.

Future research may seek to further examine the potential connection between collective violence and community members’ use of social media in responding to the criminal acts committed during these events. Interviews with community members who have used Facebook as methods of response following specific instances of collective violence could provide an understanding of the intentions that often prompt individuals’ participation in social media discussions. Such analyses could also be broadened to consider Facebook’s value following other instances of collective violence aside from sporting riots such as violent political protests. Relatedly, and similarly compelling, future research may seek to more closely examine the stigma at a distance that these findings suggest emerge when instances of collective violence threaten individual and collective social identities. It is my intention to explore this particular area as the focus of my doctoral research. By pairing analyses of social media commentary with interviews with those who have embraced these sites as outlets for response, my doctoral research will aim to examine a specific instance of violent political protest so as to answer the following question: “What values do individuals attribute to social media as outlets for responding to collective violence during instances of violent political protest?”

REFERENCES

- Abrahamson, M. (1983). *Social research methods*. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Abrams, D., Palmer, S. B., Rutland, A., Cameron, L., & Van de Vyver, J. (2014). Evaluations of and reasoning about normative and deviant ingroup and outgroup members: Development of the black sheep effect. *Developmental Psychology*, 50(1), 258-270.
- Adang, O. M. (2011). Initiation and escalation of collective violence: An observational study. In T. D. Madensen & J. Knutsson (Eds.), *Preventing crowd violence* (pp. 47-68). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
- Akers, R. L., La Greca, A. J., Sellers, C., & Cochran, J. (1987). Fear of crime and victimization among the elderly in different types of communities. *Criminology*, 25(3), 487-505.
- Allen, B. (1982). *Payback: The nature and morality of revenge*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Allport, F. H. (1924). *Social Psychology*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Allport, G. W., & Postman, L. (1947). *The psychology of rumor*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Alper, M., Chappell, A. T. (2012). Untangling fear of crime: A multi-theoretical approach to examining the causes of crime-specific fear. *Sociological Spectrum: Mid-South Sociological Association*, 32(4), 346-363.

- Amiot, A. E., & Sansfacon, S. (2011). Motivations to identify with social groups: A look at their positive and negative consequences. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 15(2), 105-127.
- Anderson, M. R. (2010). *Community identity and political behavior*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Andreescu, M. (2011). Principle of proportionality, criterion of legitimacy in the public law. *Lex ET Scientia International Journal*, 18(1), 113-120.
- Andrews, T. (2012). What is social constructionism? *The Grounded Theory Review*, 11(1), 39-46.
- Armstrong, D., Gosling, A., Weinman, J., & Marteau, T. (1997). The place of inter-rater reliability in qualitative research: An empirical study. *Sociology*, 31(3), 597-606.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20-39.
- Au, K. H. (1998). Social constructivism and the school literacy learning of students of diverse background. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 30(2), 297-319.
- Bachrach, K. M., & Zautra, A. J. (1985). Coping with a community stressor: The threat of a hazardous waste facility. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 26(2), 127-141.
- Baek, Y. M., Wojcieszak, M., & Delli Carpini, M. X. (2011). Online versus face-to-face deliberation: Who? Why? What? With what effects? *New Media & Society*, 14(3), 363-383.

- Bagguley, P., & Hussain, Y. (2008). *Riotous citizens: Ethnic conflict in multicultural Britain*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing.
- Baker, S. A. (2012). From the criminal crowd to the “mediated crowd”: The impact of social media on the 2011 English riots. *Safer Communities*, 11(1), 40-49.
- Baker, S. A. (2012b). Policing the riots: New social media as recruitment, resistance, and surveillance. In Briggs, D. (Ed.), *The English riots of 2011* (pp. 169-190). Hook: Waterside Press Limited.
- Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2000). You can’t always do what you want: Social identity and self-presentational determinants of the choice to work for a low-status group. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(8), 891-906.
- Bauman, Z. (2012). Fuels, sparks, and fires: On taking to the streets. *Thesis Eleven*, 109(1), 11-16.
- Baym, N. K. (1998). The emergence of on-line community. In S. G. Jones (Ed.), *CyberSociety 2.0: Revisiting computer-mediated communication and community* (pp. 35-68). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Becker, H. S. (1973). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bell, D., Loader, B. D., Pleace, N., & Schuler, D. (2004). *Cyberculture: The key concepts*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Benson, M., L., Alarid, L. F., Burton, V. S., & Cullen, F. T. (2011). Reintegration or stigmatization? Offenders’ expectations of community re-entry. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(5), 385-393.

- Beran, T. N., Rinaldi, C., Bickham, D. S., & Rich, M. (2012). Evidence for the need to support adolescents dealing with harassment and cyber-harassment: Prevalence, progression, and impact. *School Psychology International*, 33(5), 562-576.
- Berg, B. L. (2004). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, Inc.
- Bettencourt, B. A., & Hume, D. (1999). The cognitive contents of social-group identity: Values, emotions, and relationships. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29(1), 113-121.
- Bicchieri, C. (2006). *The grammar of society: The nature and dynamics of social norms*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (1996). Beyond distrust: "Getting even" and the need for revenge. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 246-260). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Biressi, A., & Nunn, H. (2003). Crimes of violence in social/media space. *Space & Culture*, 6(3), 276-291.
- Bjork, M. (2013). Contours of an interaction sequence in rioting: The Gothenburg disturbances of 2009. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 14(1), 24-42.

- Blanchard, A. L., Markus, M. L. (2004). The experienced “sense” of a virtual community: Characteristics and processes. *The DATA BASE for Advances in Information Systems*, 35(1), 65-79.
- Blumer, H. (1951). Collective behavior. In A. M. Lee (Ed.), *Principles of sociology* (pp. 167-224). New York, NY: Barnes & Noble.
- Bobowik, M., Basabe, N., & Paez, D. (2014). “Heroes of adjustment”: Immigrant’s stigma and identity management. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 41, 112-124.
- Bohstedt, J. (1994). The dynamics of riots: Escalation and diffusion/contagion. In M. Potegal and J. F. Knutson (Eds.), *The dynamics of aggression: Biological and social processes in dyads and groups* (pp. 257-306). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Boin, A., & Rattray, W. (2004). Understanding prison riots: Towards a threshold theory. *Punishment & Society*, 6(1), 47-65.
- Boisjoli, R. A. (1987). *Vigilantism in Canada*. (Order No. ML46718, University of Ottawa (Canada)). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, 0-1. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/303785938?accountid=14701>. (303785938).
- Borland, K. (1991). “That’s not what I said”: Interpretive conflict in oral narrative research. In S. B. Gluck & D. Patai (Eds.), *Women’s words: The feminist practice of oral history* (pp. 63-76). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Box, S., Hale, C., & Andrews, G. (1988). Explaining fear of crime. *British Journal of Criminology*, 28(3), 340-356.

- Boyd, D., Hargittai, E., Schultz, J., & Palfrey, J. (2011). Why parents help their children lie to Facebook about age: Unintended consequences of the 'Children's Online Privacy Protection Act'. *First Monday*, 16(11), 1-22.
- Boyd, D. M., & Ellison, N. B. (2008). Social networking sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210-230.
- Braithwaite, J. (2000). Shame and criminal justice. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 42(3), 281-298.
- Branscombe, N. R., & Wann, D. L. (1992). Role of identification with a group, arousal, categorization processes, and self-esteem in sports spectator aggression. *Human Relations*, 45(10), 1013-1033.
- Breakwell, G. M. (2007). *The psychology of risk*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bremmer, I. (2010). Democracy in cyberspace: What information technology can and cannot do. *Foreign Affairs*, 89(6), 1-8.
- Brewer, M. B. (2007). The importance of being we: Human nature and intergroup relations. *American Psychologist*, 62(8), 738-751.
- Bridges, L. (2012). Four days in August: The UK riots. *Race & Class*, 54(1), 1-12.
- Briggs, D. (2012). What we did when it happened: A timeline analysis of the social disorder in London. *Safer Communities*, 11(1), 6-16.
- Broderick, J. J. (1993). Why is there punishment? Contemporary answers to an old question. *Criminal Justice Review*, 18(2), 251-260.

- Brown, K., Jackson, M., & Cassidy, W. (2006). Cyber-bullying: Developing policy to direct responses that are equitable and effective in addressing this special form of bullying. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 57, 38-46.
- Brown, N. A., & Billings, A. C. (2013). Sports fans as crisis communicators on social media websites. *Public Relations Review*, 39(1), 74-81.
- Brown, R. (2000). Social identity theory: Past achievements, current problems and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 745-778.
- Brown, Stephanie. (2012, January 17). Twitter Usage in Times of Crises. Retrieved December 29, 2012, from The University of Sydney website:
http://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/bitstream/2123/8136/1/DRPJournal_1pm_S2_2011.pdf
- Brunton-Smith, I. (2011). Untangling the relationship between fear of crime and perceptions of disorder: Evidence from a longitudinal study of young people in England and Wales. *British Journal of Criminology*, 51(6), 885-899.
- Bryant, E., & Marmo, J. (2012). The rules of Facebook friendship: A two-stage examination of interaction rules in close, casual, and acquaintance friendships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 29(8), 1013-1035.
- Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bush, R. (2010). Food riots: Poverty, power and protest. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 10(1), 119-129.

- Canadian Judicial Council. (2004). General principles. Retrieved May 2, 2014, from http://www.cjc-ccm.gc.ca/english/lawyers_en.asp?selMenu=lawyers_pmf_generalprinciples_en.asp
- Carlsmith, K. M. (2006). The roles of retribution and utility in determining punishment. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42(4), 437-451.
- Carlsmith, K. M., & Darley, J. M. (2008). Psychological aspects of retributive justice. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 193-236). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.
- Carpenter, J. P. (2007). The demand for punishment. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 62(4), 522-542.
- Cavanagh, A., & Dennis, A. (2012). Framing the riots. *Capital & Class*, 36(3), 375-381.
- Cederblom, J. (1995). The retributive liability theory of punishment. *Public Affairs Quarterly*, 9(4), 305-315.
- Cesaroni, C., Downing, S., & Alvi, S. (2012). Bullying enters the 21st century? Turning a critical eye to cyber-bullying research. *Youth Justice*, 12(3), 199-211.
- Chadee, D., & Ng Ying, N. K. (2013). Predictors of fear of crime: General fear versus perceived risk. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43, 1896-1904.
- Cheong, P. H., & Gong, J. (2010). Cyber vigilantism, transmedia collective intelligence, and civic participation. *Chinese Journal of Communication*, 3(4), 471-487.

- Cheung, A. (2009). China internet going wild: Cyber-hunting versus privacy protection. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 25(3), 275-279.
- Chua, C. E. (2009). Why do virtual communities regulate speech? *Communication Monographs*, 76(2), 234-261.
- City of Vancouver. (2011). City of Vancouver internal review of the 2011 Stanley Cup riot. Retrieved May 11, 2013, from <http://www.vancouver.ca/files/cov/2011-stanley-cup-riot-CoV-internal-review.pdf>
- Coffey, B., & Woolworth, S. (2004). "Destroy the scum, and then neuter their families": The web forum as a vehicle for community discourse? *The Social Science Journal*, 41(1), 1-14.
- Cohen, G. L., & Sherman, D. K. (2007). Self-affirmation theory. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Social Psychology* (pp. 787-789). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Colman, A. M. (2008). *A dictionary of psychology* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Colombo, M., & Senatore, A. (2013). The discursive construction of community identity. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 15(1), 48-62.
- Comunella, F., & Anzera, G. (2012). Will the revolution be tweeted? A conceptual framework for understanding the social media and the Arab Spring. *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, 23(4), 453-470.
- Cook, C. L., & Fox, K. A. (2011). Fear of property crime: Examining the effects of victimization, vicarious victimization, and perceived risk. *Violence and Victims*, 26(5), 684-700.

- Conklin, J. E. (1971). Dimensions of community response to the crime problem. *Social Problems*, 18(3), 373-385.
- Corner, J. (1991). In search of more complete answers to research questions. Quantitative versus qualitative research methods: Is there a way forward? *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 16(6), 718-727.
- Correll, J., Spencer, S. J., & Zanna, M. P. (2004). An affirmed self and an open mind: Self-affirmation and sensitivity to argument strength. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40(3), 350-356.
- Crombag, H., Rassin, E., & Horselenberg, R. (2003). On vengeance. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 9(4), 333-344.
- David-Ferdon, C., & Hertz, M. F. (2007). Electronic media, violence, and adolescents: An emerging public health problem. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41(6), S1-S5.
- Davis, R. (2005). *Politics online: Blogs, chatrooms, and discussion groups in American democracy*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dennis, D. (1999). Reconstituting the monster: Images of techno-criminality at century's end. In S. Henry and D. Milovanovic (Eds.), *Constitutive criminology at work: Applications to crime and justice* (pp. 111-126). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Dietz-Uhler, B., Murrell, A. (1998). Effects of social identity and threat on self-esteem and group attributions. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 2(1), 24-35.
- DiPasquale, D., & Glaeser, E. L. (1998). The Los Angeles riot and the economics of urban unrest. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 43(1), 52-78.

- Dobrovolny, J. L., & Fuentes, S. C. G. (2008). Quantitative versus qualitative evaluation: A tool to decide which to use. *Performance Improvement*, 47(4), 7-14.
- Doosje, B., Spears, R., & Koomen, W. (1995). When bad isn't all bad: The strategic use of sample information in generalization and stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 642-655.
- Duffy, M. E. (1985). Designing nursing research: The qualitative-quantitative debate. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 10(3), 225-232.
- Dumsday, T. (2009). On cheering Charles Bronson: The ethics of vigilantism. *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 47(1), 49-67.
- Durodié, B. (2012). The changing nature of riots in the contemporary metropolis from ideology to identity: Lessons from the recent UK riots. *Journal of Risk Research*, 15(4), 347-354.
- Durrant, R. (2011). Collective violence: An evolutionary perspective. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 16(5), 428-436.
- Economist Intelligence Unit. (2011). A summary of the liveability ranking and overview February 2011. Retrieved April 30, 2014, from http://www.eiu.com/Handlers/WhitepaperHandler.ashx?fi=LINKED_Liveability_rankings_Promotional_PDF.pdf&mode=wp&campaignid=Liveability2011
- Eisenlauer, V. (2013). *A critical hypertext analysis of social media: The true colours of Facebook*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Elo, S., & Kyngas, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107-115.

- Escamilla-Castillo, M. (2010). The purposes of legal punishment. *Ratio Juris*, 23(4), 460-478.
- Evans, J. M. (1991). The principles of fundamental justice: The Constitution and the common law. *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*, 29(1), 51-92.
- Ezzy, D. (2002). Rigour. In D. Ezzy (Ed.), *Qualitative Analysis* (pp. 50-57). Victoria: Routledge.
- Facebook. (2014). Facebook community standards. Retrieved April 3, 2014, from <https://www.facebook.com/communitystandards>
- Fanti, K. A., Demetriou, A. G., & Hawa, V. V. (2012). A longitudinal study of cyberbullying : Examining risk and protective factors. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 9(2), 168-181.
- Farrar, M. (2012). Rioting or protesting? Losing it or finding it? *Parallax*, 18(2), 72-91.
- Fehr, E., & Fischbacher, U. (2004). Social norms and human cooperation. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 8(4), 185-190.
- Fenton, N., & Barassi, V. (2011). Alternative media and social networking sites: The politics of individuation and political participation. *The Communication Review*, 14(3), 179-196.
- Ferguson, K. M., & Mindel, C. H. (2007). Modeling fear of crime in Dallas neighborhoods: A test of social capital theory. *Crime & Delinquency*, 53(2), 322-349.
- Ferraro, K. F. (1995). *Fear of crime: interpreting victimization risk*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ferraro, K. F., & LaGrange, R. L. (1987). The measurement of fear of crime. *Sociological Inquiry*, 57(1), 70-101.

- Fischer, P., Haslam, S. A., & Smith, L. (2010). "If you wrong us, shall we not revenge?" Social identity salience moderates support for retaliation in response to collective threat. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 14(2), 143-150.
- Frank, R., Cheng, C., & Pun, V. (2011). Social media sites: New fora for criminal, communication, and investigation opportunities. Retrieved October 8, 2012, from Scholars Portal Books website:
<http://books1.scholarsportal.info/viewdoc.html?id=503719>
- Franklin, C. A., & Franklin, T. W. (2009). Predicting fear of crime: Considering differences across gender. *Feminist Criminology*, 4(1), 83-106.
- Fransozi, R. (2008). *Content analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Frase, R. S. (2005). Punishment purposes. *Stanford Law Review*, 58(1), 67-83.
- Friedman, D., & Singh, N. (2009). Equilibrium vengeance. *Games and Economic Behaviour*, 66(2), 813-829.
- Frijda, N. H. (1994). The lex talionis: On vengeance. In S. H. M. van Goozen, N. E. van der Poll, & J. A. Sergeant (Eds.), *Emotions: Essays on emotion theory* (pp. 263-289). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Fry, D. P. (2006). Reciprocity: The foundation stone of morality. In M. Killen & J. G. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 399-422). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fuchs, C. (2012). Social media, riots, and revolutions. *Capital & Class*, 36(3), 383-391.

Furlong, J. A., & Keefe, D. J. (2011). The night the city became a stadium: Independent review of the 2011 Vancouver Stanley Cup playoffs riot. Retrieved October 8, 2012, from Scholars Portal Books website:

http://books2.scholarsportal.info/viewdoc.html?id=/ebooks/ebooks0/gibson_cppc/2011-11-18/1/10498048

Fyson, S. J. (1999). Developing and applying concepts about community: Reflections from the field. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 27(3), 347-365.

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B. A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). The common ingroup identity model: Recategorization and the reduction of intergroup bias. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 4(1), 1-26.

Galligan, D. J. (1996). *Due process and fair procedures: A study of administrative procedures*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press Inc.

Garland, D. (1997). The punitive society: Penology, criminology and the history of the present. *The Edinburgh Law Review*, 1(2), 180-199.

Garland, D. (2000). The culture of high crime societies: Some preconditions of recent 'law and order' policies. *British Journal of Criminology*, 40(3), 347-375.

Gerber, M. M., & Jackson, J. (2013). Retribution as revenge and retribution as just deserts. *Social Justice Research*, 26(1), 61-80.

Gergen, K. J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist*, 40(3), 266-275.

- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Gollwitzer, M., & Denzler, M. (2009). What makes revenge sweet: Seeing the offender suffer or delivering a message? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(4), 840-844.
- Greenawalt, K. (1983). Punishment. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 74(2), 343-362.
- Greene, S. (2004). Social identity theory and party identification. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(1), 136-153.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2014, March 24). With malice toward none and charity for some: Ingroup favoritism enables discrimination. *American Psychologist*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/a0036056
- Greer, C., & McLaughlin, E. (2010). We predict a riot: Public order policing, new media environments and the rise of the citizen journalist. *British Journal of Criminology*, 50(6), 1041-1059.
- Hall, S. (1997). The work of representation. In *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices* (pp. 15-64). London: Sage Publications.
- Hamilton, V. L., & Rauma, D. (1995). Social psychology of deviance and law. In K. S. Cook, G. A. Fine, & J. S. House (Eds.), *Sociological perspectives on social psychology* (pp. 524-547). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hampton, J. (1990). Mens rea. In E. F. Paul, F. D. Miller, and J. Paul (Eds.), *Crime, culpability, and remedy* (pp. 1-28). Cambridge: Basil Blackwell Inc.

- Hand, M., & Sandywell, B. (2002). E-topia as cosmopolis or citadel: On the democratizing and de-democratizing logics of the Internet, or toward a critique of the new technological fetishism. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19(1-2), 197-225.
- Hannem, S. (2012). The mark of association: Transferred stigma and the families of male prisoners. In S. Hannem & C. Bruckert (Eds.), *Stigma revisited: Implications of the mark* (pp. 95-117). Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Hardin, R. (1995). Contested community. *Society*, 32(5), 23-29.
- Harris, N. (2006). Reintegrative shaming, shame, and criminal justice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62(2), 327-346.
- Hartnagel, T. (1979). The perception and fear of crime: Implications for neighborhood cohesion, social activity, and negative affect. *Social Forces*, 58(1), 176-193.
- Hartnagel, T. F., & Templeton, L. J. (2012). Emotions about crime and attitudes to punishment. *Punishment & Society*, 14(4), 452-474.
- Healy, D. (1997). Cyberspace and place: The Internet as middle landscape on the electronic frontier. In D. Porter (Ed.), *Internet Culture* (pp. 55-68). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Henham, R. (2000). Sentencing theory, proportionality and pragmatism. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 28(3), 239-263.
- Heverin, T., & Zach, L. (2012). Use of microblogging for collective sense-making during violent crises: A study of three campus shootings. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 63(1), 34-47.

- Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(3), 575-604.
- Hil, R. (1998). Juvenile crime and autonomous citizen action. *Youth Studies Australia*, 17(3), 36-42.
- Hinkle, J. C. (2013). The relationship between disorder, perceived risk, and collective efficacy: A look into the indirect pathways of the broken windows thesis. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 26(4), 408-432.
- Hirt, E. (2007). Discourse. *IEEE Aerospace and Electronic Systems Magazine*, 22(8), B-3-B-3.
- Ho, R., ForsterLee, L., ForsterLee, R., Croft, N. (2002). Justice versus vengeance: Motives underlying punitive judgements. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33(3), 365-377.
- Ho, S. S., & McLeod, D. M. (2008). Social-psychological influences on opinion expression in face-to-face and computer-mediated communication. *Communication Research*, 35(2), 190-207.
- Hogan, M. J., Chiricos, T., & Gertz, M. (2005). Economic insecurity, blame, and punitive attitudes. *Justice Quarterly*, 22(3), 392-412.
- Holroyd, J. (2010). The retributive emotions: Passions and pains of punishment. *Philosophical Papers*, 39(3), 343-371.
- Horowitz, D. L. (2001). *The deadly ethnic riot*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Howard, P. N., & Hussain, M. M. (2011). The upheavals in Egypt and Tunisia: The role of digital media. *Journal of Democracy*, 22(3), 35-48.

- Hsieh, H., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- Huey, L., Nhan, J., & Broll, R. (2012). 'Uppity civilians' and 'cyber vigilantes': The role of the general public in policing cyber-crime. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 13(1), 81-97.
- Illum, S. F., Ivanov, S. H., & Liang, Y. (2010). Using virtual communities in tourism research. *Tourism Management*, 31(3), 335-340.
- Israel, M. (2004). Integrity and the disclosure of criminological and socio-legal research. *British Journal of Criminology*, 44(5), 715-740.
- Jackson, J. (2006). Introducing fear of crime to risk research. *Risk Analysis*, 26(1), 253-264.
- Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Hough, M., Myhill, A., Quinton, P., & Tyler, T. R. (2012). Why do people comply with the law? Legitimacy and the influence of legal institutions. *British Journal of Criminology*, 52(6), 1051-1071.
- Jackson, L. A., Sullivan, L. A., Harnish, R., & Hodge, C. N. (1996). Achieving positive social identity: Social mobility, social creativity, and permeability of group boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(2), 241-254.
- Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1996). Intergroup norms and intergroup discrimination: Distinctive self-categorization and social identity effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(6), 1222-1233.
- Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1998). Intergroup similarity and group variability: The effects of group distinctiveness on the expression of in-group bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1481-1492.

- Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Postmes, T. (2004). Intergroup distinctiveness and differentiation: A meta-analytic integration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(6), 862-879.
- Johnson, D. (2009). Anger about crime and support for punitive criminal justice policies. *Punishment & Society*, 11(1), 51-66.
- Johnston, L. (1996). What is vigilantism? *British Journal of Criminology*, 36(2), 220-236.
- Joinson, Adam N. (2003). *Understanding the psychology of Internet behaviour*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jones, L. M., Mitchell, K. J., & Finkelhor, D. (2013). Online harassment in context: Trends from three youth internet safety surveys (2000, 2005, 2010). *Psychology of Violence*, 3(1), 53-69.
- Juliano, S. (2012). Superheroes, bandits, and cyber-nerds: Exploring the history and contemporary development of the vigilante. *Journal of International Commercial Law and Technology*, 7(1), 44-64.
- Jurgenson, N. (2012). When atoms meet bits: Social media, the mobile web, and augmented revolution. *Future Internet*, 4(1), 83-91.
- Kahne, J., Middaugh, E., Lee, N., & Feezell, J. T. (2011). Youth online activity and exposure to diverse perspectives. *New Media & Society*, 14(3), 492-512.
- Kaplowitz, S. A., & Campo, S. (2004). Drinking, alcohol policy, and attitudes toward a campus riot. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(5), 501-516.

- Kear, K. (2011). *Online and social networking communities: A best practice guide for educators*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Keaton, S. A., & Bodie, G. D. (2011). Explaining social constructivism. *Communication Teacher*, 25(4), 192-196.
- Kelly, L., & Gill, A. K. (2012). Rotis not Riots. *Safer Communities*, 11(1), 62-72.
- Kim, I., & Kuljis, J. (2010). Applying content analysis to web-based content. *Journal of Computing and Information Technology*, 4, 369-375.
- Kim, W., Jeong, O., & Lee, S. (2010). On social web sites. *Information Systems*, 35(2), 215-236.
- King, M., & Waddington, D. (2013). Riots and social protest in an age of austerity. *Policing & Society*, 23(1), 1-5.
- Kirmayer, L. J., Raikhel, E., & Rahimi, S. (2013). Cultures of the internet: Identity, community and mental health. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 50(2), 165-191.
- Klein, A. (2012). Policing as a causal factor - a fresh view on riots and social unrest. *Safer Communities*, 11(1), 17-23.
- Koh, J., & Kim, Y. (2003). Sense of virtual community: A conceptual framework and empirical validation. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 8(2), 75-93.
- Kohm, S. A. (2009). Naming, shaming and criminal justice: Mass mediated humiliation as entertainment and punishment. *Crime Media Culture*, 5(2), 188-205.
- Kowalski, R. M., & Limber, S. P. (2007). Electronic bullying among middle school students. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41(6), S22-S30.

- Kruglanski, A. W., Shah, J. Y., Pierro, A., & Mannetti, L. (2002). When similarity breeds content: Need for closure and the allure of homogenous and self-resembling groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(3), 648-662.
- Kugler, M. B., Funk, F., Braun, J., Gollwitzer, M., Kay, A. C., & Darley, J. M. (2013). Differences in punitiveness across three cultures: A test of American exceptionalism in justice attitudes. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 103(4), 1071-1113.
- Kumar, N. (2012). 'Social media: A virtual global community hall'. *Indian Streams Research Journal*, 2(10), 1-5.
- Kury, H., & Ferdinand, T. (1999). Public opinion and punitivity. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 22(3-4), 373-392.
- Kwan, G., & Skoric, M. (2013). Facebook bullying: An extension of battles in school. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 29(1), 16-25.
- Labuschagne, A. (2003). Qualitative research – airy fairy or fundamental? *The Qualitative Report*, 8(1), 100-103.
- LaGrange, R. L., & Ferraro, K. F. (1989). Assessing age and gender differences in perceived risk and fear of crime. *Criminology*, 27(4), 697-719.
- Lange, P. G. (2007). Publicly private and privately public: Social networking on YouTube. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 361-380.
- Law, D. M., Shapka, J. D., Hymel, S., Olson, B. F., & Waterhouse, T. (2012). The changing face of bullying: An empirical comparison between traditional and internet bullying and victimization. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 28(1), 226-232.

- Le Bon, G. (1896). *The crowd: A study of the popular mind*. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
- Leonard, M. (2010). What's recreational about 'recreational rioting'? Children on the streets in Belfast. *Children & Society*, 24(1), 38-49.
- Lewis, D. A., & Salem, G. (1986). *Fear of crime: Incivility and the production of a social problem*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Levi, J. L. (2003). Shame, stigma, and crime: Evaluating the efficacy of shaming sanctions in criminal law. *Harvard Law Review*, 116(7), 2186-2207.
- Levine, M., & Crowther, S. (2008). The responsive bystander: How social group membership and group size can encourage as well as inhibit bystander intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(6), 1429-1439.
- Levy, J. (1991). Due process. *Rutgers Law Journal*, 22(4), 938-952.
- Levy, L. (1989). A study of sports crowd behaviour: The case of the great pumpkin incident. *Journal of Sports and Social Issues*, 13(2), 69-91.
- Li, Q. (2007). New bottle but old wine: A research of cyberbullying in schools. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23(4), 1777-1791.
- Lindgren, S. (2005). Social constructionism and criminology: Traditions, problems and possibilities. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 6(1), 4-22.
- Lindsay, M., & Krysik, J. (2012). Online harassment among college students. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 703-719.

- Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. C. (2001). Conceptualizing stigma. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 363-385.
- Lipton, J. D. (2011). Combating Cyber-Victimization. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, 26(2), 1103-1155.
- Liska, A. E., Sanchirico, A., & Reed, M. D. (1988). Fear of crime and constrained behavior specifying and estimating a reciprocal effects model. *Social Forces*, 66(3), 827-837.
- Liu, C. H., & Matthews, R. (2005). Vygotsky's philosophy: Constructivism and its criticisms examined. *International Education Journal*, 6(3), 386-399.
- Ljepava, N., Orr, R., Locke, S., & Ross, C. (2013). Personality and social characteristics of Facebook non-users and frequent users. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 29(4), 1602-1607.
- Lockard, J. (1997). Progressive politics, electronic individualism and the myth of virtual community. In D. Porter (Ed.), *Internet Culture* (pp. 219-231). London: Routledge.
- Loewenstein, G. F., Weber, E. U., Hsee, C. K., & Welch, E. S. (2001). Risk as feelings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(2), 267-286.
- Loewy, A. H. (1988). Culpability, dangerousness, and harm: Balancing the factors on which our criminal law is predicated. *North Carolina Law Review*, 66(2), 283-314.
- Lombard, M., Snyder-Duch, J., & Campanella Bracken, C. (2002). Content analysis in mass communication: Assessment and reporting of intercoder reliability. *Human Communication Research*, 28(4), 587-604.

- Loseke, D. R. (2003). *Thinking about social problems: An introduction to constructionist perspectives* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Low, S., & Espelage, D. (2013). Differentiating cyber bullying perpetration from non-physical bullying: Commonalities across race, individual, and family predictors. *Psychology of Violence*, 3(1), 39-52.
- Macdonald, R. A. (1987). Procedural due process in Canadian constitutional law: Natural justice and fundamental justice. *University of Florida Law Review*, 39(2), 217-267.
- Manuel, N. R. (2011). Cyber-bullying: Its recent emergence and needed legislation to protect adolescent victims. *Loyola Journal of Public Interest Law*, 13(1), 219-252.
- Marlin-Bennett, R., & Thornton, N. (2012). Governance within social media websites: Ruling new frontiers. *Telecommunications Policy*, 36(6), 493-501.
- Marx, G. T. (1970). Issueless riots. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 391(1), 21-33.
- Mark, L., & Ratliffe, K. T. (2011). Cyber worlds: New playgrounds for bullying. *Computers in the Schools*, 28, 92-116.
- Mason, D. T., & Murtagh, J. A. (1985). Who riots? An empirical examination of the “new urban black” versus the social marginality hypotheses. *Political Behaviour*, 7(4), 352-373.
- Massaro, T. M. (1991). Shame, culture, and American criminal law. *Michigan Law Review*, 89(7), 1880-1944.

- May, D. C., Rader, N. E., & Goodrum, S. (2010). A gendered assessment of the “threat of victimization”: Examining gender differences in fear of crime, perceived risk, avoidance, and defensive behaviors. *Criminal Justice Review*, 35(2), 159-182.
- May, R. (1986). *Criminal evidence*. London: Sweet & Maxwell.
- McCann, K. (2011). Vancouver Police Department 2011 Stanley Cup riot review. Retrieved October 8, 2012, from Scholars Portal Books website:
http://books1.scholarsportal.info/viewdoc.html?id=/ebooks/ebooks0/gibson_cppc/2011-11-18/1/10497923
- McCotter, S. S. (2001). The journey of a beginning researcher. *The Qualitative Report*, 6(2), 1-22.
- McLaughlin, M. L., Osborne, K. K., & Smith, C. B. (1995). Standards of conduct on Usenet. In S. G. Jones (Ed.), *CyberSociety: Computer-mediated communication and community* (pp. 90-111). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McLean Parks, J. (1997). The fourth arm of justice: The art and science of revenge. In R. J. Lewicki, R. J. Bies, & B. H. Sheppard (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (pp. 113-144). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 14(1), 6-23.
- McNamara, N., Stevenson, C., & Muldoon, O. T. (2013). Community identity as resource and context: A mixed method investigation of coping and collective action in a disadvantaged community. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43(5), 393-403.

- McPhail, C., & Wohlstein, R. T. (1983). Individual and collective behaviours within gatherings, demonstrations, and riots. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9, 579-600.
- Meisenbach, R. J. (2010). Stigma management communication: A theory and agenda for applied research on how individuals manage moments of stigmatized identity. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 38(3), 268-292.
- Mesch, G. S. (2000). Perceptions of risk, lifestyle activities, and fear of crime. *Deviant Behavior*, 21(1), 47-62.
- Michinov, N., Michinov, E., & Toczec-Capelle, M. (2004). Social identity, group processes, and performance in synchronous computer-mediated communication. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 8(1), 27-39.
- Micucci, A. J., & Gomme, I. M. (2005). American police and subcultural support for the use of excessive force. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33(5), 487-500.
- Monterosso, S. (2009). Punitive criminal justice and policy in contemporary society. *Queensland University of Technology Law and Justice Journal*, 9(1), 13-25.
- Moore, M. (1997). *Placing blame: A general theory of the criminal law*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Muchielli, L. (2009). Autumn 2005: A review of the most important riot in the history of French contemporary society. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration studies*, 35(5), 731-751.
- Mullen, E., & Skitka, L. J. (2006). Exploring the psychological underpinnings of the moral mandate effect: Motivated reasoning, group differentiation, or anger? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(4), 629-643.

- Murthy, D. (2012). Towards a sociological understanding of social media: Theorizing Twitter. *Sociology*, 46(6), 1059-1073.
- Myers, D. J. (2000). *Media, communication technology, and protest waves*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame. Retrieved from University of Notre Dame website: <http://www.nd.edu/~dmyers/lomond/myers.pdf>
- Myers, D., Spencer, S., & Jordan, C. (2009). *Social psychology (4th ed.)*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill.
- Myers, S. L., & Chung, C. (1998). Criminal perceptions and violent criminal victimization. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 16(3), 321-333.
- Nesbary, D. K. (2000). *Survey research and the world wide web*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Neville, F., & Reicher, S. (2011). The experience of collective participation: Shared identity, relatedness and emotionality. *Contemporary Social Science*, 6(3), 377-396.
- Newburn, T. (2012). Counterblast: Young people and the August 2011 riots. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 51(3), 331-335.
- Newnham, J., & Bell, P. (2012). Social network media and political activism: A growing challenge for law enforcement. *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism*, 7(1), 36-50.

- O'Brien, T. (2012). Food riots as representations of insecurity: Examining the relationship between contentious politics and human security. *Conflict, Security & Development*, 12(1), 31-49.
- Oldenburg, R. (1999). *The great good place: Cafés, coffee shops, bookstores, bars, hair salons, and other hangouts at the heart of a community*. New York, NY: Marlowe & Co.
- Olesen, M., & Lassen, C. (2012). Restricted mobilities: Access to, and activities in, public and private spaces. *International Planning Studies*, 17(3), 215-232.
- Ong, R. (2012). Online vigilante justice Chinese style and privacy in China. *Information & Communications Technology Law*, 21(2), 127-145.
- Pagliaro, S., Ellemers, N., Barreto, M. (2011). Sharing moral values: Anticipated ingroup respect as a determinant of adherence to morality-based (but not competence-based) group norms. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(8), 1117-1129.
- Palys, T., & Lowman, J. (2000). Protecting research confidentiality: Towards a research participant shield law. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 21(1), 163-185.
- Panagiotopoulos, P., Bigdeli, A. Z., & Sams, S. (2012). "5 days in August": How London local authorities used Twitter during the 2011 riots. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 7443, 102-113.
- Pantelli, N. (2009). *Virtual social networks: Mediated, massive and multiplayer sites*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Papacharissi, Z. (2004). Democracy online: Civility, politeness, and the democratic potential of online political discussion groups. *New Media & Society*, 6(2), 259-283.

- Papacharissi, Z. A. (2010). *A private sphere: Democracy in a digital age*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Patton, D. U., Eschmann, R. D., & Butler, D. A. (2013). Internet banging: New trends in social media, gang violence, masculinity and hip hop. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(5), A54-A59.
- Paulson, R. (2009). Four American riots. *The Hopkins Review*, 2(4), 560-584.
- Petray, T. L. (2011). Protest 2.0: online interactions and Aboriginal activists. *Media, Culture & Society*, 33(6), 923-940.
- Pickett, J. T., Mears, D. P., Stewart, E. A., Gertz, M. (2013). Security at the expense of liberty: A test of predictions deriving from the culture of control thesis. *Crime & Delinquency*, 59(2), 214-242.
- Pinto, I. R. (2006). *A subjective group dynamics approach to group socialization processes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Porto.
- Plant, R. (2004). Online communities. *Technology in Society*, 26(1), 51-65.
- Plummer, M., Hiltz, S. R., Fluhr, N. S., Rosario, R. M. (2009). *Measuring sense of community in groups that use social networking sites to promote collaboration*. Proceedings of the 42nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. (pp. 1-10). Big Island, HI: Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers.
- Poell, T., & Borra, E. (2011). Twitter, YouTube, and Flickr as platforms of alternative journalism: The social media account of the 2010 Toronto G20 protests. *Journalism*, 13(6), 695-713.

- Poerksen, B. (2011). *The creation of reality: A constructivist epistemology of journalism and journalism education*. Charlottesville, VA: Imprint Academic.
- Porter, D. (1997). *Internet culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pratt, J. (2002). *Punishment and civilization: Penal tolerance and intolerance in modern society*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Preece, J. (2001). Sociability and usability in online communities: Determining and measuring success. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 20(5), 347-356.
- Presdee, M. (2000). *Cultural criminology and the carnival of crime*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Prior, D. (2010). Safer communities and community justice. In K. Doolin, J. Child, J. Raine, & A. Beech (Eds.), *Whose criminal justice? State or community?* (pp. 159-172). Hampshire: Waterside Press.
- Pryor, J. B., Reeder, G. D., & Monroe, A. E. (2012). The infection of bad company: Stigma by association. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(2), 224-241.
- Puddifoot, J. E. (1995). Dimensions of community identity. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 5(5), 357-370.
- Puddifoot, J. E. (2003). Exploring “personal” and “shared” sense of community identity in Durham City, England. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 31(1), 87-106.
- Rader, N. E. (2004). The threat of victimization: A theoretical reconceptualization of fear of crime. *Sociological Spectrum*, 24(6), 689-704.

- Rader, N. E., May, D. C., Goodrum, S. (2007). An empirical assessment of the “threat of victimization”: Considering fear of crime, perceived risk, avoidance, and defensive behaviors. *Sociological Spectrum*, 27(5), 475-505.
- Razsa, M. J. (2013). Beyond ‘riot porn’: Protest video and the production of unruly subjects. *Ethnos: Journal of Anthropology*, 1-29.doi: 10.1080/00141844.2013.778309.
- Reicher, S. D. (1984). The St. Paul’s riot: An explanation of the limits of crowd action in terms of a social identity model. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 14(1), 1-21.
- Reicher, S. (2011). Mass action and mundane reality: An argument for putting crowd analysis at the centre of the social sciences. *Contemporary Social Science*, 6(3), 433-449.
- Rheingold, H. (1993). *The virtual community homesteading on the Electronic Frontier*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Ribiero, A. (2012). “A period of turmoil”: Pittsburgh’s April 1968 riots and their aftermath. *Journal of Urban History*, 39(2), 147-171.
- Riger, S., LeBailly, R., & Gordon, M. (1981). Community ties and urbanities’ fear of crime: An ecological investigation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 9(6), 653-655.
- Rimke, H. (2010). Beheading aboard a Greyhound bus: Security politics, bloodlust justice, and the mass consumption of criminalized cannibalism. *The Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research*, 1, 172-192.
- Roach, K. (1999). *Due process and victims’ rights: The new law and politics of criminal justice*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Roberts, J. V., & Hough, M. J. (2002). *Changing attitudes to punishment: Public opinion, crime and justice*. Cullompton: Willan Publishing.
- Roberts, J. V., Stalans, L. J., Indermaur, D., & Hough, M. (2003). *Penal populism and public opinion: Lessons from five countries*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Roberts, P., & Zuckerman, A. (2010). *Criminal evidence*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Robinson, J. B., Lawton, B. A., Taylor, R. B., & Perkins, D. D. (2003). Multilevel longitudinal impacts of incivilities: Fear of crime, expected safety, and block satisfaction. *Journal of Qualitative Criminology*, 19(3), 237-274.
- Roebuck, G., & Wood, D. (2011). A retributive argument against punishment. *Criminal Law and Philosophy*, 5(1), 73-86.
- Rountree, P. W. (1998). A reexamination of the crime-fear linkage. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 35(3), 341-372.
- Rountree, P., & Land, K. (1996). Burglary victimization, perceptions of crime risk, and routine activities: A multilevel analysis across Seattle neighborhoods and census tracts. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 33(2), 147-180.
- Ruddell, R., Thomas, M., & Way, L. B. (2005). Breaking the chain: Confronting issueless college town disturbances and riots. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33(6), 549-560.
- Rudé, G. (1981). *The crowd in history: A study of popular disturbances in France and England, 1730-1848*. London: Serif Books.

- Runions, K., Shapka, J. D., Dooley, J., & Modecki, K. (2013). Cyber-aggression and victimization and social information processing: Integrating the medium and the message. *Psychology of violence*, 3(1), 9-26.
- Russell, G. W. (1995). Personalities in the crowd: Those who would escalate a sports riot. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 21(2), 91-100.
- Russell, G. W. (2004). Sport riots: A social-psychological review. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 9(4), 353-378.
- Russell, G. W., & Arms, R. L. (1998). Towards a social psychological profile of would-be rioters. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 24(3), 219-226.
- Russell, G. W., Mustonen, A. (1998). Peacemakers: Those who would intervene to quell a sports riot. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 24(3), 335-339.
- Russo, S., Roccato, M., Vieno, A. (2011). Predicting perceived risk of crime: A multilevel study. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 48(3), 384-394.
- Rutkowski, G. K., Gruder, C. L., & Romer, D. (1983). Group cohesiveness, social norms, and bystander intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(3), 545-552.
- Ryan, D. (2011, June 20). Family flees home after son's Vancouver riot apology. *National Post*. Retrieved January 7, 2014, from <http://news.nationalpost.com/2011/06/20/family-flees-home-after-sons-vancouver-riot-apology/>
- Salter, M., & Bryden, C. (2009). I can see you : Harassment and stalking on the internet. *Information & Communications Technology Law*, 18(2), 99-122.

- Sanders, A. K., Olsen, N. C. (2012). Re-defining defamation: Psychological sense of community in the age of the internet. *Communication Law and Policy*, 17(4), 355-384.
- Sasson, T. (1995). *Crime talk: How citizens construct a social problem*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine De Gruyter, Inc.
- Savelsberg, J. J. (2002). Cultures of control in contemporary societies. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 27(3), 685-710.
- Scherl, L. M., & Smithson, M. (1987). A new dimension to content analysis: Exploring relationships among thematic categories. *Quality and Quantity*, 21(2), 199-208.
- Scheuermann, L., & Taylor, G. (1997). Netiquette. *Internet Research: Networking Applications and Policy*, 7(4), 269-273.
- Schneider, C. J., & Trottier, D. (2012). The 2011 Vancouver riot and the role of Facebook in crowd-sourced policing. *BC Studies*, 175, 57-72.
- Schrock, A. R., & Boyd, D. (2011). Problematic youth interactions online: Solitication, harassment, and cyberbullying. In K. B. Wright & L. M. Webb (Eds.), *Computer-mediated communication in personal relationships* (pp. 368-396). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Schroeder, A., Pennington-Gray, L., Donohoe, H., & Kioussis, S. (2013). Using social media in times of crisis. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 30(1), 126-143.
- Schutt, R. K. (2012). *Investigating the social world: The process and practice of research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Sederberg, P. C. (1978). The phenomenology of vigilantism in contemporary America: An interpretation. *Terrorism: An International Journal*, 1(3-4), 287-305.
- Seegerberg, A., & Bennett, W. L. (2011). Social media and the organization of collective action: Using Twitter to explore the ecologies of two climate change protests. *The Communication Review*, 14(3), 197-215.
- Sharp, D., Atherton, S., & Williams, K. (2008). Civilian policing, legitimacy and vigilantism: Findings from three case studies in England and Wales. *Policing & Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy*, 18(3), 245-257.
- Sherif, M. (1966). *The psychology of social norms*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Sherman, D. K., & Cohen, G. L. (2006). The psychology of self-defense: Self-affirmation theory. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 183-242.
- Shotland, R. L., & Goodstein, L. I. (1984). The role of bystanders in crime control. *Journal of Social Issues*, 40(1), 9-26.
- Shippee, N. D. (2012). Victimization, fear of crime, and perceived risk: Testing a vulnerability model of personal control. *Sociological Perspectives*, 55(1), 117-140.
- Skolnick, J. H., & Fyfe, J. J. (1993). *Above the law: Police and the excessive use of force*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Skogan, W. G., & Maxfield, M. G. (1981). *Coping with crime: Individual and neighborhood reactions*. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

- Sievers, B., & Redding Mersky, R. (2006). The economy of vengeance: Some considerations on the aetiology and meaning of the business of revenge. *Human Relations*, 59(2), 241-259.
- Simester, A. P., & Smith, A. T. H. (1996). *Harm and culpability*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Skitka, L. J., & Mullen, E. (2003). The dark side of moral conviction. *Analysis of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 2(1), 35-41.
- Slonge, R., Smith, P. K., & Frisé, A. (2013). The nature of cyberbullying, and strategies for prevention. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 29(1), 26-32.
- Sobkowicz, P., & Sobkowicz, A. (2012). Two-year study of emotion and communication patterns in a highly polarized political discussion forum. *Social Science Computer Review*, 30(4), 448-469.
- Spiegel, S. (2007). Prison “race riots” An easy case for segregation? *California Law Review*, 95(6), 2261-2293.
- Staihar, J. (2010). Culpability and the relevance of substantial risks, motivations, and lesser harms. *Law and Philosophy*, 29(4), 385-400.
- Stalans, L. J. (2002). Measuring attitudes to sentencing. In J. V. Roberts, & M. J. Hough (Eds.), *Changing attitudes to punishment: Public opinion, crime and justice* (pp. 15-32). Cullompton: Willan Publishing.
- Stemler, S. (2001). An overview of content analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 7(17), 1-9.

- Sternberg, J. (2012). *Misbehavior in cyber places: The regulation of online conduct in virtual communities on the Internet*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc.
- Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63(3), 224-237.
- Steverson, L. A. (2011). Shaming penalties. In W. J. Chambliss (Ed.), *Corrections* (pp. 275-289). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Sticca, F., & Perren, S. (2013). Is cyberbullying worse than traditional bullying? Examining the differential roles of medium, publicity, and anonymity for the perceived severity of bullying. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 42(5), 739-750.
- Stott, C., Adang, O., Livingstone, A., & Schreiber, M. (2008). Tackling football hooliganism: A quantitative study of public order, policing and crowd psychology. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 14(2), 115-141.
- Stout, L. A. (2006). Social norms and other-regarding preferences. In J. N. Drobak (Ed.), *Norms and the law* (pp. 13-34). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Tadros, V., & Tierney, S. (2004). The presumption of innocence and the Human Rights Act. *The Modern Law Review*, 67(3), 402-434.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). Social stereotypes and social groups. In J. Turner & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup behaviour* (pp. 144-167). Oxford: Blackwell.

- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *The psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1994). *Theories of intergroup relations: International social psychological perspectives (2nd ed.)*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Tester, K. (2012). August in England. *Thesis Eleven*, 109(1), 4-10.
- Thompson, H. A. (2000). Understanding rioting in postwar urban America. *Journal of Urban History*, 26(3), 391-402.
- Tierney, T. F. (2013). *The public space of social media: Connected cultures of the network society*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tittle, C. R., Bratton, J., & Gertz, M. G. (2003). A test of a micro-level application of shaming theory. *Social Problems*, 50(4), 592-617.
- Tonkin, E., Pfeiffer, H. D., & Tourte, G. (2012). Twitter, information sharing and the London riots. *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 38(2), 49-57.
- Tonnevold, C. (2009). The internet in the Paris riots of 2005. *Javnost – The Public*, 16(1), 87-100.
- Tonteri, L., Kosonen, M., Ellonen, H., & Tarkiainen, A. (2011). Antecedents of an experienced sense of virtual community. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(6), 2215-2223.

- Torrens, P. M., & McDaniel, A. W. (2013). Modeling geographic behaviour in riotous crowds. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 103(1), 20-46.
- Treadwell, J., Briggs, D., Winlow, S., & Hall, S. (2013). Shopocalypse now: Consumer culture and the English riots of 2011. *British Journal of Criminology*, 53(1), 1-17.
- Tripp, T. M., Bies, R. J., & Aquino, K. (2002). Poetic justice or petty jealousy? The aesthetics of revenge. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 966-984.
- Troyer, R. J., & Wright, R. D. (1985). Community response to crime: Two middle-class anti-crime patrols. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 13(3), 227-241.
- Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 63(6), 384-399.
- Tufekci, Z., & Wilson, C. (2012). Social media and the decision to participate in political protest: Observations from Tahrir Square. *Journal of Communication*, 62(2), 363-379.
- Turner, R., & Killian, L. (1987). *Collective behaviour* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Tyler, T. R. (2002). Is the internet changing social life? It seems the more things change, the more they stay the same. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(1), 195-205.
- United States General Accounting Office. (1989). Content analysis: A methodology for structuring and analyzing written material. Retrieved March 13, 2013, from <http://archive.gao.gov/d48t13/138426.pdf>

- Useem, B. (1998). Breakdown theories of collective action. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24(1), 215-238.
- Van den Hoonaard, D. K. (2012). *Qualitative research in action*. Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Van Vugt, M., & Hart, C. M. (2004). Social identity as social glue: The origins of group loyalty. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(4), 585-598.
- Vidmar, N. (2001). Retribution and revenge. In S. Sanders and V. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of justice research in law* (pp. 31-63). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Vrouva, I., & Dennington, L. (2011). "Hug a hoodie": Reflections in the aftermath of the English riots. *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, 8(4), 341-345.
- Wagner, B. (2013). Governing internet expression: How public and private regulation shape expression governance. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 10(4), 389-403.
- Wain, N., & Joyce, P. (2012). Disaffected communities, riots and policing: Manchester 1981 and 2011. *Safer Communities*, 11(3), 125-134.
- Wainwright, D. (1997). Can sociological research be qualitative, critical and valid? *The Qualitative Report*, 3(2), 1-18.
- Ward, T., & Salmon, K. (2009). The ethics of punishment: Correctional practice implications. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 14(4), 239-247.
- Webster, C. M., & Doob, A. N. (2007). Punitive trends and stable imprisonment rates in Canada. *Crime and Justice*, 36(1), 297-369.

- Wehmhoener, K. A. (2010). *Social norm or social harm: An exploratory study of internet vigilantism*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Iowa State University.
- Weisenfeld, E. (1996). The concept of "we": A community social psychology myth? *Journal of Community Psychology*, 24(4), 337-346.
- Welsh, B. C., & Irving, M. H. (2005). Crime and punishment in Canada, 1981-1999. *Crime and Justice*, 33, 247-294.
- White, M. D., & Kane, R. J. (2013). Pathways to career-ending police misconduct: An examination of patterns, timing, and organizational responses to officer malfeasance in the NYPD. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 40(11), 1301-1325.
- White, R. (2006). Swarming and the social dynamics of group violence. *Trends & Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, 326, 1-6.
- Wilkins, S. C. (2007). *Faculty identity: An exploratory study using social identity theory*. (Order No. 3299397, University of Kentucky). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 141.
Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304835300?accountid=9894>.
(304835300).
- Wilkinson, S. I. (2009). Riots. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 12, 329-343.
- Williams, J. S., Singh, B. K., Singh, B. B. (1994). Urban youth, fear of crime, and resulting defensive actions. *Adolescence*, 29(114), 323-330.
- Williams, K. R., & Guerra, N. G. (2007). Prevalence and predictors of internet bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41(6), S14-S21.

- Williams, M. (2007). Policing and cybersociety: The maturation of regulation within an online community. *Policing & Society*, 17(1), 59-82.
- Wishart, H. (2013). Criminal culpability, criminal attempts and the erosion of the choice theory. *The Journal of Criminal Law*, 77(1), 78-90.
- Wolak, J., Mitchell, K. J., & Finkelhor, D. (2007). Does online harassment constitute bullying? An exploration of online harassment by known peers and online-only contacts. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41(6), S51-S58.
- Wolfsfeld, G., Segev, E., & Sheaffer, T. (2013). Social media and the Arab Spring: Politics comes first. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 18(2), 115-137.
- Woo, A. (2012, October 20). Searching for justice in the murky vigilante world. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved January 28, 2014, from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/british-columbia/searching-for-justice-in-the-murky-vigilante-world/article4625880/>
- Yamagishi, T. (1995). Social dilemmas. In K. S. Cook, G. A. Fine, & J. S. House (Eds.), *Sociological perspectives on social psychology* (pp. 311-335). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Young, R., & Hoyle, C. (2003). Restorative justice and punishment. In S. McConville (Ed.), *Use of Punishment* (pp. 199-234). Portland, CT: Willan Publishing.
- Zdaniuk, A., & Bobocel, R. (2012). Vertical individualism and injustice: The self-restorative function of revenge. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(5), 640-651.
- Zuckerman, A. A. S. (1989). *The principles of criminal evidence*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.