Appendix A: Logging in—A Brief Note on Methodology

Studies examining violence in the media generally fall into one of two opposing approaches steeped in methodological purism: the quantitative positivism of the media effects tradition and the qualitative interpretivism of the cultural studies/criminology tradition. Given the explicit aversion to quantitative methods voiced by several key cultural criminologists (see Ferrell 2009; Young 2011; Ferrell et al. 2008), and the similar aversion of many media effects researchers to qualitative methods, the relationship between these two traditions may be best described, to use Schrøder's (2013, 44) term, as one of 'antagonistic self-sufficiency,' whereby neither approach sees much value in the other. There is, however, much to be gained through employing qualitative and quantitative methods together in researching this area. Reception studies researchers have, for example, long argued that investigating audiences and spectatorship is best achieved through analysing both qualitative 'intentionalist' data relating to beliefs, values and intentions, and quantitative 'non-intentionalist' data pertaining to observable practices (see Jensen and Rosengren 1990).

In line with this approach, I employed a qualitatively driven mixed-methods methodology (see Mason 2006) to generate the grounded theories of antisocial media and crime-watching advanced in this study.

© The Author(s) 2018
M.A. Wood, *Antisocial Media*, Palgrave Studies in Crime, Media and Culture,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-63985-7

Through triangulating survey and observational methods, qualitative and quantitative analysis, and digitized and natively digital data (Rogers 2013, 19), I was able to produce a richer account of fight page spectatorship than a purely qualitative or quantitative project could have provided. Underpinning my methodological compatibilist position is a pragmatic understanding of knowledge and inquiry (see Baert 2005). Epistemologically, pragmatists reject what Dewey (1929, 204) has termed the 'spectator theory of knowledge,' that is, the belief that an object of inquiry can ever be viewed objectively from a disengaged and wholly disinterested standpoint (see Ezrahi 1997). Following from this, research informed by pragmatism understands the pursuit of knowledge as self-corrective inquiry, views the division between 'hard' and 'soft' sciences as ultimately untenable (Rorty 1980) and, consequently, views both qualitative and quantitative methods as potentially productive, with their own respective strengths and weaknesses for particular fields of inquiry (Howe 1988).

Given its rejection of the spectator theory of knowledge, research underpinned by pragmatism places a strong emphasis on reflexivity. In this study I maintained a commitment to reflexivity primarily through engaging in analytical autoethnography: the practice of making explicit what would ordinarily be left implicit in the final write up of a study, namely the researcher's experiences, beliefs and subjectivity, and their effects on the analysis of data (Anderson 2006; Wakeman 2014). Often, the researcher's identity is framed negatively as something that taints an analysis rather than produces a more astute one. One aspect of my background, however, proved enormously beneficial to this study. Throughout the production of this book, I trained in the mixed martial arts style of Zen Do Kai at *Firestorm Dojos* and gained an embodied knowledge of fighting through sparring with other members of my dojo (see Spencer 2014b). The technical and embodied knowledge of hand-to-hand combat I acquired through this training proved extremely valuable in analysing the content hosted on fight pages, which often employed martial arts discourses. Moreover, as I will explain in the following section, autoethnography also represented a key analytical tool for grappling with the adaptive and personalized nature of Facebook's interfaces.

Providing an Account of/for Oneself: Following Facebook Pages as an Observational Method

In exploring television audiences, one of the most significant methodological issues reception studies faces is documenting practices and experiences that overwhelmingly occur in private (Morley 1992). With the emergence of social media, the audience, reconfigured as users, has never been so accessible (see Jensen 2011). Whilst offering far from an open window into the practices and experiences of spectators, the comments box and, to a lesser extent, the like and share buttons nonetheless provided a means of observing fight page users readings of and responses to the clips of bare-knuckle violence they view. This study's data pertaining to the content of these domains, and their users' participatory practices, attitudes and responses to specific forms of recorded violence, was therefore primarily obtained through following and observing five prominent fight pages on a daily basis for five months.

Owing to the lack of scholarly data on fight pages, upon commencing this study, I undertook an initial exploratory investigation between January and May, 2014, to obtain information pertaining to their nature and prevalence on Facebook. In undertaking this initial exploratory investigation, I followed several of the ethnographic data collection principles advocated within actor–network theory—a perspective that has recently demonstrated significant utility in exploring new media environments (see Farnsworth and Austrin 2010). First, I was mindful of the sociotechnical nature of fight pages and was careful not to privilege investigating their content at the expense of investigating their technological form. During this initial investigation, I generated intricate concept maps detailing the assemblage of features, affordances and algorithms that make up Facebook's infoscapes. Over the course of the study, these maps were an invaluable resource for theory construction and were updated to reflect changes in Facebook's visible data structures and invisible algorithms. Second, I accorded to the key actor–network theory principle to 'follow the actors' (Latour 2007, 12) by tracing elements of a network that transcend bounded research fields. Through doing so, and

following the hyperlink networks between fight pages, I initially located 74 of these pages; a number that would increase to 120 over the course of the study. Of these 74 pages, *Crazy Street Fights*, *The Craziest Fights Ever*, *Just Fights Videos*, *Real Crazy Fights* and *Only Street Fighting* were selected for daily in-depth observation owing to their popularity and the general nature of the fight clips they hosted.

In June 2014, I commenced this second phase of daily in-depth observation by 'liking' each of these five pages. Within Facebook's media ecology, 'liking' a page is akin to following or subscribing to its content. Upon 'liking' a page, content posted by it may be narrowcast into a user's personalized News Feed. As many fight page users only encounter the content posted by these domains within their algorithmically curated News Feeds, observing these five pages through the News Feed interface was crucial to ascertaining the nature of the content that these users would most regularly engage with. This second phase of daily observations lasted five months, and concluded in October 2014. During this time, I collected data from 1498 video posts that I encountered in my News Feed. Following this phase of daily observation, I continued to monitor all five pages semi-regularly, and I continued to collect small amounts of data from them up until February of 2016.

Given their participatory nature, the pages I followed allowed for a similarly participatory approach to observation, in line with the principles of digital ethnography (see Hine 2008; Postill and Pink 2012; Pink et al. 2016). However, owing to the specific nature of participation on these pages, and the difficulties that this brand of participation presented for interviewing page users, I ultimately favoured an unobtrusive approach to observation. On the five pages I followed, participating users were too numerous and their engagement with page content too fleeting to build rapport. Moreover, due to the often enormous audience to comments on these pages, the specific conventions associated with commenting on posts, and the undesirable social consequences for failing to follow these conventions, the probability that many users would respond to any questions I posed to them was low. For these reasons, the comments sections situated within each of the pages I observed were far from conducive environments for conversing with the users of these domains. Additionally, there were several clear benefits to unobtrusively

observing these five pages. Firstly, in observing these pages unobtrusively, I avoided incurring the Hawthorne effect, whereby individuals alter their behaviour when made aware that they are being observed (see McCambridge et al. 2014). Further, in unobtrusively viewing the content posted by these pages, I mirrored the behaviour of most fight page users, who similarly do not comment on fight videos, nor interact with other page users.

More fundamentally through, I shared another commonality with these individuals: I myself am a Facebook user, and my encounters with fight pages primarily occurred through my personal Facebook account. In other words, I followed and observed these pages as a Facebook user, that is, through a number of the site's user-interfaces and at the shifting rates shaped by the site's personalization algorithms. In traditional terms, this approach did not constitute participatory observation, but arguably, nor did it truly constitute non-participatory observation either. As many methodologists and ethnographers have long noted, observation is shaped, in part, by a researcher's subjectivity and choices within a field (see Davies 2008; Okely and Callaway 1992). On adaptive websites, this is not just a result of a researcher's selective perception, but also of the field's reactions to a researcher within it. In such information environments, content is personalized through advanced machine learning algorithms, meaning that the content one researcher encounters when using the site may differ substantially from what others encounter. Within these highly sophisticated adaptive websites, researchers can never just observe: every click on a link, and every minute spent viewing content is recorded by the site's algorithms, and each subsequent observation is coloured by the actions that occurred in the last. The 'field' is itself an actor that the researcher interacts with, and which shapes the way the researcher experiences the subject of their investigations. Consequently, in using a Facebook account to investigate online phenomena, it is imperative that researchers provide an account of themselves and their subjective experiences of the site.

For example, following pages as a Facebook user provides a way of examining how particular online behaviours, such as liking everything they encountered in their News Feed for several days (see Honen 2014), or consistently viewing the content of fight pages, alters the information

environment curated by a site's personalization algorithms. Adaptive websites and personalization thus create a new use for autoethnography that has, to my knowledge, been uncharted within academic research: that of mapping the effects of personalization algorithms on the researcher's own experience of a site, and the information environment that is generated through their highly individualized interactions with a number of pages. For whilst anecdotal accounts of the effects of personalization, such as Pariser's (2011) ground-breaking research into filter bubbles, have been a mainstay of many journalists accounts of new media, academic researchers have yet to employ a similar autoethnographic approach to the information environments of adaptive social media websites.

To generate this autoethnographic account of my experiences viewing and consuming fight pages, I employed two methods. Firstly, to ascertain the number of times a fight page's content appeared in my News Feed each day, I undertook a structured quantitative content analysis. Though the use of this quantitative method might be viewed as a little sacrilegious and beyond the bounds of autoethnography, through employing it I was able to chart the algorithmically driven rhythms of fight page content in my News Feed over eight months. Secondly, in addition to this structured quantitative content analysis, I wrote field notes detailing my personal(ized) experience of these pages. These field notes were essential to detailing my experiential and affective responses to the agonistic content I viewed. Far from being detached note-taking, observation affects the researcher emotionally and affectively, and these emotions profoundly shape what is observed and how it is recorded. In researching online media, there is, however, the potential for this affective dimension of observation to be neglected. Unlike the transience of much of the phenomena recorded in offline observations, many of the key events, practices and exchanges on fight pages endure as textual, pictorial and video artefacts; their artefactual mortality masked by seeming permanence. However, an approach that equates online observation with the 'copy and paste' collation of digital artefacts neglects the experiential dimension of engaging with these sites. The observational approach to data collection adopted within this research attempted to mitigate such a copy and paste style observation of fight pages, through taking field notes of my own observations in additional to extensively documenting text, images and

videos using computational copy/pasting, screen capturing and (where possible) downloading functions.

Surveys

Following five fight pages provided rich data on the forms of violence aggregated on these domains, and the discourses their administrators cite in curating this violence. However, it provided only limited data on the users of these domains, including, notably, their practices, experiences, content preferences and attitudes. Data pertaining to these issues was therefore elicited through surveying fight page users. Ultimately, anonymous online surveys were utilized owing to challenges I faced recruiting participants for face to face or online interviews. Though I spoke briefly to members of my martial arts dojo about their own consumption of fight clips on Facebook, few were willing to undertake a more formal interview, and most volunteered only brief snippets of information on the subject. Moreover, as noted afore, the nature of the pages this project examined further made for a difficult environment to generate trust and rapport with page users and ultimately recruit interview participants. This difficulty in gaining the trust of page users extended out to advertisement based recruitment methods, compounded by the unavoidable need for site users to reveal their identity to the researcher—a condition that may have deterred many individuals from participating. Therefore, to obtain the sufficient quantity of data collection required to complete this project, it had to employ a method of data collection that could be undertaken quickly, immediately and anonymously. Yet despite these criteria, this project also required more time consuming qualitative data to properly investigate spectators' attitudes towards violence and experiences viewing fight clips—thus precluding the use of a quicker multiple-choice survey.

As such, the use of short five to ten minute surveys comprised of multiple choice and short answer questions represented a pragmatic compromise between sufficient data quantity and quality. My questionnaire was comprised of four sections and a final debrief section. The first introductory section consisted of a plain language statement on the purpose

and nature of the study and a 'click to submit' consent form detailing, inter alia, participants' right to withdraw data. The second 'background' section then consisted of questions that gauged the identity of participants, including their gender, age, highest level of education and occupation. In the third section, participants were then asked about their experiences and practices of using fight pages, including how, when and why they viewed fight videos on Facebook, and what forms of bare-knuckle violence they preferred to spectate on the platform. Moreover, to document the effect of spectating fight clips, participants were asked to describe how they most regularly felt when they viewed such footage. In the fourth section, participants were then asked a series of questions relating to their attitudes towards violence, and were asked whether they believed viewing scenes of bare-knuckle violence on Facebook had changed or reinforced their attitudes towards violence, and if so how?

Owing to the lack of a survey frame of fight page users, I employed purposive non-probability sampling using Facebook advertisements and manually posted advert comments to recruit fight page users to this study. The majority of the 205 fight page users who participated in this study (n.171) were recruited using paid Facebook advertisements. Manually posting adverts in comments was a less successful strategy, recruiting only the remaining 34 respondents. Facebook advertisements were initially served to individuals aged 18 and over who had liked 'street fighting' as an interest on Facebook. Both forms of survey advertisement were posted on a semi-public Facebook page that was created using a specifically created research account. The use of this account prevented any undesired future contact from my population, which may otherwise have occurred if using my personal account.[1]

Reading Violence: Data Analysis

My approach to analysing footage of bare-knuckle violence and fight page users' comments, accounts and practices was heavily influenced by reception studies (Jensen and Rosengren 1990). For reception studies scholars, it is absolutely vital that media content is analysed in context

through the lens of its audiences (Livingstone 1998; Staiger 2005). In accordance with this semiotic approach to researching communication, rather than analysing the content of fight videos as a text or an object of analysis in-and-of-itself (see Bertrand and Hughes 2005), my unit of analysis was instead the spectatorial encounter with fight videos; that is, the ways in which this footage was interpreted, experienced and responded to by spectators. Descriptive and *in vivo* codes (see *Saldaña*2016) were therefore generated through a thematic analysis of page users' comments and video titles (Boyatzis 1998), whilst quantitative content analysis was used to examine the frequency of these themes (Jupp 2006).

Having generated these codes, I then undertook a qualitative content analysis of videos that was mindful of their 'dominant' readings by commenters (see Hall 1980). Through analysing videos in this way, I was able to discern categories or genres of fight videos that demonstrated, to misappropriate the phrase made famous by Raymond Carver, what fight page users talked about when they talked about violence. In analysing the content of these videos, I noted down details relating to the location of the event(s) they featured, the number and identities of individuals recorded and their roles in the event, the dynamics of the violent event (one-on-one fight, two-on-two fight, four-on-one fight etc.), the martial arts techniques used by those directly involved in the event (see Larkin and Dwyer 2016), and the event's outcome (one party knocked unconscious, both parties separated by bystanders or detained by police etc.). If at all discernible, I also elaborated on a violent event's immediate or proximal causes. Finally, I noted any other details within a video that commenters had discussed, such as the actions of a passer-by, or the presence of a novel object. To establish how prevalent each of these genres of fight video was on the five pages I followed, I tabulated their frequencies. With these fight video genres established, I was then able to analyse survey participants' responses with an understanding of the nature of the videos they referred to. Like this study's observational data, I analysed survey participants' responses thematically, this time in order to generate typologies of viewing motivations, attitudes towards violence, affective responses to content and content preferences.

Researcher Discretion Advised: The Ethics and Pains of Researching Fight Pages

During this study, I regularly encountered videos of extreme violence, often accompanied by a 'viewer discretion advised' warning. Indeed, all of the pages I followed hosted confronting footage of violence, including recordings of stabbings, and individuals being body-slammed head-first into concrete. Further, though the most confronting content hosted on these pages was contained within the videos they posted, the comments posted by their users often offered little respite, and in some instances featured statements disturbing in either their racism or misogyny or homophobia or sheer callousness. Repeatedly viewing such content was emotionally draining and provides an example of the 'pains of criminological research' to use the term offered by Beyens et al. (2013). In researching these domains, I therefore had to use discretion to limit the potential harm not only to my participants but also to my own wellbeing.

Prior to obtaining school ethics approval for this study in 2014, I discussed with my supervisors the potentially distressing nature of the domains I was researching and, together, we developed a framework of support mechanisms (as advised also by Moncur 2013) and research practices for maintaining my emotional wellbeing over the course of the project. This framework consisted of two key elements: regular debriefing sessions with my supervisors and timed observation sessions. Throughout the study, I regularly debriefed with my supervisors and discussed my feelings about the project, alongside any concerns I had about it, or any specific videos I had encountered. In addition to these formal debriefing sessions with my supervisors, I also participated in a PhD support group with several of my peers who were also studying sensitive subject matter. During meetings, we discussed issues we had encountered in our research—including confronting subject matter—and provided emotional support to one another. Owing to the nature of their content, engaging in the sustained observation of fight pages was emotionally draining, even in instances where I did not encounter comparatively brutal recordings of violence. For this reason, I limited sessions of structured fight page observation to two hours a day, and logged off if I ever felt distressed after viewing a video.

Both of the primary data collection methods used in this study are accompanied by quite distinct and well-documented ethical issues that need to be mindfully considered to minimize harm to participants, and the population being researched. In surveying fight page users, I had to address several relatively standard ethical considerations relating to informed consent and minimizing the risk of harm to participants. To ensure participants' informed consent, I opened the online survey with a plain language statement and consent form—a practice that has become the most common means of obtaining informed consent in online survey research (Fink 2016). To take part in the study, participants had to acknowledge that they'd read the statement through clicking an 'agree' button. Moreover, in addition to these standard ethical issues pertaining to informed consent and the right to withdraw data, this study's violent subject matter also raised concerns about potential harm to survey participants. Given the sensitive and potentially triggering nature of the issues discussed within surveys, measures were therefore taken to minimize harm to respondents. These included phrasing questions in a non-threatening and non-judgmental manner, limiting participation in the survey to individuals aged 18 and above, and providing the researcher's contact details should participants need to debrief, express concerns about the research design, or access support services due to experiencing distress as a result of the survey.

Additionally, before I began harvesting data from the five fight pages, I had to grapple with several ethical considerations stemming from the online nature of these domains. Perhaps the most considerable of these considerations related to the ethicality of observing fight pages covertly and quoting their users. Arguments over the ethics of observing online spaces covertly by 'lurking' or engaging in 'cyber-stealth' (Ebo 1998, 3) often hinge on whether the space being observed can be considered public, private, 'publicly private,' or 'privately public' (see Wascul and Douglass 1996; Eysenbach and Till 2001; Berry 2004; Moreno et al. 2008; Zimmer 2010; Mathieu et al. 2016). Consequently, whether certain areas within Facebook constitute public, semi-public or private domains ultimately determines if informed consent is required to observe and quote individuals using these online areas. This concern with issues of privacy and informed consent in research into social media platforms

has recently intensified following Kramer et al.'s (2014) ethically contentious study of 'emotional contagion' on Facebook, in which researchers covertly modified the content narrowcast on 689,003 users' News Feeds and monitored their behaviour without obtaining informed consent. Unlike Kramer et al.'s study, this study's observations were naturalistic rather than experimental and insofar as it can be considered a form of pure non-participatory observation taking place in a public domain, would not require informed consent from observed individuals.

Certainly, not all user-generated Facebook pages can, nor should, be considered public spaces. For the users of pages with only a small number of likes (subscribers), such domains may have a small presumed audience (see Zimmer 2010), even if they are 'open' (public) pages rather than 'closed' (private) groups. However, owing to their number of subscribers and daily users, the open conditions for accessing and participating on them, and the perceived audience of users' comments on their posts, all five of the fight pages followed in this study can reasonably be considered public spaces. Each of the five fight pages investigated within this project had well over 100,000 likes, and the videos they posted were each day viewed by an even greater number of Facebook users. Further, as popular fight videos sometimes accumulate hundreds of thousands of views, and hundreds of comments, in commenting on one of these public video posts, there is an expectation that it will be viewed by large quantity of people who the commenter is not acquainted with. Nevertheless, to lessen the risk of harming fight page users through attributing comments to them, I have anonymized fight page users' when quoting them in full.

A similar ethical consideration stemming from the online nature of fight pages related to the potential harms of directly quoting user comments (see Bassett and O'Riordan 2002). Because comments are public and easily locatable when entered into a search engine, directly quoting fight page users could leave them open to future intrusion. One proposed solution to this confidentiality issue is to deliberatively alter or fabricate comments, thereby removing the possibility of tracing them to their authors via a search engine (see Markam 2012). However, considering again the four factors listed above—the number of users of fight pages, the open conditions for accessing and participating in them, the per-

ceived audience for users' comments, and the nature of the associations between their users—it is again reasonable to conclude that quoted site users are unlikely to face an increased level of outside intrusion as a result of being quoted in this project (which itself has a small audience). Nevertheless, to provide a degree of protection against such a breach of confidentiality, I have not specified the dates that videos were shared, and in doing so have made it more difficult to trace quoted comments to their authors.

A related ethical consideration concerned whether or not to reproduce still images taken from the fight videos I encountered. Researchers within visual sociology and visual anthropology have long demonstrated that pictures represent an invaluable means of conveying research findings (see Pink 2003; Becker 2007). However, as Pink (2013) notes, researchers must tread carefully in reproducing 'found' visual content even when it is located within an already public forum. Reproducing such content in a new context risks alienating its producers and subjects, who may not have anticipated its re-use in this new manner (see Bakardjieva and Feenberg 2000). More problematically still, it was clear that many of the recorded subjects of fight videos did not consent to being filmed. Consequently, further disseminating this footage may act as a source of additional shame and humiliation (see Moller 2012; Reinhardt 2012). Finally, given the illegality of many of the events recorded and posted on fight pages, reproducing stills from these videos could, though highly unlikely, have legal ramifications for the individuals featured in these recordings. For these reasons, stills from fight videos were reproduced only sparingly in this book and only in instances where their pixelated nature precluded any identification of the individuals they featured.

Notes

1. See Fileborn (2016) for a discussion of the challenges of recruiting survey participants using Facebook as a recruitment tool.

Appendix B: Additional Tables

Table A.1 Like counts of the 99 encountered fight pages that remained online in March 2016

Number of likes	Number of pages
>1,000,000 likes	4
500,000–999,999 likes	7
250,000–499,999 likes	13
100,000–249,999 likes	32
50,000–99,999 likes	8
20,000–49,999 likes	19
10,000–19,999 likes	13
1–9999 likes	3
Total	121

It is worth emphasizing that these figures are not representative of the average like counts of fight pages. The lower figure for pages with fewer than 10,000 likes can be attributed primarily to the nature of Facebook's search engine, which privileges pages with higher like counts

© The Author(s) 2018

M.A. Wood, *Antisocial Media*, Palgrave Studies in Crime, Media and Culture,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-63985-7

Table A.2 Survey participants' motivations for viewing clips of bare-knuckle street violence on Facebook, 2014

Fight page	Clean fights	Brawls	One-sided attacks
Only Street Fighting	103	154	45
Crazy Street Fights	76	121	53
The Craziest Fights Ever	84	90	16
Real Crazy Fights	68	76	32
Just Fights Videos	61	63	21
Total	392	504	167

Table A.3 Subcategories of the 104 fight pages I encountered during this study, 2014

Subcategory	Number of fight pages
Generic fight pages	37
Street fight pages	25
School fight pages	14
Generic school fight pages	9
School specific school fight pages	3
Location specific school fight pages	2
Ghetto' fight pages	8
Girl' fight pages	7
Ratchet' fight pages	3
Location based pages	6
Knockout pages	3
WorldstarHipHop fan pages	2
Hooligan' fights	1
Skater and BMX fights	1
Total number of fight pages	121

Table A.4 Survey participants' motivations for viewing clips of bare-knuckle street violence on Facebook, 2014

Viewing motivation	Percentage of respondents	Number of respondents
Entertainment	13	23
Righteous justice	21	36
Amusement	12	21
Boredom Alleviation	12	20
Intrigue	25	43
Self-validation	9	15
Self-defence learning	25	43
Risk awareness	9	15
Skipped question	20	34
Total	100	171

Table A.5 Survey participants' demographics, 2014

Demographic characteristic	Number of respondents	Percentage of sample
Gender		
Male	194	94.6
Female	9	4.3
Unspecified	2	0.9
Age		
17	17	8.3
18–24	88	42.9
25–34	58	28.3
35–44	25	12
45–54	10	4.8
55–64	2	1
65+	0	0
Unspecified	5	2.4
Country		
UK	76	37
USA	58	28.2
Ireland	14	6.8
Canada	5	2.4
Sweden	3	1.4
Australia	3	1.4
Switzerland	1	0.4
Germany	1	0.4
Dubai	1	0.4
Madagascar	1	0.4
Unspecified	42	20.4
Overall sample	205	100

Table A.6 Survey participants' frequency of viewing clips of bare-knuckle street violence on Facebook, 2014

Viewing frequency	Percentage of participants	Number of participants
Once a day	13	23
Two to three times a day	21	36
More than three times a day	12	21
Once a week	12	20
Two to three times a week	25	43
Once a month	9	15
Two to three times a month	8	13
Skipped question	16.5	34
Total	100	205

Table A.7 Survey participants' time spent viewing clips of bare-knuckle street violence on Facebook, 2014

Viewing duration	Percentage of participants	Number of participants
Less than 5 minutes	38	65
5–10 minutes	33	55
10–15 minutes	14	24
15–25 minutes	14	23
Longer than 25 minutes	1	2
Skipped question	16.5	36
Total	100	205

Table A.8 Survey participants' pathways to online clips of bare-knuckle street violence, 2014

Viewing pathway	Percentage of participants	Number of participants
Visiting a fight page	31	53
Visiting a YouTube fight channel	9	15
Search engine	2	4
News Feed (from followed page)	37	62
News Feed (content friend has liked)	21	35
Skipped question	17.5	36
Total	100	205

Table A.9 Survey participants' viewing of comments left on fight clips, 2014

Viewing of comments	Percentage of participants	Number of participants
Never	28	46
Rarely	24	37
Occasionally	29	45
Often	8	12
Always	11	17
Skipped question	23.5	48
Total	100	205

Table A.10 Survey participants' preferred fight clip content, 2014

Preferred clip content	Percentage of participants	Number of participants
One-on-one fights	10	21
Bully gets defeated	4	8
Underdog wins	2	4
Bloody/brutal content	6	13
Knockout	7	14
Skilled fighters	5	10
Random attacks/muggings	2	3
Hood fights	1.5	3
Girl/women fights	1.5	3
Skipped question	1.5	125
Total	100	205

Table A.11 Survey participants' views on when violence is acceptable, 2014

Attitude towards violence	Percentage of participants	Number of participants
Self-defence	44	90
Defending friends or family	11	23
Defending others from harm	10	20
Resolving a dispute	2.5	5
Responding to disrespect	8	16
Standing up for what's right	4	8
When both parties consent	4.5	9
Controlled environment	6.5	13
Violence is never acceptable	2	4
For fun	0.5	1
Skipped question	61	125
Total	100	205

Table A.12 Frequency of comment types on *Only Street Fighting*, *Crazy Street Fights*, *The Craziest Fights Ever*, *Just Fights Videos* and *Real Crazy Fights*, May–December 2014

Fight page	Normative judgments	Humour	Tagging	Analysing technique	Flaming	Bragging
Only Street Fighting	451	432	427	234	98	54
Crazy Street Fights	342	413	358	352	66	34
The Craziest Fights Ever	421	347	463	452	24	11
Real Crazy Fights	370	389	359	235	35	34
Just Fights Videos	396	349	214	357	19	22
Total	1980	1930	1821	1630	242	155

Bibliography

Aas, K. F. (2004). From narrative to database: Technological change and penal culture. *Punishment & Society, 6*(4): 379–393.

Aas, K. F. (2007). Analysing a world in motion: Global flows meet 'criminology of the other'. *Theoretical Criminology, 11*(2): 283–303.

Adolphie, C. (2015). Legitimate pain and antisocial media: A call to respect mourning after Parisian tragedy. *The Manitoban*, November 24. Retrieved October 15, 2016, from http://www.themanitoban.com/2015/11/legitimate-pain-and-antisocial-media/25969/

Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Agnew, R. (1991). The interactive effects of peer variables on delinquency. *Criminology, 29*(1): 47–72.

Akers, R. L. (1977). *Deviant behaviour: A social learning approach*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Akwagyiram, A. (2005). Does 'happy slapping' exist? *BBC News*, May 12. Retrieved October 15, 2016, from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4539913.stm

Allan, S., & Thorsen, E. (Eds.). (2009). *Citizen journalism: Global perspective*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Anderson, B. (2004). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, UK: Verso.

© The Author(s) 2018

M.A. Wood, *Antisocial Media*, Palgrave Studies in Crime, Media and Culture,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-63985-7

Anderson, C. A., Berkowitz, L., Donnerstein, E., Huesmann, L. R., Johnson, J. D., Linz, D., et al. (2003). The influence of media violence on youth. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 4*(3): 81–110.

Anderson, E. (2000). *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Anderson, L. (2006). Analytic autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 35*(4): 373–395.

Antony, M. G. (2015). *Audience responses to real media violence: The knockout game*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Theory, Culture, and Society, 7*(2): 295–310.

Asuncion, J. (2010). Reaction images. *Know Your Meme*. Retrieved October 15, 2016, from http://knowyourmeme.com/memes/reaction-images

Atkinson, R., & Rodgers, T. (2015). Pleasure zones and murder boxes: Online pornography and violent video games as cultural zones of exception. *British Journal of Criminology*. doi:https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azv113

Baert, P. (2005). *Philosophy of the social sciences: Towards pragmatism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Bainbridge, C. (2004). The trauma debate: Just looking? Traumatic affect, film form and spectatorship in the work of Lars von Trier. *Screen, 54*(4): 391–400.

Bakardjieva, M. (2003). Virtual togetherness: An everyday-life perspective. *Media, Culture & Society, 25*(3): 291–313.

Bakardjieva, M., & Feenberg, A. (2000). Involving the virtual subject. *Ethics and Information Technology, 2*(4): 233–240.

Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science, 348*(6239): 1130–1132.

Bal, M. (2003). Visual essentialism and the object of visual culture. *Journal of Visual Culture, 2*(1): 5–32.

Bal, M. (2012). Imaging pain. In A. Grønstad & H. Gustafsson (Eds.), *Ethics and images of pain*. London, UK: Routledge.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. New York, NY: General Learning Press.

Bandura, A. (1978). Social learning theory of aggression. *Journal of Communication, 28*(3): 12–29.

Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1963). Imitation of film-mediated aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66*(1): 3–11.

Barabási, A., & Albert, R. (1999). Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science, 286*(5439): 509–512.

Barker, M., & Petley, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Ill effects: The media violence debate*. London, UK: Routledge.

Barratt, M. (2015). A discussion of dark net terminology. *Drugs, Internet, Society*, January 15. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://monicabarratt.net/?m=201501

Barrett, B. (2015). Facebook doesn't need (or even want) a dislike button. *Wired*, September 15. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.wired.com/2015/09/facebook-dislike-button/

Barthes, R. (1967). The death of the author. *Aspen*, 5–6: 2–6.

Barthes, R. (1974). *S/Z*. London, UK: Blackwell.

Barthes, R. (2009). *Mythologies*. London, UK: Vintage.

Bartlett, J. (2015). *The dark net*. London, UK: Windmill Books.

Bartlett, J., Reffin, J., Rumball, N., & Williamson, S. (2014). Anti-social media. *Demos*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.demos.co.uk/files/DEMOS_Anti-social_Media.pdf

Bassett, E. H., & O'Riordan, K. (2002). Ethics of Internet research: Contesting the human subject research model. *Ethics and Information Technology, 4*: 233–247.

Bataille, G. (2012/1957). *Literature and evil*. London, UK: Penguin.

Baudrillard, J. (2012/1987). *The ecstasy of communication*. Cambridge, MA: Semiotext(e).

Baudry, J. L. (2011/1975). Ideological effects of the basic cinematographic apparatus. In T. Corrigan, P. White, & M. Mazaj (Eds.), *Critical visions in film theory: Classic and contemporary readings*. Bedford, UK; Boston, MA: St. Martin's.

Bauman, Z., & Lyon, D. (2013). *Liquid surveillance*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Baym, N. K. (2010). *Personal connections in the digital age*. Oxford, UK: Polity.

Baym, N. K., & boyd, d. (2012). Socially mediated publicness: An introduction. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 56*(3): 320–329.

Beccaria, C. (2006/1819). On crimes and punishments. In A. Thomas (Ed.), *On crimes and punishments and other writings*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Becker, H. S. (2007). *Telling about society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Beer, D. (2009). Power through the algorithm? Participatory web cultures and the technological unconscious. *New Media & Society, 11*(6): 985–1002.

Bell, D. (2006a). Introduction: Cyberidentities. In D. Bell (Ed.), *The cybercultures reader: Second edition*. London, UK: Routledge.

Bell, D. (2006b). Webs as pegs. In S. Herbrechter & M. Higgins (Eds.), *Returning (to communities)*. New York, NY: Rodopi.

Bennett, C. (2014). Facebook KO fails to keep Perth 'Fight Club' pages down. *WAtoday*, November 26. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.watoday.com.au/wa-news/facebook-ko-fails-to-keep-perth-fight-club-pages-down-20141126-11u88b.html

Bennett, J. (2005). *Empathic vision: Affect, trauma, and contemporary art*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bennett, T. (1996). Figuring audiences and readers. In J. Hay, L. Grossberg, & E. Wartella (Eds.), *The audience and its landscape*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Bernstein, N. W. (2004). Auferte Oculos: Modes of spectatorship in Statius Thebaid 11. *Phoenix, 58*(1–2): 62–85.

Bernstein, R. J. (2010). *The pragmatic turn*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Berry, D. M. (2004). Internet research: Privacy, ethics and alienation—An open source approach. *Internet Research, 14*(4): 323–332.

Berry, D. M. (2012). The social epistemologies of software. *Social Epistemology, 26*(3–4): 379–398.

Berry, D. M. (2015). *The philosophy of software: Code and mediation in the digital age*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Best, J. (1999). *Random violence: How we talk about new crimes and new victims*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Bevier, L. (2015). The meaning of cultural criminology: A theoretical and methodological lineage. *Journal of Theoretical & Philosophical Criminology, 7*(2): 34–48.

Beyens, K., Christiaens, J., Claes, B., De Ridder, S., Tournel, H., & Tubex, H. (Eds.). (2013). *The pains of doing criminological research*. Brussels, Belgium: ASP.

Bhattacharjee, S., Gopal, R. D., & Sanders, G. L. (2003). Digital music and online sharing: Software piracy 2.0? *Communications of the ACM, 46*(7): 107–111.

Birke, S. (2010). Facebook and violence: Antisocial media. *The Economist*, August 25. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.economist.com/blogs/americasview/2010/08/facebook_and_violence

Blackman, S. (2014). Subcultural theory: An historical and contemporary assessment of the concept for understanding deviance. *Deviant Behavior, 35*(6): 496–512.

Blackshaw, T., & Crabbe, T. (2004). *New perspectives on sport and 'deviance': Consumption, performativity and social control*. London, UK: Routledge.

Bogost, I., & Montfort, N. (2009). Platform studies: Frequently questioned answers. Paper presented at *Digital Arts and Culture 2009*, Irvine, TX, December 12–15.

Bohannon, J. (2015). Is Facebook keeping you in a political bubble? *Science*, May 7. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2015/05/facebook-keeping-you-political-bubble

Borthwick, J. (2009). Distribution ... now. *Brodwick Personal Blog*, May 13.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Bowman, P. (2015). *Martial arts studies: Disrupting disciplinary boundaries*. London, UK: Rowman & Littlefield.

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

boyd, d. (2008). *Taken out of context: American teen sociality in networked publics*. PhD dissertation, University of California Berkeley.

boyd, d. (2010). Social network sites as networked publics: Affordances, dynamics, and implications. In Z. Papacharissi (Ed.), *Networked self: Identity, community, and culture on social network sites*. London, UK: Routledge.

Bozdag, E., & van der Hoven, J. (2015). Breaking the filter bubble: Democracy and design. *Ethics and Information Technology, 17*(4): 249–265.

Brett, B. (2012). The psychology of sharing: Why do people share online? *The New York Times Customer Insight Group*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://nytmarketing.whsites.net/mediakit/pos/

Briggs, R., & Hollis, N. (1997). Advertising on the web: Is there response before click-through? *Journal of Advertising Research, 37*(2): 33–46.

Brin, S., & Page, L. (1998). The anatomy of a large-scale hypertextual web search engine. *WWW7/Computer Networks, 30*: 107–117.

Brown, C. M. (1998). *Human-computer interface design guidelines*. Exeter, UK: Intellect Books.

Brown, M. (1996). The portrayal of violence in the media: Impacts & implications for policy. *Australian Institute of Criminology,* (55): 1–6.

Brown, M. (2014). Visual criminology and carceral studies: Counter-images in the carceral age. *Theoretical Criminology, 18*(2): 176–197.

Brown, S. (2003). *Crime and law in media culture*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Brown, S. (2006). The criminology of hybrids: Rethinking crime and law in technosocial networks. *Theoretical Criminology, 10*(2): 223–244.

Brown, S. (2013). Virtual criminology. In E. McLauglin & J. Muncie (Eds.), *The SAGE dictionary of criminology: 3rd edition*. London, UK: Sage.

Bruns, J., & Hauser, W. A. (2003). The epidemiology of traumatic brain injury: A review. *Epilepsia, 44*(Supplement 10): 2–10.

Bucher, T. (2012). Want to be on the top? Algorithmic power and the threat of invisibility on Facebook. *New Media & Society, 14*(7): 1164–1180.

Bukatman, S. (1996). *Terminal identity*. London, UK: Duke University Press.

Burgess, J., & Green, J. (2009). *YouTube: Online video and participatory culture*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Burnett, R., & Marshall, P. D. (2003). *Web theory: An introduction*. London, UK: Routledge.

Bushman, B. J., & Anderson, C. A. (2001). Media violence and the American public: Scientific facts versus media misinformation. *American Psychologist, 45*(4): 477–489.

Bushman, B. J., & Anderson, C. A. (2009). Comfortably numb: Desensitizing effects of violent media on helping others. *Psychological Science, 20*(3): 273–277.

Bushman, B. J., & Stack, A. D. (1996). Forbidden fruit versus tainted fruit: Effects of warning labels on attraction to television violence. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 2*(3): 207–226.

Butler, J. (2008/1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. London, UK: Routledge.

Callon, M. (1986). The sociology of an actor-network: The case of the electric vehicle. In M. Callon, J. Law, & A. Rip (Eds.), *Mapping the dynamics of science and technology: Sociology of science in the real world*. London, UK: Macmillan Press.

Calvete, E., Orue, I., Estevez, A., Villardon, L., & Padilla, P. (2010). Cyber bullying in adolescents: Modalities and aggressors' profile. *Computers in Human Behaviour, 26*(5): 1128–1135.

Carney, P. (2010). Crime, punishment and the force of photographic spectacle. In K. J. Hayward & M. Presdee (Eds.), *Framing crime: Cultural criminology and the image*. London, UK: Routledge.

Carrabine, E. (2008). *Crime, culture and the media*. London, UK: Polity.

Carrabine, E. (2012). Just images: Aesthetics, ethics and visual criminology. *British Journal of Criminology, 52*(3): 463–489.

Carrabine, E. (2014). Seeing things: Violence, voyeurism and the camera. *Theoretical Criminology, 18*(2): 134–158.

Castells, M. (1996). *The information age 1: The rise of the network society*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Castells, M. (1999). Grassrooting the space of flows. *Urban Geographies, 20*(4): 294–302.

Castells, M. (2005). Space of flows, space of places: Materials for a theory of urbanism in the information age. In S. Bishwapriya (Ed.), *Comparative planning cultures*. London, UK: Routledge.

Castells, M. (2007). Communication, power and counter-power in the network society. *International Journal of Communication, 1*(1): 238–266.

Castells, M. (2009). *Communication power*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Castells, M. (2010). *The power of identity: Economy, society, and culture*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Castells, M. (2011). *The rise of the network society: The information age: Economy, society, and culture*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Chadwick, K., & Scraton, P. (2013). Critical criminology. In E. McLauglin & J. Muncie (Eds.), *The SAGE dictionary of criminology: 3rd edition*. London, UK: Sage.

Chan, J., & Bennett Moses, L. (2016). Is Big Data challenging criminology? *Theoretical Criminology, 20*(1): 21–39.

Cheever, N. (2009). The uses and gratifications of viewing mixed martial arts. *Journal of Sports Media, 4*(1): 25–53.

Cheung, C. (2004). Identity construction and self-presentation on personal homepages: Emancipatory potentials and reality constraints. In D. Gauntlett & R. Horsley (Eds.), *Web studies*. London, UK: Edward Arnold.

Cheung, C. M. K., Chiu, P., & Lee, M. K. O. (2011). Online social networks: Why do students use Facebook? *Computers in Human Behavior, 27*(4): 1337–1343.

Clark, L. (2013). The weird world of Facebook's moral code: Beheadings good, breastfeedings bad. *Wired UK*, October 13. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.wired.co.uk/news/archive/2013-10/22/facebook-beheading

Clarke, R. (1988). Information technology and dataveillance. *Communications of the ACM, 31*(5): 498–512.

Clarke, R. V. G., & Mayhew, P. (1980). *Designing out crime*. London, UK. Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Clifford, J. (2012/1986). Introduction: Partial truths. In J. Clifford & G. E. Marcus (Eds.), *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Cobbina, J. E., Like-Haislip, T. Z., & Miller, J. (2010). Gang fights versus cat fights: Urban young men's gendered narratives of violence. *Deviant Behaviour, 31*(7): 596–624.

Cohen, A. K. (1955). *Delinquent boys: The culture of the gang*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Cohen, A. P. (1985). *The symbolic construction of community*. Chichester, UK: Ellis Horwood.

Cohen, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (1994). Self-protection and the culture of honor: Explaining southern violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20*(5): 551–567.

Cohen, J., & Richardson, J. (2002). Pit Bull panic. *Journal of Popular Culture, 36*(2): 285–317.

Cohen, S. (1972). *Folk devils and moral panics*. London, UK: MacGibbon & Kee.

Comstock, G. (2008). A sociological perspective on television violence and aggression. *American Behavioural Scientist, 51*(8): 1184–1211.

Couldry, N. (2006). *Listening beyond the echoes: Media, ethics, and agency in an uncertain world*. London, UK: Paradigm.

Cover, R. (2006). Audience inter/active: Interactive media, narrative control and reconceiving audience history. *New Media & Society, 8*(1): 139–158.

Cover, R. (2012). Performing and undoing identity online: Social networking, identity theories and the incompatibility of online profiles and friendship regimes. *Convergence, 18*(2): 177–193.

Coyle, J. R., & Thorson, E. (2001). The effects of progressive levels of interactivity and vividness in web marketing sites. *Journal of Advertising, 30*(3): 65–77.

Crawford, S. D., Couper, M. P., & Lamias, M. J. (2001). Web surveys: Perceptions of burden. *Social Science Computer Review, 19*(2): 146–162.

Cunneen, C. (2001). *Conflict, politics and crime: Aboriginal communities and the police*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Curry, C. (2012). World star hip hop provides home for fights sex and violence. *ABC News*, February 8. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://abcnews.go.com/US/world-star-hip-hop-home-fights-sex-violence/story?id=15493007

Davenport, T. H., & Beck, J. C. (2001). *The attention economy: Understanding the new currency of business*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Davies, C. A. (2008). *Reflexive ethnography: A guide to researching selves and others*. London, UK: Routledge.

de Haan, W. (2008). Violence as an essentially contested concept. In S. Body-Gendrot & P. Spierenburg (Eds.), *Violence in Europe*. New York, NY: Springer.

De Maeyer, J. (2013). Towards a hyperlinked society: A critical review of link studies. *New Media & Society, 15*(5): 737–751.

Dean, S. (2015). Pictured: The shocking real-life fight club where videos of bare-knuckle brawls are shared by thousands on Facebook. *Daily Mail Australia*, January 29. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2930397/Real-life-fight-club-takes-NT-members-start-posting-bare-knuckle-brawls-Facebook.html

Debord, G. (2010/1983). *The society of the spectacle*. Detroit, MI: Black & Red.

Décary-Hétu, D., & Morselli, C. (2011). Gang presence in social network sites. *International Journal of Cyber Criminology, 5*(2): 876–890.

Deleuze, G. (2012/1983). *Cinema 1: The movement image*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2010/1980). *A thousand plateaus*. London, UK: Continuum.

Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. (1992). *Given time: I counterfeit money*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. (1997). *Of grammatology*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Dewey, J. (1929). *The quest for certainty: Vol. 4*. New York, NY: Minton.

Dill, K. E. (2009). Violent video games, rape myth acceptance, and negative attitudes toward women: Violence against women in families and relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*, 3016–3031.

Doolin, B., & Lowe, A. (2002). To reveal is to critique: Actor-network theory and critical information systems research. *Journal of Information Technology, 17*(2): 69–78.

Downes, E. J., & McMillan, S. J. (2000). Defining interactivity: A qualitative identification of key dimensions. *New Media & Society, 2*(2): 157–179.

Downing, J. D. H. (2000). *Radical media: Rebellious communication and social movements*. London, UK: Sage.

Doyle, A. (1998). Cops': Television policing as policing reality. In M. Fishman & G. Cavender (Eds.), *Entertaining crime: Television reality programs*. New York, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Doyle, A. (2011). Revisiting the synopticon: Reconsidering Mathiesen's 'The Viewer Society' in the age of Web 2.0. *Theoretical Criminology, 15*(3): 283–299.

Dreyfuss, E. (2016). Linguists not exactly wow about Facebook's new reactions. *Wired*, February 28. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.wired.com/2016/02/linguists-not-exactly-wow-facebooks-new-reactions/

Duncan, A. (2015). Antisocial media: Thousands sign petition to axe 'killing best friend prank' YouTube channel. *Pedestrian*, December 1. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from https://www.facebook.com/pedestriantv-158215867416/?fref=ts

Dwyer, T., & Stockbridge, S. (1999). Putting violence to work in new media policies: Trends in Australian Internet, computer game and video regulation. *New Media Society, 1*(2): 227–249.

e Silva, A. S. (2006). From cyber to hybrid: Mobile technologies as interfaces of hybrid spaces. *Space and Culture, 9*(3): 261–278.

Ebo, B. (1998). Internet or Outernet? In B. Ebo (Ed.), *Cyberghetto or Cybertopia? Race, class and gender on the Internet*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Elias, N. (1982). *The civilizing process*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Entwistle, P. (2014). Facebook fight page numbers growing. *6PR882 News Talk*, November 26. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.6pr.com.au/news/facebook-fight-page-numbers-growing-20141126-11u65z.html

Eysenbach, G., & Till, J. E. (2001). Ethical issues in qualitative research on internet communities. *British Medical Journal, 323*(7321): 1103–1105.

Ezrahi, Y. (1997). Dewey's critique of democratic visual culture and its political implications. In D. M. Levin (Ed.), *Sites of vision: The discursive construction of sight in the history of philosophy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Facebook. (2007). *Facebook Ads*. Facebook, November 7, Retrieved June 14, 2015, from https://www.facebook.com/notes/facebook/facebook-ads/6972252130

Facebook. (2015a). *Community standards: Keeping you safe*. Facebook. March 16, Retrieved June 14, 2015, from https://touch.facebook.com/communitystandards/?section=0

Facebook. (2015b). *Facebook Q2 2015 results*. Facebook, July 29. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://files.shareholder.com/downloads/AMDA-NJ5DZ/0x0x842064/619A417E-5E3E-496C-B125-987FA25A0570/FB_Q215EarningsSlides.pdf

Facebook. (2016). *Newsroom*. Facebook. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://newsroom.fb.com/company-info/

Fagan, G. G. (2011). *The Lure of the arena: Social psychology and the crowd at the roman games*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Farnsworth, J., & Austrin, T. (2010). The ethnography of new media worlds? Following the case of global poker. *New Media Society, 12*(7): 1120–1136.

Feeley, M. M., & Simon, J. (1992). The new penology: Notes on the emerging strategy of corrections and its implications. *Criminology, 30*(4): 449–474.

Feenberg, A. (1991). *A critical theory of technology*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Felony Fights. (2016). *Felony Fights* – YouTube channel. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from https://www.youtube.com/user/officialfelonyfights/featured

Felson, R. B. (1996). Mass media effects on violent behavior. *Annual Review of Sociology, 22*(1): 103–128.

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, C. J. (2002). Media violence: Miscast causality. *American Psychologist, 57*(6): 446–447.

Fernback, J. (2007). Beyond the diluted community concept: A symbolic interactionist perspective on online social relations. *New Media Society, 9*(1): 49–69.

Ferrell, J. (1999). Cultural criminology. *Annual Revue of Sociology, 25*: 395–418.

Ferrell, J. (2009). Kill method: A provocation. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Criminology, 1*(1): 1–22.

Ferrell, J., Hayward, K., & Young, J. (2008). *Cultural criminology: An invitation*. London, UK: Sage.

Fileborn, B. (2014). Online activism and street harassment: Digital justice of shouting into the ether. *Griffith Journal of Law and Human Dignity, 2*(1): 32–51.

Fileborn, B. (2016). Participant recruitment in an online era: A reflection on ethics and identity. *Research Ethics, 12*(2): 97–115.

Fink, A. (2016). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide*. London, UK: Sage.

Finkelstein, S. (2008). Google, links and popularity versus authority. In J. Turow & L. Tsui (Eds.), *The hyperlinked society*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Fischer, P., Vingilis, E., Greitemeyer, T., & Vogrincic, C. (2011). Risk-taking and the media. *Risk Analysis, 31*(5): 699–705.

Fiske, J. (1982). *Introduction to communication studies*. London, UK: Routledge.

Flaxman, S. R., Goel, S., & Rao, J. M. (2016). Filter bubbles, echo chambers, and online news consumption. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 80*(1): 298–320.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. Brighton, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Fowler, G. A. (2012). Facebook: One billion and counting. *The Wall Street Journal*, October 4. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10000872396390443635404578036164027386112

Fowles, J. (1974). On chronocentrism. *Futures, 6*(1): 65–68.

Frabetti, F. (2015). *Software theory: A cultural and philosophical study*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Fragosa, S. (2011). Understanding links: Web science and hyperlink studies at macro, meso and micro-levels. *New Review of Hypermedia and Multimedia, 17*(2): 163–198.

Francis, P. (2009). Visual criminology. *Criminal Justice Matters, 78*(1): 10–11.

Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social Text, 25/26*: 56–80.

Freedland, J. (2013). Facebook has got it spectacularly wrong on beheading videos. *The Guardian*, October 22. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/oct/22/facebook-beheading-videos-editorial-judgment-breastfeeding

Freud, S. (1962). *The ego and the id*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Friedman, S. L. (2006). Watching "Twin Bracelets" in China: The role of spectatorship and identification in an ethnographic analysis of film reception. *Cultural Anthropology, 21*(4): 603–632.

Fuller, M. (2008). *Media ecologies: Materialist energies in art and technoculture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fuller, M., & Goffey, A. (2012). *Evil media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Funk, J. B., Baldacci, H. B., Pasold, T., & Baumgardner, J. (2004). Violence exposure in real-life, video games, television, movies and the Internet: Is there desensitisation? *Journal of Adolescence, 27*(1): 23–39.

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research, 6*(3): 167–191.

Garland, D. (2001). *The culture of control*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Garver, N. (1988). Violence and the social order. Paper presented at *Philosophy of Law, Politics, and Society. Proceedings of the 12th International Wittgenstein Symposium*, Kirchberg/Wechsel, Austria, August 7–14.

Gebotys, R. J., Roberts, J. V., & DasGupta, B. (1988). News media use and public perceptions of crime seriousness. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 30*(1), 3–16.

Gerbner, G. (1998). Cultivation analysis: An overview. *Mass Communication & Society, 30*(3): 175–194.

Gerlitz, C., & Helmond, A. (2013). The like economy: Social buttons and the data-intensive web. *New Media Society, 15*(8): 1348–1365.

Giannakos, M. N., Chorianopoulos, K., Giotopoulos, K., & Vlamos, P. (2013). Using Facebook out of habit. *Behaviour & Information Technology, 32*(6): 594–602.

Gibson, J. J. (2014/1979). The theory of affordances. In J. J. Gieseking, W. Mangold, C. Katz, S. Low, & S. Saegert (Eds.), *The people, place, and space reader*. London, UK: Routledge.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the modern age*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. Boczkowski, & K. Foot (Eds.), *Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality, and society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Glaser, D. (1956). Criminality theories and behavioural images. *American Journal of Sociology, 61*(5): 433–444.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.

Goggin, G. (2006). *Cell phone culture: Mobile technology in everyday life*. London, UK: Routledge.

Goldhaber, M. H. (1997). Attention Shoppers! *Wired*, Issue 5, December 12. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://archive.wired.com/wired/archive/5.12/es_attention.html

Goldsmith, A. J. (2010). Policing's new visibility. *British Journal of Criminology, 50*(5): 914–934.

Goldsmith, A. J., & Brewer, R. (2015). Digital drift and the criminal interaction order. *Theoretical Criminology, 19*(1): 112–130.

Goldstein, J. (1998). Why we watch. In J. Goldstein (Ed.), *Why we watch: The attractions of violent entertainment*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Graells-Garrido, E., Lalmas, M., & Quercia, D. (2013). Data portraits: Connecting people of opposing views. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.4658*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://arxiv.org/abs/1311.4658

Gray, R. (2015). 'Tinder for fighting' app lets you challenge people to brawls: Rumblr pits users against each other in bare-knuckle clashes. *The Daily Mail*, November 9. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-3310184/Tinder-Fighting-app-lets-challenge-people-brawls-Rumblr-pits-users-against-bare-knuckle-clashes.html

Greene, K., & Krcmar, M. (2005). Predicting exposure to and liking media violence: A uses and gratifications approach. *Communication Studies, 56*(1): 71–93.

Greenfield, A. (2010). *Everyware: The dawning age of ubiquitous computing*. Berkeley, CA: New Riders.

Greenfield, S. (2014). *Mind change: How digital technologies are leaving their mark on our brains*. London, UK: Rider Books.

Greer, C. (2004). Crime, media and community: Grief and Virtual engagement in late modernity. In J. Ferrell, K. Hayward, W. Morrison, & M. Presdee (Eds.), *Cultural criminology unleashed*. London, UK: Routledge.

Greer, C. (2010). Introduction. In C. Greer (Ed.), *Crime and media: A reader*. London, UK: Routledge.

Greer, C., & McLaughlin, E. (2010a). Trial by media: Policing, the 24-7 news media sphere and the politics of outrage. *Theoretical Criminology, 15*(1): 23–46.

Greer, C., & McLaughlin, E. (2010b). 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.

Greitemeyer, T. (2010). Exposure to music with prosocial lyrics reduces aggression: First evidence and test of the underlying mechanism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*(1): 28–36.

Grenoble, R. (2013). Facebook reverses stance on beheading videos, but nipples are still a No-No. *The Huffington Post Australia*, October 23. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com.au/2013/10/22/facebook-allows-beheading-videos-graphiccontent_n_4143244.html?utm_hp_ref=technology&ir=Australia

Grønstad, A., & Gustafsson, H. (Eds.). (2012). *Ethics and images of pain*. London, UK: Routledge.

Gross, E. F. (2004). Adolescent Internet use: What we expect, what teens report. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 25*(6): 633–649.

Guattari, F. (2013/1989). *Schizoanalytic cartographies*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.

Gunter, B. (2008). Media violence: Is there a case for causality. *American Behavioural Scientist, 51*(8): 1061–1122.

Gurevitch, M., Bennett, T., Curran, J., & Woolacott, J. (Eds.). (1982). *Culture, society and the media*. London, UK: Routledge.

Guttman, A. (1998). The appeal of violent sports. In *Why we watch: The attractions of violent entertainment*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hall, S. (1980). *'Encoding/decoding'. Culture, media, language: Working papers in cultural studies, 1972–1979*. London, UK, Hutchinson.

Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J., & Roberts, B. (1978/2013). *Policing the crisis: Mugging, the state and law and order*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hall, S., & Winlow, S. (2015). *Revitalizing criminological theory: Towards a new ultra realism*. London, UK: Routledge.

Hallman, T. (2013). Facebook page devoted to Oak Cliff street fights worries Dallas leaders. *The Dallas Morning News*, June 12. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.dallasnews.com/news/metro/20130711-facebook-page-devoted-to-oak-cliff-street-fights-worries-dallas-leaders.ece

Halsey, M. (2001). An aesthetic of prevention. *Criminal Justice, 1*(4): 385–420.

Hansen, M. (1993). Early cinema, late cinema: Permutations of the public sphere. *Screen, 34*(3): 197–210.

Hansen, M. B. N. (2000). *Embodying technesis: Technology beyond writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan University Press.

Haraway, D. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs and women: The reinvention of nature*. London, UK: Routledge.

Harlow, S. (2011). Social media and social movements: Facebook and an online Guatemalan justice movement that moved online. *New Media & Society, 14*(2): 225–243.

Harrell, D. F. (2013). *Phantasmal media: An approach to imagination, computation and expression*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Harvy, B. (2015). 'Adelaide Box Ons' Facebook page condemned—It's Fight Club in the schoolyard. *The Advertiser*, March 31. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.adelaidenow.com.au/news/south-australia/adelaide-box-ons-facebook-page-condemned-its-fight-club-in-the-schoolyard/story-fni6uo1m-1227284951312

Hassan, R. (2008). *The information society*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Hayward, K. J. (2004). *City limits: Crime, consumer culture and the urban experience*. London, UK: Glasshouse.

Hayward, K. J. (2007). Situational crime prevention and its discontents: Rational Choice Theory versus the 'Culture of Now'. *Social Policy & Administration, 41*(3): 232–250.

Hayward, K. J. (2009). Visual criminology: Cultural criminology style. *Criminal Justice Matters, 78*(1): 12–14.

Hayward, K. J. (2012). Five spaces of cultural criminology. *British Journal of Criminology, 52*(3): 441–462.

Hayward, K. J., & Young, J. (2004). Cultural criminology: Some notes on the script. *Theoretical Criminology, 8*(3): 259–273.

Hearn, G. (1989). Active and passive conceptions of the television audience: Effects of a change in viewing routine. *Human Relations, 42*(10): 857–875.

Heath, L., & Gilbert, K. (1996). Mass media and fear of crime. *American Behavioral Scientist, 39*(4): 379–386.

Heimer, K. (1997). Socioeconomic status, subcultural definitions, and violent delinquency. *Social Forces, 75*(3): 799–833.

Henderson, M., & Kim, J. (2015). Hello world. *von Hughes website*. Retrieved from http://vonhughes.getrumblr.com/

Henry, N., & Powell, A. (2015). Beyond the 'sext': Technology-facilitated sexual violence and harassment against adult women. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 48*(1): 104–118.

Henry, S., & Milovanovic, D. (1996). *Constitutive criminology: Beyond postmodernism*. London, UK: Sage.

Herring, S. C. (2002). Computer-mediated communication on the Internet. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, 36*(1): 109–168.

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2007). *The cultural industries: Second edition*. London, UK: Sage.

Hess, K., & Waller, L. (2014). The digital pillory: Media shaming of 'ordinary people' for minor crimes. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies, 28*(1): 101–111.

Higson, A. (2002). The concept of national cinema. In A. Williams (Ed.), *Film and nationalism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers.

Hillyard, R., Pantazis, C., Tombs, S., & Gordon, D. (2004). *Beyond criminology: Taking harm seriously*. London, UK: Pluto Press.

Hine, C. (2008). *Ethnography for the Internet: Embedded, embodied and everyday*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.

Hoenig, C. (2014). Anti-social media: Study finds racist Tweets are sent This Many Times a Day. *DiversityInc*, February 18. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.diversityinc.com/news/anti-social-media-study-finds-racist-tweets-sent-many-times-day/

Hogan, B. (2010). The presentation of self in the age of social media: Distinguishing performances and exhibitions online. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, 30*(6): 377–386.

Holden, T. J. M., & Tsuruki, T. (2003). Deai-kei: Japan's new culture of encounter. In N. Gottlieb & M. McLelland (Eds.), *Japanese cybercultures*. London, UK: Routledge.

Honen, M. (2014). I liked everything I saw on Facebook for two days. Here's what it did to me. *Wired*, November 8. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.wired.com/2014/08/i-liked-everything-i-saw-on-facebook-for-two-days-heres-what-it-did-to-me/

Horeck, T. (2014). 'A film that will rock you to your core': Emotion and affect in Dear Zachary and the real crime documentary. *Crime Media Culture, 10*(2): 151–167.

Horowitz, R., & Schwartz, G. (1974). Honor, normative ambiguity and gang. *American Sociological Review, 39*(2): 238–251.

Howard, P. N. (2011). *Castells and the media*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Howe, K. R. (1988). Against the quantitative-qualitative incompatibility theses or Dogmas Die Hard. *Educational Researcher, 17*(8): 10–16.

Hsu, C., & Park, H. W. (2011). Sociology of Hyperlink Networks of Web 1.0, Web 2.0, and Twitter: A case study of South Korea. *Social Science Computer Review, 29*(3): 354–368.

Hunt, D., Atkin, D., & Krishnan, A. (2012). The influence of computer-mediated communication apprehension on motives for Facebook use. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 56*(2): 187–202.

Hutchby, I. (2001). Technologies, texts and affordances. *Sociology, 35*(2): 441–456.

Hutchby, I. (2003). Affordances and the analysis of technologically mediated interaction: A response to brian rappert. *Sociology, 37*(3): 581–589.

International Society for Research on Aggression (ISRA). (2012). Report of the media violence commission. *Aggressive Behaviour, 38*: 335–341.

Jackson-Jacobs, C. (2004). Taking a beating: The narrative gratifications of fighting as an underdog. In J. Ferrell, K. Hayward, W. Morrison, & M. Presdee (Eds.), *Cultural criminology unleashed*. London, UK: Glasshouse Press.

Jackson-Jacobs, C. (2014). Competitive violence and the micro-politics of the fight label. *The Sociological Review, 62*(Suppl. S2): 166–186.

James, D. (1998). Gender-linked derogatory terms and their use by women and men. *American Speech, 73*(4): 399–420.

Jane, E. A. (2012). "Your a ugly, whorish, slut": Understanding E-bile. *Feminist Media Studies, 14*(4): 531–546.

Jay, M. (2002). Cultural relativism and the visual turn. *Journal of Visual Culture, 1*(3): 267–278.

Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Jensen, J. F. (1998). Interactivity: Tracing a new concept in media and communication studies. *Nordicom Review, 19*: 185–204.

Jensen, K. B. (1987). Qualitative audience research: Towards an integrative approach to reception. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 4*(1): 21–36.

Jensen, K. B. (2011). New media, old methods – Internet methodologies and the online/offline divide. In M. Consalvo & C. Ess (Eds.), *The handbook of internet studies*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Jensen, K. B., & Rosengren, K. E. (1990). Five traditions in search of the audience. *European Journal of Communication, 5*(2): 207–238.

Jewkes, Y. (2002). The use of media in constructing identities in the masculine environment of men's prisons. *European Journal of Communication, 17*(2): 205–225.

Jewkes, Y. (2015). *Media and crime*. London, UK: Sage.

Jo, E., & Berkowitz, L. (1994). A priming effect analysis of media influences: An update. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

John, N. A. (2012). Sharing and Web 2.0: The emergence of a keyword. *New Media & Society, 15*(2): 167–182.

Joinson, A. N. (2008). Looking at. 'Looking up' or 'Keeping up with' people? Motives and uses of Facebook. In *CHI 2008 proceedings: Online social networks*, April 6.

Jupp, V. (2006). Content analysis. In V. Jupp (Ed.), *The SAGE dictionary of social research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kacholia, V. (2013). News feed FYI: Showing more high quality content. *Facebook for Business*, August 24. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from https://

www.facebook.com/business/news/News-Feed-FYI-Showing-More-High-Quality-Content

Kannampilly, A. (2007). French slap back at happy slappers. *ABC News*, March 8. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://abcnews.go.com/International/story?id=2936331&page=1

Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media. *Business Horizons, 53*(1): 59–68.

Katz, J. (1987). What makes crime 'news'? *Media, Culture & Society, 9*(1): 47–75.

Katz, J. (1988). *Seductions of crime: Moral and sensual attractions in doing evil*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Kaun, A., & Stiernstedt, F. (2014). Facebook time: Technological and institutional affordances for media memories. *New Media Society, 16*(7): 1154–1168.

Kellermann, A. L., & Mercy, J. A. (1992). Men, women, and murder: Gender-specific differences in rates of fatal violence and victimization. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery, 33*(1): 1–5.

Kiesler, S., Siegel, J., & McGuire, T. W. (1984). Social psychological aspects of computer-mediated communication. *American Psychologist, 39*(10): 1123–1134.

Kim, E. (2014). Mark Zuckerberg wants to build the 'Perfect Personalised Newspaper' for every person in the world. *Business Insider Australia*, November 7. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.businessinsider.com.au/mark-zuckerberg-wants-to-build-a-perfect-personalized-newspaper-2014-11

Kim, S., Greenwell, C., Andrew, D. P. S., Lee, J., & Mahony, D. F. (2008). An analysis of spectator motives in an individual combat sport: A study of mixed martial arts fans. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 17*(2): 109–119.

Kimbo Slice Fights. (2016). *Kimbo Slice Fights*—Facebook page. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from https://www.facebook.com/KimboSliceFights/?fref=ts

Kimmel, M. S. (1994). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kiousis S. (2002). Interactivity: A concept explication. *New Media & Society, 4*(3): 355–383.

Kitchin, R., & Dodge, M. (2011). *Code/space: Software and everyday life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kittler, F. A. (1992). *Discourse networks 1800/1900*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.

Kittler, F. A. (2013). There is no software. In J. Johnson (Ed.), *Literature, media, information systems: Friedrich A. Kittler Essays*. London, UK: Routledge.

Köbler, F., Riedl, C., Vetter, C., Leimeister, J. M., & Krcmar, H. (2010). Social Connectedness on Facebook – An explorative study on status message usage. In *Proceedings of the sixteenth Americas conference on information systems*, Lima, Peru, August.

Koskela, H. (2011). 'Don't mess with Texas!' Texas virtual Border Watch Program and the (botched) politics of responsibilization. *Crime Media Culture, 7*(1): 49–65.

Kozinets, R. V. (2010). *Netnography: Doing ethnographic research online*. London, UK: Sage.

Kramer, A. D. I., Guillory, J. E., & Hancock, J. T. (2014). Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111*, 8788–8790.

Kress, G. (2000). Multimodality. In B. Cope & N. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures*. London, UK: Routledge.

Kundanis, R. (2004). Televisual media for children are more interactive. *The American Journal of Psychology, 117*(4): 643–648.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2008). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lange, P. G. (2008). Publicly private and privately public: Social networking on YouTube, *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 13*(1): 361–380.

Lapidot-Lefler, N., & Barak, A. (2012). Effects of anonymity, invisibility, and lack of eye-contact on toxic online is inhibition. *Computers in Human Behavior, 28*(2): 434–443.

Larkin, A., & Dwyer, A. (2016). Fighting like a Girl … or a Boy? An analysis of videos of violence between young girls posted on online fight websites. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice, 27*(3), 269–284.

Lash, S. (2007). Power after hegemony: Cultural studies in mutation? *Theory, Culture & Society, 24*(3), 55–78.

Lash, S., & Urry, J. (1994). *Economies of signs and space*. London, UK: Sage.

Latour, B. (1991). Technology is society made durable. In J. Law (Ed.), *A sociology of monsters: Essays on power, technology and domination*. London, UK: Routledge.

Latour, B. (2007). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network theory*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Laurillard D., Stratfold, M., Luckin, R., Plowman, L., & Taylor, J. (2000). Affordances for learning in a non-linear narrative medium. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education, 2*(Art-2).

Law, J. (2009). Actor network theory and material semiotics. In B. S. Turner (Ed.), *The New Blackwell companion to social theory*. London, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Lazer, B. D. (2015). The rise of the social algorithm. *Science, 348*(6239), 1090–1091.

Lea, M., O'Shea, T., Fung, P., & Spears, R. (1992). *Flaming in computer-mediated communication: Observations, explanations, implications*. New York, NY: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Leban, M. (2003). Internet search for TV content based on TV anytime. *EUROCON 2003: Computer as a Tool, 2,* 70–73.

Leckenby, J. D. (2005). The interaction of tradition and new media. In M. R. Stafford & R. J. Faber (Eds.), *Advertising, promotion, and new media*. New York, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Leonardi, P. M., & Meyer, S. R. (2015). Social media as social lubricant: How ambient awareness eases knowledge transfer. *American Behavioral Scientist, 59*(1), 10–34.

Lessig, L. (1999). *Code and other laws of cyberspace*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Lessig, L. (2006). *Code Version 2.0*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Lieberman, J. D., Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., & McGregor, H. A. (1999). A hot new way to measure aggression: Hot sauce allocation. *Aggressive Behaviour, 25*(5), 331–348.

Livingstone, S. (1998). Relationships between media and audiences: Prospects for audience reception studies. In T. Liebes & J. Curran (Eds.), *Media, ritual and identity: Essays in honor of Elihu Katz*. London, UK: Routledge.

Livingstone, S. (2004). The challenge of changing audiences: Or, what is the audience researcher to do in the age of the Internet? *European Journal of Communication, 19*(1), 75–86.

Lyng, S. (1990). Edgework: A social psychological analysis of voluntary risk taking. *American Journal of Sociology, 95*(4), 851–886.

Lyon, D. (2007). *Surveillance studies: An overview*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

MacNiven, A. (2014). Perth school fights page removed from Facebook. *WAtoday*, November 19. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.watoday.com.au/wa-news/perth-school-fights-page-removed-from-facebook-20141119-11pq0c.html

Maffesoli, M. (1996). *The time of the tribes: The decline of individualism in mass society*. London, UK: Sage.

Mann, L. (1988). Sports crowds and the collective behaviour perspective. In J. H. Goldstein (Ed.), *Sports, games, and play: Social and psychological viewpoints*. London, UK: Psychology Press.

Mann, S., Nolan, J., & Wellman, B. (2003). Sousveillance: Inventing and using wearable computing devices for data collection. *Surveillance & Society, 1*(3), 331–355.

Manning, P. (1998). Media loops. *Popular Culture, Crime and Justice, 1,* 25–39.

Manovich, L. (1999). Database as symbolic form. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies, 5*(2), 80–99.

Manovich, L. (2001). *The language of new media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Manovich, L. (2013). *Software takes command*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury.

Marek, H. (2014). Yarrabah police tackle social media monster. *myPolice Far North*. Retrieved November 18, 2015, from http://mypolice.qld.gov.au/far-north/2014/09/08/yarrabah-police-tackle-social-media-monster

Markam, A. (2012). Fabrication as ethical practice: Qualitative inquiry in ambiguous Internet contexts. *Information, Communication & Society, 15*(3), 334–353.

Marwick, A. E., & boyd, d. (2010). I Tweet honestly, I Tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience. *New Media & Society, 13*(1), 114–133.

Mason, J. (2006). Mixing methods in a qualitatively driven way. *Qualitative Research, 6*(1), 9–25.

Massanari, A. (2017). #Gamergate and the Fappening: How Reddit's algorithm, governance, and culture support toxic technocultures. *New Media & Society*, *19*(3), 329–346.

Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the virtual: Movement, affect, sensation*. London, UK: Duke University Press.

Mathiesen, T. (1997). The viewer society: Michel Foucault's 'Panopticon' revisited. *Theoretical Criminology, 1*(2), 215–234.

Mathieu, D., Vicente-Mariño, M., Brites, M. J., Amaral, I., Chimirri, N. A., Finger, J., et al. (2016). Methodological challenges in the transition towards online audience research. *Participations: Journal of Audience & Reception Studies, 13*(1), 289–320.

Mayfield, J. (2006). Power law of participation. *Ross Mayfield's webblog 27*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://ross.typepad.com/blog/2006/04/power_law_of_pa.html

McCambridge, J., Witton, J., & Elbourne, D. R. (2014). Systematic review of the Hawthorne effect: New concepts are needed to study research participation effects. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 67*(3), 267–277.

McCosker, A. (2014). Trolling as provocation: YouTube's agonistic publics. *Convergence, 20*(2), 201–217.

McCulloch, J. (2008). Key issues in a critical approach to policing. In T. Anthony & C. Cunneen (Eds.), *The critical criminology companion*. Sydney, Australia: Hawkins Press.

McGee, M. (2013). EdgeRank is dead: Facebook's News feed Algorithm Now has close to 100K weight factors. *Marketing Land*, August 16. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://marketingland.com/edgerank-is-dead-facebooks-news-feed-algorithm-now-has-close-to-100k-weight-factors-55908

McGowen, T. (2003). Looking for the gaze: Lacanian Film theory and its vicissitudes. *Cinema Journal, 42*(3), 27–47.

McKinnon, R. C. (1997). Virtual rape. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication, 2*(4).

McMillan, S. J., & Hwang, J. S. (2002). Measures of perceived interactivity: An exploration of the role of direction of communication, user control, and time in shaping perceptions of interactivity. *Journal of Advertising, 31*(3), 29–42.

Mejias, U. A. (2013). *Off the network: Disrupting the digital world*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Melnick, M. J. (1993). Searching for sociability in the stands: A theory of sports spectating. *Journal of Sport Management, 7*(1), 44–60.

Melzer, Z. (2014). Spectroaming instaticity: The aesthetics of digital-out-of-home media in highly screened environments. *Écranosphère,* (1), 1–18.

Merrin, W. (2014). *Media Studies 2.0*. London, UK: Routledge.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (1997). *Crime as structured action: Gender, race, class, and crime in the making*. London, UK: Sage.

Meyrowitz, J. (1997). Shifting worlds of strangers: Medium theory and changes in "Them" versus "US". *Sociological Inquiry, 67*(1), 59–71.

Michalowski, R. J. (1996). Critical criminology and the critique of domination: The story of an intellectual movement. *Critical Criminology, 7*(1), 9–16.

Milivojevic, S., & McGovern, A. (2014). The death of Jill Meagher: Crime and punishment on social media. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy, 3*(3), 22–39.

Miller, D. (2000). The fame of Trinis: Websites as traps. *Journal of Material Culture, 5*(1), 5–24.

Miller, W. I. (2005). *Eye for an eye*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mitchell, W. (1995a). *City of bits: Space, place, and the Infobahn*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Mitchell, W. J. T. (1995b). Interdisciplinarity and visual culture. *Art Bulletin, 77*(4), 540–544.

Mitchell, W. J. T. (2002). Showing seeing: A critique of visual culture. *Journal of Visual Culture, 1*(2), 165–181.

Moller, F. (2012). Associates in crime and guilt. In A. Grønstad & H. Gustafsson (Eds.), *Ethics and images of pain*. London, UK: Routledge.

Moncur, W. (2013). The emotional wellbeing of researchers: Considerations for practice. In *CHI 2013: Changing perspectives*, Paris, France, April 27–May 2.

Moore, S. E. H. (2014). *Crime and the media*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Moreno, M. A., Fost, N. C., & Christakis, D. A. (2008). Research Ethics in the MySpace Era. *Pediatrics, 121*(1), 157–161.

Morgans, J. (2015). Some genius has made an app to help angry douchebags fight each other. *Vice*, November 9. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.vice.com/en_au/read/some-genius-has-made-an-app-to-help-angry-douchebags-fight-each-other?utm_source=vicefbanz

Morley, D. (1992). *Television, audiences and cultural studies*. London, UK: Routledge.

Morozov, E. (2013). *To save everything, click here: The folly of technological solutionism*. New York, NY: PublicAffairs.

Morrison, D. E., & Millwood, A. (2007). The meaning and definition of violence. *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics, 3*(3), 289–305.

Morselli, C., & Décary-Hétu, D. (2013). Crime facilitation purposes of social networking sites: A review and analysis of the 'cyberbanging' phenomenon. *Small Wars & Insurgencies, 24*(1), 152–170.

Mosher, D. L., & Sirkin, M. (1984). Measuring a macho personality constellation. *Journal of Research in Personality, 18*(2), 150–163.

Mulvey, L. (1975). Visual pleasure and narrative cinema. *Screen, 16*(3), 6–18.

Nadkarni, A., & Hofmann, S. G. (2012). Why do people use Facebook? *Personality and individual differences, 52*(3), 243–249.

Napoli, P. N. (2008). Hyperlinking and the forces of 'massification'. In J. Turow & L. Tsui (Eds.), *The hyperlinked society*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Ng, A. (2015a). Rumblr, the 'Tinder for Fighting' app, to launch its beta trial on November 9; This application is 100% serious, team says. *Daily News New York*, November 8. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/rumblr-tinder-fighting-app-launch-beta-nov-9-article-1.2427623

Ng, A. (2015b). Rumblr, the 'Tinder for Fighting' app is fake, turned out to be a marketing stunt. *Daily News New York*, November 9. Retrieved October 16,

2016, from http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/rumblr-tinder-fighting-marketing-hoax-article-1.2428605

O'Connell, M. (2014). The antisocial-media App. *The New Yorker*, April 18. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.newyorker.com/tech/elements/the-antisocial-media-app

O'Neil, M. (2009). *Cyber chiefs: Autonomy and authority in online tribes*. London, UK: Pluto Press.

Oddey, A., & White, C. (2009). Introduction: Visions now—Life is a screen. In A. Oddey & C. White (Eds.), *Modes of spectating*. Chicago, IL: Intellect.

Okely, J., & Callaway, H. (1992). *Anthropology and autobiography*. London, UK: Routledge.

Oliver, M. B. (1994). Portrayals of crime, race, and aggression in 'reality-based' police shows: A content analysis. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 38*(2), 179–192.

Oliver, M. B. (2003). African American men as 'criminal and dangerous': Implications of media portrayals of crime on the 'criminalization' of African American men. *Journal of African American Studies, 7*(2), 3–18.

Oreskovic, A. (2013). Facebook lifts ban on graphic violence, allows beheading clips. *The Sydney Morning Herald*, October 22. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.smh.com.au/digital-life/digital-life-news/facebook-lifts-ban-on-graphic-violence-allows-beheading-clips-20131021-2vxqq.html

Orlikowski, W. J. (2000). Using technology and constituting structures: A practice lens for studying technology in organizations. *Organization Science, 11*(4), 404–428.

Palahniuk, C. (1996). *Fight club: A novel*. London, UK: WW Norton & Company.

Papacharissi, Z. (2009a). The virtual sphere: The Internet as a public sphere. *New Media & Society, 4*(1), 9–27.

Papacharissi, Z. (2009b). The virtual geographies of social networks: A comparative analysis of Facebook, LinkedIn and ASmallWorld. *New Media & Society, 11*(1–2), 199–220.

Papacharissi, Z., & Rubin, A. M. (2000). Predictors of Internet use. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media,* 44(2), 175–196.

Parikka, J. (2012). *What is media archaeology?* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*. London, UK: Penguin Books.

Pariser, E. (2015). Did Facebook's big new study kill my filter bubble thesis. *Backchannel*, May 7. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from https://medium.com/backchannel/facebook-published-a-big-new-study-on-the-filter-bubble-here-s-what-it-says-ef31a292da95#.g8u8ueict

Park, H. W. (2003). Hyperlink network analysis: A new method for the study of social structure on the web. *Connections, 25*(1), 49–61.

Parker, R. (2012). Social and anti-social media. *The New York Times*, November 15. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://campaignstops.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/11/15/social-and-anti-social-media/?_r=0

Parkinson, J. (2003). Facebook defends allowing beheadings footage to continue. *BBC News*, November 19. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-24998833

Pascoe, C. J. (2005). 'Dude, You're a Fag': Adolescent masculinity and the fag discourse. *Sexualities, 8*(3), 329–346.

Pattanaik, D., & Chatterjee, J. (2008). Sociology of digital communities: Bridging the gap between theories of "Internet Spectatorship" and "Rule System Theory". In *Proceedings of the 2nd OPAALS international conference*.

Peelo, M. (2006). Framing homicide narratives in newspapers: Mediated witness and the construction of virtual victimhood. *Crime Media Culture, 2*(2), 159–175.

Peirce, C. S. (1998). *The essential Peirce: Selected philosophical writings, Vol.2, 1893–1913*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Pezdek, K. (1985). Is watching TV passive, uncreative, or addictive? Debunking some myths. *Television and Families, 8*(2), 41–46.

Phillipson, M., & Roche, M. (1974). Phenomenology, sociology and the study of deviance. In P. Rock & M. McIntosh (Eds.), *Deviance and social control: Explorations in sociology*. London, UK: Tavistock Publications.

Pink, S. (2003). Interdisciplinary agendas in visual research: Re-situating visual anthropology. *Visual Studies, 18*(2), 179–192.

Pink, S. (2011). Multimodality, multisensoriality and ethnographic knowing: Social semiotics and the phenomenology of perception. *Qualitative Research, 11*(3), 261–276.

Pink, S. (2013). *Doing visual ethnography*. London, UK: Sage.

Pink, S., Horst, H., Postill, J., Hjorth, L., Lewis, T., & Tacchi, J. (2016). *Digital ethnography: Principles and practice*. London, UK: Sage.

Plant, R. (2012). Call it antisocial media: Even Twitter has a dark side. *Harvard Business Review*, December 7. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from https://hbr.org/2012/12/call-it-antisocial-media-even/

Polk, K. (1999). Male and honor contest violence. *Homicide Studies, 3*(1), 6–29.

Postill, J., & Pink, S. (2012). Social media ethnography: The digital researcher in a messy web. *Media International Australia: Incorporating Culture & Policy, 145*(1), 123–134.

Potter, W. J. (1999). *On media violence*. London, UK: Sage.

Poulsen, J. (2015). N.T. Fights Facebook page has attracted thousands of likes after posting videos of violent bare knuckle street fights. *NT News*, January 28. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.ntnews.com.au/news/northern-territory/nt-fights-facebook-page-has-attracted-thousands-of-likes-after-posting-videos-of-violent-bare-knuckle-street-fights/story-fnk0b1zt-1227200088798

Powell, A. (2009). New technologies, unauthorised visual images and sexual assault. *ACSSA Aware, 23*, 6–12.

Powell, A. (2015). Seeking rape justice: Formal and informal responses to sexual violence through technosocial counter-publics. *Theoretical Criminology, 19*(4), 571–588.

Presdee, M. (2000). *Cultural criminology and the carnival of crime*. London, UK: Routledge.

Pribham, E. D. (2004). Spectatorship and subjectivity. In T. Miller & R. Stam (Eds.), *A companion to film theory*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Putnam, H. (1990). *Realism with a human face*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Putnam, H. (2002). *The collapse of the fact/value dichotomy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pyrooz, D. C., Decker, S. H., & Moule, R. K. (2015). Criminal and routine activities in online settings: Gangs, offenders, and the Internet. *Justice Quarterly, 32*(3), 471–499.

Quan-Haase, A., & Wellman, B. (2005). Hyperconnected net work: Computer mediated community in a high-tech organisation. In C. Heckscher & P. Adler (Eds.), *Collaborative community in business and society*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rafaeli, S. (1988). Interactivity: From new media to communication. In R. P. Hawkins, J. M. Wieman, & S. Pingree (Eds.), *Advancing communication science: Merging mass and interpersonal processes*. Newbury Park, NJ: Sage.

Rafter, N. (2007). Crime, film and criminology: Recent sex-crime movies. *Theoretical Criminology, 11*(3), 403–420.

Rafter, N. (2014). Introduction to special issue on visual culture and the iconography of crime and punishment. *Theoretical Criminology, 18*(2), 176–197.

Raftery, J. (2012a). Phoenix Jones fist fight video goes viral. *MyNorthWest.com*, November 12. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://mynorthwest.com/76/2126651/Phoenix-Jones-fist-fight-video-goes-viral

Raftery, J. (2012b). Phoenix Jones fist fight video goes viral. *KIRO-FM/MYNorthwest.com*, November 12. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://mynorthwest.com/76/2126651/Phoenix-Jones-fist-fight-video-goes-viral

Rainie, L., & Wellman, B. (2007). *Networked: The new social operating system*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Reinhardt, M. (2012). Painful photographs: From the ethics of spectatorship to visual politics. In A. Grønstad & H. Gustafsson (Eds.), *Ethics and images of pain*. London, UK: Routledge.

Rennison, C. M. (2009). A new look at the gender gap in offending. *Women & Criminal Justice, 19*(3), 171–190.

Rheingold, H. (1993). *The virtual community: Homesteading on the electronic frontier*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Riches, R. (1986). The phenomenon of violence. In D. Riches (Ed.), *The anthropology of violence*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Riddle, K. (2014). A theory of vivid media violence. *Communication Theory, 24*(3), 291–310.

Robards, B., & Bennett, A. (2011). MyTribe: Post-subcultural manifestations of belonging on social network sites. *Sociology, 45*(2), 303–317.

Robben, A., & Nordstrom, C. (1995). The anthropology and ethnography of violence and sociopolitical conflict. In A. Robben & C. Nordstrom (Eds.), *Fieldwork under fire: Contemporary studies of violence and survival*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities*. London, UK: Sage.

Robins, K. (1999). Against virtual community: For a politics of distance. *Angelaki, 4*(2), 163–170.

Rock, P. (2005). Chronocentrism and British criminology. *British Journal of Sociology, 56*(3), 473–491.

Rogers, R. (2010). Mapping public web space with the Issuecrawler. In B. Reber & C. Brossard (Eds.), *Digital cognitive technologies: Epistemology and knowledge economy*. Hoboken NJ; London, UK: Wiley.

Rogers, R. (2013). *Digital methods*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rorty, R. (1980). *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Rose, A., & Friedman, J. (1994). Television sport as mas(s)culine cult of distraction. *Screen, 35*(1), 22–35.

Rosenfeld, L., & Morville, P. (1998). *Information architecture for the world wide web*. Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly and Associates.

Rosengren, K. E., & Windhal, S. (1972). Mass media consumption as a functional alternative. In D. McQuail, (Ed.), *Sociology of mass communication*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R., Roskos-Ewoldsen, B., & Dillman Carpentier, F. (2009). Media priming: An updated synthesis. In J. Bryant & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*. London, UK: Routledge.

Ross, L., Greene, D., & House, P. (1977). The 'false consensus effect': An egocentric bias in social perception and attribution processes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 13*(3), 279–301.

Ross, N. (2011). Teen in court over series of random attacks in CBD. *Herald Sun*, February 28. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/victoria/teen-in-court-over-series-of-random-violent-attacks-in-cbd/story-e6frf7kx-1226013597129

Rowe, C. (2009). E-mail play and accelerated change. In C. Rowe & E. L. Wyss (Eds.), *Language and new media: Linguistic, cultural, and technological evolutions*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Rubin, A. M. (1984). Ritualized and instrumental television viewing. *Journal of Communication, 34*(3), 67–77.

Rubin, A. M. (1993). Audience activity and media use. *Communication Monographs, 60*(1), 98–105.

Rubin, A. M. (2009). Uses-and-gratifications perspective on media effects. In J. Bryant & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*. London, UK: Routledge.

Rubin, A. M., & Windahl, S. (1986). The uses and dependency model of mass communication. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 3*(2), 184–199.

Rumblr. (2015). Rumblr webpage. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://app.getrumblr.com/

Rushkoff, D. (2011). *Program or be programmed: Ten commands for a digital age*. Berkeley, CA: Soft Skull Press.

Rushton, R (2009). Deleuzian spectatorship. *Screen, 50*(1), 45–53.

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Salter, M. (2013). Justice and revenge in online counter-publics: Emerging responses to sexual violence in the age of social media. *Crime Media Culture, 9*(3), 225–242.

Salter, M. (2016). 'Real men don't hit women': Constructing masculinity in the prevention of violence against women. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 49(*4): 463–479.

Salter, M. (2016). *Crime, justice and social media*. London, UK: Routledge.

Salter, M., & Tomsen, S. (2012). Violence and Carceral Masculinities in Felony Fights. *British Journal of Criminology, 52*(2), 309–323.

Samson, A. C., & Gross, J. J. (2012). Humour as emotion regulation: The differential consequences of negative versus positive humour. *Cognition and Emotion, 26*(2), 375–384.

Sandberg, S. (2008). Street capital: Ethnicity and violence on the streets of Oslo. *Theoretical Criminology, 12*(2), 153–171.

Sanders, C. R., & Lyon, E. (1995). Repetitive retribution: Media images and the cultural construction of criminal justice. In J. Ferrell & C. R. Sanders (Eds.), *Cultural criminology*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Sanghani, R. (2013). David Cameron condemns Facebook's beheading films. *The Telegraph*, October 22. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/facebook/10395816/David-Cameron-condemns-Facebooks-beheading-films.html

Sassen, S. (2006). *Territory, authority, rights: From medieval to global assemblages*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Saunders, R. (2005). Happy slapping: Transatlantic contagion or home-grown, mass-mediated nihilism? *Static, 1*, 1–11.

Sauter, T. (2014). 'What's on your mind?' Writing on Facebook as a tool for self-formation. *New Media & Society, 16*(5), 823–839.

Schandorf, M. (2012). Mediated gesture: Paralinguistic communication and phatic text. *Convergence, 19*(3), 319–344.

Schauffler, A. (2012). 'Superhero' Phoenix Jones gets into street brawl as officers watch. *King 5.com*, November 9. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from https://web.archive.org/web/20130719101110/http://www.king5.com/news/cities/seattle/Self-proclaimed-crime-fighter-Phoenix-Jones-gets-into-street-brawl--178243281.html

Schinkel, W. (2010). *Aspects of violence: A critical theory*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schlesinger, P., Haynes, R., & Boyle, R. (1998). *Men viewing violence*. London, UK: Broadcasting Standards Commission.

School Fights. (2016). *School Fights*—Facebook page. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from https://www.facebook.com/School-Fights-307685814569/

Schopenhauer, A. (1966). *The World as will and representation, Vol.1*. New York, NY: Dover Publications.

Schrøder, K. M. (2013). From Dogmatism to open-mindedness? Historical reflections on methods in audience reception research. *The Communication Review, 16*(1–2), 319–344.

Schwier, R. A., & Misanchuk, E. (1993). *Interactive multimedia instruction*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Scott, D. T. (2016). Participation, pain, and world making: Affective political economies of irish traveller fight videos. *Television & New Media, 17*(7), 595–611.

Scraton, P. (1991). Recent developments in criminology: A critical overview. In M. Haralambos (Ed.), *Developments in sociology: An annual review, No. 7*. Ormskirk, UK: Causeway Press.

Seidler, K. (2010). *Crime, culture and violence: Understanding how masculinity and identity shapes offending*. Bowen Hills, Australia: Australian Academic Press.

Shannon, C. E., & Weaver, W. (2015/1963). *The mathematic theory of communication*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Shaw, J., Crosby, K., & Porter, S. (2015). The impact of a video game on criminal thinking: Implicit and explicit measures. *Simulation & Gaming, 45*(6), 786–804.

Sheldon, P. (2008). Student favourite: Facebook and motives for its use. *Southwestern Mass Communication Journal, 23*(2), 39–53.

Shelton, A. A. (1994). Cabinets of transgression: Renaissance collections and the incorporation of the new world. In J. Elsner & R. Cardinal (Eds.), *The cultural of collecting*. London, UK: Reaktion Books.

Short, J. A., Williams, E., & Christie, B. (1976). *The social psychology of telecommunications*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Shouse, E. (2005). Feeling, emotion, affect. *M/C Journal, 8*(6).

Sims, R. (1994). Seven levels of interactivity: Implications for the development of multimedia education and training. In M. Ryan (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Asia Pacific Information Technology in Training and Education (APITITE) Conference, Vol. 3*, June 28, Brisbane, Australia.

Slater, M. D. (2003). Alienation, aggression, and sensation seeking as predictors of adolescent use of violent film, computer, and website content. *Journal of Communication, 53*(1), 105–121.

Slater, M. D., Henry, K. L., Swaim, R. C., & Anderson, L. L. (2003). Violent media content and aggressiveness in adolescents: A downward spiral model. *Communication Research, 30*(6), 713–736.

Smith, O., & Raymen, T. (2016). Deviant leisure: A criminological perspective. *Theoretical Criminology*, doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480616660188

Smock, A. D., Ellison, N. B., Lampe, C., & Wohn, D. Y. (2011). Facebook as a toolkit: A uses and gratification approach to unbundling feature use. *Computers in Human Behavior, 27*(6), 2322–2329.

Sohn, D. (2011). Anatomy of interaction experience: Distinguishing sensory, semantic, and behavioral dimensions of interactivity. *New Media & Society, 13*(8), 1320–1335.

Sontag, S. (1977). *On photography*. Melbourne, Australia: Penguin.

Sontag, S. (2003). *Regarding the pain of others*. London, UK: Penguin.

Spears, R., & Lea, M. (1992). Social influence and the influence of the 'social' in computer-mediated communication. In M. Lea (Ed.), *Contexts of computer mediated communication*. London, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Spector, P. (2015). Point and shoot: The antisocial media. *The Huffington Post*, September 15. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/paul-spector-md/point-and-shoot-the-antis_b_8125224.html?ir=Australia

Spencer, D. C. (2009). Sex offender as homo sacer. *Punishment and Society, 11*(2), 219–240.

Spencer, D. C. (2014a). From many masters to many students: YouTube, Brazilian Jiu Jitsu, and communities of practice. *JOMEC Journal,* (5), 1–13.

Spencer, D. C. (2014b). Sensing violence: An ethnography of mixed martial arts. *Ethnography, 15*(2), 232–254.

Sproull, L., & Kiesler, S. (1991). *Connections: New ways of working in the networked organization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Staiger, J. (2005). *Media reception studies*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Standage, T. (2007). *The Victorian Internet: The remarkable story of the telegraph and the nineteenth century's on-line pioneers*. New York, NY: Walker & Company.

Stephens, M. (2005). Safe danger & virtual slumming: Gangsta rap, grand theft auto & ghetto tourism. *Popmatters*, June 17.

STREETBEEFS FIGHTS. (2015). *About*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from https://www.youtube.com/user/yungxcraven/about

Striphas, T. (2015). Algorithmic culture. *European Journal of Cultural Studies, 18*(4–5), 395–412.

Sturken, M., & Cartwright, L. (2009). *Practices of looking: An introduction to visual culture*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Suler, J. (2004). The online disinhibition effect. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 7*(3), 321–326.

Surette, R. (2011). *Media, crime, and criminal justice: Images, realities, and policies*. Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.

Surette, R. (2015). Performance crime and justice. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice, 27*(2), 195–216.

Sutherland, E. H. (1939). *Principles of criminology*. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott.

Sykes, G. M., & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralisation. *American Sociological Review, 22*(6), 664–670.

Tait, S. (2008). Pornographies of violence? Internet spectatorship on body horror. *Critical Studies in Media Communications, 25*(1), 91–111.

Taylor, I., Walton, P., & Young, J. (2013). *The new criminology: For a social theory of deviance*. London, UK: Routledge.

The MEN'S Bible. (2006). *The MEN'S Bible—Facebook page*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from https://www.facebook.com/MEN8Bible/timeline

Thoits, P. A. (1989). The sociology of emotions. *Annual Review of Sociology, 15*(1), 317–342.

Thompson, C. (2008). 'I'm so totally, digitally close to you: How news feed, twitter and other forms of incessant online contact have created a brace new world of ambient intimacy. *New York Times Magazine*, September 7.

Times of Trenton Editorial Board. (2015). Editorial: Antisocial media—Vile video of Trenton park attack on teen girls. *True Jersey*, April 13. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.nj.com/opinion/index.ssf2015/04editorial_video_of_trenton_park_attack_on_teen_gir.html

Toohey, P., & Poulsen, J. (2015). NT Fights Facebook page back online after being shutdown over violent and racist content. *NT News*, May 31. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.ntnews.com.au/news/northern-territory/nt-fights-facebook-page-back-online-after-being-shutdown-over-violent-and-racist-content/story-fnk0b1zt-1227376771754

Trahan, A. (2011). Qualitative research and intersectionality. *Critical Criminology, 19*(1), 1–14.

Trayner, D. (2015). Rumblr: 'Tinder for fighting' lets you play Fight Club for real. *Daily Star*, November 9. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from https://www.dailystar.co.uk/news/weird-news/474596/rumblr-tinder-for-fighting-lets-you-play-real-fight-club

Tripathi, K. P. (2011). A study of interactivity in human computer interaction. *International Journal of Computer Applications, 16*(6), 1–3.

Twight, M. F., & Martin, J. (1999). *Extreme alpinism: Climbing light, high, and fast*. Seattle, WA: The Mountaineers.

Valier, C., & Lippens R. (2004). Moving images, ethics and justice. *Punishment & Society, 6*(3), 319–333.

van Dijck, J. (2009). Users like you? Theorizing agency in user-generated content. *Media Culture Society, 31*(1), 41–58.

van Dijck, J. (2012). Facebook and the engineering of connectivity: A multi-layered approach to social media platforms. *Convergence, 19*(2), 141–155.

van Dijck, J. (2013). *The culture of connectivity: A critical history of social media*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

van Dijk, J. (2012). *The network society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Virilio, P. (1986). *Speed and politics*. New York, NY: Semiotext(e).
Virilio, P. (2008/1984). *Negative horizon*. London, UK: Continuum.
Wacquant, L. J. D. (1995). Pugs at work: Bodily capital and bodily labour among professional boxers. *Body and Society, 1*(1), 65–93.
Wåhlberg, A. A., & Sjöberg, L. (2000). Risk perception and the media. *Journal of Risk Research, 3*(1), 31–50.
Wakeman, S. (2014). Fieldwork, biography and emotion: Doing criminological autoethnography. *British Journal of Criminology, 54*(5), 705–721.
Wall, D. S. (2007). *Cybercrime*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
Walsh, M. (2004). The immersive spectator. *Journal of the Theoretical Humanities, 9*(3), 169–185.
Walsham, G. (1997). Actor-Network theory and IS research: Current status and future prospects. In A. S. Lee, J. Liebenau, & J. I. Degross (Eds.), *Information systems and qualitative research*. London, UK: Chapman & Hall.
Warner, M. (2002a). Publics and counterpublics (abbreviated version). *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 88*(4), 413–425.
Warner, M. (2002b). *Publics and counterpublics*. Cambridge, MA: Zone Books.
Wascul, D., & Douglass, M. (1996). Considering the electronic participant: Some polemical observations on the ethics of On-line research. *The Information Society, 12*(2), 129–140.
Watt, K. (2013). Participatory promises: Living through resistance at the theater. *Theater, 43*(3), 36–49.
Watt, N. (2006). 'Happy slapping' spreads in London. *ABC News*, May 17. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://abcnews.go.com/Nightline/story?id=1972548&page=1
Wender, J. (2004). Phenomenology, cultural criminology and the return to astonishment. In J. Ferrell, K. Hayward, W. Morrison, & M. Presdee (Eds.), *Cultural criminology unleashed*. London, UK: Glasshouse Press.
West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society, 1*(2), 125–151.
Wheeldon, J., & Harris, D. (2015). Expanding visual criminology: Definitions, data and dissemination. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice, 27*(2), 141–162.
Wiener, N. (1948/2013). *Cybernetics: Or the control and communication in the animal and the machine*. Eastford, CT: Martino Fine Books.
Wikström, P. O. H., & Sampson, R. J. (2003). Social mechanisms of community influences on crime and pathways in criminality. In B. Lahey, T. Moffitt, & A. Caspi (Eds.), *The causes of conduct disorder and serious juvenile delinquency*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Wilkins, L. T. (1964). *Social deviance*. London, UK: Tavistock.
Williams, M. (2006). *Virtually criminal: Crime, deviance and regulation online*. London, UK: Routledge.
Williams, M., & Burnap, P. (2016). Cyberhate on social media in the aftermath of Woolwich: A case study in computational criminology and Big Data. *British Journal of Criminology, 56*(2), 211–238.
Willson, M. (1997). Community in the abstract: A political and ethical dilemma. In D. Holmes (Ed.), *Virtual politics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Winthrop-Young, G. (2011). *Kittler and the media*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
Winthrop-Young, G. (2013). Cultural techniques: Preliminary remarks. *Theory, Culture & Society, 30*(6), 3–19.
Wolfgang, M. E., & Ferracuti, F. (1967). *The subculture of violence: Towards an integrated theory in criminology*. London, UK: Tavistock Publications.
Wood, M. A. (2016). 'I just wanna see someone get knocked the fuck out': Spectating affray on Facebook fight pages. *Crime Media Culture*. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/1741659016667437
Wood, M. A. (2017). Antisocial media and algorithmic deviancy amplification: Analysing the id of Facebook's technological unconscious. *Theoretical Criminology, 21*(2), 168–185.
WorldStarHipHop. (2016). *WorldStarHipHop: Entertainment and News Media—Website*. Retrieved from http://www.worldstarhiphop.com/videos/
Yar, M. (2010). Screening crime: Cultural criminology goes to the movies. In K. J. Hayward & M. Presdee (Eds.), *Framing crime: Cultural criminology and the image*. London, UK: Routledge.
Yar, M. (2012). Crime, media and the will-to-representation: Reconsidering relationships in the new media age. *Crime Media Culture, 8*(3), 245–260.
Yar, M. (2016). Toward a cultural criminology of the Internet? *Rethinking Cybercrime*, The University of Central Lancashire, June 28.
Young, A. (1996). *Imagining crime: Textual outlaws and criminal conversations*. London, UK: Sage.
Young, A. (2008). Culture, critical criminology and the imagination of crime. In T. Anthony & C. Cunneen (Eds.), *The critical criminology companion*. Sydney, Australia: Hawkins Press.
Young, A. (2010). *The scene of violence: Cinema, crime, affect*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
Young, A. (2013). Just images? On the troubling relationship between crime, culture and spectatorship. *The John Barry Memorial Lecture*, The University of Melbourne, November 14.

Young, A. (2014). From object to encounter: Aesthetic politics and visual criminology. *Theoretical Criminology, 18*(2), 159–175.

Young, E. (2015). Facebook deletes Perth page dedicated to school fights. *WAtoday*, December 23. Retrieved from http://www.watoday.com.au/wa-news/facebook-deletes-perth-page-dedicated-to-school-fights-20151223-glu6es.html

Young, E. (2016). 'Perth fights' social media accounts resurface after Facebook, YouTube bans. *WAtoday*, March 9. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.watoday.com.au/wa-news/perth-fights-social-media-accounts-resurface-after-facebook-youtube-bans-20160309-gne9aw.html

Young, J. (1971). *The drugtakers: The social meaning of drug use*. London, UK: MacGibbon and Kee.

Young, J. (2003). Merton with energy, Katz with structure: The sociology of vindictiveness and the criminology of transgression. *Theoretical Criminology, 7*(3), 389–414.

Young, J. (2011). *The criminological imagination*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Zaitch, D., & de Leeuw, T. (2010). Fighting with images: The production and consumption of violence among online football supporters. In K. J. Hayward & M. Presdee (Eds.), *Framing crime: Cultural criminology and the image*. London, UK: Routledge.

Zedner, L. (2007). Pre-crime and post-criminology? *Theoretical Criminology, 11*(2), 261–281.

Zillmann, D. (1991). Television viewing and physiological arousal. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Responding to the screen: Reception and reaction processes*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Zillmann, D., & Bryant, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Selective exposure to communication*. London, UK: Routledge.

Zimmer, M. (2010). 'But the data is already public': On the ethics of research in Facebook. *Ethics and Information Technology, 12*(4), 313–325.

Zimmerman, G. M., & Messner, S. F. (2011). Neighborhood context and nonlinear peer effects on adolescent violent crime. *Criminology, 49*(3), 873–903.

Zuckerman, M., Eysenck, S. B. J., & Eysenck, H. J. (1978). Sensation seeking in England and America: Cross-cultural, age, and sex comparisons. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46*(1), 139–149.

Zurawik, D. (2012). Worldstarhiphop.com makes a name for itself with violent viral videos. *Baltimore Sun*, March 23. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2012-03-23/entertainment/bs-ae-zontv-worldstar-20120323_1_ski-mask-east-baltimore-website

Index[1]

A

Administrators, *see* Page administrators
Affect, 8
  algorithmic deviancy amplification, 99–100
  and desensitisation, 74
  and spectatorship, 8, 9, 62, 82
  See also Algorithmic deviancy amplification
Affordances, 4
  communicative affordances, 117
  functional vs. relational properties, 80
  limitations of concept, 46
  See also Media ecology
Aggregation, 24
  ambient collectives, 145, 159
  and fight pages, 2, 23, 24, 36, 40–42, 47, 74, 94, 129, 145, 161
  implications of, 114
  manifest collectives, 145
  See also Sociality
Algorithmic deviancy amplification, 15
  definition of, 100
  and the technological unconscious, 170, 172
  See also Filter bubbles; Personalisation
Alternative media, 5
Ambient awareness
  definition of, 93
  and fight pages, 93
Ambient collectives, *see* Aggregation
Antisocial media
  versus alternative media, 5
  as cabinets of transgression/curiosity, 160
  effect on the commodification of transgression, 101
  history and precursors, 24

[1]Note: Page numbers with "n" denote footnotes

© The Author(s) 2018
M.A. Wood, *Antisocial Media*, Palgrave Studies in Crime, Media and Culture,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-63985-7

Antisocial media (*cont.*)
implications of for the media/ crime nexus, 46
journalists' uses of the term, 3, 6
as publics, 16, 17, 160
See also Aggregation; Publics
Attention economy, 56, 92
See also News Feed
Attitudes, 2
attitude change, 66, 67, 74
towards violence, 15, 43, 54, 57, 64, 66, 67, 72–74, 93, 94, 98, 145, 147, 160, 183–185
See also Cultivation; Fight page administrator's attitudes towards violence
Audience reception studies, *see* Reception studies

B

Boredom, 67, 73, 91, 160
Bourdieu, P., *see* Capital
Broadcast media, 4, 47, 49, 84, 85, 89, 101, 158

C

Capital, 132–134, 136, 148n3
pugilistic capital, 133
Castells, M.
and network individualism, 160
and network society, 90, 94, 168
spaces of flows, 81, 95
switching power and programming power, 159
Citizen journalism, 34, 47
Collapsed contexts, 120, 148
Computer-mediated communication, 115
cues filtered out, 115, 116
and online disinhibition, 126
See also Like button
Consumption, 3, 16, 62, 64, 81, 94, 99, 158, 163, 183
See also Crime-watching
Convergence
and fight-tubes, 26
Crime-watching, 8–13, 17, 74, 79, 80, 83, 85, 90, 97, 115, 146, 157–161, 172, 177
See also Modes of spectatorship
Critical criminology of software, 17, 165–173
as distinct from cyber-criminology, 167
See also Critical theory of technology
Critical theory of technology
versus instrumental conception of technology, 171
Cultivation, 136
Cultural criminology
assumptions of, 123, 172
criticisms of, 166
and research of the media crime nexus, 46
theory of mediated loops and spirals, 83
Curation, 97
algorithmic curation
fight page administrators as curators, 42–45
Cyber-criminology, *see* Critical criminology of software

D

Democratisation, 46, 158
See also Prosumption

Derrida, J., 137
Desensitisation
 emotional desensitisation, 74
 and fight page users, 74
Deviant leisure, 5
Discourse network, 102
Distanced proximity, 93
 See also Risk

E

Economic fights, 133–137
 an economic violence, 133
 uneconomic fights, 133
Edgework, 36, 37

F

Facebook, 1
 community standards, 155, 170
 history, 85
 number of users, 125, 188
 See also News Feed; Personalisation; Timeline
Fear of crime, 72
Fight club, 23–49, 160
Fight page administrator's attitudes towards violence, 33
Fight-tubes
 decline of, 26
 and media convergence, 26
Filter bubbles, 98, 99, 182
 See also Algorithmic deviancy amplification; Personalisation
Foucault, M., 129, 168

G

Gender, 32
 and girl fight pages, 39, 40
 intersectionality, 140
 policing of on fight pages, 170
 and sexuality, 119, 140
 masculinity
Ghetto tourism, 63
Glocalisation
 and discourses of violence, 161

H

Homo sacer, 45
Honour
 honour contests, 156
 using violence to uphold honor, 34
Hyperconnectivity
 culture of connectivity, 158
 to images of transgression, 14, 93, 158
 implications for fight pages, 14, 93, 156
 and mobile media, 16, 92, 94, 158

I

Identity play, 120
 in criminology, 119, 121
Interactivity
 and immersion, 87
 implications for fight pages, 16, 85, 87, 156
 and personalisation, 16, 75, 79, 80, 102
 and the Timeline, 120
Internet centrism, 162

J

Justice
 informal justice, 166

Justice (*cont.*)
street justice, 16, 17, 65, 74, 160, 161
and thresholds of legitimacy, 45

K

Katz, J., 72
Kittler, F., 171
discourse networks, 102

L

Lessig, L.
Code is law, 165, 170
Like button, 97, 116
See also Like Economy
Like economy, 158, 163
See also Affect; Algorithmic deviancy amplification; Personalisation

M

Martial arts
and fight page spectatorship, 10, 75, 85, 101, 159, 178
mixed martial arts pages, 178
and self-defence, 42, 70
Masculinity
hypermasculinity, 36–38
and violence, 34, 35, 139, 147
Massumi, B., *see* Affect
Media archaeology, 170
Media convergence, *see* Convergence
Media criminology, 163, 173
Media ecology, 14, 75, 80, 83, 102, 180
Media effects, *see* Desensitisation
criticism of, 7
limited effects, 84
priming, 94
Mediascape, 94, 102, 158, 160
Mediatisation, 49, 158, 163
Memes, 41, 115, 123
Methodology, 177–196
methods of the medium, 163
Modes of spectatorship
as an anti-essentialist approach to spectatorship, 11
in cinema studies theory, 9, 11
to fight videos, 66, 114

N

Networked individualism, 160
News Feed
Top Stories, 15, 16, 97–101, 158, 170
See also Personalisation
News media, 41, 48, 159
commercial imperatives of, 47
Newsworthiness, 46

P

Page administrators, 4, 33, 35, 45, 121
Performance crime, 25
and the will to representation, 47
Performativity, 119
Personalisation
and Edgerank, 96
and filter bubbles, 98, 99, 182
implicit versus explicit, 95, 96
on Facebook, 25, 81, 95, 181

See also Algorithmic deviancy amplification; Filter bubbles
Popular criminology, 45
Presdee, M., 63, 121
Prosumers, 166
Publics
agonistic publics, 17, 118, 126, 160
counterpublics, 16, 119, 144

R

Race
and ghetto fight pages, 39
racism, 32, 137, 138, 141, 160, 162, 186
Reception studies, 8, 11, 173, 177, 179, 184
Risk
and distanced proximity, 93
fight page spectatorship as risk awareness, 159

S

Schadenfreude, 65, 66, 73, 121
Selective exposure
and attitude towards violence and crime, 89, 90
and filter bubbles, 99
Sociality, 114–121, 143, 148
in criminological studies of the Internet, 14, 144
definition of, 117
See also Aggregation; Virtual community
Software, 17
data structures vs. algorithms, 165, 166
designing out crime, 167
as a new concern for cultural criminologists and media criminologists, 166
political economy of, 169
and risk assessment, 166, 167
and technological solutionism, 168
and the technological unconscious, 14, 165, 170
values inscribed into, 17, 169, 172
See also Critical criminology of software; Software studies
Software studies, 14, 103, 148, 163, 165
Spectacle, 2, 9, 11, 43, 117, 145
Spectatorship
Deleuzian perspectives, 62
theories of, 11
visual criminology, 12
See also Modes of spectatorship
Street fighting
'good clean' fights, 28, 56
health risks, 49n4
'no holds barred' fights, 27, 31, 58, 65, 164
as a response to disrespect, 58, 59, 66
to uphold honor, 139
Subcultures, 118, 145

T

Technological determinism, 172
Technological solutionism, 168
Technological unconscious, 14, 16, 148, 164, 165, 170
and technological form, 7, 16, 179

Technological unconscious (*cont.*)
See also Algorithmic deviancy amplification
Thresholds of legitimacy, *see* Justice
Timeline, 91
and the archiving of transgression, 102
and interactivity, 88
See also Interactivity

U

Uses and gratifications
assumptions of, 13
criticisms of, 103

V

Van Dijck, J., 24, 84, 90, 117, 143, 158, 169, 172
Video aggregators, 23, 47, 145
Violence (passim)
and justice, 45
instrumental reading of, 130
legitimate violence, 139
symbolic violence, 134, 160
Violent media content, 8
graphicness, 97, 155
legitimacy, 45, 60, 130, 133
See also Media effects
Virtual community, 117, 118, 159
content communities, 118
Visual criminology, 12

W

Web 2.0, 95, 100, 102
WorldstarHipHop, 41, 56

Y

Young, A.
and fascination, 68
on primacy of the encounter with images of crime, 13
YouTube
cultural influence of, 90
and fight channels, 24, 56, 162