

**IS THE WHOLE WORLD STILL WATCHING? EXPLAINING
POLICE VIOLENCE DURING THE TORONTO G8/G20 MEETINGS**

by

Tarah Hodgkinson

A thesis submitted to the Department of Sociology

In conformity with the requirements for

the degree of Masters

Queen's University

Kingston, Ontario, Canada

(June, 2011)

Copyright © Tarah Hodgkinson, 2011

Abstract

In recent years the G8 and G20 Summits have become important sites of protest and conflict. Extensive planning by police and protesters have transformed the public meaning of these yearly assemblies into large-scale events characterized by what many see as threats to public order. The summits have also provided a world-stage for the economically and racially disadvantaged as well as globalized free trade dissenters to voice their resistance and opposition. At the same time, police have been placed on the opposite side of the conflict, ordered to “control the masses.” This conflict situation can sometimes lead to collective violence, especially on behalf of the police. In attempting to explain the police collective violence witnessed at the G8/G20 protests in Toronto in June of 2010, Neil Smelser’s (1962) value-added model of collective behaviour can be employed. This model demonstrates how processes involving structural conduciveness, structural strain, the spread of a generalized belief, the mobilization of participants and finally the utilization of social control can lead to an event such as collective violence. Recent revisions to the value-added argument by Fine (1997) have shifted attention away from the functionalist assumptions of the model and toward a more social constructionist stance. Thus, for Fine, belief itself does not create action. Rather, the use of the belief by claimsmakers can lead to a call to action, through media or other outlets. Finally, Randall Collins’s (2008) theory of forward panic is useful for illustrating the finer details of precisely how police mobilize for violence. In order to analyze the police collective violence witnessed over the weekend, a combination of participant observation, semi-structured interviews and ethnographic content analysis methods were employed. The findings support that because of the placement of the G8/G20 meetings, the conflicting relationship between the police and the protesters and the construction of the protesters as troublemakers, meant to be approached with suspicion, the police were able to overcome the tense conflict situation and attack the protesters. I conclude by suggesting a community-policing model for future protest situations.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, mentor and dear friend Dr. Vincent Sacco. My first few years at Queen's were characterized by the anxiety of not fitting in among such privilege. However, when I took Sociology of Deviance in third year, I met Vince. He helped me realize that this paradise called academia didn't have to feel so strange. I've been blessed to have Vince as my guide and my confidante for the last four years. His dedication and compassion are an inspiration to all of the students whose lives he has touched. His patience, wisdom and advice have been crucial to my development academically and personally. Few others have influenced my life so positively. Words are not enough to express my gratitude.

I would also like to thank members of the department. Wendy, Michelle and Anne not only guided me through the bureaucratic process of university, but also provided a friendly smile and words of encouragement before and during the program. I would also like to thank Dr. Carl Keane, Dr. Vincent Sacco and Dr. Rob Beamish for their guidance during my TAs. Special thanks are due to my second reader Dr. Laureen Snider, whose encouragement and insight were invaluable to this process. I would also like to extend my gratitude to the other members of my defense committee Dr. Sergio Sismondo and Dr. Vincent Mosco. Thanks are due to my friends in the department and over the last few years. Many discussions over wine have firmed up my arguments and enlightened me to others. I will truly miss you all.

I especially would like to thank the Garner family for their hospitality during the weekend of my research. Not only did they provide me with a quiet place to collect my thoughts, but also with snacks for the road and an audience to vent my observations of police abuses. They patiently listened to my ideas and concerns and offered feedback. I feel very lucky to have had such wonderful hosts. At the same time, I must express my gratitude to the protest participants who answered my questions and guided me through the weekend. The courage and passion I witnessed on behalf of many of the protesters

was inspiring. Protest may be the politics of the powerless, but I've never shared an experience so powerful.

Gratitude is also due to my Lone Star family. Over the last six years, Lone Star was the one place I truly felt at home. Not only did the job help me pay my way through school, but it also provided me with lifelong friends. My gratitude goes out specifically to Glenn 'Rider' Rea and the management team, whose guidance and patience has not only improved me as an employee, but also as a person.

Finally I wish to thank my family for their emotional support. I especially would like to thank my mother. Her unfailing love and compassion played a major role in my emotional stability in this process. My partner Vishal also deserves thanks. His genius, patience and love were crucial to this final product. He listened to my rants, challenged my weak arguments and held me when the stress seemed unbearable. I am so lucky to have him and all of those aforementioned in my life.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review	8
<i>Defining Collective Violence</i>	9
<i>Protest and Collective Violence</i>	12
<i>The Study of Collective Behaviour</i>	14
<i>Gustave Le Bon – Mob Mentality</i>	14
<i>Floyd Allport – Convergence Theory</i>	15
<i>Ralph Turner and Lewis Killian – Emergent-Norm Perspective</i>	18
<i>Neil Smelser – Value-added Theory</i>	20
<i>Collective Violence according to Smelser’s Value-added Model</i>	24
<i>Support for Value Added Theory</i>	26
<i>Woodstock 1999</i>	26
<i>Recognizing Strain Prior to the Bulls Riot of 1992</i>	29
<i>Structural Strain and the New Mexico Prison Riot of 1980</i>	30
<i>Competitive Sport Violence as a Precipitant of Crowd Violence</i>	33
<i>The Rodney King Verdict and Urban Riots</i>	34
<i>A Study of the Kent State Affair</i>	36
<i>Critiquing the Value-Added Model</i>	40
<i>Critiquing Strain</i>	41
<i>Critiquing Smelser’s Structural Functionalist Roots</i>	42
<i>Taking Issue with the Hostile Belief</i>	44
<i>The Continued Value of the Value-Added Model</i>	45
<i>The Generalized Belief, Social Constructionism and Claimsmakers</i>	46
<i>Defining Social Constructionism</i>	46
<i>Applying the Social Constructionist Model</i>	47
<i>Mobilization for Action and Micro-situational Violence</i>	48

<i>Violence as Situational</i>	49
<i>Fear and the Ugliness of Violence</i>	50
<i>Forward Panic</i>	51
<i>Conclusion</i>	53
Chapter 3 Methodology	55
<i>Why Toronto?</i>	55
<i>How to Study Collective Behaviour</i>	56
<i>Defining Participant Observation</i>	57
<i>The Benefits of Participant Observation</i>	59
<i>Difficulties in Using Participant Observation Research</i>	63
<i>Choosing Sides</i>	65
<i>Semi-Structured Interviews</i>	66
<i>Ethnographic Content Analysis</i>	67
<i>Selected Cases for Analysis</i>	70
<i>Conclusion</i>	73
Chapter 4 Findings and Analysis	75
<i>Structural Conduciveness</i>	76
<i>Structural Strain</i>	78
<i>The Generalized Belief</i>	80
<i>Mobilization of Participants for Action</i>	87
<i>Emotional Rush</i>	88
<i>Emotional Entrainment</i>	88
<i>Overkill</i>	91
<i>Social Control</i>	93
<i>Conclusion</i>	93
Chapter 5 Summary and Conclusions	95
References	102

Chapter 1

Introduction

The study of collective violence has traditionally been focused on the violence committed by unorganized crowds such as protesters, sport spectators, and other near-groups (Turner and Killian, 1957; Smelser, 1962; Levy, 1989; Yablonsky, 1959). However, in recent years, the focus of study has been shifting to those who are more organized and have a monopoly on the use of violence, such as the police and military agents (Tilly, 2003; Ruggiero, 2006; Zimbardo, 2007, Collins, 2008). Studying collective violence, especially when it is committed by those usually responsible for public safety, can illuminate divisions of class and power. Popular accounts of collective violence by the police or military agents often claim that there were a few bad apples, or deny that anything wrong even happened. However, systematic conditions contribute to the possibility of collective violence on the side of those in power (Tilly, 2003; Zimbardo, 2007; Collins, 2008). Thus, while it may be easier to access and explain collective violence on the side of the disempowered, it is also our responsibility as interrogators of power and privilege to examine and explain the structural conditions that provide the opportunities for collective violence on behalf of the power elite.

The purpose of this thesis is to understand what brings together social agents in time and space to engage in a collectively violent event. Collective violence is currently explained as a branch of the study of collective behaviour. Collective behaviour is

defined as behaviour which occurs in groups and which deviates from dominant normative standards (Locher, 2002). This type of behaviour does not occur in institutionalized relationships such as formal organizations, corporations or family (Miller, 2000). Rather, it refers to the acts of unorganized groups such as newly formed crowds (Locher, 2002). Examples of collective behaviour include riots, mobs, panics, popular delusions and disasters. Original explanations of collective behaviour posit that when the crowd gathers, the members adopt the behaviour of those who are the least rational and most violent (Le Bon, 1897). Over one hundred years later, as a result of rigorous study, sociologists now agree that individuals do not lose themselves in a crowd situation. Indeed, the majority of individuals in the crowd do not engage in any violence at all. The crowd never acts as one unified mob. There are always many people doing many different things, and often in very small groups within the crowd (Allport, 1924; Turner and Killian, 1957; Smelser, 1962; McPhail, 1994). Neil Smelser transformed the study of collective behaviour in the 1960's by claiming that it could be understood as a value-added process (1962). The components of this process include structural conduciveness, structural strain, the spread of a generalized belief, mobilization for action and the operation of social control (Smelser, 1962).

Collective violence can be defined as group physical aggression towards an object or another group (Tilly, 2003). When explaining violence, many theorists have operated under the assumption that violence is easy to perform. Violence is not easy to perpetuate nor is it easy to experience. It is often difficult, messy and terrifying (Collins,

2008) Although Smelser's explanation of the value-added process is useful for understanding the broader context within which collective violence unfolds, it fails to detail how the generalized belief is spread and how the violence occurs at the micro-sociological level, especially when it is so difficult to execute. Gary Fine amended Smelser's model in the late 1990's, arguing that the generalized belief does not just magically arise as a result of shared strain. Rather, he posits the spread of the belief is a result of an active claimsmaking process. The claimsmakers can be individuals or institutions like the media that have the ability to spread the belief easily and quickly (Fine, 1997).

Randall Collins's work usefully elaborates how social agents mobilize for action. He claims that violence is not easy and because it is not easy, one cannot assume that strain and belief alone will lead to violence (Collins, 2008). Situational factors contribute to whether or not an event will become violent. His argument deviates from traditional explanations of violence, which try to explain why "types of individuals" become violent. He claims that an analysis of the similarities of violent *situations* rather than violent people is more useful for explaining violence. In Chapter Two these theories are explained and combined to construct a theoretical framework to explain an episode of collective violence. By so doing, I hope to address a gap in the collective violence literature which fails to make sense of the situational factors which influence the likelihood of a violent episode.

I argue that it is useful to combine theoretical positions to explain collective violence as a social event. Event models have become increasingly popular in a number of areas, particularly criminology. For instance Vincent Sacco and Leslie Kennedy (2008) explain criminal events according to a three-stage sequence which includes precursors, transactions and aftermaths. The precursors to an event consist of the structural factors that influence what groups come together in space and time. The transaction involves a consideration of how the interaction of the two groups (or individuals) leads or does not lead to violence. The aftermath includes the consequences of the transaction for both parties and the community (Sacco and Kennedy, 2008).

The thesis provides an empirical assessment of the merits of a macro-social collective behaviour theory combined with a micro-social analysis of violence, through an analysis of a collective behaviour event. From June 26th to June 28th, 2010 the streets of Toronto, Canada became a world stage for dissent. Affinity groups, labour unions, human rights activists, environmentalists and other protesters joined together as close as possible to the meeting place of the Group of Eight (G8) and Group of Twenty (G20) in order to voice their frustration about issues ranging from inadequate environmental policy to the capitalist structure. There is a history of large protests accompanying international meetings such as the G8 and G20, and there was no reason to believe the Toronto meeting would be any different. A steel fence was erected around the downtown core where the meetings would take place to prevent protesters from accessing or preventing the meetings. Despite this barrier, thousands of protesters gathered on the

streets of Toronto to march and demonstrate. Although I originally intended to research how participants in a protest construct their understandings of strain and how particular claimsmakers within the crowd spread these understandings, my research interests changed as the events of the weekend unfolded.

The thousands of protesters on the street that weekend did not have the streets to themselves. Over twenty thousand police officers were present in Toronto to ensure order (Toronto Police Service, 2011). The protesters and police met on the streets of Toronto in direct conflict. The protesters claimed that they were angry with the police who would not let them reach the fence to voice their concern to the world leaders. Interviews with the police and public statements by spokespeople illuminated their concern that the protesters were a threat to the international leaders' security. As a result these two groups were placed in diametric opposition for most of the weekend.

As Smelser's model would suggest, the combination of structural conduciveness, structural strain and the spread of a generalized belief created the setting for the several incidents of collective violence between the police and the protesters. For the most part however, this violence was police violence. I will attempt to explain here that the violence was not a result of a few "bad apples," but rather a "bad barrel" (Zimbardo, 2007). I do not attempt to provide reasons here for why the protesters gathered. Nor, do I attempt to explain why certain police were violent and not others. The aim of this thesis is to demonstrate that situational factors are essential to any explanation of collective violence. These factors include the coming together of the police and protesters in time

and space, the pre-existing strain between the two groups who have been placed in conflict by the nature of the situation, the socially constructed beliefs about the opposing group and the characteristics of the violent transaction, such as prolonged tension and anger, that allow the aggressors to overcome their fear of violence and attack the other group.

Researching collective violence as an event requires a combination of methods. I attended the protests in Toronto as a participant observer and conducted semi-structured interviews with several protesters and a few police officers I was able to access. I also conducted an ethnographic content analysis of the video footage of several violence episodes. Due to the nature of large protest, episodes of collective violence can occur several kilometers from each other in different confrontations and at different times. Thus, I was unable to witness many of these episodes during my participant observation. The large amount of video footage of the event and the consequent postings of this footage to media sharing websites allowed me to analyze much of what I had missed. My experience at the protest informed my analysis of the video footage. Due to the complex nature of the event, a triangulation of methods was useful. In Chapter Three the qualitative methods I used are elaborated.

In Chapter Four, the data collected from these qualitative methods are combined with the theoretical underpinnings of my research to provide an analysis of the incidents of collective violence. This chapter is organized in terms of Smelser's five stages of the value-added process and conceptualizes collective violence as an event. In the first three

sections, I detail the precursors to the violent transaction. The first section considers the structural conditions that brought together the police and protesters in time and space. The second section focuses on the strained relations of the two groups as they are placed in conflict. This section is based on a combination of my field notes, interviews with the protesters and police and footage of the protests available online. The third section explains how the generalized belief about the protesters as a threat was established through a combination of claimsmakers such as the chief of police and the media. The fourth section analyzes the micro-situational details of the violent transaction through Collins's (2008) concept of forward panic. Here I detail the incidents of collective violence and explain how situational factors contribute to the violence witnessed. The fifth section considers the presence of social control, the last of Smelser's stages.

In the final chapter I consider the aftermath of the collectively violent event. I summarize the arguments and consider the implications of this type of explanation. I conclude with suggestions for future research and propositions for policy considerations in regards to dealing with large crowds and police accountability.

Drawing on the connection between violence and power, this chapter has provided an outline of a theoretical explanation for collective violence. The precursors for collective violence can be explained through a combination of Smelser's value-added model and Fine's social constructionist approach. The violent transaction is best explained through Collin's micro-situational theory of violence. In the following chapter I detail the background to this theoretical framework.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Introduction

This chapter provides the background theory necessary to understand collective violence in protest situations. I begin by elaborating a definition of collective violence, and then discuss how collective violence is understood in protest. Following this, the major theories of collective behaviour will be examined. Value added theory will be the central focus as it promises to be the most applicable in explaining how collective violence emerges in the protest situation. I review the critiques of the value-added model to demonstrate the theory's strengths and weaknesses and how it has commonly been understood. I demonstrate how one of the major critiques of Neil Smelser, his roots in functionalism, can be addressed through Gary Fine's (1997) social constructionist reinterpretation of the model. Smelser also fails to explain the micro-social process through which violence is mobilized. Randall Collins's theory of micro-situational violence is useful to account for this failing. The integrations of Smelser's and Collins's theoretical insights will provide a basis for understanding the collective violence witnessed during the protests that surrounded the Toronto, Canada meeting of the G8/G20 leaders.

Defining Collective Violence

Collective violence can be understood from a number of theoretical positions. This definition need not be so broad as to encompass all violence that happens at the group level, nor so narrowly focused on the specific violent event that the analysis is irrelevant to other research. Violence is not common. For example “if we consider that everyday life unfolds in a chain of situations, minute by minutes, most of the time there is very little violence” (Collins, 2008:3). It is also important to state here that violence itself is not easy to perpetuate. The violent aggressor must deal with the fearful nature of the violent interaction as well as their inhibitions and resistance to committing violence. Because violence is not easy, it only happens in certain situations (Collins, 2008).

In the past, collective violence was commonly referred to as “rioting”. The riot is defined as a sudden eruption of group violence. Participants in riots engage in a number of damaging acts towards property, such as smashing windows or arson (Locher, 2002:92). The term riot has become less preferable than collective violence for a few reasons. The word riot represents a political opinion, rather than a methodical characteristic. Those in power label violent behaviour, which they disapprove of, as rioting. As a result, they place a value judgment on the behaviour. However, when authorities and observers approve of the behaviour, they will call it a protest or demonstration (Tilly, 2003). Charles Tilly, who has documented numerous violent events, has argued that participants never self-identify as rioters, and thus it is not appropriate to label them as such (Tilly, 2003). Finally, using the term riot, assumes the

violence is carried out by the less organized side, as in, the protesters. This leaves little room for considering violence on the side of those in power, as in, the police.

There are several ways to define collective violence. Charles Tilly's definition of collective violence is widely cited. Tilly defines collective violence in terms of several specific criteria. First, he claims that collective violence is any act that immediately inflicts physical damage on persons and/or objects. "Damage" includes forcible seizure of persons or objects over restraint or resistance (Tilly, 2003). Second, Tilly explains that these phenomena must involve at least two individuals inflicting the damage, and that there is coordination between some of the actors involved in the damaging acts. From Tilly's standpoint, individual actions are not included, nor are accidents or long term corporate crime processes such as dumping waste (2003). This definition has been critiqued for its inability to define who these "persons" involved in the violence are, and what these "objects" are upon which physical damage has been inflicted (McCarthy, Martin and McPhail, 2009).

Steven Barkan and Lynne Snowden define collective violence as group behaviour intended to achieve or prevent political, social or economic change (2001). According to the authors, collective violence is intentional and instrumental, rather than expressive. This means that collective violence is a means to an end, an attempt to improve one's life chances or make gains rather than to express an emotion such as anger or frustration (2001). Barkan and Snowden also recognize that the rationality of collective violence can be called into question. They argue, however, collective violence has led to policy and

social change and this is oftentimes its goal. If one defines rational as goal-directed, then they argue collective violence is obviously quite rational (Barkan and Snowden, 2001).

Collective violence has also been defined as social control. Building on Donald Black's (1983) analysis of crime as social control, Roberta Senechal de la Roche describes collective violence as self-help by a group rather than an individual. De la Roche argues that lynching, vigilantism, terrorism and "rioting" are all behaviours that respond to particular conduct the group's member's views as deviant. Collective violence in this respect is a behavioural response that is moralistic and attempts to achieve some form of justice (de la Roche, 1996).

Collective violence is not just about social change or social control. It can be argued that it is not intentional, as Barkan and Snowden argue, but in fact expressive. Randall Collin's maintains that violence is a result of a 'situational process' (2008: 19). The situational process is marked by fear and tension. Such emotions often prevent the occurrence of violence, because violence goes against pro-social tendencies to care for others (Collins, 2008). Because violence is so difficult, it is often poorly executed. Thus it is not the type of participants, or their rationality, but rather the situation that leads to violence. Collins claims that in order to engage in violence, one must surmount this fear and transform it into emotional energy. It is easier to surmount this fear when the object of violence is considered weaker (2008). From these definitions we can ascertain that collective violence is a group phenomenon, in which another group or object is cooperatively targeted. However, because violence is not easy, it is often confusing and

unorganized. Practice and training can improve the accuracy of violence, but not by much. Thus, collective violence is often characterized by heightened emotional energy, transformed into disorganized action against a weaker person, group or object.

If collective violence can be understood as a situational process, as Collins argues, then analyzing collective violence should be like analyzing an event. In considering collective violence as an event, we must account for the precursors, the transaction and the aftermath (Sacco and Kennedy 2008). Theories of collective behaviour and violence will provide the explanations for each part of the collective violence event.

Protest and Collective Violence

As stated, collective violence as a form of protest has often been called a “riot.” According to most researchers, there are five general types of collective violence episodes. The first is communal collective violence often referred to as “race riots,” involving the clash of two racialized groups (Miller, 2002). Examples of this include the L.A. race riots in 1992 and the Quebec Richard Riot in 1955 (Fuller, 1993; Di Felice, 1999). Second is commodity collective violence, which often involves attempts to gain property or access to food. An example is the collective violence witnessed in Argentina in 1989 after hyperinflation prevented many people from being able to buy food (Miller, 2002; Auyero and Moran, 2007). Third, is celebratory collective violence. These episodes of collective violence tend to consist of fans who engage in destruction of property in order to express excitement. An example is the May Day Celebration in Ohio in 1984 or

the Stanley Cup Riot in Vancouver in 1994 (Miller, 2002; Locher, 2002; Roberts and Benjamin, 2000). Fourth is issueless collective violence. Issueless collective violence is spontaneous and illegitimate and does not share a common purpose (Marx, 1970). Fifth and finally, is protest collective violence. This violence is often in response to government policy and tends to consist of extraordinary¹ means in order to demonstrate frustrations (Miller, 2002; Rose 1982). All five types of collective violence listed make reference to the violence on the side of the unorganized group. It is important to recognize in protest collective violence, the violence can stem from the organized police.

The protest involves a group of people, usually coordinated in their demands, trying to negotiate a political response to conditions they perceive as unjust (Rose, 1982). These demands usually include a change in law or changes or revisions to administrative practices (Rose, 1982). The protest has also been labeled an instance of collective self-help (De la Roche, 1996). Often they include strikes, demonstrations or disruptions. However, when they involve conflicting groups the protest can turn violent (Rose 1982).

Protest collective violence is directed primarily at persons assumed to be accountable for some grievance (McPhail, 1994). The two contending groups in these collective violence episodes usually consist of police officers and protesters (Miller, 2002). Civilians will often attack government property which is indicative of the issues, or engage in civil disobedience against the authorities. Sometimes civilians will throw small projectiles at the authorities such as rocks or bottles, but rarely will they use

¹ Extraordinary means infrequency rather than the peculiar character of the incident.

weapons such as Molotov cocktails (Miller, 2002). If the violence is not directed against authorities, and does not demand action from government or other authoritative agents, it is not protest collective violence (Rose, 1982). However, it is important to recognize that the definition of protest collective violence should also include police violence against the protesting group. To understand how protest collective violence emerges, an analysis of collective behaviour literature is necessary.

The Study of Collective Behaviour

Collective violence (the “riot”) is considered a general category of the study of collective behaviour (Locher, 2002:92). As discussed collective behaviour, is usually defined as group behaviour that is unusual or deviates from the norm (Locher, 2002). It is episodic and thus differentiated from routine human behaviour (Rose, 1982). As collective behaviour has come to be conceptualized as more similar to conventional behaviour than to deviant behaviour, its interpretation has slowly shifted from viewing it as an irrational response to a more rational and political one (Barkan and Snowden, 2001). The study of collective behaviour has been approached in one of three ways: as an aroused emotion, an adaptive response, or a response to social strain (Miller, 2000:8).

Gustave Le Bon – Mob Mentality

The study of collective behaviour originates with the contributions of Gustave Le Bon (1897). After the French Revolution, theorists began to question the episodes of

collective behaviour they routinely observed (Barkan and Snowden, 2001:14). In *The Crowd*, Le Bon posits that in the formation of a crowd, all individual members are reduced to the level of the most violent and least intelligent member (Le Bon, 1897). Therefore Le Bon's theory of the crowd can be understood as an aroused emotion approach to collective behaviour. During the collective behaviour episode, the members of the crowd lose their personal identities. Individuality is weakened and individuals become more susceptible to suggestion (Le Bon, 1897). Le Bon argues there is a dormant, instinctive and destructive personality in everyone. This personality emerges in crowd situations, because one is anonymous in a crowd and not easily subject to consequence (Le Bon 1897:57). The subconscious dominates and similar emotion is easily passed from one person to the next through suggestion. He called this "contagion" (Le Bon, 1897). Although this form of contagion theory is no longer supported by most sociologists, it had an important influence on the direction of collective behaviour theory. Floyd Allport for instance was heavily influenced by Le Bon's work and despite subtle changes continued to treat collective behaviour as an aroused emotion.

Floyd Allport - Convergence Theory

Floyd Allport argued that individuals with similar characteristics assemble around a common interest and prepare for a certain type of action (McPhail, 1991). Collective behaviour, then, is two or more individuals commencing the same behaviour at the same

time. Their response to this object is often associated with intense emotional reactions (Allport, 1924).

In 1924, Floyd Allport proposed an alternative to Le Bon's contagion theory. While he maintained that crowd behaviour could be linked to an aroused emotion, he differed in his understanding of the makeup of the crowd. Allport tried to move away from "mob mentality" theories of collective behaviour. He stated that there was no such thing as a group impulse, but rather a collection of individual impulses (Allport 1924). He argued only individuals have minds, not the group. Secondly, he stated that the behaviour could not be understood without determining societal causes (Allport, 1924). Therefore, in order to understand collective behaviour, one must first understand the individuals' underlying motives, their understandings, and responses to the social situation (Allport, 1924). In a crowd, individuals resort to the basic levels of their innate human drives. Satisfying these drives in the crowd situation is sometimes difficult. If there is interference with the satisfaction of a learned drive that a number of people share, these people may come together in order to overcome this interference. An example of this is struggle and anger taking the form of competition in a sports match. According to Allport, one of two things has to occur for the process of amalgamation to transform into collective action. First, a leader suggests a collective action course and this prepares the group to respond to a given signal by the leader or supplement action already occurring. Second, once the suggestion has been put into action by a few easily influenced crowd members, their behaviour creates a model for others to follow. The suggestion can be

peaceful or violent. However, its influence on the most malleable will set the tone for the more indecisive and facilitate the behaviour in which they engage. If violent, the drives are in turn modified into strength and aggression, rather than prosocial behaviour (Allport, 1924). The crowd thus is a “struggle group”. The struggle group fights to maintain their innate drives to survive and thrive (Allport, 1924).

According to Allport, the crowd situation does not add anything new; it only intensifies emotions and the response and likelihood of determined action. The individual acts as he or she would in or out of the crowd. The behaviour is merely intensified in the crowd (Allport, 1924). In short, the crowd feeds off its emotion and its intense behaviour. This is not to say the crowd makes a person “mad” but rather that those involved in a crowd already have varying levels of “madness” in common.

Convergence theory has been critiqued for assuming that all individuals in the crowd are innately deviant and prone to violence or non-conformity (McPhail, 1991). Recent theorists have also empirically demonstrated that all members of the crowd do not behave the same way (McPhail, 1991). Allport’s theory and other emotion-based reasoning have also been criticized for being vague and contradictory. It fails to provide empirical support that demonstrates that individuals resort to innate learning strategies of struggle (Locher, 2002). Emotion-based theories began to lose favour as collective behaviour came to be understood as an adaptive response. The adaptive understanding of collective behaviour is exemplified in the “emergent norm” perspective.

Ralph Turner and Lewis Killian – Emergent-Norm Perspective

Unlike previous theorists, Turner and Killian based their theory on the principle that participants of collective behaviour remain rational (Locher, 2002). Over the years they have revised their theory, but they maintain that collective behaviour is a result of emergent norms. Emergent norm theory finds its theoretical roots from symbolic interactionism (Locher, 2002). Turner and Killian argue that collective behaviour is a group phenomenon and refers to the characteristics of the group, not those of the individuals (1957). Similar to Blumer, they posit that in episodes of collective behaviour traditional norms and values are not upheld and can be replaced by alternative standards (Turner and Killian, 1957). This definition also finds its roots in Le Bon's argument that "in the crowd, the old is destroyed so that it may be replaced by the new" (Turner and Killian 1957). Despite the acceptance of Le Bon's case for norm change within the crowd, Turner and Killian clearly disapprove of his value-laden definition of collective behaviour. They argue that this leads to defining the behaviour as emotional or irrational (Turner and Killian, 1957).

Turner and Killian posit that in every society there are varying values and norms. Inconsistency in norms and values can cause conflicts in a group as it interrupts their patterned behaviour and prevents normative integration. Value conflicts can also arise out of rapid social change causing frustration (Turner and Killian, 1957). Collective behaviour arises as an attempt to resolve this conflict (Turner and Killian, 1957).

Individuals tend to follow the norms of the situation most of the time. When the situation is nuanced or unusual, as it often is in collective behaviour, these norms are not as obvious. Thus new norms must be created. New norms cannot be created if the group does not feel connected and somewhat homogenous. The united feeling of the group allows for communication. Communication is necessary for a collective situation to evolve into collective action, maintaining new norms that suit the behaviour (Turner and Killian, 1957). Increased anxiety can lead to increased suggestibility. Thus, individuals are more willing to accept the new norms as they explain the ambiguous and uncertain situation and ease anxiety and insecurity. As long as the new norm does not lead to immediate consequences within the group, it is accepted by more and more members. Such circular reinforcement leads more members to internalize the new norm and act according to its precepts. Hence, the new norm is not a result of irrationality, as previous theorists had posited about collective behaviour, but rather rational, conformist behaviour according to the circumstances. This is not to say that collective behaviour participants are susceptible to all new suggestions; rather, they are directed only to behaviour that already “matches” their attitudes. This concept has been influenced by convergence theory, in that like-minded individuals group together to engage in collective behaviour. In the case of collective violence, physical damage to persons and/or objects would become normative behaviour. Participants would then begin to engage in violence collectively as it would appear appropriate to the situation.

In the final pages of their original work on collective behaviour, Turner and Killian focus on norms as a mechanism of social change. The types of values expressed in collective behaviour are reflective of cultural shifts. Furthermore, collective behaviour acts as a safety valve allowing accumulated tensions to be released and discontent to be expressed. This analysis flows almost seamlessly into Neil Smelser's theory of collective behaviour. His theory conceptualized collective behaviour as a response to social strain.

Neil Smelser –Value-added theory

In 1962, Neil Smelser re-evaluated collective behaviour theory and argued that it was not necessarily similar individual characteristics that brought people together to act on a group level. Instead, it was their common reaction to social conditions and strain. New circumstances could create a need to release the strain and that release may involve collective violence. As a result, collective violence can be seen as functional for society. Like Turner and Killian, Smelser pointed out the difficulty in studying collective behaviour, because of the emotional reaction to the behaviour by many analysts. Further, he argued that due to the spontaneous nature of collective behaviour, it is difficult to conduct an experiment and control all the variables. Thus it is difficult to sample collective behaviour and predict when such behaviour would turn violent (Smelser 1962).

Smelser defines collective behaviour as behaviour that is not institutionalized. It forms as a response to unstructured situations (Smelser, 1962). For the behaviour to achieve a collective quality, channels of communication must exist, which transform

these responses into action. However, there is no one form of communication that is an essential characteristic of collective behaviour (Smelser, 1962) Smelser posits a six-stage model to explain how collective behaviour emerges. He calls this a “value-added” process, because each stage is necessary for the suitable and effective addition of the next stage (Smelser, 1962). Although a temporal logic is present, any one of the determinants may exist for an indefinite amount of time, before it is activated (Smelser, 1962).

Stage one is structural conduciveness. Structural conduciveness is any factor in the environment that permits a particular social situation to occur. Structurally conducive conditions could include weather, proximity to other people, the time of day or year, or the type of resources available. For example, in times of economic pressure, particular forms of trade become possible such as acceptance of new or different forms of property transfer. Other examples of structurally conducive conditions of collective behaviour could include warm weather which brings people into public settings, a time period in which many people are not working, such as a weekend, or a large gathering of people in a concentrated area for something like a festival (Smelser, 1962). There are three aspects of structural conduciveness; the structure of accountability, the presence of outlets for articulating grievances and the possibility of interaction among the aggrieved.

Accountability refers to the party on whom the blame is placed, for the strain. The weather, the time of day, and technologies can play a role in how the aggrieved interact and whether the lines of communications need to be open and accessible (Smelser, 1962).

Stage two, in the six stage value-added process, is “structural strain.” Smelser defines structural strain as an experience of deprivation or injustice for the people who end up participating in collective behaviour. Deprivation and injustice are felt as a result of the existing social arrangements (1962). Smelser argues that some form of strain must be present for a collective behaviour event to occur. The likelihood of the episode increases with the severity of the strain. However there is no direct causal link between a specific type of strain and a specific type of collective event (Smelser, 1962). Strain here is understood only as it relates to the structural conduciveness that initially led to the collective behaviour. The two, in combination, increase the possibility of collective behaviour (Smelser, 1962).

Stage three is defined by the growth and spread of a generalized belief. Here, the meaning of the collective behaviour episode is established. In all forms of collective behaviour a belief exists that guides the participants into action (Smelser, 1962). However, this belief does not need to be held by everyone in order for an episode to occur (Smelser, 1962). According to Smelser there are five types of generalized beliefs. The first is the hysteria belief, in which an uncertain situation is transformed into a compelling widespread threat. The second is a wish fulfillment belief which transforms the situation into something effectual and all-powerful. The third, the hostile belief, considers something an obstacle or threat and seeks to remove it. The fourth, the norm-oriented belief, is based on a desire to reconstitute the normative structure. Fifth and finally value-oriented beliefs focus on maintaining a value system that is threatened

(Smelser, 1962). Any of these five types of beliefs pinpoint the source of strain, characterize this source accordingly and seek to respond to it appropriately in accordance with the belief (Smelser, 1962)

Stage four involves “precipitating factors”. There is usually a particular episode or act that precipitates collective behaviour (Smelser 1962). This episode gives the collective behaviour substance (Locher, 2002). In recent years precipitating factors have been subsumed under the generalized beliefs stage of value-added theory (Smelser, 1972). The two stages are said to be inter-dependent and intertwined (Locher, 2002). The precipitating factor has several effects on the generalized belief. It substantiates fears or hatreds, it reduces opportunities for peaceful expressions of grievances, it introduces a new injustice or strain and it acts as a guide to the assignment of responsibility (Smelser, 1962).

Stage five involves the mobilization of participants for action. The generalized belief assigns responsibility for strain and participants mobilize into action against the responsible actors. There are factors that bring the affected group into action. Factors that facilitate mobilization for action include having a leader (or leaders), who is be engaging and trusted, and having a purpose for action. Overall, this stage focuses on how people mobilize into action, what resources they access and how they assemble (Smelser, 1962). The final stage is the operation of social control. Social control consists of the counter-determinants to collective behaviour. Social control disturbs, redirects, or inhibits the episode. There are two types of social control according to Smelser. The first type

prevents collective behaviour by minimizing strain and conduciveness. The second type is mobilized after a collective behaviour event has begun and thus, impedes its progress. These controls establish how quickly, how far and where the event will develop (Smelser, 1962:17).

The value of this model is how it stresses process. At each step along the process the group and their activities are affected and altered. These changes make some types of behaviour more likely while limiting the possibility of other types of behaviour (Fuller, 1993).

Collective Violence According to Smelser's Value-added Model

A student of functionalism, Smelser concentrated on the structural social conditions that lead to collective violence. Smelser was the first to deny the psyche of the participants as a major cause of collective violence. Rather he claimed structural conditions cause strain for particular people in the population (Locher, 2002). However, collective violence does not occur any time that a few members of society feel strained. Particular determinants must be in place for collective violence to occur. These determinants make up the value-added process (Smelser, 1962). According to Smelser, collective violence is understood as a "hostile outburst". To understand collective violence as a process it must be defined according to the six stage model.

For stage one, Smelser asks several questions in order to determine the structural conduciveness of the setting to the emergence of collective violence. Is responsibility

clearly institutionalized and legitimate? Are the authorities able to control violence? Are there cultural or religious tensions in the community? What other opportunities are there for expressing dissatisfaction? Finally, how do the means of communication for the group under strain operationalize (1962)?

In stage two, structural strain adds to the likelihood of a hostile outburst through the associated frustration or deprivation on the side of the strained group. This can result from power inequality, social cleavages or the loss of alternative means of expressing dissatisfaction.

In stage three hostile beliefs inform the collective violence. The development of the hostile belief emerges as a result of its own five stage sub process. This process consists of uncertainty, apprehension, assignment of responsibility to agents, a need to punish these agents and a generalized belief in strength and supremacy (Smelser, 1962). Smelser argues that the hostile belief is a generalized and simple belief that lacks complexity, but breeds hostility. Collective violence emerges out of unfavourable opinions toward a particular object (Smelser, 1962).

At stage four, the precipitating factor, reaffirms or exaggerates the experiences of these conditions of strain. The generalized belief is transformed into its specific expectations, fears and aggressions.

Smelser describes how in stage five, structural conduciveness such as particular days of the week (such as weekends), times of year, types of weather and types of transportation affect the mobilization for action. There are three variables which provide

an ordering of the mobilization process. These are leadership, the organization of the outburst and the spread of the hostile outburst. Organization is dependent on the level of pre-existing structures and the response of social control. Once participants have been mobilized, the breakdown of social order creates a situation even more structurally conducive to collective violence. As a result, a large number of violent attacks occur very quickly.

Finally, for a collective violence event to take place, the authorities or representatives of social order fail to mobilize until after the violence has begun. How quickly and effectively they respond defines how the collective violence event will escalate and how damaging it will be (Smelser, 1962). Smelser's model is quite valuable in explaining collective violence in this respect because it not only explains the behaviour but also how the authorities respond to that behaviour (Fuller, 1993).

Support for Value-added Theory

Woodstock 1999

Stephen Vider's analysis of the Woodstock riot of 1999, suggests how the event could be understood according to the value-added model. Vider initially argued that the Woodstock riot of 1999 could be understood in reference to Steve Reicher's model of social identity (Vider, 2004). Reicher's model draws heavily on Emergent Norm Theory and argues that one's sense of self is reliant on both personal identity and several social identities (1984). Thus the crowd's behaviour is defined by a collective sense of purpose,

constructed through discussion and rumour, and reliant on the beliefs of the social group (Vider, 2004). However, Vider's findings are consistent with the value-added model.

At Woodstock in 1999, participants were awaiting a special finale concert. When the concert turned out to be a video tribute to guitar icon Jimi Hendrix, the crowd began to use the "peace" candles they had been given to burn property. Concert goers also flipped over a car and set it on fire, looted tents and broke automated teller machines. Participants justified their violence as a result of overpriced water and food, lack of clean facilities, large distances between stages and overall extortion on behalf of the Woodstock organizers (Vider, 2004). Using the social identity model, one would explain the crowd violence as a result of intergroup encounters in which the group identifies the out-group's behaviour as illegitimate and cohesively acts against the out-group (Reicher, 1984).

Neil Smelser's value-added theory is an appropriate theory to use in explaining this instance of collective violence. The 1999 Woodstock festival was structurally conducive to collective violence due to a few factors. First, the festival occurred in the summer, on a weekend, meaning more people could go, because they would not be at work. There were over 225,000 people were in attendance, increasing the number of people who could participate in violence. Second, on the Sunday, the organizers handed out peace candles to all in attendance, providing participants with easy access to fire.

With regard to stage two, structural strain, the participants' interpretations of the event should be examined. Here the participants who were interviewed often claimed

they were bored by the festival. They felt like they were not a part of history and felt exploited by the festival's organizers, who overcharged for food and water, failed to deal with unsanitary conditions and provided concert goers with little shade. Boredom and the desire for excitement combined with a feeling of exploitation, contributed to the strain in the situation. A few incidents could have acted as precipitating events and added to the assignment of blame onto the Woodstock organizers. First, there had been a few small bonfires on the first two days of the festival that were extinguished by organizers (Vider, 2004). These fires would have set precedent for the use of fire on Sunday. Second, the participants believed that they were being taken advantage of because prices were inflated, sanitation was poor and there was no protection from summer heat (Vider, 2004). Third, participants expected a final surprise concert and the organizers failed to meet this expectation. This disappointed many participants and could have contributed to their hostile generalized belief that the organizers were to blame for the concert-goers boredom and feelings of exploitation.

Several leaders emerged to mobilize action at the Woodstock Festival. Vider explains how this emergence was often signaled by an act as simple as the destruction of a piece of property (2004). This analysis is in line with stage five of the value-added model and demonstrates how participants are mobilized by watching others (leaders) engage in destructive behaviour. Also, some individuals called for action by stating "we need to riot tonight" (Vider, 2004). Discussion of engaging in violence can mobilize others to take part in the violence. Social control clearly failed to immediately inhibit the

mobilized action, because cars were flipped over and fires were set. While Vider analyzes the Woodstock riot according to social identity theory, the event process can be seen to unfold according to the value-added process.

Recognizing Strain Prior to the Bulls Riot of 1992

Michael Rosenfeld demonstrates the usefulness of analyzing structural strain as a determinant of collective violence in his interpretation of the Chicago Bulls Riot of 1992. In early April of 1992, Illinois experienced its largest welfare cut in history. Over sixty thousand unemployed male Chicagoans lost their benefits, which included over \$150 a month plus Medicaid health benefits. Despite opposition of Black Chicagoan leaders, who threatened to riot, these cuts had been enacted in the state legislative session in 1991 (Rosenfeld, 1997). That same year the Chicago Bulls, a National Basketball Association team, won the final championship game. This was their second championship in a row. The night of the victory, fans took to the streets in celebration. Their celebration was characterized by incidents of collective violence. In the downtown core some taxicabs were overturned and drunken revelers danced on top. However, in Chicago's south and west side hundreds of stores were looted, and ninety police officers were injured. Over one thousand people were arrested. Ninety-eight percent of those arrested were black and male (Rosenfeld, 1997).

The Chicago Bulls riot is often misconstrued as only a celebratory riot (Rosenfeld, 1997). However, because of the structural strain present in Chicago at the

time of the collective violence, one could question the validity of the label “celebratory.” Black male Chicagoans were experiencing strain over their loss of benefits. Many had also just witnessed the Rodney King beating, and the aftermath in which the four police responsible had been acquitted. Built up tension from the loss of some financial security was combined with the anger over the police acquittal contributed to the structural strain that Chicago residents were experiencing at the time of the Bulls victory. Rosenfeld claims that the rebellious nature of the violence made the episode political. While the Bulls victory acted as a precipitating factor, Rosenfeld argues the built up strain and frustration within ghettoized Chicago, turn the celebration violent (1997). The violence was so damaging because the counter-determinant of social control was not productive. The majority of the police were deployed in the downtown core, far from the site of much of the looting. While Rosenfeld does not use the value-added model to explain the collective violence associated with the 1992 Chicago Bulls victory, he does demonstrate support for the influence of strain as a precursor to mobilization for action.

Structural Strain and the New Mexico Prison Riot of 1980

In a time when few researchers supported the structural breakdown model of collective behaviour, Bert Useem explained how a prison riot arose out of strain and loss of normative structure. The concept of breakdown is analogous to the concept of structural strain. The breakdown model, assumes that collective behaviour emerges as a

result of the breakdown of solidarity structures such as family, work, the church and voluntary organization.

Useem discusses the New Mexico prison riot as occurring within an atypical subpopulation that is prisoners. He also explains that these prisoners would be experiencing severe deprivation at anytime while imprisoned, because they are denied their freedom. However he claims that a standard of deprivation is constructed within the prison system. Thus, despite inmates being deprived of their freedoms, they come to expect a certain level of deprivation within their imprisonment. Any such violation of their standards would cause strain (Useem, 1985).

Useem explains several of the determinants associated with value-added theory that affected the outcome of the prison riot. The conditions of the prison were structurally conducive as a result of a number of security lapses. A security gate was left unlocked, a newly-placed window was easily broken through by inmates and there were acetylene torches left behind by renovation crews that could be used to burn gates open (Useem, 1985).

The inmates experienced strain as a result of their conditions. The conditions in the prison prior to the riot had become quite awful. Complaints included extremely bad food, harassment by the guards, and a sense of animosity among the inmates. The prison also was over capacity with many blocks holding twice as many inmates as for which the cells were designed. The deputy warden had been recently fired and a new warden had taken over. The previous warden had provided programs and activities for the inmates.

The new warden removed a lot of the programs leaving many inmates to complain that there was nothing to do all day and they were feeling bored and deprived. Inmates felt like they had nothing to look forward to. Furthermore, the lack of other activities made the inmates more available to mobilize. A new informant system had been put in place and many of the inmates felt they could not trust each other. The informant system, coupled with the sense of deprivation, led to a lot of inmate on inmate violence (Useem, 1985).

Useem demonstrates the futility of using resource mobilization theory to explain a prison riot and the usefulness of value-added theory. He claims that inmates often lack organizational skills as a result of them often lacking social skills. Thus, resource mobilization theory would expect inmates to be passive and easily controlled (Useem, 1985). Support for the rationality of collective violence, present in the value-added model, was evident here. Prisoners assisted some guards to escape, if the guards had been nice to them in the past. Other, cruel guards were targeted for the most violence. Furthermore none of the guards were killed as the inmates recognized both how this would affect their future, and how it was more important to make the guards suffer. Finally, not all inmates were a part of the violence. Some chose to protect themselves and leave (Useem, 1985). It is evident here that a lot of the behaviour was rational and does not support the earlier theories of collective behaviour such as emergent-norm, convergence and contagion.

Smelser's argument that collective violence is a result of a value-added process is supported by this example. Many of the inmates Useem interviewed described the riot as

an attempt to relieve their bad conditions and ultimately their deprivation. Inmates are likely to feel that they do not have the means to protest their conditions and collective violence was the only manner in which they could express their deprivation. It is also important to note that inmates who participated in the 1980 riot claimed they would not engage in further collective violence because they felt their conditions had improved (Useem, 1985). It is then evident that the collective violence witnessed here supports a structural strain model of collective behaviour.

Competitive Sports Violence as a Precipitant of Crowd Violence

During the 1970's Michael Smith collected ten years' worth of Canadian news to determine the precipitants of crowd violence at sporting events. He gathered data relating to sixty-eight episodes of collective violence in which ten or more people had participated (Smith, 1976). Smith found that sport violence appeared to be the main precipitant of crowd violence at sporting events. The majority of collective violence episodes at spectator sports were preceded by some sort of assaultive behaviour as a precipitating event (1976). He argues that sport, or any other direct competition, often exacerbates tension or strain already experienced by different groups. He also explains that a stadium or arena in which sports competitions are held is structurally conducive to collective violence, because it brings people together who would not normally meet, involves alcohol, heat, loud noise, excitement and frustration and a place in which people can easily communicate or taunt. These factors combined with the precipitating sport

violence can add to the likelihood of spectator violence (Smith, 1976). It is evident that Smith's content analysis demonstrates support for many of the determinants of the value-added model, most of all, the precipitating event.

The Rodney King Verdict and Urban Riots

John Fuller uses value-added theory to explain the collective violence following the acquittal of four white police officers in 1992. In 1992, these four police officers beat a black man named Rodney King whom they had detained in a traffic stop. This beating was recorded by an amateur cameraman and part of the recording was aired repetitively over national television (Fuller, 1993). Fuller explains the details of the riot and how they connect with each stage of the value-added process. He argues that the structural conditions making what he deems a 'race riot' possible consisted of economic inequality, differential opportunities and the segregation of populations as a result of race (1993). Fuller describes structural strain as a feeling of deprivation and uncertainty in the nation's ghettos. Strain in the cities which witnessed collective violence after the verdict consisted of high crime and unemployment rates as well as increased drug- and gang-related activities and homelessness (Fuller, 1993).

The precipitating event, the acquittal of the police officers, and the spread of a generalized belief, that assigned blame to a racist justice system, was accomplished through media visual cues. The American public watched repeated images of the beating. Viewing this beating created a shared belief that the police were racists and something

needed to be done. Beyond the images of appalling violence, the trial was also moved to a suburb outside of South Central Los Angeles. This changed the racial dynamic of the jury, to being predominantly white. As a result, many questioned whether the trial would be fair. The general belief consisted of the problematic nature of the beating of Rodney King and the seemingly obvious guilt of the police officers involved. If the verdict were anything other than guilty, the public would view this as a mockery of justice (Fuller, 1993). Finally, the resulting verdict was the acquittal of the four police officers. Since many had witnessed the brutal beating on television they had difficulty understanding how the police officers were acquitted. The precipitating event allowed for the assignment of responsibility to be placed on justice system that was now considered racist. The acquittal led many to believe that the justice system had failed in protecting people of colour (Fuller, 1993).

Fuller describes how after the news of the acquittal spread, incidents of collective violence began to emerge across the country. The media were very quick to respond and Fuller argues that this played into the mobilization for action. He posits that there was less of a need for leadership in the mobilization for action here, because the visibility of collective violence in some cities was enough to provide a standard for further action (1993). This is consistent with the argument made by Smelser that events can function as standards of leadership (1962). Fuller explains the final stage of value-added theory as the inability of local police forces to respond to seemingly spontaneous collective violence. The manner in which agents of social control mobilize can affect the spread and

size of collective violence (Smelser, 1962). In Los Angeles the police were slow to react, though many argue that they should have been prepared for a hostile outburst (Fuller, 1993). Here is evident that the events features of the collective violence related to the Rodney King verdict fit the value added model.

A Study of the Kent State Affair Using Smelser's Value-added Model

On May 4, 1970 in a hostile outburst at Kent State University four undergraduate students were shot dead and nine students were wounded by the National Guard (Lewis, 1972). Sociologist Jerry Lewis (1972) explains how the details of this event come together in the value-added model to produce the hostile outburst that resulted in four killings that day. Lewis argues that the collective violence witnessed at Kent State was a result of structurally conducive conditions, because of the structure of responsibility, communication and the ability of the aggrieved to access channels of communication and use them.

The structure of responsibility is defined according to whom blame is assigned. By the time of the killings on Monday, May 4th, the students had already been challenging police for three days. Students had been gathering and protesting President Nixon's announcement that troops had been sent to Cambodia in connection with the Vietnam War. Students were also displeased with the placement of a Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) building on campus, as it indicated that students were being recruited for the war. Over the course of the weekend several small fires were set to the

building. When authorities responded to the destruction of property they were often met with hostility. The authorities often failed to apprehend those responsible for the initial stages of disorder and, as a result, small acts of destruction and defiance continued. Students became more hostile when the National Guard appeared and immediately interfered with their destructive activities. Students felt the Guard did not belong on campus, nor should they have the right to prevent the students from gathering where and when they wanted. When classes let out early as a result of the disruption on campus the Guard was again quite visible. Thus not only were more students available to participate in collective violence since they had no class, but also more students were seeing the National Guard and becoming upset by their presence on the university campus(Lewis, 1972).

The second structurally conducive determinant was the communication among the aggrieved. The students were able to congregate quickly and in large numbers because of their access to a common, well known space. The “Commons” at the university was used widely and located in the centre of campus. Thus the main core of protesters could centre in the middle of what and be surrounded by supporters and spectators. This made communication from the active core to the outside spectators quite easy. The Guard was also protecting a building beside the commons that had been attacked the day before. Thus they were located in plain view of the gathering of students (Lewis, 1972).

The final structurally conducive determinant was the presence and absence of channels of communication that can help and hinder the manner in which collective

violence spreads. The students had gathered in the Commons around an active group of protesters on the Monday of the fourth. After an order to disperse, the Guard and police used teargas on the students. This cut off communication between the main core of protesters and the spectators and supporters. Marshalls, consisting mostly of faculty, were no longer able to negotiate between the core and the Guard, because of the tear gas (Lewis, 1972).

Lewis argues that the major source of structural strain was the Guard's presence on campus. On Monday morning the students were told to disperse but they felt they had a right to stay assembled at a traditional campus gathering place. Congregating at the Commons was a norm on campus and the ability to do so was being disrupted by the Guard. Lewis argues that the strain was not one-sided. The Guard, who thought the students knew the university had just declared the rally illegal, thought the assembly was a direct challenge to authority.

The third determinant of the value-added model was the growth and spread of a hostile belief. Lewis asserts that ambiguity played a large part in the hostile outburst at Kent State. Firstly, over half of the students stated that they were not aware of the university's decision to prohibit rallying. Secondly, when the students were told to disperse many thought the officers were asking, not ordering. As a result students were confused by the aggressive police response that followed. For the generalized belief to form, responsibility must be assigned. Here, the Guard was assigned responsibility for the students' feelings of ambiguity and hostility. The core protesters desired to punish the

Guard for their presence and interference on campus. Furthermore, as the interaction progressed, the students at the rally began to feel they had gained power. The students had moved with the Guard to the football field and felt they had encircled the Guard. Feelings of power, mixed with a desire to punish, supported the formation of the generalized belief that the Guard needed to be removed from campus. Even when the police kneeled down and pointed their rifles at the students, the students that they believed the Guard was bluffing. It was later determined that 94% of participants of the rally and 81% of observers did not think that the police would shoot (Lewis, 1972).

The precipitating factor provides credibility to the hostile belief (Smelser, 1962) Lewis claims that there were two precipitating factors. The first factor was the call for a Monday rally. This call was initially made at the Friday rally. The second factor was the formation of the Guard outside the burned campus building.

The fifth determinant, mobilization for action, is described by Lewis according to leadership and organization of the hostile outburst. Similarly to the collective violence witnessed around the Rodney King incident the rally event acted as a leadership model for mobilization for action. The final determinant of the value-added model, the action of social control agents, can be understood through the Guard's action. The Guard was unable to cut off communication between protesters, allowing the hostile belief to be maintained. Secondly, the guard did not interfere with the core protesters and the followers. Thirdly, the Guard bluffed force. They threw the canisters back and forth with the students when the initial tear gassing occurred. Finally, the Guard here was the major

target of the hostile belief and thus engaged in conflict with the crowd. This maintained them as a focal point of hostility. All of the Guard's actions only increased hostility and mobilization rather than acting as a counter-determinant to collective violence.

Again this example demonstrates how Smelser's value-added model is useful in examining collective violence phenomena. The determinants of the hostile outburst all contribute to the six stages of the model and demonstrate how a hostile outburst can become predictable. The interpretation of the Kent State incident supports the use of Smelser's theory in understanding collective violence.

Critiquing The Value-Added Model

Neil Smelser's value-added theory has been subject to much criticism over the years. While strain theories of collective behaviour dominated in the 1960's, they fell out of favour in the mid 1970's to mid 1980's (Buechler, 2008). At this point, many of those studying collective behaviour were starting to participate in it as well (Piven and Cloward, 1977). Researchers were often involved in collective behaviour such as protest and collective violence as a part of the civil rights movement, the women's movement, the anti-war movement and the student movement. Strain theorists failed to account for the rational actors in their analysis of collective behaviour. Researchers perceived themselves to be rational when participating in collective behaviour and thus a paradigm shift occurred in the academe (Buechler, 2008). Soon collective behaviour was being understood in reference to "resource mobilization theory". Resource mobilization theory

posits that individuals are rational in their actions. They mobilize resources such as money and the media as part of protest to ensure their voices are heard (McCarthy and Zald, 1977). Despite the dominance of this theory and other similar theories, strain and structural breakdown theories were still considered useful to some marginalized researchers (Buechler, 2008). Support for strain theory likely rested in the recognition that the theory was useful for explaining how tension between conflicting groups could still act as one of the many precursors to violence. In the last few years, strain theory has re-emerged as an explanatory tool for collective behaviour. However its weaknesses have also a renewed focus of attention.

Many authors have critiqued the value-added model, claiming that it does not always operate temporally (McPhail and Miller, 1973). They claim collective behaviour, or the mobilization of participants prior to collective behaviour, presupposes strain or hostile beliefs. However Smelser does not argue that each stage need occur temporally. One does not presuppose the other. Nor are the six stages necessarily consecutive. Rather he claims that certain stages can occur at the same time (Smelser, 1962). The convergence of all three increases the likelihood that individuals will engage in collective violence.

Critiquing Strain

Some writers have been critical of attempts to treat strain as an objective social condition. Smelser explains that strain is the breakdown of the relations between the

components of action and as a result their insufficient function. However, strain is also subjective as it is understood through the individual experience within a community of importance (Fine, 1997).

Clark McPhail criticizes Smelser's use of structural strain saying it is not useful to explain collective behaviour. McPhail also states that while structural strain may exist there are no methodical consistencies between variation in levels of structural strain and the amount of and the intensity of collective violence (1994).

Smelser does not argue that strain is a useful cause of collective violence, but rather one step in a six step process (Crossley, 2002). There must also be major social dislocations before strain will translate into collective behaviour (Piven and Cloward, 1979). Strain is also experienced in different ways by different people and thus a value cannot be placed on strain.

Critiquing Smelser's Structural Functionalist Roots

Many researchers have criticized Smelser's value-added theory, specifically his concepts of agency and social structure, because of its functionalist roots. Smelser was a student of Talcott Parsons, one of the founders of structural functionalism theory (Parsons, 1951). Parsons' work was rooted in the structural writings of Emile Durkheim. Durkheim argued that if there is a state of equilibrium between normative expectations and the division of labour then a society will be well integrated and stable (Walder, 2009). In furthering this notion, Parsons asserted that rapid change in a society, as a result

of structural specialization and changes in norms, can lead to strain. Strain is mostly experienced by those who are the most affected by the disruption in stability. Strain can be social or psychological and lead people to engage in protest or violence (Walder, 2009).

Structural functionalism has been critiqued for its macro-structural focus and its underlying assumption that if a system is functioning it should be maintained. However, Parsons did not intend to say that a functioning system is necessarily a good one. (Smith, Hamon, Ingoldsby, 2008). Furthermore, structural functionalism does not account for agency (Ritzer and Goodman, 2004). However, Parson originally did focus on individuals and agency, but failed to explain why individuals acted in certain ways and not others (Parsons and Shils, 2001). Finally, the theory is a moral claim about human behaviour, because whether or not it defines human behaviour as free, the theory posits the hope that human actors will choose behaviours within socially acceptable limits (Seidman, 2008). Despite these critiques, structural functionalist theory played an important role in providing the grounding for Smelser's macro-structural analysis of collective behaviour. Although agency seems to be lost in functionalism, Smelser's recognition of social structure is necessary for understanding how situational conditions can permit or constrain said agency.

Taking Issue with the Hostile Belief

There are several critiques of Smelser's depiction of the hostile belief. First, the belief is cast as held by all. This eclipses the multitude of beliefs that can be held by crowd participants (Smith, 1976). It is also not always verifiable empirically despite its place as an indispensable determinant of the hostile outburst (Smith, 1976). Smelser also defines it as extraordinary, which can also be understood as irrational. It is imprecise and thus prevents disconfirmation (Smith, 1976). Finally, it is often provided as a justification for, rather than a cause of, behaviour after the fact (Smith, 1976).

Smelser's depiction of the generalized hostile belief has also been critiqued for misrepresenting representing violent actors as a collective. Since only a minority of participants engages in violence when in the crowd, there is doubt as to whether a shared norm has emerged from the crowd's interaction (Schweingruber and Wohlstein, 2005).

Smelser never claims that the entire crowd engages in hostile behaviour as a result of hostile beliefs. These beliefs can exist independently of action. The act is merely the next stage in the six stage model. Furthermore it would be very unlikely that every individual would engage in violence when experiencing strain and sharing a hostile belief. Only a small group of people engaging in violence is necessary when characterizing an event as collective violence.

There is some validity to these concerns, especially with regard to the multitude of beliefs held by the crowd. However, while several hostile beliefs could and likely do exist, a generalized hostile belief is necessary for individuals to work together to engage

in collective violence. Furthermore, while many theorists question the generalized belief concept, few debate that the hostile outburst is precipitated by an atmosphere of tension and assignment of responsibility (Smith, 1976). Finally, a lot of the research on collective violence demonstrates that some form of hostile belief is present, though it is often specific and not generalized. This implies that some cognition of hostility is shared by the collective prior to the precipitating event, but the cognition cannot be generalized to the group (Smith, 1976). A revised analysis of the hostile belief, as posited by Gary Fine, better demonstrates how this belief is formed and used.

The Continued Value of the Value-Added Model

Clearly, value-added theory has been subjected to several critiques over the years. Despite such critiques, it is important to recognize that value-added theory is still useful to explain collective phenomena. In fact it is re-emerging as an important tool for understanding collective behaviour (Buechler, 2008). While some of these critiques are important to improve the model, others often only demonstrate a poor reading of Smelser. Despite these critiques, the usefulness of the value-added model is maintained. Rather, it provides us with an opportunity to see in what ways the model is useful, and in what other ways it is not. The value-added model is useful for understanding the precursors of collective violence, but does little to explain how the generalized belief is spread or how the violent transaction actually takes place.

The Generalized Belief, Social Constructionism and Claimsmakers

Gary Fine uses social constructionist theory to enhance the explanation of the generalized belief. He employs Smelser's model to explain how media structures, moral messages and governmental action affected the generalized beliefs surrounding the Fatty Arbuckle Scandal during 1920's Hollywood.² Gary Fine revised the generalized belief stage, claiming that belief itself does not lead to action. He argued rather that belief was used by claimsmakers to mobilize action. Structural strain is always present, but it must be meaningfully connected to the beliefs that inform and mobilize the collective behaviour (Fine, 1997). Fine argues that the social structure influences the social construction of social problems and understandings of reality. Having raised the issue of Smelser's model appearing as functionalist, Fine's argument addresses this critique, by demonstrating that structural strain is not a given.

Defining Social Constructionism

The social constructionist perspective argues that there are no absolutes or universal characteristics that define the world, and different social contexts outline and delineate understandings of events and behaviour (Berger and Luckmann, 1967). The

² In September of 1921 Roscoe Arbuckle, a star at Paramount, the largest film company, decided to hold a party at his hotel in San Francisco. Prohibition had just started but San Francisco still had access to bootlegged liquor. Virginia Rappe, an actress and model, was present at the party. As the party progressed Rappe became ill. She screamed and pulled off her clothes. She was unable to be calmed and was taken to another room and attended by a doctor. Soon after Rappe had become ill, her friend, Maude Bambina Delmont, accused Arbuckle of jumping on Rappe and crushing her bladder. She did not improve and died four days later at a sanitarium of peritonitis causing a ruptured bladder. Delmont's accusation and some of Rappe's mumblings while ill led to Arbuckle being charged with murder. After three trials Arbuckle was acquitted of murder. However, a few days later Arbuckle was banned from appearing in films.

social constructionist perspective is useful for understanding why individuals would participate in collective violence and how they understand events involving collective violence (Barkan and Snowden, 2007). It argues that there is the potential for multiple understandings of an event and also the individuals who are involved in the event (Adler and Adler, 2003). According to Gary Fine (1997), the social structure and social order are often ignored in constructionist rhetoric. He claims that these conditions inform how participants understand and react to social issues. The social structure creates the social conditions that permit certain interpretations or social constructions to gain precedence over others (Fine, 1997). Thus to understand the meanings of collective violence and how it is perceived by participants, a knowledge of structure is necessary. It is useful therefore to integrate the insights derived from social constructionism and value-added theory.

Fine argues that social constructionism and value-added theory are theoretically intertwined. One cannot claim that social constructions are real in their consequences and are able to be analyzed without claiming that social conditions are real in their consequences as well. The reality of social conditions makes social constructions plausible.

Applying the Social Constructionist Model to the Value-added Model

As stated, the social constructionist model can be applied to the value-added model in order to increase the validity of the model. An understanding of social structure

contributes to the understanding of particular problems (Fine, 1997). For example the social structure in effect can impact how protesters understand their dissent and how the police interpret the protester (Fine, 1997).

Claimsmakers employ traditional rhetoric. Thus their definitions of reality are constrained by the known discourse. Subjective discourse is reflective of a structural and objective reality (Fine, 1997). Thus an important source from which to acquire understandings of strain and hostile beliefs are the participants of collective behaviour themselves. While it is still important to question the legitimacy of what are recognized as objective social conditions, structural arrangements cannot be separated from their interpretation. This makes historical analyses of structural conduciveness and structural strain very difficult if one is not able to access the interpretations of participants who experienced these structural arrangements. Fine argues Smelser is so important to understanding collective behaviour because he combines structure with agency (1997). Fine's revision to the generalized belief is useful to not only addressing the issue of functionalism within the value-added model, but also for understanding the final portion of the precursors of the violent event. It demonstrates that the generalized belief is socially constructed and spread to other participants through claimsmakers.

Mobilization for Action and Micro-situational Violence

As stated earlier, value-added theory even in a revised format does not speak to the specifics of violent situations. Randall Collins's theory of micro-situational violence

provides an explanation for the part of the event known as the transaction. The theory is useful for explaining the details of how actors mobilize for action. Collins explains the minute details of the violent interaction and the commonalities of the situations. Smelser claims that those actors assemble against the agents which they have assigned blame, but he fails to explain how these transactions are carried out. Having explained the precursors to collective violence through the use of explanations developed by Smelser and Fine, it is now necessary to theorize about the transaction.

Violence as Situational

Randall Collins argues that violence is a situational process (2008). Like routine activities theory, his micro-sociological theory changes the focus of analysis away from the participant and toward the situation (2008). The violent situation consists of those present including those engaged in the violence the spectators and uninterested bystanders and how these parties interact (2008). Events which occur previous to the situation have little effect on whether the participants of a confrontation will be violent, or how successful they will be in their violence. Collins argues it is important to recognize some background conditions, but also that these conditions are not sufficient to explain violence. Theories that analyze only background conditions, assume that violence is easy once the confronting parties meet and motivation is present. Collins's analysis of extensive video footage, police recordings and amateur video and security video demonstrates that violence is quite difficult (2008). When individuals attack each other,

either physically or with weapons, there is increasing tension and anticipation and this is common across situations (Collins, 2008). Hence, there is a need to combine Smelser and Fine's precursors with a situational analysis of the actual violence if we want to understand not only how actors confront each other in time in space, but also what is it about the situation that allows it to turn violent.

Fear and the Ugliness of Violence

Violence is marked by fear. Collins claims that violence is not easy, and because it is not easy, it is not common. Instead violence is awful and frightening for both parties to a conflict. Most individuals are shocked when they initially encounter real violence, because real violence is ugly. The majority of the violence we see is mythical. It is staged or fake (Collins, 2008). Thus, when encountering actual violence, most individuals are overwhelmed by its ugliness. Nearly all social actors who are faced with a violent situation are fearful of not only the risk of violence, but also their own violence (Collins, 2008).

Overcoming fear and engaging in violence is a product of two forces. First, violence is a tactic involving intense tension and fear. In order to engage in violence an individual must convert the emotional tension of the violent situation into emotional energy. This energy allows the agent to engage in violence. However this violence is usually messy, brief and for the most part ineffective (Collins, 2008). Second training and organization allows one to overcome the fear and ineffectiveness of violent situations and

to participate in violence. Organization allows individuals to overcome fear that prevents most parties from engaging in violence. Violence is then easier for military and police forces, as they have been trained how to use weapons and how to conduct violence. However, despite their training, many of these social control agents continue to struggle with violence. In the case of war, for instance, the senior officers stand behind the soldiers, not to guide them, but rather to keep them from running away (Collins, 2008).

Forward Panic

A forward panic is a rush to the front of a violent conflict. Instead of running away, typical of panic, in a forward panic, the actors rush forward towards the enemy in a release of emotions of tension and fear. Forward panic has similar characteristics of the violent conflict, however tension and fear is prolonged and built up. Emotion intensifies until it reaches a peak. During this period of tension, the parties are fairly inactive. The party that ends up engaging in forward panic is somewhat passive, holding their position so that they may be able to attack when the opportunity arises. When the situation has reached a peak, the tension is released in an emotional rush of destruction (Collins, 2008).

Forward panic is exemplified by overkill. It has the appearance of an atrocity, because it is the disproportionate use of force. More shots are fired or more kicks or punches are thrown than necessary. It is the strong against the weak, the powerful against the powerless. Forward panic involves anger and rage, which are released in a hot rush of

not only physical adrenaline, but also uncontrollable laughter, loud noise and jeering or whooping. The emotional violence is unstoppable for a period of time and takes a while to calm down (Collins, 2008). The emotional energy can be described as entraining. The aggressor is emotionally entrained with the victim. Aggressors repeat their violent actions or comments, because they are caught up in the rhythm of the violence. Thus their emotional rush self-reinforcing (Collins, 2008). Other participants only add to the emotional entrainment, because they act as a form of solidarity. They cheer each other on and maintained a heightened emotion, which supports the actions of the other participants. The victim is entrained in the violence as well. They are caught up in the shock of the situation, which results in them playing the role of the victim. The victim's weakness or inability to resist actually works against them. It is their complete inability to resist that supports an atmosphere of total domination. The aggressors are encouraged by the vulnerability of the victims as the victims continue to be demoralized by the aggressor. Despite the intensity of the violence in a forward panic, the violence continues to be largely inaccurate and unorganized (Collins, 2008).

Clearly the concept of forward panic is important to the analysis of collective violence and protest. Because forward panic is the strong against the weak, it rarely occurs in the cases in which the protesters and the police are evenly matched. Rather, forward panic occurs when the aggressors are present in large numbers and the victims' numbers are few (Collins, 2008) In other words, forward panic characterizes many of the violent situations during the G8/G20 protests in Toronto. The violence witnessed often

involved the police cornering or attacking small groups of protesters in an ineffective rush of emotion.

Conclusion

While there is clearly support for the use of Smelser's value-added process to explain collective violence, the criticisms of the process also need to be addressed. Smelser does not explain exactly how the hostile belief emerges or is spread. However, Fine's recognition that social agents or social institutions become claimsmakers, who construct and spread the hostile belief, addresses this error. Further, Smelser's model brings us close to understanding how participants mobilize for action, but Collins brings us closer. His explanation of the situational process of violence illuminates how certain situations do or do not result in violence. Moreover, his use of the concept of forward panic explains how power and strength can play a role in a prolonged tense situation and affect the level of violence. The combination of Smelser's and Fine's theories help to explain the precursors to violence, while Collins's work is important for understanding the situational factors that lead to a violent transaction.

This theoretical framework is of particular value as we turn our attention to the specific case of the G8/G20 protests and subsequent collective violence in Toronto. Smelser's model is useful for framing the events of the weekend, while Fine's discussion of the generalized belief helps to explain the police understandings of the protesters.

Finally, Collin's theory of forward panic is necessary for explaining how the violent transactions witnessed came about.

Chapter 3

Methodology

In this chapter I will explain the methodology used in researching collective violence. I will discuss the selection of the research site, and why I used participant observation, semi-structured interviews, and ethnographic content analysis.

Why Toronto?

I chose the Toronto G8/G20 meetings in June of 2010 to observe protest, because international meetings of this type have a history of producing protest. My interest in protest emerges out of a broader fascination with collective behaviour. Collective behaviour, especially when it involves protest, often reflects a greater feeling of strain or displeasure with the current social structure. Class and power lines are often obvious in these situations and this is where my focus rested. The protests and collective violence that occurred in Toronto were reminiscent of several previous episodes across North America and the world in the last twenty years. There is a history of collective violence at the meetings of major economic and international organizations. This history includes the “Battle of Seattle”, a mass demonstration and subsequent collective violence during the World Trade Organization meeting in 1999 (Summers, 2001). Collective violence was later evident during the Summit of the Americas in Quebec, the G8 meetings in Aughters in 2005, the ASEM meetings in Hamburg in 2007 and at the G20 meetings

in London, England and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in 2009 (CNN, 2001; Tempest, 2005; Spiegel Online, 2007; Lewis, 2009; Urbina 2009).

Apart from the history of protest at international meetings, there was even more reason to think there might be major protests in Toronto, because of the way in which new technologies were being used by organizers. Internet groups supporting activism and protest in Toronto were becoming more common in social media such as “Facebook.” Protest organizers used a web-based communication site called Toronto Community Mobilization Network to coordinate supporters and organize events. This network listed a number of rallies, marches and masses which were planned for the G8/G20 weekend (Toronto Community Mobilization Network, 2010). Therefore, because protest was common during international meetings and because Internet organization had already begun, I thought that Toronto would host similar protests and possibly collective violence.

How to study collective behaviour

Collective behaviour is not easy to research, and thus it is often necessary to employ a combination of research methods. Historically, the study of collective behaviour and collective violence is methodologically weak (Miller, 2000). Empirical study is difficult, because these episodes are typically spontaneous and hard to predict. There are very few variables the researcher can control. Formal experiments are unethical, as they could place participants in danger (Rose, 1982). Participant observation

is a useful research method for collective behaviour events, because it allows for the study of complex processes and activity (Friedrichs and Ludtke, 1975). Participant observation is a method of discovery and thus is useful for exploring collective behaviour where it actually takes place, rather than a controlled environment. This method allows the analyst to collect data and recognize the importance of situational factors (Friedrichs and Ludtke, 1975). Participant observation as a methodology has a long history in Sociology and has been employed in many classic studies (Whyte, 1955; Humphreys, 1970; Gans, 1982; Jankowski, 1991; Venkatesh, 2000).

Defining participant observation

Participant observation is a method of research in which the researcher takes part in the phenomena he or she is studying. It involves accessing a group and gathering information through participation in the group's activities (Becker, 1958). In order to understand particular events in the group, one must be able to place these events in relation to the group's everyday life (Whyte, 1955). Placing these events in context is important, because it allows the researcher to see what led up to a particular event and how the participants and spectators understand the event before, during and after it has occurred (Becker and Geer, 1957).

The participant observer deals with two major issues in conducting this type of research. One is the role of selective perception. Observation is a result of individual world knowledge, theory and experience. Thus, no two observations are the same

(Friedrichs and Ludtke, 1975). The researcher favours certain content while ignoring or missing other content. This is affected by the prior knowledge they bring to the situation and how the situation unfolds. These observations in turn affect the quality of data and analysis they produce (Friedrichs and Ludtke, 1975). While this issue can never be completely overcome, the participant observer can attend to this problem by approaching the field with a good deal of theory, and also by asking the participants for clarification so the researcher does not misinterpret that which they observe.

The second issue with participant observation is the role the researcher plays in the community or group that is the object of study. Within the field of observation, the researcher can affect the field of action simply by being there (Friedrichs and Ludtke, 1975). Thus, an extended period of exposure is necessary to understand what usually happens. Also, the researchers need to pay attention to how others perceive their presence (Friedrichs and Ludtke, 1975). The role the participant observer takes must therefore be realistic, fitting and non-threatening (Friedrichs and Ludtke, 1975). In the case of collective behaviour research, this requirement is navigated fairly easily, because the sheer number of participants involved in the event, and the likelihood that not all participants know each other, reduces the possibility that someone would recognize an outsider.

In collective behaviour research, participant observation can provide the researcher with a full spectrum of the relevant human behaviour. This is often more representative than video coverage or other forms of observation alone (Miller, 2000).

The research method allows analysts to study the group while in motion (Alasuutari, 1998). It is a process of insight within the process of human relationships and real time (Friedrichs and Ludtke, 1975). I chose participant observation, because I wanted to analyze the ways in which participants understood and interpreted the event and to gather data on the interaction of event participants. These interpretations would help identify whether or not participants were experiencing the strained relationships with the police or were merely distressed by other sources of strain such as poverty or discrimination. Participant observation allowed me to engage in conversations with participants during the protest, conduct semi-structured interviews and observe the confrontations between police and protesters. This type of research however, has both positive and negative consequences.

The benefits of participant observation

Participation in the crowd permits the researcher to observe how peaceful protest can transition to violence. Crowd membership can also illuminate police and crowd relations (Drury and Stott, 2001). The participant observer is able to see that which is rarely visible to the outsider, because it is often purposely concealed or hidden from other such investigators as police or the media. Knowledge of such occurrences could jeopardize the participants or their plans (Miller, 2000). Therefore it is important to establish contact and trust. These issues were thoroughly discussed at the ethics approval stage.

I was able to establish contact with groups of protesters and ask questions through a number of different tactics. First, I travelled to the event on a union bus with protesters. Here I made connections with other protesters and became familiar with plans for the weekend. I also had two friends from the university on the bus who connected me to others. These others would later guide me through the protest on day one. My guides explained certain phenomena that I did not understand and pointed me to happenings that I might have missed. For example they cued me to who certain protest groups such as the Black Bloc, CUPE, Green Peace and others, pointed out police hand signals and movements and directed me to minor confrontations between the police and protesters. Second, due to the sheer size and heterogeneity of the crowd, it was assumed I was a protester. I was questioned by a few people when I pulled out my notebook. However, I was honest about my role as a researcher (as well as about being a supporter of many of the issues being protested). The explanation seemed to suffice. Often it led to more discussion. Treated as a member of the group I was able to hear things and ask questions that otherwise may not have been accessible.

Outsiders are not privy to information about organization or sudden crowd formation. The non-participant researcher is thus prevented from being in the right place at the right time (Drury and Stott, 2001). On the first day my guides were very accommodating and let me follow leads. I told them of the research I was hoping to conduct and they agreed to take me to the centre of the protest and stayed with me when I found something interesting. Their guidance was helpful for entering the protest zone and

knowing what to expect. However it hindered my ability to follow all leads, because I had to check in with them to follow each lead. On the second day, unable to contact my guides on their cell phone, I entered the protest zone alone. With few ties to any particular protesting group, I could leave wherever I was and follow new leads. An example of insider knowledge is illustrated when a large group of black clad protesters, typically referred to as the Black Bloc, broke off from the main march on Saturday and started attacking property on an adjacent street. The Black Bloc is a temporary group which uses militant street tactics and destroys property and confronts the police. The group usually consists of young anarchists, although not exclusively, who dress all in black and often mask their faces. However the Black Bloc more properly references tactics of confrontation and property destruction than a definitive group (Bisticas-CoCoves, 2003). Having overheard that those planning to engage in Black Bloc tactics were going to break off the main march while we were gathering in Queen's Park, I was prepared to follow. On the third day, I was with other protesters who had heard of increased violence at the corner of Peter and Queen Street in downtown Toronto. We were at Jimmie Simpson Park, located on the outside of Toronto's downtown, waiting for the final planned protest of the weekend, a fireworks show in support of maintaining the prison farms. Here we received insider information about the change in location and this allowed us to join other protesters on Queen Street.

In my research it was imperative that I take detailed notes. Small flip notebooks with several pens made this easier. I also had to detail the time of each observation.

Temporal accounts allowed me to analyze how quickly each event led to another. Detail and precision in my note taking improved the data with which I had to work.

The flexibility of participant observation allowed me to move when I received word that a major conflict had emerged elsewhere. This type of research also permitted me to observe the conflicts first hand. On the Saturday, flexibility was essential, as there were several locations of collective behaviour and collective violence emerging simultaneously.

Finally, participant observation research reveals participants' emotions, such as fear or shame (Becker and Geer, 1957). Reading emotions is important in the crowd situation. It provides the researcher with information about how participants react to certain stimuli during the situation, rather than trying to gather their interpretations afterwards. Retrospection is often faulty (Tavris and Aronson, 2007). The reaction to police violence is a good example. I experienced this directly when observing the protesters during the first, second and third day of protest. On the first day violence was often met with shock by the protesters. On the second day, violence on behalf of the police seemed to incite anger. On the third day the emotion had become a mix of anger and fear. The events of each day helped to inform these emotions and my understanding of them.

Difficulties in Using Participant Observation research

Participant observation involves many challenges that must be overcome. First the participant observer compiles a great deal of detailed description, which can be informative, but also difficult to analyze systematically (Becker, 1958). There is an overwhelming amount of unorganized and subjective data which the researcher must not only observe and record, but also attempt to interpret in a relatively unattached manner (Smith, 1978). Clearly, recording my notes temporally helped to organize this data. Furthermore, I had to compile these notes in a running script of the events. Finally, it was important to then code the information according to particular themes that emerged.

Second, participant observation takes a great deal of time and exertion. In some instances this research method can even be dangerous for the researcher, as the research can involve unsafe conditions or violence (Miller, 2000). This research was physically exhausting. Two of the three days I was carrying a twenty pound hiking backpack. On all three days I spent anywhere from seven to ten hours on my feet, often times running. The ability to long distance run allowed me to gather information from several different sites of the event, as well as quickly escape areas that were becoming dangerous. Thus in this type of participant observation, physical training and good health were important. Protest participant observation also involves the threat of being arrested. As a result I had to ensure that I had the phone number for legal help written on my body. I could not wear anything that could be interpreted as suspicious such as a gas mask, a bandana covering my face, or a helmet. Protesters and media representatives informed me that the police

would be targeting participants with these items. Finally, in protest participant observation research there is the danger of getting physically hurt. Thus, despite attempts to be at the forefront of most confrontations, I had to back off when the conflicts became too violent.

Third, whether or not the researcher is disguised, he or she always plays a particular role in the phenomena being studied. This role shapes not only the information the researcher accesses, but also how other participants react to the researcher (Vidich, 1955). I was twenty -three and female. All three days I was wearing a t-shirt, running shoes and shorts. I also was always carrying a notebook, although sometimes I concealed it. My appearance, my age, my gender and what I was carrying all affected how others perceived me. As a young female, I was approached and able to talk to many more men than women. My notebook often initiated conversation that allowed me to connect with more people. My clothing demonstrated no affiliation to any group and I assume was perceived as non-threatening. My research was thus somewhat skewed by my location in the field. Based on the nature of the situation I was forced to adopt the protester perspective. However, no participant observer is able to access all groups equally.

Fourth and finally, in order to attain certain information and gain genuine experiences, the researcher can become too immersed in the research and the people he or she is studying. This can make it impossible for one to be somewhat objective of the experience afterwards (Vidich, 1955). I supported the protesters I was participating with, but this was a reflection of my own political views. However, I never carried a sign, I

never took part in the violence (though I helped those who were hurt), and I never verbally attacked the police. I have kept an eye and ear on the related news stories since, but I never fully integrated into the protesting subculture. The ability to step back from the experience has allowed me to write more objectively. Recall that the information accessed in participant observation is not accessible in any other research method.

Choosing sides

Crowd events are often characterized by intergroup conflict. If a researcher remains neutral, he or she has still chosen a position in the conflict. In this scenario both sides of the conflict will treat the researcher with suspicion (Drury and Stott, 2001). How the participants react to the researcher is crucial in the type of information they will reveal and what the researcher will be able to observe. This can affect the type of data collected and accuracy (Becker, 1958). Thus researchers must not only choose sides, but also become well acquainted with the participants they are investigating (Humphreys 1970). Although I was there as a researcher, I took the side of the protesters. I marched and chanted with them. I linked arms with them and called for others to do the same. During conflicts with the police some protesters would get hurt and retreat quite quickly. I used my knowledge of collective behaviour and called out for people to slow down, so others would not be hurt. I sympathized with those who had been injured. I offered water and sometimes food to those in need. I discussed interpretations of what was happening with others. Through doing all of this, I built trust with those around me. I could then

access and observe more than the neutral observer. While the participant observer may choose sides during the research, this does not mean that such partisanship will carry over into their analysis (Drury and Stott, 2001). However, it does mean that it is important to recognize one's own position in conducting and analyzing participant observation, as well as recognizing the inherent bias in any research.

Semi-structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews complemented my participant observation research. Not all methods are suitable for all research (Friedrichs and Ludtke, 1975). In the case of a collective behaviour event, structured interviews or surveys were unreasonable, as participants were moving too quickly to take the time to be interviewed. Thus, short questions, focused on the events at hand and understandings of the event were much more appropriate. Qualitative interviews, while forfeiting the consistency of surveys, provide a fuller development of information (Weiss, 1994). These responses are not easily categorized and thus analyzing responses relies more on interpretation and integration than counting. However, these interviews are important for drawing out the processes that are the precursors to the outcome of an event (Weiss, 1994). In the case of this study, convenience sampling was used. While this type of sampling is not useful for generalization, it can be useful for learning about a group to which gaining access is difficult (Weiss, 1994). The police would be an example of this type of group. The

interactions I had with police and the few questions I was able to ask them, provided me insight into a fairly well protected group.

The interviewer is encouraged to take on the role of the naïve but interested outsider (Taylor and Bogdan, 1998). If the researcher questions that which “everybody knows,” they avoid making assumptions about the event (Taylor and Bogdan, 1998: 58). Furthermore, interviewees enjoy talking to someone who listens and asks questions (Weiss, 1994). It is also important for the interviewer to be at the right place at the right time in order to gain information they might not otherwise access (Taylor and Bogdan, 1998). In Toronto I had to be with the protest march all day, every day in order to obtain the information I needed. Also, in acting naïve, by asking and not offering alternative perceptions I avoided alienating my research participants. These skills were necessary to collect information that would guide me through the weekend and enhance my research.

Ethnographic Content Analysis

I supplemented my participant observation with a content analysis of video footage of collective violence incidents from the weekend. This footage was located through a search on online video posting site called YouTube (www.youtube.com) and Google Video (www.video.google.ca). The proliferation of video cameras and cell phone cameras throughout the weekend meant that, for the most part, all incidents of collective violence were caught on tape. Many of these videos were uploaded to the YouTube website. YouTube is the largest and fastest growing, free, video sharing website on the

internet (Peer and Ksiazek, 2010). Since its creation in 2005, it has been an unequalled leader in online video. In 2009, the website had a share of over fifty percent of the video streaming market (Peer and Ksiazek, 2010). As a result, the majority of amateur video footage from the weekend would be found on this website. However, there is no systematic way to randomly sample the videos of the weekend, as new videos are uploaded all the time, and not all videos provide the content or the visibility of the situation needed for proper analysis (Peer and Ksiazek, 2010). Thus a more ethnographic approach is necessary for analyzing this footage.

Ethnographic content analysis (ECA) is a qualitative alternative to traditional content analysis. Quantitative content analysis measures the incidence and diversity of messages in a medium in order to collect data. ECA however is much more reflexive (Altheide, 1987). Ethnography involves the observation of human behaviour and the meaning attached to that behaviour. It is a process of discovery. ECA is the interactive study of how meaning is communicated. The analyst is central to this methodology. It involves an intensive analysis of communication data, with the purpose of discovery and verification of theoretical relationships (Altheide, 1987). It is a collection of qualitative data, rather than an attempt to categorize. The reflexive nature of ECA allows new concepts to be developed while attempting to understand all aspects of the content. ECA is designed to place communication mediums within a context of meaning (Altheide, 1987).

To properly analyze the available video footage of the weekend I would not be able to use traditional random sampling, because these methods can miss important footage or issues (Altheide, 1987). I used a number of search words to locate footage of collective violence. These included *riot, violence, police, protester, G20, G8, Toronto, June 2010, attack, kettle and streets*. These search terms reflected the focus of my research, collective violence, and the results of preliminary searches I had conducted out of interest when I returned from the event. A combination of these search words, including suggested video links from the pages I found, resulted in several hours of footage of collective violence. I viewed all of this footage and narrowed the analysis down to five key incidents. In a few of these incidents, there was more than one video of the same event. In these cases I analyzed all of the videos that provided a reasonable viewpoint of the event in order to gain a full understanding what happened. The research I conducted in the field, informed the choices I made about which videos to analyze and how they were analyzed. I observed the incidents several times, noting expressions, movements, voices, shouts and physical altercations and anything else I observed. As these notes accumulated, certain themes began to emerge. This is an ethnographic content analysis because of the reflexive process through which I analyzed the data. It was a process of discovery of themes and commonalities, rather than an attempt to fit certain incidents into predefined categories.

Selected Cases for Analysis

A synopsis of the video cases of collective violence is provided here. For some of the cases there is more than one link. This is often because the footage available from one source was not enough for proper analysis.

Case A

The video for this case can be located at

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aohGLp00MmU&feature=related> and was entitled

“G20 Toronto- Police surround and attack small group of protesters at Queen and Spadina” (sic). The video can also be found at

http://www.youtube.com/watch?annotation_id=annotation_77403&feature=iv&v=280hrwKUqKg and was entitled “G20 Toronto June 27, 2010 Queen and Spadina 5:45.”

Finally the video can be found at

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KlhhO4_Q6eA&feature=related and was entitled

“Snatch and grab arrests of peaceful civilians G20 Toronto June 27 Queen and Spadina” (sic). In this conflict situation, the police surround the protesters at a major intersection in downtown Toronto. The protesters stand around and ask the police where they are supposed to go now that they are surrounded. The police begin to push the protesters into an even tighter circle and then begin to violently pull them out of the crowd. I analyzed three separate videos of this same incident to get a full picture of exactly how the police conducted the kettle, as well as how the protesters responded.

Case B

The footage for this case can be found at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GaYbq484abs> and was entitled “POLICE SURROUND PROTESTERS AND ATTACK - QUEENS PARK TORONTO - G20.” In this instance protesters are attempting to maintain their position against the police by sitting down in the grass. Moments later police push up protesters with their bicycles, repeatedly attacking some of them with nightsticks and kicking at them. For the most part the protesters disperse backward while shouting at the police. A large police presence can be seen throughout the footage. The video ends with the protesters backing up.

Case C

The video for this instance can be located at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ACcMfm3hmI&NR=1> and was entitled “Toronto G20 close up people being attacked and arrested.” In this video the camera person walks around protesters attempting to get closer to the police and protester conflict. The police are in a definitive line facing the protesters. The police then begin to push the protesters back by moving forward in groups. In so doing, they take and arrest a few protesters while pushing others back. The police then reform their line of defense against the protesters. This video demonstrates some of the snatch and grab tactics of the police and the conflicting nature of the police and protesters.

Case D

The video footage for this case can be found at two locations. One is

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Heb9BXjYcII>

and is entitled “Peaceful G20 protest at Queen & Spadina”. The second is located at

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mXoE9VGabKA> and is entitled “O Canada sung at

G20 then riot police rush the singers of Canada's National Anthem - Fuck the NWO.” In

this incident of collective violence, protesters are standing in direct confrontation with the

police. There are two distinct lines. They are in the middle of singing the national anthem

of Canada. Four protesters move to the front of the protesting line and sit down facing the

other protesters as the song finishes. When the anthem ends, the police charge forward, in

a rush of sound, and attack protesters. Those on the ground are pushed up or run over and

within seconds another the two protesters and police reassemble their lines. This time the

protesters are much more dispersed and continue to move backward.

Case E

The footage for this video can be found at

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KiLt40d_AbU&feature=related

and is entitled “Police open fire on peaceful protesters at G20.” It can also be found at

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pw2TokwsmKQ>

and is entitled “Police fire rubber bullets.” Finally, this incident can be found at

http://www.dailymotion.com/video/xdunmu_police-face-off-against-protesters_news and

is called “Police face-off against protesters outside...”. In this case a group of protesters has gathered outside of the temporary prison constructed to hold arrested protesters from the weekend. They have marched toward the prison and are interacting with the police for over an hour. Their request is for the removal of protesters from the temporary prison. In the incident the police and protesters again are placed in a conflict situation. The police rush the protesters back. Two conflicting lines again form. Here the protesters sit down and start chanting “peaceful protest.” A few minutes later the police start attacking the sitting protesters telling them to get up. The protesters again back up and attempt to construct another line. A woman moves forward from this line and shouts at the police officer about three feet away. A police officer moves forward holding a rubber bullet gun. After a few moments of hesitation she is shot. Afterwards, a few more bullets are fired and the police move forward and again push the protesters back.

Conclusion

Clearly, there are many difficulties in the study of collective behaviour. However, participant observation allows the researcher to learn how groups are organized, what meanings participants attach to their actions, how the group interacts with other groups and how it interacts internally. Participant observation also makes evident participants’ interpretations and understandings of the phenomena and their lived experience. Such observations are rarely accessible or obvious to an outsider. Although the researcher must take sides in studying crowd events, the information they are able to access is far more

substantial than what is obtained by a “neutral” observer. Thus, despite the difficulties involved in participant observation, it was the best methodological choice for this research.

Chapter Four

Findings and Analysis

As noted, violence can be conceptualized at both the micro and macro-social level. On the micro-social level, violence is not easy to perform and because it is not easy, it is not common. Violence can be understood as a situated process marked by apprehension and anxiety. In order to triumph over feelings of anxiety one side may transform those feelings into emotional energy and in turn, engage in violence rather than fleeing. For our purposes this macro-social level suggests a necessary but not sufficient condition. Particular conditions and experiences of strain are conducive to situational violence.

Smelser's value-added model in conjunction with Fine's and Collins revisions are useful in explaining not only how structural conditions and constructed beliefs which set the stage for collective violence, but also how violence emerges between two conflicting groups at the situational level. Smelser argued that hostile outbursts emerge as part of a five stage process. These stages include structural conduciveness, structural strain, spread of a generalized belief, mobilization for action and the presence or lack thereof social control. As discussed, Smelser's structural argument was revised by Fine, who argued that belief itself did not lead to action. Rather, belief was constructed by claimsmakers to mobilize action. As a result, these calls to action were situated in particular times and spaces within the social structure. This structure informs the manner

in which participants comprehend and respond to structural strain. Finally, Collins's work on violence is useful in understanding specifically how participants are mobilized. These theories form the basis of the analysis of the process of collective violence which occurred during the G8/G20 protests.

The analysis of the events of the weekend is organized in terms of the revised five stages of Smelser's value-added model. The events of the weekend revealed that both parties engaged in violence in different forms, in different situations and with varying consequences. In line with Collins's claim that violence is difficult and therefore not common, relatively little violence actually occurred. The relatively pacific nature of the weekend contrasts vividly with the sensational media imagery which characterized coverage of the protests.

Structural Conduciveness

Structural conduciveness refers to the contextual factors that cause an event to unfold in a particular manner (Smelser, 1962). In the case of the G8/G20 weekend there are several structurally conducive elements to consider. First, the event was held on a weekend. As a result, many residents of Canada were not working. Without the requirements of work, many participants were available to engage in the protest. Second, the protest occurred in June. As a typically warm month in Toronto, participants were able to leave their homes earlier, stay out later and not worry about harsh weather conditions. As the weekend continued the weather became more and more important as

public transportation systems were shut down in the center of the city and movement was restricted to mostly pedestrian or bicycle traffic. Third, Toronto is a metropolis. A large and diverse population contributed to the sizeable participant population. Many people already lived in the city and thus did not need to travel far. Those who did travel into the city to protest had little trouble, because the city is a transportation hub. Fourth, almost one billion dollars was allocated to funding the cost of the police officers (Haupt, 2010; French, 2010). As a result, around 20,000 police were present, and situationally available to engage in violence, during the protest weekend (Toronto Police Service, 2011). Fifth, large portions of the downtown core were shut down and employees were encouraged to work from home (Toronto Police Service, 2011). Shutting down parts of the city provided a relatively empty downtown core for the protesters to gather, free from regular traffic or commerce. It is evident these conditions allowed for numerous protesters and police to come together in time and space, with the potential for situational violence.

In addition, the access to and use of communication technologies is very relevant to structural conduciveness. Individuals rarely protest, rather, groups protest. This means, that for others to get involved in protest, they likely need to know someone who is already involved in the activist community (Scott, 2008). Thus, we can comfortably assume that the numerous structures of communication available during the G8/G20 protest led to the amassing of several thousands of protesters. Each technology played a role in assembling participants. Websites, such as Toronto Community Mobilization Network, were used to provide information about the planned demonstrations and

marches for the weekend. Social media sites such as Facebook were used to connect protest groups to potential new recruits. As well, group events were planned on these sites to help coordinate transportation for the protesters. Cell phones and text messages were used to connect different groups during the protest weekend, so that they could assemble and disperse quickly as needed. In using these technologies, protest groups were able to increase their numbers, assemble large groups in very little time and avoid the police in certain areas.

Structural Strain

Structural strain is often explained as the experience of deprivation or injustice (Smelser, 1962). In the case of the protests, the strain existed between the police who were there to control the masses and the protesters who claimed they should be able to express their right to free speech wherever they pleased. In order to analyze the strain existing between the police officers and the protesters, one need not look much further than the slogans shouted by the protesters and the scare tactics and abrasive stance of the police. Non-violent confrontations between the police and protesters, such as stand-offs in the street and protesters destroying police property, exemplified this strain as well.

On the first full day of the protests, Friday, June 25, several young protesters could be heard shouting “fuck the police.” This claim quite directly reflects the distaste of the police expressed by several of the protesters. Although the majority of the signs reflected political opinions directed to the G8/G20 leaders such as “No one is illegal,

status for all,” “G20 can end exploitation, why don’t they?” “Who is representing us – where are the women at the G8/G20?” “Give us back the special diet!” and others, the voices and chants of the protesters told a different story. The protesters often voiced their displeasure with the police for blocking their planned march to the G8/G20 leaders’ headquarters and for protecting the fence around downtown core where the leaders were meeting. Cries of “let our voices be heard” and “let us go to the fence” were common and directed at the police. Several of the participants supported their signage by claiming they were frustrated with the government policies that disadvantaged them. However, unable to express these frustrations to the individuals who developed and decided on these policies, participants were left to articulate their dissatisfaction to the police. While many of the protest participants recognized it was not the police who decided on these policies, the police were preventing them from accessing the leaders who did. As a result, as with many protest situations, the police and the protesters were placed in direct physical opposition.

Many of the conflicts involved nothing more than police preventing the protesters from going down certain streets and accessing certain areas. The police would form a barricade, by standing side by side with shields out and batons at the ready. The less organized protesters would also form a line, which was much more fluid and unstructured. Here they would face the police, with several hundreds or thousands of protesters behind them and yell at the police to let them through. On these occasions, the police rarely responded to the protesters verbally other than telling them to “move back”.

Several of these confrontations were relatively uneventful. The police would hold their ground, every so often changing placement of police, and the protesters would remind the police that they were peaceful and should be allowed to protest wherever they wanted. The chant that most likely conveyed this expression was “Whose streets? Our streets!” This chant was used most often in these confrontations. I gathered that the chant was meant to remind the police that the protesters were trying to march on their own streets, and that the police were blocking their right as Canadians to do so. These confrontations also built tension between the protesters and the police. The police were prepared to stop the protesters if they should surge forward and try to claim certain streets for their march, and the protesters were angry that the police were preventing them from marching. This tension gave rise to an obvious strain between the protesters and the police. This strain, marked by anger and the stand-off situation, began to compound, after each confrontation. As a result, the tension was prolonged and built up, and led towards a climax. My observations, as well as my analysis of the video footage, indicate that the structural strain evident in the increasing tension between the police and protesters contributed to conduciveness of the situation for collective violence.

The Generalized Belief

The generalized belief refers to the point in the process in which the meaning of collective violence is established (Smelser, 1962). This is the belief that guides the participants into action. Recall that Fine argues belief by itself does not necessarily lead

to action. Rather claimsmakers actively construct and spread beliefs in order to mobilize action. Claimsmakers meaningfully connect structural strain with the beliefs that inform and mobilize the collective behaviour (Fine, 1997). In most analyses of collective behaviour, the analysis focuses on the generalized belief of the protesters. In this case, analyzing the emergence of the generalized belief for the police is not as easy, because the police communications are not as readily available to outsiders. Thus, the understandings of the situation and protesters, from the view of the police, must be analyzed from the few incidents in which the police spoke to the protesters or about the protesters, as well as the documented views of the police available online or through the media.

It can be argued that the generalized belief shared by police was that the protesters were dangerous and needed to be controlled. This view derives support from a variety of data sources including conversations with police, and video footage. A process of dehumanization of the protesters was evident in all of these data. Dehumanization is the process in which a social actor begins to believe that another individual or group of individuals is less than human. As a result, actors believe that they can treat the dehumanized worse than others, since they do not deserve the same treatment as a good human being (Zimbardo, 2007). The police would never openly define the protesters as less than human. However, the protesters were constructed by the media and the officers in charge, such as Bill Blair chief of Toronto police, as a “mob” who threatened the values of safety and security the police held dear. The police made their interpretation of

the protesters as trouble makers clear on a number of occasions. For example, they told me that there were many trouble makers in the crowd. Furthermore, in conflict situations, the police would remind protesters that they were there because of their problematic actions. This interpretation was likely fuelled by the confrontations with protesters, as well as some of the property damage done by particular protesters.

The generalized belief consists of assigning responsibility to the object or agent causing anxiety or ambiguity (Smelser, 1962). The police assigned the protesters the blame for the need for police presence during the weekend and their constant tension with the protesting group. If the protesters had just not come then there would be no need for so many police. However, this belief does not just arise out of thin air. It is constructed by the sort of propaganda we see in war time, where victims are blamed for their own fate. Propaganda is defined as ideas or images that claimsmakers, construct and perpetuate about a group (Zimbardo 2007, Best 2008). The Toronto chief of police, Bill Blair, was a key claimmaker in the propaganda constructed around the protesters, because he had “expert status.” Expert status involves holding special knowledge in one’s field. Experts are considered skilled in interpreting social problems, because they have special knowledge that pertains to the social problem (Best, 2008). As chief of police, Blair was considered to hold special knowledge about criminal behaviour and potential risks to safety and security. His claimmaking status is particularly effective in this case, because he was in charge of the police force that weekend. In several of his interviews before, during and after the protests, he referred to the protesters as “the mob.” He also

claimed that some protesters “came to attack our city.” He repeatedly thanked his police force for their “courageous actions” and for their ability to stand up “against these criminals.” This rhetoric reinforces the “us versus them” dichotomy, in which the police are reminded that they are in the right, they are the good side and opposing the bad side. Clearly because the police chief had expert status, he was a key claimmaker in how the public and the police understood the protesters as dangerous and criminal.

The media played a key role in claimmaking as well. The media can alter how a social issue is understood, however they are often not the initial claimmakers (Best, 2008). News workers have very little time to get a story out to their audiences. Time restrictions lead to a restructuring of the initial claim, one that is shorter, more unambiguous and more dramatic. Stories that are easily packaged or contain dramatic footage are often selected over stories that do not provide visuals or defined roles of good and evil (Best, 2008). In the case of the G8/G20 protests, several news stories featured loops of the burning car and individuals dressed in black smashing windows. These images were the easiest to obtain and very dramatic, and they supported the police presence. The images also reified the police chief’s claims that these protesters were a dangerous and destructive mob. Through both experts and the media, the protesters were constructed as dangerous, unpredictable and violent.

The manner in which the protesters were constructed resembles how an enemy is constructed in war time, and this dehumanizing protest was reflected in the interactions with the police over the three days. During bag searches, the police often made reference

to what they regarded as the disreputable nature of some of the protesters. When searched on the first day, I told the police officers who searched me that I was a researcher. At this point they told me that while they expected a peaceful protest, there were several protesters who were only “there to cause trouble.” Two of them warned me to be careful and to avoid those protesters in all black, as a lot of them were there to “just wreck shit up.” The police were clearly relaying a generalized belief that there was a violent group among the protesters who should be controlled, because they are irrational, violent, or the bad “others” not the good “us.” On the last day of the protests, I was searched again, this time I was alone and surrounded by ten police officers. After finding my notes, and realizing that I was not lying about being a researcher, the officers proceeded to tell me how I did not look like a protester anyways. Most of the women who were protesters, they claimed, were not very attractive, appeared not to shower and for the most part were “very hairy.” While these comments may not appear to fit the criteria of dehumanization, they demonstrate a perceived hierarchy in which the police officers felt that female protesters were not as attractive or good as “regular” women and therefore were likely not worthy of the same treatment.

The generalized belief, that the protesters were dangerous, could easily turn violent and thus needed to be controlled, was also noticeable in the physical stance and actions of the police. In confrontations with the police, officers refused to make eye contact. Rather, they moved their eyes aggressively from one protester to the next. Whenever I caught an officer’s eye they immediately shifted their gaze away. If I

continued to stare, they would look back only for a moment and then immediately and uncomfortably shift their gaze away again. Eye contact is important for understanding both police confrontation training and dehumanization. Little or no eye contact reflects the dehumanizing process, because looking into the eyes of “the enemy” often forces the other side to recognize their humanity. Thus, in the confrontation situation, the police are trained to never look in the eyes of the enemy (Collins, 2008). By refusing to look any protester in the eye, it was evident that the police understood us as the enemy. Eye contact also makes violence very difficult (Collins, 2008). As a result, if the police refused to look into the eyes of the protesters, it would be easier for them to engage in violence.

There were numerous other cases in which I noted the generalized belief of the police that the protesters were a dangerous group. The police often repetitively called out to each other to maintain formation against “the enemy.” I often heard commands such as, “hold the line” and “tighten up.” These commands were often made in loud, but somewhat distressed voice, as though there were some fear that the protesters would break through. The police would also rarely communicate with the protesters, despite the repeated attempts on the side of the protesters to engage the police in conversation. The protesters often asked the police to drop their shields and join them in protest because they thought they and the police should be fighting on the same sides. The protesters also attempted to get the police to talk to them about what they were protesting. The police rarely responded to the protesters. The refusal to communicate with the protesters

demonstrates police training to not show weakness in the face of the enemy by engaging with them on their level. The police only spoke to the protesters when they conducted searches or during confrontations and this was often in the form of a command. These commands often consisted of repeatedly shouting “Get back!” or “Move! Move!” Such commands demonstrate the police assertions of control in the confrontation situation.

The precipitating event is the action or events that give the behaviour substance and confirms existing fears and hatreds (Locher, 2002). In the case of the G8/G20 protests, the numerous confrontations and the property destruction by a few protesters should be considered the precipitating events. The destruction of property consisted of a small group of protesters using rocks and sign poles to smash store and car windows, as well as another small group lighting a police cruiser on fire. Such property violence confirmed the constructed claim that this “mob” was dangerous. The confrontations, while not particularly violent, often consisted of verbal abuses of the police and a coming together of hundreds and thousands of people against the police. Such stand-offs definitely contributed to build up tension and fear on behalf of the police. Through the claimmaking ability of experts and the media, the crowd was constructed as dangerous. The generalized belief, coupled with the structural conduciveness of the situation and the strain between the police and protesters, set the stage for mobilization for action.

Mobilization of Participants for Action

Mobilization of participants for action includes the factors that bring participants together to act upon the generalized belief (Smelser, 1962). Smelser claims that leaders, organization and access to resources are necessary for mobilization (1962). However, Smelser fails to explain the micro-situational process through which the mobilization of violence occurs. Recall that Collins argues that violence is a situational process (2008). The violent situation is tense and often accompanied by fear. This fear and tension often causes the situation to terminate. For violence to occur, the actors must overcome their fear. To do so, Collins argues they transform emotional tension into emotional energy (2008). The instances of collective violence witnessed that weekend are what Collins calls forward panic. As stated, forward panic is characterized by prolonged tension and anxiety leading toward a peak. When the conflict has reached a climax the participants, who have been holding back, suddenly become very active and their tension and fear come out in an emotional rush of violence and destruction. This is what happened in the episodes of police violence on protesters. The police and the protestors were in a state of tension for several hours, and the police believed the crowd was the enemy. I will analyze several cases in which these situational processes are evident in order to support this argument.

The Emotional Rush

The forward panic is characterized by an emotional rush in which prolonged tension is released in physical adrenaline and emotional anger and rage. This emotional rush also often consists of a lot of noise and violence. Emotion and noise are evident in the video footage of the police violence. In all five cases to be discussed, the adrenaline rush can be witnessed in the way in which the officers rush the crowd. In cases A, C, and E specifically, the police officers rush in the crowd and grab protesters and drag them out. In case E, the police officer who has grabbed a protester and thrown him against a house, has a visible face of anger. His jaw is clenched, his eyebrows narrowed and his face tense. Also, his emotion and adrenaline is evident in the manner in which he violently throws the protester against a wall. In case B, the police blow their whistles quite loudly and begin to violently push protesters up with their bicycles. The noise combined with the aggressive rush forward is characteristic of the forward panic. In cases A, C and D the police officers yell or create a lot of noise with their batons while they rush the crowd. The noise is a reflection of their anger and emotion as the situation reaches its climax and their emotion is released on the crowd.

Emotional Entrainment

Forward panics are also characterized by emotional entrainment. Emotional entrainment is repetitive aggressive behaviour or verbal commands within a forward panic. The angry emotion is self-reinforced through repetition (Collins, 2008). Emotional

entrainment through repetition is witnessed most obviously in these cases through the police officers use of commands, and their use of batons and pepper spray. In case A, B, C, and E, after the police had rushed the protesters they repeated commands at the protesters. In all of these cases, at least a few police officers repetitively shouted “get back, get back!” In case E, the police shouted “Go,go, go! And “move, get up, get up!” In all of these cases, the commands were repeated several times by several officers. Repetition maintains the aggressors’ emotional energy, as well as demonstrates how one gets caught in their own aggressive rhythm.

Emotional entrainment also occurs between the two sides. It is domination of one side over the other (Collins, 2008). The aggressive side gains emotional dominance through the demoralization and disintegration of the other side. In case D, the protesters run away when they are rushed by the police. Amidst shouts of terror and physical fleeing, weakness is displayed and the police gain emotional dominance of the situation. The protesters do not make a stand or fight back because they are caught up in the fear and the emotional entrainment of the situation. When the rushing slows down and the police and protesters reconvene their lines, the protesters shout at the police. However, they have dwindled in numbers and their shouts, while angry, are marked with trembling, reminiscent of fear. The protesters do not display the same boldness they did moments before they were rushed, when they were singing to the police. The protesters also demonstrate their asymmetrical emotional entrainment in case A, when they are kettled. Kettling is a police tactic in which protesters are surrounded by a circle of police. If they

attempt to leave from within the circle, they are usually arrested (Rosie and Gorringe, 2009). In this case of kettling, the protesters yell at the police, but their voices are weakened and fearful. Another girl within the crowd is crying and begging to be let free. There are very few protesters in this group and it is thus easy for the police to target and dominate. They are no longer facing a massed opponent. Kettling does not have the same atrocious appearance of most forward panics, because it occurs at a much slower rate and does not consist of one group running from the other (Collins, 2008). However, the police still are caught in emotional entrainment in this situation as they have cornered the weak and are periodically attacking and arresting those kettled, fairly violently in this case.

Bystanders contribute to entrainment and forward panic, because their presence requires the actors to demonstrate solidarity (Collins, 2008). The number of people at the scene of conflict contributes to the likelihood that a forward panic will occur (Collins, 2008). Increased police presence does not contribute to forward panic, simply because there are more people available to take part in the attack, or more people who contribute to anonymity. Rather, the greater number of people contributes to the emotional entrainment which involves a high level of interaction and solidarity (Collins, 2008). In case E, the police officer looks back at his fellow officers before he shoots his weapon. His shifting position reflects tension and hesitation. He looks to the other officers to gain support for his action. This social interaction is reminiscent of solidarity, the police officers support his actions and thus it is easier for him to engage in violence. In all other

cases, the police presence is fairly substantial, and this solidarity contributes to the police violence and forward panic, they amplify each other's emotions and anger.

Overkill

Overkill is another characteristic of forward panic. Overkill is the over use of force, the strong attacking the weak, unnecessary tactics used to break up the group (Collins, 2008: 94). There are several instances in which overkill was observed during the G8/G20 protests. In case A, a protester was dragged out by their neck. Another protester was dragged out by her shirt. While these do not appear like overkill initially, the police proceeded to pile on top of these protesters in order to arrest them. In case E, the violent arrest is also evident. Protesters were grabbed and thrown either against a building or the ground, and then covered by several other police. In these cases the protesters seemed to barely resist. The police officer could have likely handcuffed the protester by themselves and yet several police officers joined in these arrests, likely to the physical detriment to the protester, who was being crushed by their weight. In case B and D, the protesters were seated while they protested. Here the police ran them over on foot or in case B, their bicycles. In case B, the police also kicked protesters and hit them with batons. Furthermore, they sprayed pepper spray directly into the eyes of some of the protesters. These protesters were not resisting, nor being violent. They were trying to get up while the police pushed them back. The police use of force here was overkill. They were attacking unarmed and seated protesters. Violence is most successful when the strong

attack the weak (Collins, 2008). This dynamic is observable in both cases. The final and most dramatic example of overkill is observed in case E. After several clashes between the protesters and the police, the protesting group has backed up fairly far from the temporary prison. A protester came forward out of the group and was yelling at the police. A police officer has moved toward her and is holding a rubber bullet gun. When the protester turns to look back at the crowd, a moment in which the police officer need not look at her eyes, he shoots her at close range. Afterwards a few more bullets are shot at the crowd. It appeared that the crowd posed no real threat to the police at this point. Despite shouts of displeasure, the protesters made no indication that they would engage in violence. There was no need for such violent force to push the protesters back. This incident is clearly overkill. In each of these cases, the strong attack the weak and more force than necessary is used to push back the protesters. Here the characteristics of forward panic are evident and observable.

All of the cases analyzed here represent forward panic for several reasons. They demonstrate a rush of emotion and physical adrenaline. Emotional entrainment is evident in police commands such as “get back” and “go, go,” as well as bystander solidarity. Finally, during each incident the police over use force to achieve victory. They hit and kick protesters too many times, they spray them with pepper spray and they shoot them with rubber bullets. Clearly, these incidents of collective violence witnessed at the G8/G20 protests can be defined as forward panic.

Social Control

The final stage of Smelser's value-added model is the operation of social control. This counter determinant consists of social control forces preventing, redirecting or interrupting collective violence (Smelser, 1962). The presence or absence of social control agents is usually discussed in reference to the presence or absence of the police. Agents of social control failed to prevent, interrupt or redirect violence in these cases, because they were responsible for the violence. Social control forces are often discouraged from engaging in conflict with the crowd (Lewis, 1972). However this was impossible in the case of the G8/G20 protests, as the police were source of the violence. While the prevalence of cameras and video footage likely hindered some of the potential police violence, or led to some police officers being held accountable, there were no agents of control for the police. This lack of accountability was further underwritten by the tendency of the police to remove their nametags.

Conclusion

Clearly, the collective violence witnessed at the G8/G20 protests in Toronto can be understood according to a revised version of Smelser's value-added model. Structural conditions and the generalized belief set the stage for the collective violence, by contributing to the placement of the participants of violence, the strain between the violent and the victims and the constructed understandings of the victims. The mobilization for action was characterized by a forward panic, in which the police

transcended the prolonged tension and fear and transformed that emotional energy into violence. Finally, the violence was poorly controlled, because the agents of social control were themselves engaged in the violence. The analysis demonstrates the validity of Smelser's models and its additions in explaining collective violence.

Chapter Five

Summary and Conclusions

In the final chapter I summarize the thesis and present my conclusions. While the thesis has taken an event perspective, the focus has been on the precursors and transactions. However, for the sake of comprehension, a discussion of the aftermath is necessary. By the time the protest weekend had come to a close, over one thousand people had been arrested or detained. Hundreds of others had been victim of some kind of police collective violence. Participants, victims and legal representatives came together in the following weeks and began the process of a public inquiry into the police behaviour. Their work resulted in a class action suit against the Toronto Police Services Board in August of 2010. This inquiry and subsequent class action suit demonstrated that some Canadians were not convinced that the police behaviour represented the security and safety its supporters claimed.

Through this study I have attempted to demonstrate the value of an integrated theoretical framework for explaining police collective violence in protesting crowd situations. In the second chapter a review of collective behaviour and collective violence literature was presented. It was argued that collective violence can be understood according to the event process of precursors, transactions and aftermath, using Smelser's value added model to set up the stages of this process. The precursors included structural conduciveness, structural strain and spread of a generalized belief. I revised the

generalized belief stage according to Fine's argument that claimsmakers play a role in constructing and dispersing the belief. The transaction, mobilization for action, consists of violence between conflict groups. Collin's theory of forward panic informed this part of the theoretical framework. Forward panic is useful for explaining how social agents overcome their fear of violence and how they engage in aggressive behaviour at the group level.

Chapter three involved a discussion of the methodological framework. I explained how several methods are necessary for event-based research. The benefits and limitations to participant observation and the reasons for using ethnographic content analysis and semi-structured interviewing were discussed. I also elaborated on how the events of the weekend unfolded and several of the practical issues involved in the study.

In chapter four I offered an analysis of the events of the weekend through the value-added process. Recall the value-added process involves structural conduciveness, structural strain, the spread of a generalized belief, mobilization for action and the operation of social control. This involved an analysis of the factors that set the stage for collective violence and how the social agents actually engaged in collective violence. Through the analysis and findings, it was demonstrated that the example of police violence at the G8/G20 protests in Toronto, Ontario in June of 2010 supported the proposed theoretical framework.

Research Implications

This research has several implications. First, it begs the question of how researchers can best understand collective violence. I initially approached my data with the intent to explain the minor incidences of protester violence. However, I could not ignore the obvious examples of police violence from the weekend. This is especially true considering that the police are supposed to “serve the people” and in this case, repeatedly attacked them. Perhaps then, in past collective behaviour research, too much time has been spent on trying to explain the “wrong” side of the conflict. This research adds to a growing literature that interrogates tactics and violence by the wielders of power.

Similarly, my research has implications for how we understand protesters and police. Currently, a great deal of media constructs protesters as “rebels” and the police as the only means of security against the rebels. In the news leading up to the protest, this was the case. However, as the events of the weekend shifted, more and more media outlets began to question the role of the police as protectors. This was partly due to the treatment of media by police over the weekend. Several media representatives were also attacked, arrested and targeted. Other factors that contributed to the shift in coverage included the access to the amateur video which was so necessary for my analysis. As these videos began to circulate the internet, reporters could no longer ignore the police violence. The most evident example of this is the Fifth Estate that aired in March of 2011. The Fifth Estate is an hour long investigative reporting show that airs on CBC, a major Canadian news network. This episode titled *You Should Have Stayed at Home*, brought

these amateur videos to the forefront, along with several of the protesters who had experienced police violence. This report and others that emerged during and after the weekend directly challenged the police status of protectors.

Third, in regards to methods, this research illuminates issues in event-based research. The research requires a triangulation of methods, because of the complex nature of a collective behaviour event. In conducting similar research, a tape recorder would have been useful for taking notes. I was searched by police three times over the weekend. In the last search my notes were removed from my bag and some of them were read. Had I spoken my notes into a tape recorder, these tapes could have been hidden from the police easier than notebooks. Further, because of the nature of protest, I could have had more detailed descriptions of what I was seeing rather than trying to write down everything and walk or run at the same time. Having another trained researcher would have been useful for covering more ground as well. Further, connecting with more participants carrying video cameras and exchanging information could have provided me with a larger pool of video footage to analyze. This is especially useful if not all photographers upload their footage to online sharing sites such as YouTube.

Fifth, the study has implications for future police violence research. Interviewing police prior to the event would have better elicited understandings and beliefs about the protesters. It could also illuminate police understandings of conflict situations, and their emotions in those situations. Future police violence research could also consider comparing police violent behaviour across situations, jurisdictions and countries. Doing

so could not only support the theoretical framework proposed here, but also offer insights in how to reduce the likelihood of future police violence.

This brings me to my sixth and final implication. The research presented here can inform policy regarding protest situations and police training. In this study I have shifted away from considering historical antecedents to violence. I have demonstrated that it is the situational factors that contribute to the likelihood of violence. Currently the protest situation sets up the police and protesters in direct and tense conflict. Thus the situation needs to be altered to reduce the threat of collective violence. If police and protester interests could be allied through the guiding of marches and the encouragement of cross group discussion and interaction, the conflicting nature of the situation would be reduced significantly. The constructed belief of the protesters as the violent “other” would have little influence here. If we reduce the opportunities for collective violence, then in turn, we reduce collective violence.

Limitations

The research is subject to a few limitations. For one, because of the protected nature of the group, I was relatively unable to access the police. Lacking access to the police brings up issues of the lack of transparency and the privilege of secrecy, both of which are indicators of power. Had I been able to access the police, I would have been provided with verification for the spread of a generalized belief and a better understanding of the police’s experiences within the collective violence event. Any

attempts at doing so after the fact were impeded by the public inquiry into the police behaviour. This silenced the police force regarding their actions and they were unlikely to reveal anything that might be used against them. However, the discussions I was able to have with police over the weekend provided me with a good base on how they were experiencing the event and how they understood the protesters.

Another limitation reflects the availability of video footage. Most of the footage posted was fairly amateur and did not always provide a great deal of detail. I was also restricted to the footage that others chose to share. This restriction reduced the diversity of the sample of collective violence events available for analysis. However, because of my experience as a participant observer, I was aware of the majority of collective violence incidents throughout the weekend. Having this knowledge reduced ambiguity about the materials I was able to collect.

Conclusions

This thesis has combined three theoretical frameworks in order to explain collective violence phenomena in a protest event setting. I have argued that collective violence can be understood in an event process. Precursors such as structural conduciveness, structural strain and a generalized belief set the stage for a conflict situation. The nature of the situation, for example prolonged tension, anger and fear, can result in a hot rush of emotion on one side of the conflict leading to a piling on of aggression and overkill. The other side, shocked by the sudden rush of violence does little

to defend themselves. In the aftermath of these violent transactions, the victims can be left questioning what happened, and how their assailants were able to engage in such aggressive behaviour. The thesis offers a distinctive theoretical assemblage to understanding collective violence and will hopefully contribute to further research in this area.

References

- Adler, Patricia A. and Peter Adler. 2003. *Constructions of Deviance: Social Power, Context and Interaction*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Alasuutari, Pertti. 1998. *An Invitation to Social Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Allport, Floyd. 1924. *Social Psychology*. Cambridge: The Riverside Press.
- Altheide, David L. 1987. "Ethnographic Content Analysis." *Qualitative Sociology*. 10(1): 65-77.
- Auyero, Javier and Timothy Moran. 2007. "The Dynamics of Collective Violence: Dissecting Food Riots in Contemporary Argentina." *Social Forces*. 85(3):1341-1367.
- Barkan Steve E. and Lynne L. Snowden, 2001. *Collective Violence*. Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.
- Becker, Howard. 1958. "Problems of Inference and Proof in Participant Observation." *American Sociological Review*. 23(6) 652-660.
- Becker, Howard S. and Blanche Geer. 1957. "Participant Observation and Interviewing: A Comparison." *Human Organization*. 16(3):28-32
- Berger, Peter and Thomas Luckmann. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor.
- Best, Joel. 2008. *Social Problems*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Ltd.
- Bisticas-CoCoves, Marcos. 2003. "Black Bloc, Pink Bloc, Reflections on the Tactics of the Anti-Globalization Movement." Retrieved April 20, 2011 from www.sspp.us.
- Black, Donald. 1983. "Crime as Social Control." *American Sociological Review*. 48(1):34-45.
- Buechler, Steven M. 2008. "Social Strain, Structural Breakdown, Political Opportunity and Collective Action." *Sociology Compass*. 2(3)1031-1044
- CNN. 2001. "Police Push Back Protesters as Quebec Summit Opens." *CNN World*. April

21. Retrieved June 8, 2011 from http://articles.cnn.com/2001-04-21/world/summit.americas.03_1_protesters-demonstrators-globalization?_s=PM:WORLD
- Collins, Randall. 2008. *Violence: A Micro-sociological Theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Crossley, Nick. 2002. *Making Sense of Social Movements*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- De la Roche, Roberta Senechal. 1996. "Collective Violence as Social Control." *Sociological Forum*. 11(1): 97-128.
- Di Felice, David. 1999. "The Richard Riot: A Socio-Historical Examination of Sport, Culture and the Construction of Symbolic Identities." M.A. Thesis, Department of History, Queen's University, Kingston, ON.
- Drury, John and Clifford Stott. 2001. "Bias as a Research Strategy in Participant Observation: The Case of Intergroup Conflict." *Field Methods*. 13(1): 47-67
- Gans, Herbert J. 1982. *The Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian Americans*. New York: The Free Press.
- Houpt, Simon. 2010. "Will the G20 Really Sell Toronto?" *Globe and Mail*. June 17 Retrieved June 30, 2010 from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/will-this-really-sell-toronto/article1608303/?cmpid=rss1>
- Humphreys, Laud 1970. *Tearoom Trade: Impersonal Sex in Public Places*. Piscataway: Aldine.
- Fine, Gary F. 1997. "Scandal, Social Conditions and the Creation of Public Attention: Fatty Arbuckle and the Problem of Hollywood." *Social Problems*. 44(3): 297-323
- French, Cameron. 2010. "Toronto Faces Hard Post-G20 Security Questions." Reuters. June 28. Retrieved September 12, 2011. From <http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/06/28/us-g20-toronto-idUSTRE65R4JW20100628>
- Friedrichs, Jurgen and Harmut Ludtke. 1975. *Participant Observation: Theory and Practice*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Fuller, John R. 1993. "The Rodney King Verdict and Urban Riots: A Value-Added

- Theory Perspective.” *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*. 9(2): 42-45.
- Jankowski, Martin S. 1991 *Islands in the Street: Gangs and American Urban Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Le Bon, Gustave. 1897. *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
- Levy, Linda. 1989. A Study of Sports Crowd Behavior: The Case of the Great Pumpkin Incident.” *Journal of Sports and Social Issues*. 13(2): 69-91.
- Lewis, Jerry M. 1972. “A Study of the Kent State Incident Using Smelser’s Theory of Collective Behavior” *Sociological Inquiry*. 42(2): 87-96.
- Lewis, Paul. 2009. “G20 Protests: Cry Havoc- and Let Slip a Rainbow Alliance of Summit Protesters.” *The Guardian*, March 28. Retrieved September 30, 2010 from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/mar/28/g20-protests-london>
- Locher, David A. 2002. *Collective Behaviour*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Miller, David. 2000. *Introduction to Collective Behaviour and Collective Action. Second Edition*. Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Martin, Andrew W., John D. McCarthy and Clark McPhail. 2009. “Why Targets Matter: Toward a More Inclusive Model of Collective Violence.” *American Sociological Review*. 74:821-841.
- Marx, Gary. 1970. “Issueless Riots.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political Social Science*. 391: 21-33
- McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. “Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory.” *American Journal of Sociology*. 82(6): 1212-1241.
- McPhail, Clark, 1991. *The Myth of the Madding Crowd*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- McPhail, Clark, 1994. “Presidential Address: the Dark Side of Purpose: Individual and Collective Violence in Riots.” *The Sociological Quarterly*. 35(1): 1-32
- McPhail, Clark and David Miller. 1973. “The Assembling Process: A Theoretical and Empirical Examination.” *American Sociological Review*. 38(6) 721-735.

- Parsons, Talcott. 1951. *The Social System*. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Parsons, Talcott and Edward A. Shils. 2008. *Toward a General Theory of Action: Theoretical Foundations for the Social Sciences*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Peer, Limor and Thomas B. Ksiazek, 2010 “Youtube and the Challenge to Journalism.” *Journalism Studies*. 12(1): 45-63.
- Piven, Frances F. and Richard A. Cloward. 1979. *Poor People’s Movements: Why they Succeed, How they Fail*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Reicher, Stephen. 1984. “Social Influence in the Crowd: Attitudinal and Behavioural Effects of De-individuation in Conditions of High and Low Group Salience.” *British Journal of Social Psychology*. 23(4): 341-350.
- Ritzer, George and Douglas Goodman. 2004. *Contemporary Social Theory*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Roberts, Julian and Cynthia Benjamin. 2000. “Spectator Violence in Sports: A North American Perspective.” *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*. 8(2): 163-181.
- Rose, Jerry D. 1982. *Outbreaks: The Sociology of Collective Behaviour*. New York: The Free Press
- Rosenfeld, Michael, 1997. “Celebration, Politics, Selective Looting and Riots: A Micro Level Study of the Bulls Riot of 1992 in Chicago.” *Social Problems*. 44(4): 483-502
- Rosie, Michael and Hugo Gorringer. 2009. “What a Difference a Death Makes: Protest, Policing and the Press at the G20.” *Sociological Research Online*. 14(5): 4.
- Ruggiero, Vincenzo. 2006. *Understanding Political Violence: A Criminological Analysis*. New York: Open University Press.
- Sacco, Vincent F. and Leslie W. Kennedy. 2008. *The Criminal Event: An Introduction to Criminology in Canada. Fourth Edition*. Thomson Nelson.
- Schweingruber, David and Ronald T. Wohlstein. 2005. “The Madding Crowd Goes to School: Myths about Crowds in Introductory Sociology Textbooks.” *Teaching Sociology*. 33(2): 136-153.

- Scott, Nick. 2008. "The Social Dynamics of Canadian Protest Participation." in *Mobilizations, Protests and Engagements: Canadian Perspectives on Social Movements*. Ed. Marie Hammond-Callaghan and Matthew Hayday. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Seidman, Steven. 2008. *Contested Knowledge: Social Theory Today*. Fourth Edition. Boston: Blackwell Publishing.
- Smelser, Neil. 1962. *Theory of Collective Behavior*. New York: The Free Press
- Smith, Michael, 1976. "Precipitants of Crowd Violence." *Sociological Inquiry*. 48(2): 121-131
- Smith, Susan R., Raeann R. Hamon and Bron B. Ingoldsby. 2008. *Exploring Family Theories*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Louis M. 1978. "An Evolving Logic of Participant Observation, Educational Ethnography, and Other Case Studies." *Review of Research in Education*. 6: 316-377
- Spiegel Online. 2007. "Violence in the Hamburg Streets During Monday Protest." *Spiegel Online International*. Retrieved May 1, 2011 from <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,485366,00.html>.
- Summers, Clyde. 2001. "The Battle in Seattle: Free Trade, Labor Rights and Societal Values." *University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Economic Law*. 22(1): 61-90.
- Tavris, Carol and Elliot Aronson. 2007. *Mistakes were Made (but not by me): Why We Justify Foolish Beliefs, Bad Decisions and Hurtful Acts*. Orlando: Hartcourt Books.
- Taylor, Steven J. and Robert Bogdan. 1998. *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods*. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Tempest, Matthew. 2005. "Protesters Try to Storm G8 Summit." *The Guardian*. Retrieved May 1, 2011 from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2005/jul/06/g8.world>.
- Tilly, Charles. 2003. *The Politics of Collective Violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Toronto Community Mobilization Network. 2010. "G8/G20 Community Solidarity Network." Retrieved June 20, 2011. From <http://g20.torontomobilize.org/> Toronto Police Service. 2011. "G20 Toronto: Canada 2010." Retrieved May 5, 2011 from <http://www.torontopolice.on.ca/g20/>
- Turner, Ralph and Lewis Killian, 1957. *Collective Behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Halle Inc.
- Urbina, Ian. 2009. "Protester Are Met by Tear Gas at G-20 Conference." The New York Times, September 24. Retrieved September 25, 2011. From <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/25/us/25pittsburgh.html>.
- Useem, Bert, 1985. "Disorganization and the New Mexico Prison Riot of 1980." *American Sociological Review*. 50(5): 677-688
- Venkatesh, Sudhir A.2000. *Off the Books: The Underground Economy of the Urban Poor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Vider, Stephen. 2004. "Rethinking Crowd Violence: Self-Categorization Theory and the Woodstock 1999 Riot." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*. 34(2):141-166
- Vidich, Arthur J. 1955. "Participant Observation and the Collection and Interpretation of Data." *The American Journal of Sociology*. 60 (4): 354-360.
- Walder, Andrew G. 2009. "Political Sociology and Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 35: 393-412.
- Weiss, Robert S. 1994. *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. Toronto: The Free Press.
- Whyte, William F. 1955. *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Yablonsky, Lewis. 1959. "The Delinquent Gang as a Near-Group." *Social Problems*. 7(2):108-117
- Zimbardo, Philip. 2007. *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil*. New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks.