



Kent Academic Repository

Petrosian, Vardan (2015) *Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-branch of the Occupy London Movement*. Master of Arts by Research (MARes) thesis, University of Kent,.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/54421/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

This document version

UNSPECIFIED

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-branch of the Occupy London Movement

By Vardan Petrosian¹

Abstract

The rise of new media through network globalisation has led to innovative forms of “new” social movements. This study will explore whether Occupy London, a branch of the global Occupy movement, fits within the realm of a “new” social movement. A further six areas of contention are drawn from a review of literature exploring old and new social movement theory, globalisation/alter-globalisation and perspectives on sousveillance and new media. Through ethnographic participant observation and semi-structured interviewing during Occupy Democracy’s May 2015 occupation of Parliament Square, this research studies the political makeup of the movement, its demography, perception by law enforcement and use of traditional and alternative sousveillance techniques in order to fully understand the advancement of the movement, its aims and future. It further analyses how the movement’s advancement in their use of the Internet and other new media platforms could potentially cause a shift from its continuous media blackout to a more growing presence within the criminological landscape.

¹ This thesis is submitted in fulfilment of the degree of Masters by Research in Criminology, September 2015, University of Kent. Supervisory panel: Dr. Phil Carney and Prof. Roger Matthews.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my friends and family for their unconditional encouragement throughout the duration of my postgraduate studies, and my girlfriend Nara Mackenzie for her enormous patience and reassuring words that motivated me to continue challenging myself. I express my sincerest gratitude to my supervisors Dr Phil Carney and Prof Roger Matthews for unremitting support in my academic development throughout the researching and writing of this thesis. Much of this work is attributed to the fiery supervisory techniques of my panel, who have pushed me consistently to progress as an ethnographer and researcher in the study of criminology. I express my appreciations to David Manlow for his words of encouragement at the most challenging times. Finally, I would like to acknowledge my work-colleague Paul West for his brilliant advice on techniques of alleviating writer's block.

Contents

1. Literature Review	2
1.1. “Old” Social Movements	2
Classical Approach.....	3
Resource Mobilisation Approach	4
1.2. “New” Social movements.....	6
Origins.....	6
Demography	7
Production of Knowledge	8
Globalisation and Alterglobalisation	9
1.3. Occupy	11
Occupy Wall Street and Occupy London	11
Demography	13
Values	14
Occupy and Alterglobalisation	17
The Battle for Space	18
1.4. Sousveillance	20
1.5. New Media and Occupy	22
1.6. Research Questions	24
2. Methodology.....	26
2.1. Epistemology	26
2.2. Approach	27
2.3. Methods	29
2.4. Digital Recording & Visual Criminology	32
2.5. Analysis.....	35
2.6. Ethics	36
2.7. Challenges.....	39
Access	39
Data Collection	40
3. Findings/Analysis.....	41
3.1. Occupy Democracy.....	42
3.2. Politics.....	44
Campaigns	44
Spectrum	45
Green Party	48
Cannabis.....	49
3.3. Demography.....	51
3.4. Law Enforcement.....	54
Police-Demonstrator Relationships	55
Arrests.....	57
Court Representation	62
3.5. Sousveillance & New Media	63
Live-Streaming & Uploading	64
Surveillance vs Sousveillance	66
Legal Observation as Sousveillance	70
Technological Advancement	72
4. Conclusions.....	74
4.1. Future Recommendations	78
5. Appendix	80
6. Bibliography.....	88
6.1. Interviews	88
6.2. Academic	89

The Occupy movement has immense potential to maintain its continuous presence. Its emergence and sharp rise was revolutionary and unlike anything that had previously before been witnessed. In order to understand this, however, one must delve into the social, historical and political contexts of the era in which the movement emerged. Why did it emerge at the time that it did? What makes it so unique and revolutionary? How has it maintained its presence for so long? What potential impact could the movement have on society?

Essentially, the aim of this research is to understand how new media is used within Occupy London, and how this leads to the advancement of the global Occupy movement. As a result of the review of literature outlining the theoretical framework that informs the research, there was a subsequent ethnographic participant observation (and semi-structured interviewing) conducted during a demonstration organised by the Occupy Democracy sub-branch in May 2015 (in the days leading up to, and following the UK General Election). The selection of this demonstration was based upon two significant factors; the timing of the event around the country's most prominent election, and the planned collaboration between the Occupy movement and other movements and agencies within the UK.

This thesis provides the review of literature, and an overview of the methodological epistemology, approach, methods of data collection and method of analysis of the study. It outlines the ethical considerations that were taken into account while conducting the fieldwork during the May demonstrations and comments on the challenges faced during fieldwork. It provides the findings of the research, touching on the background of the movement, its political standpoint, demographic makeup of the group studied, how the demonstrations were policed and the involvement of legal practices. This is then followed by an analysis of the use of new media by participants and "organisers". Finally, the study concludes with a summary of the main findings and points of analysis, and provides future recommendations for those wishing to conduct similar research into this topic.

1. Literature Review

This review of literature contains six main sections. The first section draws attention to previous theories attempting to explain the rise and actions of participants in “old” social movements, and how those theoretical perspectives are no longer applicable to contemporary and “new” social movements. The second section focuses primarily on new social movements and their difference in many aspects in comparison to “old” social movements; origins, demographics and values. It will then define and explain the importance of both globalisation and alterglobalisation in shaping the landscape of new social movement theory and the Occupy movement that falls within. The third section explores Occupy itself. It notes the uniqueness of the movement as a contemporary new social movement while still reinforcing the demographic makeup of traditional new social movements at the era of their emergence, emphasises similarities and differences between Occupy and the alterglobalisation movement. It then uses draws from studies into Occupy to demonstrate how globalisation has created a relationship between online and offline spaces, and connects this with studies of “sousveillance” utilised by the Occupy movement. The review’s fourth section focuses on research surrounding sousveillance, leading to exploration of previous studies conducted on the use of new media by the Occupy movement. The review will conclude with the key research questions that this study seeks to answer, and signpost the order in which this will be done.

1.1. “Old” Social Movements

When studying the rise of movements such as Occupy London, it is important to first consider the history of social movement theory; its origins and distinguishing features. A good starting point in summarising the theoretical basis underpinning “old” social movements is Byrne (1997). His book *Social Movements in Britain* features a culmination of theories and authors in the study of social movements and their origins. Byrne provides a broad and useful account of the different theoretical perspectives used (to date) in attempting to theorise social movements. Often drawing on Parkin’s empirical data of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, he

also describes briefly the demographic background of social movement participants. Although his account of social movement theory bares more resemblance to a textbook of collected sources rather than an analytic framework for the future directions in the study of “new” social movements, this section will use the well-termed concepts featured in Byrne’s work, and point out some of the crucial links that Byrne missed in his analyses of both old and new social movement theory.

Academics normally begin by citing Tilly & Tilly’s (1981) historical account of social movements, which compared 18th, 19th and 20th Century movements to one another within their respective contexts. In this case, it is not necessary to delve too deep into more historical social movement theory for two reasons: firstly, Tilly & Tilly’s analysis of the historical process from the 18th to 20th Century leading to changes in ways in which social movements rise, has largely been undisputed by social movement theorists, and secondly, as “new” social movements are more contemporary forms of social movements, and are to be studied as continuous processes rather than mere *ex nihilo* entities, it is more appropriate to examine more contemporary (20th Century) social movement theory in understanding why the shift between “old” and “new” social movements occurred in respective social, political and economic contexts. Although there was an over-emphasis on the role played by Rational Choice Theory in their analysis, Tilly & Tilly highlighted the significance of the introduction of the political process in shaping the changing landscape of protest from the 18th to 19th Centuries. National electoral politics was noted as the fundamental process subsequently leading to changes in collective action from the 19th to 20th Century. They also refer to the introduction of “exotic features” evident within social movements in the 20th Century; costumes, disguises, symbols and rituals (p. 20).

Classical Approach

The Classical Approach, according to Byrne, features analysis of social movements on both macrosociological and microsociological levels. The two levels often go hand-in-hand in classical sociological studies, largely due to the ease of defining macro concepts using micro terms (Rocher, 2004: 5). In this case, although theorists such as Heberle, in his 1951 book *Social Movements: An Introduction to Political Sociology*, attempted to combine the two levels of analysis in a more balanced way,

many often delve into over-emphasis on the individual actor (Byrnes, 1997: 38) participating in a protest or social movement. Byrne provides a critique of the Classical Approach in, what he describes as being, researcher attempts to cloud the judgement of society by providing explanations of “irrational” actions of individuals. This is a key aspect of the Classical Approach. Where Heberle focuses primarily on the personality, psychopathy and psychoanalytic frameworks in analysing those involved in social movements, a significant portion of analysis is missed into the role of society and its failures that can cause uprisings. Similarly, studies into collective behaviour and relative deprivation both (although taking into account some societal aspects) over-emphasise individuals’ actions in trying to explain the complex nature of the rise of social movements in a post-industrial era (Dalton & Kuechler, 1990: 6). The failures of the Classical Approach (p. 39) led academics to further the research into social movement theory in hope of finding a feasible alternative framework. The introduction of a more contemporary form of analysis of social movements emerged; known as Resource Mobilisation Theory.

Resource Mobilisation Approach

Although referred to as a “theory” by many academics studying social movements, it is more effective to refer to the term as an “approach” as (which will become clearer in subsequent sections) it seems more of a tool for assisting analysis rather than a theory on its own. Based on the assumption that there will always be grievances in society, the Resource Mobilisation Approach stresses importance in the availability of resources, whether these be physical resources (such as monetary funds) or mental resources (such as academic knowledge or skill), in explaining why some grievances turn into social movements over others (Ebaugh, 2010: 7; Morris, 1984: 280; Kuumba, 2001: 53; Goodwin & Jasper, 2009: 193; Tilly, 1978: 7). Byrne’s argument is that the analysis of the Resource Mobilisation Approach is at a meso sociological level, focusing on bridging the gap between micro and macrosociological levels (McAdam et al., 1988: 729), a fairly radical approach in the study of social movements at the time of its emergence. However, despite this attempt, there is considerable difficulty in applying the Resource Mobilisation Approach to larger social movements. Its use as a method of analysis is only

applicable to smaller-scale and less-organised social movements (Pakulski, 1991: 12).

Pakulski often draws on the work of Touraine when explaining the rise of social movements and mass social movements, commenting on Touraine's typologies of social conflicts and forms, and schools of social thought. However, the most significant point he makes in his analysis relates to the "production of knowledge". He argues that social norms, culture, ethics and morality are all produced and reproduced by 'ruling classes' (p. 21). However, availability of resources does not sufficiently explain why certain demographics take part in some social movements and not others, and, therefore, claiming that actors prioritise benefits of participation over its risks renders the reputation of the Resource Mobilisation Approach not entirely dissimilar to that of the Rational Choice Theory (Breinlinger & Kelly, 2012: 14).

This notion of production of mental knowledge is a key bridge between "old" and "new" social movements. Byrne seems to separate many of the concepts related to new social movement theory; the new middle-class concept, political opportunities, post-materialism. However, it is evident, not solely through analysis of Byrne's work, but in contemporary studies of new social movements (which will be more evident in subsequent sections), that these concepts are not only linked, but interlinked, with the core being new social movement theory itself. There are challenges in studying new social movements, such as the lack of the Resource Mobilisation Approach in explaining the "newness" of new social movements, which could otherwise be studied if focus was more on the ideology of a movement rather than availability of resources (Dalton & Kuechler, 1990: 9). It is clear, then, that Byrne does not take into account both the outdated nature of the Classical Approach and the criticisms associated with the Resource Mobilisation Approach in studying the shift between "old" and "new" social movements. There is a need to study new social movements by their ideological assumptions and influence in order to fully understand how they have, not only maintained their presence, but developed and flourished into sub-movements (such as environmental, anti-war, alterglobalisation and Occupy) evident in contemporary Western society.

1.2. “New” Social movements

Origins

There are some minor disagreements among academics as to the exact decade that can be officially attributed to the transition between “old” and “new” social movements. Nevertheless, all studying new social movement theory agree that the time-frame of its emergence falls in the era between the 1960s and 80s. This mass of new movements included environmental causes (Santos, 2013: 16; Saunders, 2013: 122; Obach, 2004: 122), women’s movements (Aggleton et al., 1992: 73; Porta & Diani, 2006: 6), civil rights movements (Kelly, 2001: 108; Powell, 2007: 115), LGBT rights (Fitzgerald & Rayter, 2012: 122; Hall, 2011: 4; Enyedi & Deegan-Krause, 2013: 7) and anti-war movements (Gottlieb et al., 2006: 37; Frickell & Moore, 2006: 301; Blau, 2007: 199). They originated around the mid-late 20th Century, but evidently could not have been possible without a sudden shift in values. An era termed by many as the “New Left” (Levy, 1994: 201; Klatch, 1999: 238; Frost, 2001: 147), many of the movements seemed to evolve through values associated with “liberalism”, described by de Ruggiero as:

‘a deep-lying mental attitude; its primary postulate, the spiritual freedom of mankind, posits a free individual, conscious of his capacity for unfettered development and self-expression.’

(de Ruggiero, 1942)

New social movements differ dramatically from “old” social movements, primarily, in demography, ideology and structure (Boggs, 1986: 46; Byrne, 1997: 47; Foweraker, 1995: 14; Fominaya & Cox, 2013: 22; Dalton & Kuechler, 1990: 10). Although attempting to explain this new phenomenon, the Classical Approach failed to account for the reasons why social movements were on the increase during the rise of the welfare state (Ellis & Kessel, 2009). Dalton & Kuechler provide four points of contrast between “old” and “new” social movements; ideology, origins, structure and goals (pg. 10). In ideological terms, there has been a clear transition from hierarchical and bureaucratised movements preceding new social movements to this notion of “freedom” and “libertarianism”. In comparison to many of the prior labour

movements, the movements of the mid-late 20th Century seemed to demonstrate a sense of unique ‘emotional togetherness’ (Siurala, 2002: 28). Similarly, Burgmann (2003) spoke of the shift from movements that were based on class to those based on identity (p. 19). “Old” social movement values were characterised primarily by class; demographically made up of members of the same class status, whereas “new” social movements have a lack of social grouping (p. 12). In reality, however, this is not necessarily true.

Demography

In contrast to Dalton & Kuechler’s (and Burgmann’s) claims regarding the demographic makeup of “new” social movement participants, studies conducted in the 60s and 70s anti-nuclear and peace movements seemed to indicate that a majority of those participating were made up of younger, well-educated and intellectually savvy individuals. Nelkin & Pollock (1981) studied the demographic composition of the anti-nuclear movements in France and Germany, suggesting that many participants seemed to be young and well-educated, many of them still students. Similarly, Richardson & Rootes (1995) found that the majority of participants in anti-nuclear movements, organised by “The Greens” in Germany during the 70s, were ‘young educated activists’ (p. 19). Jongerden & Ruivenkamp (2008) analysed new social movements through the development of agricultural activists during the 1970s. The primary activists arguing for social change (made difficult by the political structure of the era) were predominantly young students associating themselves with agricultural new social movements (p. 220). Even Klandermans & Oegema’s (1987) quantitative study of the 1983 Dutch peace movement via mail and telephone surveys, produced results suggesting high levels of education and intellectual achievement among participants. Thus, questions naturally arise as to the economic and intellectual makeup of new social movement participants. Is it the case that all new social movements are dominated by young and intellectually advanced participants? What socio-economic grouping do these participants belong to?

Byrne dedicates a fairly large section of his notes to, what he terms, the “New Middle-Class Concept”. In many theoretical accounts of new social movements between the 60s and 80s, it is evident that aside from the age and intellectual capacity of participants, there is an over-representation of middle-class participants

(Giddens & Sutton, 2010: 158; Vahabzadeh, 2003: 25; Saunders, 2013: 129; Porta & Diani, 2006: 56; Barker et al., 2013: 5). The dominance of young, middle-class involvement in new social movements also raises a further question for those studying new social movement theory; if class struggle is no longer a significant focus in demonstrations, then could the association of one class with particular social movement create hostility or alienation with other classes?

Production of Knowledge

The idea of symbolic change is also one that must be explored further, especially in relation to contemporary new social movements. There has clearly been a shift from material to non-material values among social movement participants. The reason for this is that the former is no longer needed; ‘once an individual has attained physical and economic security he may begin to pursue other, non-material goals’ (Inglehart, 1977: 22). Indeed, the era to which the rise of many new social movements can be attributed is widely known as the post-war “economic boom”, where material goals were no longer a prime necessity (Braunstein & Doyle, 2002; Marcus, 2006: 42; Om-Ra-Seti, 2012: 240). Linked to this concept is post-materialism, which is concerned with ‘higher order needs’ that cover personal growth, participation at all levels of decision-making and socialisation (Byrne, 1997: 55). Byrne did not delve particularly deep into the analysis of this concept, so was unable to make the necessary links that connected both post-materialism and the “New” Middle-Class concepts, with new social movement theory as its core. All three aspects of post-materialism are key to the rise of 21st Century new social movements.

Additionally, Byrne’s examples of Green movements in the UK and Germany illustrate that the rise of social movements largely depend on a three-fold system (what he called Political Opportunity Structures); the type of political system in place, the timing of technological and international developments, and cultural attitudes of the era (p. 56). Although this argument does not necessarily determine the subsequent development of movements, the system could potentially have significant impact on it. In this case, the most crucial phase of the system linking directly to modern-day new social movements is that of technological development. The contribution of technology in the rise of 21st Century new social movements is

much more vast and noteworthy than it had been in the new social movements of the era in which they originated.

If the three concepts were linked with one another more visually, then the key ideological value of new social movements being the ‘desire for freedom’ without interference from the state (p. 48) becomes the core of the web that connects the necessity for production of knowledge and intellectual growth, made possible primarily through modern technological advancement. The specific role of technological advancement in the rise and development of the Occupy movement will be further explored in the sub-section *The Battle for Space*; referring to the interconnected relationship between physical and virtual *space* and Occupy, the state, and law enforcement.

Globalisation and Alterglobalisation

Contemporary studies of new social movement theory have sparked debates among academics regarding the impact of globalisation on participation in movements, whether in relation to movement values, availability of resources or strategies implemented by those participating. Globalisation, in sociological terms, has many definitions. Martell (2010) culminates three categories of globalisation under the umbrella of sociological theory; pre-modern, proto and modern globalisation. It must be noted that defining globalisation is entirely dependant on the social, historical, political and economic contexts of its attempt. As Martell has already taken these contexts into account, this study will use his three-part definition to: firstly, understand globalisation and alterglobalisation and its impact on contemporary society, secondly, in doing so...attempt to explain the development of the alterglobalisation movement and, finally, connect the latter analysis to contemporary new social movement theory in order to explain the rise and presence of the Occupy movement in recent years. Martell concludes his historical analysis of globalisation by defining it:

‘(1) as worldwide rather than regional; (2) as beyond movements and connections, where regularity and systems and structures occur; and (3) where connections turn into things that have mutual effects worldwide, interdependency.’

(Martell, 2010: 66-67)

Globalisation has had a tremendous effect on late-modern society (so dubbed by Jock Young in his 2007 work *The Vertigo of Late Modernity*), as it has produced a shift from the international to the global, while at the same time maintaining invulnerability to authority and control (Archer, 2014: 221). The globalisation of the capitalist economic system used by in many Western countries cannot be attributed to a particular political party or ideology, as its presence is omnipotent and beyond external or internal influence. This does not mean, however, that it hinders movements from taking advantage of the “global” in order to provide an easy platform for the rise and spread of ideology, values and belief. As this is the case, it can become a useful tool for the promotion of democratic values of freedom of speech and expression. Moghadam (2013) writes of the global shift from traditional metatheories of social movements developed by American academics, who viewed movements as merely expressions of democracy, to current globalised forms of new social movements signifying a more mature and deepening form of democracy (p. 62). Similarly, Smith & Johnston (2002) dedicated a chapter of their co-edited work *Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social movements* to conducting cross-national comparisons between new social movements, concluding that movements in different countries seem to resemble one another in techniques of mobilisation and strategy. In Todd & Taylor’s 2004 work *Democracy and Participation: Popular Protest and New Social Movements*, one can find, most significantly, a suggestion that the most important strategies of new social movements involve the building of the movements themselves, and the critical mass and visual presence of the movements (p. 66). This indicates that globalisation provides advantages for the successful rise of new social movements in contemporary society, but can only do so if it is used as a tool. Fundamentally, the values associated with globalised movements precisely reinforce this use of the “global” in order to achieve production of knowledge, rejection of the “old” social movement over-emphasis on material resources, and promotion of deeper democratic values and freedom.

In simplistic terms, alterglobalisation can be defined as an anti-capitalist movement, but not necessarily suggesting that all participants have an active intention of overturning the globalised economic system (Pleyers, 2010). Pleyers’ writings on alterglobalisation begins by arguing that the motivation for many of the

participants during the rise of the movement in the early 21st Century is linked to a desire for ideological and political influence of Northern countries, in order to improve the poverty-stricken situation of the South. As the alterglobalisation movement has developed over the course of the 21st Century, it has become the case that many who participate not only use globalisation as a tool, but at the same time oppose economic globalisation as a system for the production of profit (Schlembach, 2014: 24). In doing so, the alterglobalisation movement has tremendous potential in influencing and eventually ‘transforming economic globalisation as it is currently understood’ (Schuerkens, 2008: 202). This provides room for two conclusions: firstly, it suggests that in order for new social movements, such as the alterglobalisation movement, to be successful, they need to utilise the tools provided by globalisation itself in order to oppose certain aspects of it, and secondly, it reinforces that the priority for many involved in new social movements is on democratic advancement, rather than material or economic capital.

1.3. Occupy

What then is the link between the alterglobalisation movement and the rise of Occupy? There is a strong connection between the disadvantages of economic globalisation that led to the Wall Street crash in 2008 and the rise of the Occupy movement across the Western world (Porta & Mattoni, 2014). State politics has been disconnected with power; political roles as representatives of constituencies have become a one-way process, with a lack of proactive change due to the constraints of globalisation (p. 122). While Europeans took to the streets in the years following the crash, it became evident that the US income distribution had become astonishingly unequal; the top 1 percent of taxpayers of both New York and Connecticut earned ‘on average 40 times the income of the bottom 99 percent’ (Sommeiller & Price, 2014: 12). The US Internal Revenue Service (IRS) released a report confirming this in 2011 and many citizens took to the streets in protest.

Occupy Wall Street and Occupy London

Inspired also partially by the Arab Spring (Castells, 2012), a wave of protests and rioting in many Middle-Eastern countries around the same era (Werbner et al., 2014;

Rand, 2013; Bebawi & Bossio, 2014; Howard & Hussain, 2013), Occupy emerged through the alliance of various protesters from around the US. The discontent was explained very simply:

‘The Occupy movement is based on the popular outrage at the growing disparity of wealth and power between individuals and corporations, as well as the failure of political representatives to resolve the problems of increasing unemployment, housing foreclosures, paralysing student debt and the aggressive defunding of social services’

(Nail, 2012: i)

The first public and most significant occupation organised was that of Zuccotti Park in New York City by Occupy Wall Street on 17th September 2011 (Gitlin, 2013: 5; Howard & Pratt-Boyden, 2013: 731; Kern & Nam, 2013: 196; Thorson et al., 2013: 422; DeLuca et al., 2012: 483; Costanza-Chock, 2012: 376; Gledhill, 2012: 342), where the rise of the slogan “We are the 99%” emerged. This occupation was both symbolic and direct as it was located in the heart of Manhattan’s Financial District (Welty et al., 2012: 144). Later this was to become the Occupy movement’s “trademark”; the occupation of spaces of symbolic significance (Steger, 2013: 120). This is a key difference between “new” social movements and the Occupy movement, where the focus is not on consumerist issues but on rights to public space and public ownership of institutions. As the Occupy movement spread across the globe, 15th October 2011 saw the occupation of St Paul’s Cathedral in London following rejection by the City of London Corporation to allow protesters to occupy the London Stock Exchange (Pickerill & Krinsky, 2012: 279; Fragkou & Hager, 2012: 532; Halvorsen, 2012: 427; Gledhill, 2012: 342; Köskal, 2012: 446; Howard & Pratt-Boyden, 2013: 731).

The sole centres for the making of decisions before, during and after occupations were General Assembly meetings, where participants gather and, through the use a variety of hand gestures and slogans, declare either their agreement, disagreement or neutrality to proposed action plans (Coy, 2013: 215; Smaligo, 2014; Harvey, 2014: 902). This is a new form of language, innovative and unique to the Occupy movement. The fact that anyone present would be granted the ability to propose ideas and plans of action, makes the process entirely participatory; a revolutionised version of direct democracy (Costanza-Chock, 2012: 383; Razsa & Kurnik, 2012: 244). In doing so, the Occupy movement is engaging in unprecedented practices that

differ substantially from other new social movements. As Juris notes in his ethnographic observation of the Occupy Boston camp in October 2011:

‘Although the meetings were frequently long and tedious, many occupiers point to these open, participatory assemblies as embodying an alternative to the current representative democratic order disproportionately influenced by the 1%.’

(Juris, 2012: 263)

Emphasising the extended length of the General Assembly meetings indicates that the process of participatory democracy is complex and requires a large amount of time to achieve results. Most results are visible through the organisation of Working Groups, where small and large groups are organised in order to provide various types of support for participants and other members of the public (Writers for the 99%, 2011: 78). In combination, both General Assembly meetings and Working Groups form the basis of the Occupy movement’s strategies in creating and maintaining a new and revolutionary form of democracy.

Demography

The demographic makeup of many of the participants in the Occupy movement is, however, not unique to other new social movements. Feye (2011) features a rather one-sided account of the movement, suggesting that ‘the demographics of the movement include all people’ (p. 6). Due to the ideological nature of the movement, this was the intention of those who participated in the Occupy Wall Street movement in Zuccotti Park and the Occupy London movement at St Paul’s Cathedral, but contemporary and ethnographic studies suggest that this is not necessarily the case. Reinforcing previous research into the demography of members of new social movements, Occupy Wall Street was dominated primarily by young, white and middle-class individuals (Welty et al., 2012: 67; Dahlgren, 2013: 73; Pollock, 2013: 12; Naples & Mendez, 2015: 181). This is potentially problematic as it makes the movement susceptible to mass negative portrayal by traditional media platforms, such as the headline by ABC News at the time of its rise following a newspaper blackout boycott of coverage (DeLuca et al., 2012: 488); ‘*Wall St. Protester Seeks “Cute Anarchist” on Craigslist Missed Connection*’ (Curry, 2011).

Furthermore, studies not only indicate that there has been a lack of representation of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups, women, the LGBT community and those of working-class status, but that there have been instances where these groups have been undermined and demoralised through the processes of General Assembly Meetings and Working Groups organised by the movement. The domination of white and straight middle-class men within the movement is argued to be as a result of its lack of structure (Costanza-Chok, 2012), a value that will be explored in the subsequent sub-section. At the same time, quantitative analysis into Occupy emphasises the challenges faced by the movement in its lack of representation of class and race differences within society, which are crucial in maintaining economic and cultural equality (Juris, 2012). In the case of Juris' work, Occupy Boston was made up of predominantly white, male and middle-class individuals; reflective of much of the research around demographics of new social movements. In addition, the observations of Chou (2014) found that there was also under-representation of women and a domination of radical and fundamentalist groups. However, in light of the lack of theoretical strength of Chou's study, his conclusions are arguably far-reaching and primarily supported by personal interpretations from ethnographic observation, a methodological issue that will also be noted in the chapter on **Methodology**.

The lack of representation of certain demographics in the Occupy movement has not, however, in any contemporary study been suggested as deliberate or intended. These issues are ones that must be further explored in relation to the movement, as certain groups being under-represented may prove problematic in the movement maintaining their values. There must be commitment in embracing the social and political contexts surrounding demonstrations in order to understand why there is such an over-representation of individuals from certain socio-economic groupings and backgrounds, not limited to participant observation but also through interviewing of participants and "organisers". Essentially, one must understand these aspects of the movement not just through personal interpretation and observation, but also through the meanings that participants themselves attach to them, otherwise there is a risk of propelling qualitative social research into the world of journalism.

Values

The values of the Occupy movement are revolutionary, not only when comparing them to traditional labour movements and street protests, but also to the types of “new” social movements highlighted in criminological and sociological literature. The notion of “acting-out” the type of political system that they wish to be implemented (through General Assembly meetings and Working Groups) creates alternative values that differ from other “new” social movements; *structurelessness*, *leaderlessness* and *decentralisation*. These values are the key aspects in explaining why the movement’s rise was sharp and its presence continuous. Essentially, structurelessness is the demonstration of fluidity, spontaneity and opposition to rigid boundaries to decision-making (Gould-Wartofsky, 2015: 8; Ellens, 2014: 38), boundaries often found in many “old” social movements. However, in practice it seems that Occupy’s structureless approach sometimes works against the aims of the movement in attempting to support the “99%”. Several academics reference Jo Freeman’s famous publication in 1970, *The Tyranny of Structurelessness*, when noting that structurelessness hinders the progress of General Assembly meetings and damages the movement when new activists join (Smith & Glidden, 2012: 289; Gamson & Sifry, 2013: 161). This is an issue that has previously been raised with regard to the demographic makeup of the movement. If there is no specific structure, then it is arguably difficult to control the types of people taking part in meetings and demonstrations, potentially harming the other values of the movement if there is over-representation of particular views. However, although (in entirety) the movement claims to be structureless, the General Assembly meetings do not appear so. Maharawal, (2013) argues that not only are decision-making practices at General Assembly meetings not structureless, but they are ‘highly structured, technical, and often laborious’ (p. 178). Indeed, if hand signals, gestures and slogans are used during General Assembly meetings, then there must be some element of structure in order to allow decisions to be made. Whether these decisions are made by participatory means is a different issue.

The idea of leaderlessness is in the form of opposition to hierarchy. Its social relations have been categorised as ‘horizontal’ and rejecting of the traditional political systems and methods of organisation (Lubin, 2012: 187). In challenging the idea of neo-liberalism (Brown, 2011), the movement has been able to establish its identity through the process of “negation”. This simply means that the movement identifies itself with that which it is not. As Donati notes:

‘In the modern symbolic code, identity is defined in terms of processes and the process of acquiring identity is conceptualized through negation: A is defined as the negation of everything that is not A.’

(Donati, 2011: 69)

In this case, the Occupy movement defines itself not just by the values that it portrays or by the aims of creating an alternate form of direct and participatory democracy, but also by the negation of everything that does not define it; neo-liberalism, capitalism, the 1%, private ownership of space and institutions. How the movement articulates this to the general public and its participants is also a question that needs exploring. If the general public or its participants are not made aware of the specifics of the movement, then there is little hope that their numbers will grow and the movement flourish further. Therefore, one must analyse how members of the public understand the values or ideology behind the movement; are the almost polar-opposites that the movement negates made public effectively?

Decentralisation provides several advantages to the movement. It not only means that globalisation allows for simultaneous occupations to take place in several parts of the world, thus increasing the spread of the message that Occupy wishes to make, but it also allows the movement to remain largely unaffected if one (or more) occupation proves unsuccessful (Gelder, 2011: 10). It is a value that demonstrates the process of negation in the formation of Occupy movement identity. In this case, Occupy, with its interconnected and well-networked presence, differs from the state in that the state will be directly affected when a disaster occurs in its core base (where decisions are made). State power is considerably determined by centralisation in comparison to the Occupy movement. Therefore, in negating the power of the current social, political and economic system, the movement is able to harness and build on its own power through the combination of the three values. They demonstrate, quite clearly, the potential influence that the movement has in challenging existing dominant discourses. The values are reinforced continuously through General Assembly meetings and Working Groups, differing dramatically from the structure of current political systems. In doing so, the movement expresses its desperate willingness to oppose contemporary capitalist economic systems, through the process of: (1) “acting out” the exact version of politics they strive to

create and (2) assisting those who they consider to be the “99%”; those at the lowest end of economic and power status.

However, a significant question also worth exploring with regard to these values is whether they are demonstrated by all branches of the Occupy movement. As there is no structure to the movement, the branches that emerge all arguably have differing aims and objectives. In this case, it is important to consider whether or not the aims of each branch and their subsequent demonstrations are true to the established values of the Occupy movement generally. Only in this way can one understand if there is potential for the movement to remain as powerful as it has been in recent years.

Occupy and Alterglobalisation

The strategies of the Occupy movement differ somewhat from the alterglobalisation movements preceding them. As Aitchinson’s study of the student protests in 2011 illustrates, new social movements must be clear in the strategy that is, or should be, implemented in order to meet their aims. In the case of the student protests, Aitchinson concludes that they were largely unsuccessful as the strategies and purposes of the occupations became unclear and blurred over the course of time. Contemporary studies of Occupy suggest that many of the strategies that were implemented by the movement may have been inspired by those of the alterglobalisation movement, though were not identical. Razsa & Kurnik (2012) highlight the fundamental differences in practice between Occupy Slovenia and Occupy Wall Street; although both practice participatory democracy as a key principle, they differ in structure of practical decision-making. They note that many of the Occupy Slovenia protesters had previously participated in the alterglobalisation movement, but that the values differed subtly from those of the Occupy movement in Ljubljana. Another key difference between the Occupy movement and the alterglobalisation movement is that the focus of the former is more localised ‘in the context’ of the global rather than in addressing international institutions (Kern & Nam 2013: 199).

In terms of its strategy of networking, the Occupy movement is reluctant to establish links with organisations that it may benefit from. Their minimal efforts and attempts in connecting with other movements and organisations, that have a more

global presence, also has a large influence on the furthering of the movement's aims (Halvorsen, 2012). Halvorsen's study is fairly critical of Occupy in their reluctance to embrace organisation and leadership. By rejecting formal organisation and hierarchical structure, Halvorsen provides that more research must be conducted into the extent of Occupy's attempts to create networks. Thus it is clear from this study that Occupy's values of *structurelessness*, *decentralisation* and *leaderlessness* place the movement in a situation where, in order to avoid compromising the values associated with its desire to occupy public space and institutions and losing its uniqueness as being devoid of authority and structural power, it is damaging its potential for further presence in "the global".

If this is the case, then one must explore whether Occupy is making full use of the tools made available through globalisation. In fact, the successful rise and prolonged presence of the movement would not be possible without network globalisation. The most significant tool comes as a direct result of technological advancement both in the 20th and 21st Centuries, which has revolutionised the ideological framework upon which new social movements base their values, and provided the necessary contemporary platforms in utilising, grounding and spreading these values; new media.

The Battle for Space

When referring to the new media, this study focuses on the contemporary methods of online networking and technological synergy, rather than the late 20th Century forms of the internet. In this case, "Internet" is used in the context of Web 2.0, which refers directly to new and updated forms of social networking; Facebook, YouTube and Twitter (Ritzer & Dean, 2015; Blessing & Tomei, 2014: 145; Azab, 2013: 77).

The use of virtual space in the form of new media utilised by new social movements could only be made possible through contemporary network globalisation (Holmes, 2001: 106; Moghadam, 2013: 208; Tsatsou, 2014: 55; Häyhtiö & Rinne, 2008: 263; Chandra, 2004: 178). As Coker notes, 'The Internet has become the indispensable medium of the new social networks that have emerged in the network communities that are at the heart of global civil society' (2014: 30). Occupy Wall Street is known as having been 'born digital', and even as a 'networked movement' Castells (2012). Many studies of the links between new media and social

movements incorporate theories of collective action and the Resource Mobilisation Approach (see Diani & McAdam, 2003). Occupy has been able to rise and subsequently sustain itself as it currently stands through a combination of both online (digital forums, social networking sites) and offline (occupation, General Assembly meetings, Working Groups) *space*; a mixture that is crucial in maintaining the success of a new social movement (Halvorsen, 2012; Fuchs, 2015: 354; van der Heijden, 2014: 367; Tkacheva, 2013: 39; Keshtiban, 2014: 261).

As the power of globalisation has been previously emphasised (autonomy and boundarylessness), and it has been noted that new media would not exist without network globalisation, then the presence of new media and the availability of social networking is also beyond the control of the state and corporate organisations. Having said this, there have been numerous instances where states have attempted to impose regulation and punitive legislation upon online sites. Examples of this include the European negotiations concerning the Stop Online Piracy Act (SOPA), Protect Intellectual Property Act (PIPA) and the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) (Edwards III & Santos, 2015: 75; Głowacki & Jackson, 2014: 7). All three proposed bills had, at some point or another (during negotiations), been widely criticised as a threat to freedom of speech and expression on the Internet (Frankel & Gervais, 2014: 259; Parker et al., 2014; Roffe & Seuba, 2015: 279; Kleinwächter, 2012: 43; Lemley et al., 2011: 36), and heavily opposed by activist movements such as Occupy and the Hactivist collective Anonymous UK. Anonymous UK's involvement in opposing the proposed bills is predictable. Being a Hactivist collective, approval of the bills as legislation would naturally render many of their merely disapproved online activities, already marginally hovering within the limbo between socially deviant and outright illegal, as criminal. Nevertheless, opposition to punitive legislation governing new media symbolises the extent of acceptance of the globalised phenomenon by participants of new social movements. It also demonstrates that attempts to impose control of new media will remain exactly as described; attempts, so long as its use continues to be regarded as supportive of the values of new social movements. Thus, the use of new media by the Occupy movement, as not only a tool of communication for both participants and other activists but also spread of information and production of mental knowledge, can be regarded as successful and potentially sustainable.

Additionally, Occupy's use of new media is not merely restricted to strategies for publicity or communication. It is a tool for the challenging of, what Foucault terms, 'discourses of absence'; themes that are suppressed or under-reported in mainstream media reports (Cheek, 2004: 1142) and reinforcing of 'discourses of resistance', through the use of synergised technology (smartphones, tablets). In this case, discourses of resistance refers to the challenging of the status quo and figures of authority. As with many social movements that are critical of the status quo, the Occupy movement has been subjected to harsh police treatment and punitive policing tactics. The Occupy Wall Street occupation in 2011 saw the pepper-spraying of an 84-year-old woman, and is one of many instances where pepper-spray has been used by the US police force during an occupation (Nagel & Nocella III, 2013: 2; Writers for the 99%, 2011: 211; Fiala, 2013: 246; Castells, 2012: 281-282). There is no question that during many occupations organised by the Occupy movement, the police use excessive force, abusing their powers in certain circumstances (Dempsey & Forst, 2014: 246; Taylor, 2011: 137; Heath et al., 2013: 50). However, there are very few academics witness to specific acts of brutality and excessive punitiveness by law enforcement agents. At the same time, traditional media coverage of demonstrations feature dominant themes that reinforce the status quo (Petrosian, 2014).

1.4. Sousveillance

How, then, are the public made aware of these marginally lawful acts by those in law enforcement? The answer lies within the boundaries of *space* between the online and offline worlds. Conventional techniques of crime control through surveillance have increased both in the US and the UK. This does not necessarily mean that states are utilising the radical theories of Jeremy Bentham's "panopticon" in order to maintain constant watch over actors of the Occupy movement, but that surveillance is 'reminiscent of a police state' (Landau, 2010: 73), continuously reinforcing state power and control. As it is no longer necessary for the public to rely on traditional media platforms to determine the truth of events unfolding during a demonstration, and the state are arguably aware that their relationship with the public cannot be solely determined through coverage in traditional media (Balutis et al., 2011: 157;

McKinney et al., 2005: 178; Lee & McGovern, 2014: 117), an alternate method for resistance emerged throughout the era of technological advancement; *sousveillance*.

The term “*sousveillance*” can be directly translated from French as ‘watching from below’ (Mann et al., 2003: 332; Michael & Michael, 2014: xxxi; McStay, 2010: 106), as opposed to surveillance meaning ‘watching from above’ (Gilliom & Monahan, 2013: 83; Lupton, 2015: 34; Michael & Michael, 2014: xxxi). It is in direct strategic opposition to the notion of surveillance. The positions refer to the power status of the individuals engaging in the act of watching. Where ‘watching from above’ indicates that members of a high-powered status are engaging in the act of observation, ‘watching from below’ signifies the opposite; those whose status of power is lower than those engaged in surveillance activities. Though the act of *sousveillance* cannot be considered anti-hierarchy as the term’s use is dependant on the status of the individual(s) engaging in observation, the act in itself is a method of resistance, as it challenges traditional power-relations between the state and its citizens. *Sousveillance*, thus, creates a dialogue between those who are powerless and those who are powerful. Both surveillance and *sousveillance* exist simultaneously on a power incline; surveillance referring to watching down the hill at the powerless, and *sousveillance* watches upward from “prisoner” to “guard” (Mann & Ferenbok, 2013).

Since the sharp rise of technological advancement from the late 20th Century, there have been numerous uses of *sousveillance* as a method of resistance to authority. The most prominent case of its kind was that of Rodney King in 1999. A local resident witnessed and video-taped Los Angeles police officers beating King, an African-American gentleman, and later exposed the footage by sending it to a media broadcasting channel (Lefait, 2013: 248; Firmino et al., 2010: 280; Weiss, 2008: 249). As the synergy of offline and online *space* has become more common, participants of new social movements use more contemporary technologies at their disposal in order to challenge those in authoritative positions. The use of smartphones and tablets during the 2009 Pittsburgh G20 protests proved the most useful in British practices of *sousveillance* and “citizen journalism”. Greer & McLaughlin (2012) provide a detailed account of the death of Ian Tomlinson at the protest, where a fellow demonstrator used their smartphone to film a police officer pushing Tomlinson to the ground, who later died of a brain injury as a result of the

fall. The officer was exposed when the video was later publicised on video-streaming site YouTube and spread “backwards” to traditional media broadcast coverages of the death. Similarly, Bradshaw (2013) analyses sousveillance methods exhibited by new social movements. His article highlights the immense power that sousveillance can have in challenging negative values and reinforcing the positive values of democracy (freedom of speech and expression). Although claiming that alterglobalisation (which he terms anti-corporate globalisation) movements are “locally rooted”, contradicting Kern & Nam, he provides a useful analysis of the G20 protests in 2009, both in terms of police relationship with protesters (excessive use of unprovoked force) and demonstrations of positive values associated with new social movement theory (direct action and participatory democracy in the form of sousveillance). Bradshaw’s work is very well signposted in its structure, clear in its aims and rationale, and uses suitable methodology to arrive at its conclusions. It does not make any unsupported assumptions and draws accurate conclusions in line with its aims. As its reliability as a strong source has been noted, one could deduce from his concluding facts that sousveillance is potentially extremely useful as a tool in holding to account those in authoritative positions when their powers are abused during a demonstration.

1.5. New Media and Occupy

New media is the compelling driver between the act of “sousveillance” and political/social change (Mann & Ferenbok, 2013; Wilson & Senisier, 2010; Shaw, 2013; Bradshaw, 2013). There are, however, debates among academics relating to the success of the use of new media and sousveillance in bringing about political and social change. Shaw’s (2013) study of the Occupy Sydney demonstrations in Hyde Park found the fact that participants were uncertain about how their images would be used by police, rendering their attempts at holding law enforcement accountable through counter-surveillance techniques were also uncertain. Similarly, Milberry (2013) uses her case study of the 2010 G20 Summit protests in Toronto to suggest that, while there are advantages to the use of sousveillance during demonstrations in recording abuses of power by the police (such as public outcry for an inquiry into G20 policing), there is a failure on the part of authorities to act despite abuse footage becoming available on social media sites such as Twitter and YouTube. Bradshaw

(2013) somewhat agrees, suggesting that protestors have been successful in using counter-surveillance techniques to record and document police repression, but that these techniques 'have yet to tame the excessive use of force by police at mass actions' (p. 453). However, he is not entirely clear whether this direction relates to the failures of society or government to take action against these abuses, or whether the use of sousveillance techniques could be altered in preventing or deterring excessive use of force by police on the ground during demonstrations. If the latter were to be assumed as the future direction, then one would need to explore to what extent the current use of sousveillance during demonstrations is effective in its ability to prevent or deter police repression or abuses of power. Wilson & Serisier's (2010) research on video activism attempted just that. They criticised Harding's three-point function of video activism (pacifier, defence and offence) through the use of interview data gathered with video activists throughout several demonstrations. The key argument of their study is that Harding's data was insufficient in addressing contradictions and uncertainties about demonstrators' use of sousveillance techniques. In their analysis, they found that sousveillance was unpredictable and sometimes caused more damage to demonstrators, as some would unintentionally incriminate one other by documenting footage of their own illegal activities; data eventually seized by police in their prosecution.

As technology has advanced and smartphones and digital cameras have become more accessible to demonstrators, their use of this technology as counter-surveillance has risen to a point where it is almost unthinkable to participate in a demonstration without the ability to "watch the watchers". Shaw predominantly focused on the creative side of sousveillance techniques on the ground during the demonstration. His study focused less on the contribution of sousveillance to power gain, and more on the original methods with which demonstrators were able to counter police surveillance. He found that police surveillance and demonstrator counter-surveillance were at a constant interplay, essentially resembling a dance of cameras (p. 8). In this case, there is also a need to understand how the relationship between surveillance and counter-surveillance is demonstrated during Occupy London demonstrations, and how the police respond to the counter-surveillance strategies utilised. At the same time, it is important to note that the rise of new media technology has not ceased, and new forms of technology are continuously developing that aid new social movements not just in their attempts to further their

aims and objectives, but also in ensuring that police-demonstrator relationships remain peaceful.

1.6. Research Questions

Many points emerge from the studies of the contemporary literature; it is clear that there is a need to explore how the Occupy movement differs from other “new” social movements. In its aims, Occupy attempt to attract individuals from all backgrounds, genders, ethnicities and socio-economic groups, but in reality this has proven not to be the case. Previous literature of Occupy’s demographic makeup suggests that the movement is dominated by white, middle-class and intellectually advanced males. Academics agree that the relationship between Occupy demonstrators and the police has never been pleasant or peaceful. On the most part, this has been due to excessive policing tactics during demonstrations and occupations. There is also general agreement that, despite the use of new media in publicising footage of law enforcement abuses of power, it has not yet been successful in producing the desired results; encouraging political and social dialogue, leading to policy changes, disciplinary action against officers involved. Sousveillance practices utilised during demonstrations are often contradictory, unpredictable and uncertain, sometimes creating more damage than good. As the literature of new media use within demonstrations drew from empirical research that focused on fairly extreme examples of police surveillance vs demonstrator counter-surveillance, there is a need to explore the use of sousveillance techniques in demonstrations where police surveillance is not as overt, intrusive and invasive. Police policies in the UK arguably do not incorporate such extreme uses of surveillance techniques, and a good starting point would be to analyse the use of sousveillance techniques by the Occupy movement locally. The extent, methods and strategies of new media use by Occupy London could prove critical in understanding how the aims of the movement are reinforced within Britain and how the values they promote are successfully publicised and networked. Studying Occupy London could also provide answers to whether the Occupy movement within the UK reinforce the general values of the movement, practice these effectively, and whether they are indeed dominated by particular demographics. Furthermore, there is a significant need to study what role new media has on the advancement of the movement, and whether this role can

maintain Occupy. This will prove to be a fairly unique contribution to the study of “new” social movement theory within criminological literature.

The key research question that therefore emerges from the literature is: *Does Occupy London fit within the realm of a “new” social movement?* This will be explored through studying the following additional research questions in relation to Occupy London:

1. What effect does the internal and external political makeup of the Occupy London movement have on their aims?
2. To what extent is the movement representative of gender, ethnicity and class differences?
3. How are Occupy London demonstrations policed? What does this signify about law enforcement’s views of the movement?
4. In what ways are sousveillance techniques used during Occupy London demonstrations?
5. What effect does the act of sousveillance have on police-demonstrator relationships?
6. How is new media used in the networking of the movement? What effect does it have on the movement’s advancement?

2. Methodology

In order to address these research questions, it is important to note that the research must be driven by a qualitative rather than quantitative approach. The methodology of the research into Occupy London must fall within one of two primary epistemological positions: Positivism and Interpretivism.

2.1. Epistemology

The term ‘epistemology’ is derived from the Greek *episteme* meaning knowledge, and *logos* meaning study (Horrigan, 2007: vii). It is therefore loosely defined as ‘the study of knowledge’, an issue that questions how the social world ‘can and should be studied’ (Bryman, 2008: 13). Quantitative research methods are favoured by those adopting a positivist epistemological view; the assumption that the existence of linear knowledge and objective truth cannot be questioned (Scott & Usher, 1996: 16). It is often an ideal source of government funding due to the lack of expense needed and ease of attaching personal interpretation to results (Humphries, 2008: 8) fit for political campaigning. Through rigorous testing in validity and reliability (Newman & Benz, 1998: 39; Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003: 78), the results of quantitative studies are presented as unbiased and impartial facts supporting a particular issue or relationship between one variable and another. In reality, the advantages to quantitative methodology are often limited as they do not sufficiently explore the necessary bridges connecting the issues in question with wider social and political contexts, thus lacking in ‘richness of meaning’ (Babbie, 2013a: 25; Fischer, 2006: 192). Without delving too deep into complex comparisons between positivist and interpretivist epistemological positions, the key difference between the two are:

‘...positivism can help the researcher discover casual relationships between phenomena while interpretivism can help the researcher deeply probe into the dynamics of these relationships and uncover their mode of operation, their casual mechanisms.’

(Meneklis & Douligeris, 2010: 80)

In contrast to positivist epistemology, interpretivism refers to the ‘understanding of the social world through an examination of the interpretation of that world by its

participants' (Bryman, 2008: 366). Thus, in order to extract deeper knowledge of a particular issue, it is insufficient to use a research methodology deriving from a positivist epistemological position. Interpretivism assumes that there is no objective truth, and that truth can be interpreted in multiple ways by various people depending on the personal meaning ascribed to each experience (Hennink et al., 2011: 15). It is linked to Max Weber's notion of *Verstehen* (in conflict with researcher notions of *Understanding*), defined as the 'studying [of] people's lived experiences which occur in a specific historical and social context' (Snape & Spencer, 2003: 7). In this sense, the adoption of an Interpretivist epistemological position is paramount in fully understanding the construction of meaning by participants involved in Occupy London demonstrations. It is important that research is not limited merely to statistical data or data that seeks to identify relationships between variables, as this would limit the contextual understanding of the movement, its participants and its relationship with authorities. Therefore, this study adopted an Interpretivist epistemological lens through which the relationships between the understanding of meaning by participants and "organisers" can be explored successfully.

2.2. Approach

Much of the contemporary literature explored in relation to both "new" social movements and the Occupy movement adopt an Interpretivist view. In using qualitative methodologies, their outlook on the research already opposes the positivist stance of quantitative methodology and data collection. Qualitative methods are normally made up of three approaches; participant observation, interviewing, and focus-groups.

Most academics begin by using participant observation in studying the Occupy movement. Bernard described this methodology as:

‘...immersing yourself in a culture and learning to remove yourself every day from that immersion so you can intellectualize what you’ve seen and heard, put it into perspective, and write about it convincingly’

(Bernard, 2006: 344)

Although some theorists use the term ‘ethnography’ merely as a definition of a qualitative research methodology, not all forms of participant observation are ethnographic in their approach. In this case, the term ‘ethnography’ will relate to the study of a social setting and its actors for a prolonged period of time (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995: 1; Fetterman, 2010: 39; O'Reilly, 2012: 28).

Thus, ethnographic participant observation is a key demonstration of Interpretivist epistemology, as it seeks to understand rather than change the subject of study. In implying that the driver for collective action, resource mobilisation and movement, is grounded upon social relationships and interaction, participant observation allows for the study of these relationships on a personal and interactive level, where the researcher is not merely watching, but actively taking part in the routines of the demonstration. However, it is not always the case that ethnographic participant observation is possible. In many instances, lack of an affiliated “insider” status in the subject of study can prove difficult and sometimes impossible in producing the desired results. Junker illustrates the level of understanding one can gather from conducting fieldwork in a social setting, titled *Theoretical Social Roles for Field Work* (1960: 36), and identifies four specific categories of social roles for observers; complete participant, participant as observer, observer as participant, and complete observer. The role of a complete participant is entirely covert, raising ethical issues relating to the deception of the individuals or groups being studied (Kimmel, 1989: 67, 75; Babbie, 2013b: 68; Sieber, 1982a: 40; Bryman, 2008: 124). At the same time, the potential for a complete participant to be able to detach themselves from personal biases relating to the subject of study is low. As Jorgensen notes, ‘research “objectivity”, in the traditional view, is not unlike virginity: Once lost, it cannot be recovered’ (1989: 62). On the other extreme end of the social role spectrum, as a complete observer it would be difficult to establish a successful relationship with the research subjects in order to effectively study behaviour and interpretation of meaning without an “outsider” gaze. A significant trait of a successful ethnographer and participant observer is not only in the ability to submerge fully into the cultures, traditions, mindset and values of the subject of study, but in identifying the key moments at which they must temporarily retreat from the research and view the situation from a theoretical perspective. Hence, the most effective forms of participant observation are in acting either of the central-ground social roles; participant as observer, or observer as participant. Both roles

require some form of submersion and retreat, but the extent to which both are exercised is dependant on the level of access of the researcher. This process is also known as ‘moderate participation’ (Spradley, 1980: 60). As Crabtree & Miller note, there is some overlap between the two roles, and in order to allow for successful data collection one must act both in the form of a back-and-forth continuum (1999: 57).

Active membership and rapport is always of paramount importance in gaining entry to the field of research. In the case of this research, these issues were not ones that presented much difficulty of access. The issue of membership does not apply to Occupy London demonstrations since Occupy, by its own values, is structureless. There is no specific membership criteria in taking part in the movement, its groups or sub-groups. The building of rapport with other participants has also been already established, since the researcher has not only attended previous Occupy demonstrations as an activist, but has established relationships on a fairly personal level with some participants and “organisers” of demonstrations.

2.3. Methods

In studying the Occupy movement, some academics used participant observation as their sole methodology or in accompanying quantitative methods of data collection (Halvorsen, 2012; Razsa & Kurnik, 2012; Liboiron, 2012; Koskal, 2012; Juris, 2012; King, 2013). Others combined participant observation with interviewing (Shaw, 2013; Uitermark & Nicholls, 2012). The most effective and convincing studies in relation to the Occupy movement were those that successfully combined the two methods of qualitative research. The combination of participant observation and interviewing ensures that there is little or no misinterpretation of the meanings of certain acts or events, the Interpretivist epistemological position of the study is upheld and even strengthened, and that specific areas that may not have been discussed throughout observation can be addressed.

Participant observation produces a rich amount of data and meaning, moreso if the approach is ethnographic and involves a good balance of participant vs observer roles. However, there is still the risk of researcher misinterpretation of some of the behaviours exhibited or the general meaning and values of the movement, particularly if the researcher has been unable or unwilling to completely immerse in the subject. Allowing participants to speak of their experiences and express opinions

on the demonstration can lead to clarification of the researcher's interpretations of what they have observed. In doing so, the researcher is able to reinforce and put into practice their epistemological stance through understanding how individuals themselves create and shape the meaning of events during demonstrations. In this way, questions can arise that would not necessarily have been answered during the course of the demonstrations, and these can be addressed during interviews. In some cases, observation is even used as the secondary methodology, preceding interviewing, in order to observe the behaviours of the participants interviewed. However, in most cases, interviewing is used as the secondary methodology where information that has been missed, or otherwise not clarified throughout observation, can be addressed. In the case of Uitermark & Nicholls (2012), they combined the use of participant observation with unstructured interviewing, and a third methodology; what they termed 'observations of social media and Internet materials' (p. 296). Their aim was to shed light on the similarities and differences between Occupy Amsterdam and Occupy LA. However, it seemed as though the findings of the interview data contributed only to a small fraction of their concluding statements, since the dialogue between researcher and participant was difficult to guide.

This is an example of one of the nuances of interview structure that can have a potential impact on the data produced. Ethnography already assumes that there will be some form of dialogue between researcher and the individuals being studied, in the form of unstructured interviewing. In direct contrast to structured interviewing, unstructured involves the addressing of questions which have not been pre-planned or structured in a specific way. This form of interviewing is often seen as the first step of dialogue in ethnography before moving to more structured forms. It is a useful way of building rapport with individuals and often allows for conversations to be explored in greater depth (Bernard, 2006: 158; Klenke, 2008: 126; Fontana & Prokos, 2007: 39). The researcher would guide rather than lead the conversation, and may or may not express their own personal opinions on the subject (Hall & Hall, 1996: 160). However, there are issues with this approach to interviewing. Firstly, the building of a personalised rapport which creates a friendly relationship with the subjects of study is of risk to the qualitative reliability of the data produced. Individuals involved in demonstrations would be less likely to divulge personal opinion to those with whom they have close friendship ties than strangers who may be unaware of the situation (Gomm, 2004: 176). Secondly, merely guiding an open-

ended and unstructured conversation into certain areas may not produce enough relevant or specific information to form a solid conclusion on the topic. Similarly, structured interviewing also carries its limitations. Structured interviewing is often seen as too rigid and formal, sometimes counterproductive if the intention of the research is to build a rapport with participants (Craig, 2005: 38; Huss, 2009: 29; Hersen & Turner, 2003: 52; Weiner & Graham, 2003: 496; Cargan, 2007: 105; Kothari, 2004: 98; Zayfert & Becker, 2007: 24). As with questionnaires or surveys, structured interviews require extensive rapport-building before the scheduling of interviews, and often involve the complete removal of the participant from the setting in which the fieldwork is being conducted (Blaikie, 2010: 205). This creates methodological complications; as the entire purpose of ethnographic participant observation is to observe the natural setting of the individuals, if one was to combine this with fully structured interviewing, then the results produced by the latter would weaken those retrieved from the former. Therefore, it is disadvantageous to conduct structured interviewing in a setting where ethnographic participant observation were taking place.

In order to avoid these extremes, it is necessary to find a balance between the two. In this case, the most appropriate methodology involves the combination of ethnographic participant observation and semi-structured interviewing. Semi-structured is in the direct centre of the spectrum between structured and unstructured interviewing (Gillham, 2000: 6; Merriam, 2009: 89). It involves preparation of some specific questions, but still allows the participant freedom to speak about issues which are important to them (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011: 102; Klandermans & Staggenborg, 2002: 92; Bernard, 2013: 181; Dawson, 2002: 29). Shaw (2013) used semi-structured interviewing to assist his fieldnotes gathered from observation at the Hyde Park demonstration in Sydney, strengthening his position by not only immersing in the event as an observer, but allowing demonstrators themselves to express their own beliefs and opinions regarding surveillance and counter-surveillance. He was able to use much of the data obtained from the interviews to validate his own interpretations of what he observed during demonstrations. At the same time, it was possible to tailor questions to specific aspects of the event without allowing them to become too rigid and structured. Thus, this permits the researcher to record the data derived from observation and interviewing into loose themes even before analysis is conducted.

2.4. Digital Recording & Visual Criminology

Most social researchers conducting ethnography or ethnographic participant observation tend to favour traditional methods of recording fieldnotes using a pad and pen. It is an essential part of ethnographic fieldwork, as assuming to remember every aspect of the day's events is outlandish (Schensul & LeCompte, 2013: 110; Atkinson & Hammersley, 2007: 144). Notetaking while in the field is dependant on two aspects: practicality and acceptability. It must be the case that it is not only possible but practical for the researcher to be able to make notes throughout the events they are studying (Murchinson, 2010; Emerson et al., 2011; McCall & Simmons, 1969: 73). When conducting research in an environment such as a demonstration, it is often difficult to find the most convenient opportunity to make physical notes. At the same time, the researcher must take into account that making notes at certain points of the demonstration may cause suspicion and risk a possibly well-established rapport with the individuals being observed (Porta, 2014: 161; Seligman, 1951: 45). Good ethnographers tend to find the ideal balance between overt and covert notetaking, sometimes retreating at ideal moments in order to record their data (see Palmer, 2001; Darke, 2014). As digital technology has developed greatly in recent years, there has been little or no research conducted into the use of new media as a method of researcher notetaking during ethnographic participant observation of social movement demonstrations. Although it has been highlighted that audio-visual techniques combined with notetaking are highly effective when conducting ethnography (Pink, 2007: 120; Nastasi, 2013: 326), there has been little talk or debate about the prospect of using digital technology itself as a form of recording fieldnotes. In the case of this study, the primary method of recording fieldnotes during observation was through the use of an Apple iPhone's "Notes" app. In using a smartphone, it was possible to eliminate the limitations of both overt and covert notetaking practices, as it was practical, not easily noticed by other participants, and did not require much dependance on the memory of specific aspects of the demonstration. Digitising fieldnotes using an Apple iPhone also meant that synergy and synchronisation of information was straightforward and did not require further digital transcription for analysis.

At the same time, the methodology of this study is situated within the visual criminological and sociological realm through the use of visual technology employed throughout the demonstrations. Visual criminology stems from cultural criminological theories of zemiology and social harm (Hayward, 2009). The introduction of zemiology and visual criminology are fairly new to the criminological landscape. Visual criminology describes not only the theoretical framework upon which the term is grounded (visual sociology and anthropology), but also refers to the method of research whereby academics can study and analyse images for potential acts of social harm and injustice (Miller, 2014: 204; Ferrell, 2006; Hayward & Presdee, 2010; Copes & Miller, 2015: 112). This is done through a combination of ‘meaning, affect, situation, and symbolic power and efficiency in the same “frame”’ (Maguire et al., 2012: 125). In essence, the ideology surrounding the introduction of visual criminology promotes ‘visual resistance’ (Naegler, 2012: 14; David, 2007) whereby the researcher allows those research subjects on the lower-end of the power incline a “voice”. Van de Voorde notes the importance of further developing visual criminology using ethnographic photography, and the impact this can have on providing a voice for the “insiders” of the field that is being researched (2012: 216). In this study, the establishment of an insider voice is vital in understanding the construction of meaning by the actors of the Occupy London movement, how these meanings are put into practice, analysing the symbolic nature of the demonstrations, and exploring police-demonstrator relationships. Gitlin (2013) made use of visual images of the Occupy Wall Street demonstrations to illustrate the movement, its demography, aims and relationship with the police. Although not necessarily the general aim of the study, several images Gitlin used project powerful messages of police brutality and repression (pp. 12-13). Similarly, Liboiron (2012) used photographic images while conducting participant observation in order to highlight the resistance to authority demonstrated by participants.

Therefore, the use of visual technology using smartphones is essential in not only aiding as a methodological tool, but in reinforcing the Interpretivist epistemology of this study; understanding the construction of meaning by social actors involved in Occupy London demonstrations. As Rieger notes:

‘Visual changes can be very subtle or so complex that they are virtually impossible to document adequately without the use of a camera, which permits “freezing” a scene in extraordinary detail’

(Rieger, 1996: 6)

Similarly, the use of digital technology for the purposes of recording interview conversations also proves very effective. In essence, vigorous notetaking when conducting semi-structured interviews is insufficient and ineffective in capturing all relevant information at any one time, particularly if the person interviewed speaks at a faster than writing pace (Reis & Judd, 2000: 291; Kvale, 1996: 161; Kvale, 2007: 95). The use of digital audio-recording is more effective and reliable than notetaking during interviews (Walliman, 2006: 93; Becker et al., 2012; Hesse-Biber, 2011: 324). Some semi-structured interviews conducted in this study were recorded using Apple iPhone's "Voice Memos" app, which dates and time-stamps the beginning and end of the recording. The advantage of using this technology is that the data recorded is not only secure, but synchronised with a personalised iCloud backup platform, making it almost impossible to misplace.

Subsequent to the recording of the interviews, they must be fully transcribed and ready for subsequent analysis. Transcription involves a time-consuming process of converting the audio conversation into written form, nowadays digitally. In some cases, transcription software, or a professional typist, can be used to speed up the process (Hai-Jew, 2015: 247; Bernard, 2013: 195; David & Sutton, 2011: 129), but in the case of the interviews conducted during this study, transcriptions were done manually using no expert transcription software. In many cases, the standards for transcriptions depend on how the researcher aims to analyse the interview data (Kvale, 2007: 95). Transcribing in complete verbatim what was said during the interview (including 'erms' and 'ahs') is more time-consuming and generally more appropriate for research seeking to analyse the discourses of what was said. As semi-structured interviewing is the secondary methodology in this study, and it is not the aim of this study to analyse the specific wording or language used but the general themes that can be drawn from the dialogue, the filler-words used during conversations were not included in the digital transcriptions.

Thus, the methods of data collection for this study involved the use of an Apple iPhone for both digital fieldnotes and photography. It was also an aid in recording several interviews for the purposes of transcription. Interviews that were conducted with "organisers" and fairly long-running members of the demonstration were recorded on an iPhone app. Those conducted with fairly new or occasional

participants were recorded through rigorous digital notes. The primary focus of the interviews were to guide conversations into loose areas of interest relating to the research questions that were to be answered. Additional information was also noted if they were deemed of significance to the understanding of the current and future positions of the movement. Audio-recorded interviews were then manually transcribed and coded in preparation for incorporating relevant themes into those drawn from the observation. All interviewees who were audio-recorded were informed of this in advance, as per the instructions and information on the participant consent forms.

2.5. Analysis

As there are several ways to analyse qualitative data, it is worth noting the reasons why certain analytic methods are not appropriate for this project. Qualitative data can be understood and interpreted in many different ways, but it is dependant on the aims of the researcher to establish which analytic method and technique they will use in order to “make sense” of the material. In the case of textual-based data such as fieldnotes, memos, transcriptions, literature and articles, researchers use their discretion in distinguishing between several methods of analysis. Discourse analysis, for example, is defined as the exploration or analysis of ‘a particular way of talking or understanding the world (or an aspect of the world)’ (Phillips & Jørgensen, 2004: 1). It refers to the study of language used that may indicate the ways in which individuals view or understand society. However, the use of discourse analysis to analyse fieldnotes are problematic. The recording of fieldnotes are entirely dependant on the practicality of the situation, meaning that in most occasions the researcher would be unable to note in verbatim exactly what was said in informal conversations. Thus, the notes taken from the field of research are researcher interpretations and general observations of events. This lack of specificity in noting conversations makes it extremely difficult to be able to analyse the use of language used by participants. On the other hand, discourse analysis can prove useful in analysing interview transcriptions for the language used by participants. In this case, discourse analysis could provide some valuable information on the use of language by demonstrators and “organisers” when referring to the movement or to one another,

but would not be sufficient enough to allow the combination of observational fieldnotes and semi-structured interviews to generate broader conclusions.

This study analyses the data using critical thematic analysis, which explore the critical themes drawn from both ethnographic participant observation and the informal conversations with participants (primary source), and semi-structured interview (secondary source) data with participants and “organisers”. Thematic analysis is most closely linked to grounded theory and critical discourse analysis (Bryman, 2012: 578). As Braun & Clarke (2006) note, thematic analysis is normally driven by two approaches; inductive (data-driven) and theoretical (theory-driven). In the first instance, commonly known as a grounded theory approach to analysis, the researcher enters the field with no pre-existing theoretical basis for conducting the research, and seeks to create new theories based on the data produced from the fieldwork. Where the research is based upon pre-existing theory and analytic interest, the analysis of the material is normally more rich and appropriate to a particular research question. Juris (2012), for example, identified three key themes from his ethnographic observation of the Occupy Boston demonstrations in 2011; *social media*, *public space* and *aggregation*. The article is well signposted in its structure, clear about its methodology, and the use of thematic analysis proves to provide a coherent argument in its conclusion – relating to further challenges Occupy faces if issues of representation are not taken into consideration.

2.6. Ethics

Before any social research is conducted, it must first take into account ethical considerations that may hinder or otherwise prevent research from taking place successfully. A number of issues must be addressed before a project begins. The most important relates to the protection of the participant and researcher from harm, whether this be physical or psychological (Babbie, 2013a: 84; Sieber, 1982a: 15; Sieber, 1982b: 21; Babbie, 2008: 68; Mertens & Ginsberg, 2009: 13; Wiles, 2013: 56; Farimond, 2013: 152). Subjecting a participant to physical or psychological harm for the purposes of conducting any form of social research has been essentially outlawed by research ethics committees over the past several decades. Two psychological experiments in the 1960s and 70s triggered this move from a largely unregulated researching era to the current solid principles that researchers must abide

by. The experiments conducted by Stanley Milgram in 1963 (published in the *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*) and Philip Zimbardo in 1972 caused a widespread academic outcry into the morals and principles that researchers should abide by. Milgram's research featured the deception of a group of volunteers who were told they would be taking part in a simple question-and-answer teaching exercise. The reality of the exercise was a lot more distressing, as the volunteers in the "teacher" roles were asked to administer electric shocks to the "student" participants when their questions are asked incorrectly. The "teacher"s were unaware they were administering fake electric shocks, and while the voltage of the shocks were raised after each question, Milgram studied their actions for signs of obedience despite the "student's" repeated calls to cease the experiment (which featured pre-recorded audio footage). Although the experiment proved conclusively that human psychological behaviour can be significantly altered when they are asked to obey orders from an "official" figure, Milgram is widely criticised for his actions that caused considerable psychological trauma to the "teacher" volunteers who thought they were administering real electric shocks to their co-volunteers. He is also criticised for deceiving participants of the true nature of the research (Jones & Watt, 2010: 31; Ezekiel et al., 2008; Korn, 1997: 98; Adler & Clark, 2008: 49; Albon, 2007: 147).

The Zimbardo experiment attempted to prove the significance of psychological labelling of individuals by asking a group of volunteers to act the roles of prisoner and prison guard. Both groups were put into a prison setting and their actions observed for signs of conformity to the roles they were volunteering as. Similar to the Milgram experiment, Zimbardo ignored repeated requests to cease the study due to psychological and physical harm to the participants. Although Zimbardo did not use deception as a means of convincing the volunteers to take part in the experiment (Vogt et al., 2012: 273;), he was criticised predominantly for his lack of concern to the well-being of the participants who were abusing one another while conforming to their respective roles (Webster Jr & Sell, 2014: 24; Murray & Holmes, 2009: 100; Klitzman, 2015: 13; Sternberg & Fiske, 2015: 135), and ignoring the wishes of the participants to withdraw from the study (Sieber & Tolich, 2013: 66; Banyard & Flanagan, 2005: 61; Brian, 2002: 245). As Milgram's experiment, Zimbardo was able to highlight the significant effects of human psychology upon the associating of an individual to a particular role. Despite these revelations in the social

sciences, the ethical and moral issues override the intellectual advancement of a field that depends on human interaction.

The British Society of Criminology Code of Ethics (2006) is clear in its ethical requirements of any researcher wishing to conduct criminological research. The code emphasises that the research should only begin once the participants have provided full informed consent to take part in the research, and recognise that they have the right to withdraw at any time (p. 3). In order to cater for both of these ethical considerations, the participants interviewed in this study were shown an information sheet with all details relating to the purpose of the research and their involvement (see **Figure. 1a** & **Figure. 1b**), and asked to sign a form consenting to take part as an interviewee, recognising that they may withdraw from the research at any time (see **Figure. 2**). In this way, the researcher was able to eliminate any issues of *deception* and *informed consent*. As the questions asked of participants could be deemed by some as being emotional in nature, each participant was informed verbally and in writing (see **Figure. 1**) who they would be able to contact if they had any concerns about the research or its aims/objectives. All participants interviewed were above the age of sixteen, so there were no occasions where issues relating to proxy consent of a minor needed addressing. Before conducting each interview, the participants were informed that they would be assigned a unique random identification number in order to ensure that there is *anonymity* in their responses. Participants were sampled through snowball sampling, where one participant would allow researcher access to another (Babbie, 2013a: 188; Bailey, 1994: 96; Babbie, 2008: 200-1). Several participants stated that they have no concerns relating to anonymity and, provided their responses have not been distorted or their meanings altered, would be happy for the researcher to disclose their names within the project thesis.

A further issue with regard to collecting and recording information from fieldnotes and interviews is *confidentiality*. It is crucial to ensure that any information relating to participants of the research remains completely confidential and unaccessed by any individual outside the research panel (Gregory, 2003: 52; Loue, 2002: 147; Buchanan, 2004: 140; Weir & Olick, 2004: 139; LeCompte & Schensul, 2015: 315). Therefore, as the research notes of this study were primarily digital, through Apple iPhone apps, security of the data was ensured through the security features provided by the smartphone itself. The researcher used the iPhone's fingerprint security feature, which only allows access to the phone when his

fingerprint is pressed to the “Home” button. At the same time, it was ensured that when the phone was not being used for research purposes, it was kept securely in the researcher’s zip trouser pocket at all times. After each demonstration, when the researcher retreated from the field, the information was transferred to a personal laptop, where it was encrypted with encryption software AutoKrypt. The data was also backed-up on a secure, encrypted and password-protected external hard drive, which was kept locked in a cupboard within the researcher’s home. In order to ensure additional security, the external hard drive was also scanned on a daily basis for viruses and potential hacking attempts.

2.7. Challenges

Despite rigorous planning before and throughout the demonstrations, and taking into account the experiences of various researchers incorporating similar methodologies and approaches to analysis, there were some distinctive challenges in gaining access to certain interviewees and ensuring that there was sufficient relevant information provided during interviews.

Access

The use of snowball sampling was significant, as it allowed for easier access to certain individuals within the group perhaps considered “more prominent”, such as those directly involved for several years. Through snowball sampling, the researcher could build rapport with each individual interviewed, or otherwise informally spoken to, in such a way that this would allow them to be continually introduced to others within the group. This was initially fairly successful, and many of the participants spoken to on an informal basis were those who had been introduced by others within the group. However, with regard to interviewing, their participation was not only reliant on the rapport built by the researcher, but also depended on the type of rapport they had with the individual introducing them to the researcher.

Needless to say there was no expectation that all participants and “organisers” would have identical views and opinions of researchers. Some participants introduced to the researcher seemed very sceptical of any external involvement in the movement, regardless of the aims and objectives of the research.

A couple of participants that were spoken to would indicate through body language and lack of communication that they did not wish to make no contribution to the research, whether formally or informally. Thus, those who were disinterested would distance themselves continuously from the researcher, perhaps due to a lack of trust. Some interviewees were asked to comments on these issues, and provided that there had been previous issues of deception by individuals claiming to conduct research with favourable intentions, which were later debunked as false. The researcher, however, made clear that it was not the intention of the study to provide a positive or negative viewpoint on the demonstrations, but merely to understand the specific connections between the use of new media and sousveillance by the movement, and its potential advancement.

The biggest challenge of the research was in attempts to interview or even informally speak to the legal observer present during the demonstrations. She was disinterested in communicating or interacting at any point with any individual not within her close circle of trust. On several occasions, attempts were made in gaining her trust and providing helpful information about events that were photographed or otherwise captured by digital footage, but despite her continuous presence, and possessing her personal contact details, it became impossible to gain access to her. Through interviewing another legal observer and adviser to the Occupy London branch, Matthew, it was evident that her role as a legal observer was biased and skewed by her participation in the movement. This, however, will be explored in subsequent sections.

Data Collection

Most interviews were carried out on field; in the immediate vicinity of the demonstrations. Initially, interviews were conducted on the grass at Parliament Square, where participants were spoken to in the presence of others around them in a more intimate and social setting. However, this was later to become an issue, as it was evident from the facial expressions of other demonstrators during interviews that some were either becoming sceptical of the nature of the questions, or were disagreeing with the responses provided by the interviewee. These acts could potentially jeopardise the findings of the interviews in two possible ways; the interviewee become aware of the reaction of others around them and tailor their

responses to suit the views and opinions of their companions, or perhaps the contrary, and those listening, if later interviewed, could be influenced by the responses provided by the initial interviewee. In either circumstance, the data collected from interviewing would be compromised from the presence of others in the natural setting. As a result, later interviewers were asked if they would be more comfortable retreating a little behind the area of demonstration in order to reduce background noise.

Furthermore, two participants complained during interviews of the background noise, which was hindering their hearing of the questions asked by the researcher. The background noise related to the timing of these interviews; during speeches or activities. In order to counter this issue, one participant was asked if they would be happy to move a little bit further from the area of demonstration, which he agreed to. The second participant that mentioned subsequently wished for the interview to take place in her car, which was parked not far from Parliament Square. This particular participant and “organiser” had health problems and felt it would be more comfortable for both her and the researcher to be in a more quiet setting. This proved to be more desirable in terms of collecting views and opinions that may not have been easily or willingly provided in the presence of other demonstrators.

3. Findings/Analysis

This study used the combination of “participant-as-observer” ethnographic participant observation (with informal dialogue) and semi-structured interviewing in order to address the research questions that emerged from the review of literature on new social movement theory and the Occupy movement. As participant, as well as observer, the researcher participated in marches and activities organised by Occupy Democracy, a sub-group of the Occupy London movement, and conducted eighteen semi-structured interviews with participants, “organisers” and several members of the public. The term “organisers” is presented in inverted commas due to the wishes of Occupy London members, who claimed that a movement without a hierarchy couldn’t contain official organisers. Therefore, those deemed to be “organisers” by this study are merely members of the movement who have had an active role in organising the events of the occupation. The face-to-face interviews were conducted

throughout the course of the demonstrations on 1st, 2nd, 4th, 6th and 7th May 2015. An alternative telephone interview with a legal observer and adviser was carried out on 13th July 2015.

Themes are then drawn from the data derived from interviews, observation and informal dialogue in order to analyse the events thematically and come to a solid conclusion that answers all research questions, and sheds light on the importance of new media use by the sub-group.

3.1. Occupy Democracy

Occupy Democracy was formed in 2014 following a General Assembly meeting organised by the Occupy London movement. It refers to itself in this way in order to challenge the stereotypical definition of the term “democracy”. In a sense, it aims to “occupy” the definition of “democracy” and create an alternative definition through direct action and participation. In its own words, Occupy Democracy describes its mission on its website:

‘Our mission is to campaign for a genuine democracy free from corporate influence. Our demand is for real democracy now! Sovereignty must rest with the people and not with Parliament’

(Occupy Democracy, 2014)

In February 2015, it was announced on social networking site, Facebook, that Occupy Democracy was to host an occupation of Parliament Square in London between 1st and 10th May, overlapping the UK General Election of 7th May and its subsequent finalising of results on 8th May 2015. Its event page was shared across a number of Occupy groups and sub-groups, as well as other activist groups and pages, such as Anonymous UK and Reclaim the Power. From approximately 4.8 thousand Facebook users that were invited to the event by “friends”, 1.1 thousand people claimed they would attend the occupations, and a further 229 replied “maybe” to their invitation. The Event page was titled ‘Occupy Democracy – The May Occupation of Parliament Square’. In their own description of the event, Occupy Democracy posted:

‘Want to do more for our democracy this May than put an X in the box?
As Britain gets ready to go to the polls, join the ten day occupation of
Parliament Square to continue building a movement for real democracy:
free from corporate control, working for people and planet!’

(Occupy Democracy, 2015).

This promotional description suggests that there is no direct pressure for individuals to take part in the movement or demonstrations, but merely questions the intentions of regular voters. The first line of the description indicates that being a non-voter in the UK General Election is not a specific criteria for participation in the occupation at Parliament Square. It is clear that there is no direct political support or message that is being publicised to citizens, but the suggestion is that individuals voting could ‘do more’ for democracy. It outlines the general theme of the occupations; the desire for freedom from corporate control, for ‘people’ (meaning regular citizens), and the planet. Aside from reinventing and demonstrating an alternative form of democracy, the aim of the occupation was to draw attention to the country’s social and political issues; climate change, environmental change, social ideologies and stereotyping, and electoral reform.

The occupation addressed these issues through speeches, discussions, scripted theatrical role-play, stand-up comedy gigs, music, dance, meditation and marches. Each day of the demonstrations had its own theme and contributed to a new depth of existing knowledge of society and politics:

Day 1: Occupy Democracy

Day 2: Reclaim the Commons!

Day 3: Climate Change: The Elephant in the Polling Booth

Day 4: Live at Parliament Square

Day 5: Free University of London at Occupy Democracy

Day 6: Election Day Occupation

Day 7: Anti-Tory March

3.2. Politics

As mentioned previously, when examining the difference between old and new social movements, it is important to note that the latter do not focus specifically on political power or engagement with particular political parties. The Occupy movement, generally, attempts to alter the political and economic structure of its respective country into a more participatory form of democracy, through the practice of direct action. As their belief is in the reforming of the current system, the movement has never officially claimed to associate itself with a particular political party. In observations of the Occupy Democracy movement, however, the reality of this association was a little more complex.

Campaigns

There were a number of different social and political issues that the sub-group attempted to draw attention to. Although the occupation generally fit under the umbrella of the theme of “change”, there were several campaigns that were less noticeable than others due to the lack of attention they received throughout. The most noticeable were those involving environmental issues and legalisation of cannabis.

“Peace” was a campaign that was less evident. Sat on the pavement by Parliament Square consistently throughout the occupation was a peace activist who was of Kurdish ancestry. Wearing a colourful array of badges, flags and business cards, the man introduced himself as an activist for the peace of humanity. When asked about his association with the Occupy movement, he replied:

‘I am everything. I am everything that promotes peace and harmony of humanity. If Occupy are doing this, then it is my duty to be present here today.’

(10374 Interview)

He was not directly involved with the Occupy movement, but claimed that one of the issues that Occupy attempts to draw attention to is world peace; something that would not be obvious if one did not stop to observe the movement in detail. Within this theme of “peace” was also solidarity with Palestine, which was not actively

demonstrated, but illuminated in some forms of clothing (see **Figure. 3**). There was also an amalgamation of the themes of “peace” and LGBT rights, demonstrated through a colourful rainbow flag titled “Peace” (see **Figure. 4**). This was further illuminated by the visit of Reverend Billy’s Stop Shopping Choir on Day 1, where the emphasis was on togetherness, police brutality and shootings in the US, the stereotyping of Aboriginal West Australians and climate change.

The first day of the occupation also saw an Anti-TTIP speaker, also wearing a piece of clothing in Palestinian solidarity (see **Figure. 5**). TTIP (Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership) is a proposal that has been systematically criticised since its leak in 2014. A proposal which has been argued to potentially cause a variety of issues affecting the NHS, food, environment, banking and privacy (The Independent, 2014), the speaker claimed that it acted as a threat to democracy.

This mixture of campaigns and issues raised differs from the focus of the Occupy movement at the time of its birth. The reason for the lack of attention to the less noticeable campaigns was that the priority lay on other issues that were more actively addressed and better organised. Despite this, there was very little practical emphasis throughout the occupations on economic reform, notwithstanding the fact that this was the primary trigger for the discontent that caused the rise of Occupy. Arguably, the focus has shifted from the economic crisis and its repercussions to current environmental and ideological issues, highlighting the identifiable features of new social movements.

Spectrum

The aims and objectives of the Occupy Democracy sub-group included the desire to bring attention to issues surrounding the political structure, its corporate influences, electoral system, and suggest a strategy of achieving true democracy. These were evident in previous research of the Occupy movement (see Uitermark & Nicholls, 2012; Chou, 2014; Costanza-Chock, 2012; Bradshaw, 2013; Aitchinson, 2011; Juris, 2012; Gitlin, 2013). Despite this, however, the sub-group (as a whole) was unclear in distinguishing between complete system reform and change while maintaining the current political structure. Although there was a mixture of contemporary political discourse used in describing their political stance and viewpoint, in most part the participants in the Parliament Square occupations situated themselves along the left

side of the political spectrum, arguing for public ownership and promotion of liberal ideologies. One participant of Kurdish ancestry claimed he was ‘libertarian left-wing, far-left’ and identified his political preference as ‘communalist’ (10530 Interview), a fairly new ideological introduction to Syrian life (Panagiotis, 2007). Another participant, D, referred to himself as a ‘left-wing socialist’ (10284 Interview), specifying not only his situation on the political spectrum, but the exact political preference.

Socialism has since the Thatcher era been criticised by both left and right-wing political parties within the UK. Thatcher, in particular, was highly anti-socialism (Evans, 1997: 27; Harrington, 2011) and believed that it created a society that was ‘evil’ and controlled by ‘bureaucrats’ (Bannister, 2014). Her involvement in the lobbying to break-up the Soviet Union throughout the 1980s left a spirit of anti-socialist Thatcherism across the British political establishment, one that is still lit today. One participant, and a long-running “organiser” within the Occupy London movement since its birth, commented on the negative stereotyping of socialism. Categorising herself as a socialist, she added:

‘Over time, the elites have bastardised what it means to be left, like to be a dictator like Chairman Mow or Stalin...I mean...what is Socialism but the redistribution of wealth so that everybody has enough?’

(10532 Interview)

In essence, she is arguing that there has been an active attempt at creating negative stereotypes of the meanings attached to socialism, not just by politicians, but by “elites” in society; those who are on the highest point of the power status incline, and those who Occupy blame for the financial crisis that has led to harsh austerity measures in recent years.

Another participant, however, who had been involved with the Occupy London group for several years, identified himself to be a mixture of political ideas. He notes:

‘I’m a mixture of Communism – I believe in state control of some industries and some services (control by the people, for the people), I also believe in the freedom of people to make their own decisions about their own lives’

(10531 Interview)

He initially had some difficulty in defining his own political viewpoint due to the ideologies attached to political discourse. Effectively, his explanation suggests that there is no existing political ideology that incorporates all or most of his views into political policy. When asked whether he believes that Occupy itself is politically motivated, he responded:

‘It’s not really a political movement. Some people here might even be voting Conservative, or Green or Labour. I don’t even know.’

(10531 Interview)

If the movement, as many claim, is not political in nature, then there is little chance that they will be able to confront the current political system as it stands. There must be an element of combined politically driven ideology if true reform is to be successful. This is not to suggest that the Occupy movement does not differ from traditional social movements that focused primarily on political change, it merely suggests that as a movement that seeks to demonstrate an alternative political structure, there must be a sense of collective identity and agreement among the participants. Even the idea that participants may vote for existing political parties indicates that the collective will and determination for political reform is not as strong as could or should be.

Claiming political neutrality is also an issue that was not evident during the events of Day 2, where singer Robin Grey performed a song titled ‘Fuck Off Back to Eton’. The lyrics were in reference to revelations that the Conservative Party candidate list featured the names of twenty-one former attendees of private boarding school Eton College (Mirror, 2010). It was soon evident that the song was more than just seemingly comical when the singer claimed that he serenaded UK Prime Minister David Cameron in public with the song upon his entrance to a Conservative Party conference a month earlier. The song was welcomed with a great deal of praise by demonstrators, who began singing along with the lyrics. At the end of the musical performance, Grey invited demonstrators to pose behind the yellow Occupy Democracy banner and sing along to the lyrics while he taped them on his smartphone, which would later make part of his YouTube music video. Many demonstrators participated in this and sang along to the chorus of the song: ‘fuck off back to Eton, fuck off back to Eton, fuck off back to Eton with all your Eton chums’

(see **Figure. 6**). The involvement of Occupy Democracy participants sent a clear message that political neutrality within the movement is not existent. Had this been the case, then demonstrators would not specifically target one political party based on the attendance of some of its politicians in a private boarding school.

Green Party

The issues of reforming a political system and working within one to promote change often overlap in the aims and objectives of activist groups who seek “revolution”. The notion of “revolution” demands a complete overthrow of the existing political system in order to push for specific ‘revolutionary goals’ and radical reform (Russell, 1974: 60). In order for a contemporary social movement to be able to successfully manage to spark a political revolution, there must be clear and robust alternatives to the existing political system. The Occupy movement is able to demonstrate and “act out” its desired political and democratic structure, but in the case of Occupy Democracy, it has failed to clarify totally whether or not the current system is able to remain in existence with their proposed alternatives. As its claim is to seek alternatives, then one would expect that the participants of the demonstrations would be neutral or ignorant of the political parties running in the 2015 UK General Election. In reality, this was not the case.

On several occasions throughout the demonstrations, there were references made by participants and “organisers” in relation to the Green Party of England and Wales. Since much of the occupation was focused around “green” issues, such as climate change, global warming and fracking, there were several instances where the idea of environmental awareness was linked to Green Party policies. The first instance of this kind was during the third day of demonstrations (focused on climate change) where several speakers addressed issues related to fracking policies, continuous use of fossil fuels, arctic drilling and carbon consumption. These speeches were held by four different members of Reclaim the Power, a grassroots network seeking to draw attention to ‘environmental, economic and social justice issues’ (Reclaim the Power, 2013). Throughout the speeches, there were several references to Green Party policies and their advantages. This sends an almost contradictory message to not only Occupy demonstrators present, but to general members of the public, about the political stance of the movement.

Similarly, the movement's lack of political neutrality was demonstrated on 7th May, the day of the UK General Election, where Adam Ramsay spoke in support of the Green Party. Ramsay is a 'co-editor of the UK section of openDemocracy.net' (The Guardian, 2015), and also works with left-wing news site Bright Green which has strong links with the Green Party of England and Wales (Bright Green, 2015). While Ramsay was speaking, one participant, J, commented on the association of Occupy with the Green Party:

'I don't get it. We're supposed to be against these cunts sitting in Parliament reaping our money. Why the fuck are we listening to this shit?'

(10893 Interview)

Why, then, did the Occupy Democracy group choose to invite a Green Party activist to speak on the day of the UK General Election? A long-running anti-austerity activist in the Occupy London movement, P, answered this question:

'There's no reason why we should discriminate against anyone who is involved in politics for the right reasons. Most of the people up there...' [points at the Houses of Parliament] '...are there just to make money...for their own gain, not for us.'

(10827 Interview)

Many of the issues raised throughout both of these days are considered "green issues", so it is hardly surprising that a political party seeking to put through policies that tackle these issues are favoured over other parties. However, the idea of inviting an activist to speak in support of an existing political party, whether or not individuals agree with the party's policies, contradicts the entire ideology surrounding the Occupy movement that argues for reform of the election process and democratic structure from representative to participatory democracy.

Cannabis

One of the "green" issues that were focused on throughout the occupation was the legalisation of cannabis. The prioritising of this issue was so large that it facilitated a march throughout Central London in its support. Not only this, demonstrators made

active attempts to emphasise that possession and use of the drug in public should not be policed.

Throughout the occupation one participant mentioned that the criminalisation of cannabis was ‘just another way of the government tell everyone “we are doing this just because we can”’ (10923 Interview) – indicating that the link between the occupation’s focus on the legalising of cannabis and the political establishment is the notion of power. The participant’s claim echoed the Foucaultian notion of the state exercising repressive means purely to reinforce its own power status and weaken that of the regular citizen (Foucault, 1975). Several other participants and “organisers” commented specifically on this issue, claiming that the idea of democracy should involve the freedom to vote on motions such as legalising cannabis (10284; 10662; 10938; 10460; 10043 Interviews).

Day 2 saw the “Free the Weed” march across Whitehall, past Downing Street, Trafalgar Square and Embankment. The march was significant in both its demographic makeup as well as its positive reception by regular members of the public. As the march was underway, one demonstrator posed for photographs outside Downing Street with a large plastic zip-seal bag full of ground cannabis, which remained unconfiscated by law enforcement officers (see **Figure. 7**). On several occasions, members of the public cheered and applauded the participant for this and some European passers-by shook hands with the participants. When asked what they feel about Occupy London’s march for the legalisation of cannabis, one young female member of the public stated:

‘Oh gosh...I didn’t even know this was an Occupy thing. I just thought this was a group of stoners trying to change the law on weed. But yeah, I’m all for it, good on them for doing something for the good of all of us’...‘I think it’s all bullshit what these scientists are saying about weed, they need to do some proper research and get their facts straight...the stuff if good for you.’

(10111 Interview)

Claims surrounding the beneficial effects of hemp use for health and other reasons have been receiving intense publicity in recent years both in Europe and the US. Several US states have already legalised the possession and consumption of cannabis for medicinal purposes, and numerous campaigns are underway in attempting to accomplish the same in European countries. Scholars have long claimed that

cannabis use has benefits for health and aids as a natural substitute to painkilling prescription medication (Kalant, 2004; Hall & Solowij, 1998; Hall & Degenhardt, 2009; Hall, 2009). Media attention of the issue has led many to also study the potential economic gain from legalising the drug (The Guardian, 2013; The Independent, 2013; The Telegraph, 2015). However, it is not the aim of this study to argue for or against the legalisation of cannabis, but it merely seeks to highlight the growing focus of the issue in recent years which have contributed to the altering of the Occupy movement's own focus for demonstrations. The political associations of this emphasis on drug legalisation are strong, considering the Green Party of England and Wales are currently the sole political party arguing the case in support of legalising cannabis (Green Party, 2006: 4). Therefore, Occupy Democracy's pro-cannabis stance is not merely an attempt to warrant the use and possession of the drug, but a political standpoint in support of an existing party present in the UK Parliament.

It is difficult to comprehend what Occupy London's position would be if the Green Party were elected into government on 7th May instead of the Conservative Party. It is not clear whether the party would embrace the movement's work as an activist participatory democratic movement without still praising its own representative victory. Another question that could arise from an overall Green Party majority is whether their political viewpoint would cater for movements such as Occupy to continue existing in their own right, without being subject to criticism for challenging the status quo.

3.3. Demography

As mentioned previously, the "Free the Weed" march was significant in its demographic makeup. In contradiction to many previous studies of new social movements and of Occupy, (and although there were some younger individuals) the participants of the march were predominantly working-class and middle-aged, some with disabilities and many with dependencies on drugs and alcohol. The young female interviewed while the march was taking place at Trafalgar Square made an observation based upon the stereotypical image of the demonstrators taking part in the march; they did not look like members of the Occupy movement. In her opinion, they looked like "a group of stoners". Many involved in the march were highly

dependant on legal and illegal substances. Several who marched were observed having spent the entire day drinking different forms of alcohol; beer, wine and spirits. Several did not at all seem intoxicated but as though their bodies had processed the alcohol with great ease, signifying that this was not the first time they had consumed such large amounts of liquor. Some were seen taking Class-A drugs beforehand while in Parliament Square, but hid their acts successfully from the law enforcement officers in the area. The march itself went peacefully and there were no acts of violence on the part of the demonstrators. However, the erratic behaviour of some individuals signalled the attention of law enforcement officers accompanying the march, leading to overt acts of surveillance (which will be explored further in section 3.5).

The demographic makeup of the sub-group generally varied day-to-day depending on the theme. Based upon their own categorising, as well as hairstyles, accents, dental makeup, choice of branded clothing and technological possessions, it was understood that the younger individuals were mainly middle-class while the older were largely working-class. Both ethnically and in terms of age, the first day was very balanced, with individuals from different ages and backgrounds collectively gathered in Parliament Square to mark the first day of demonstrations. Throughout the occupation, however, there was a back-and-forth switch between the older working-class demonstrators and younger middle-class ones. Including the first day, those themes involving environmental issues (Day 3) and matters relating to the UK General Election (Days 6 and 7) were made up of a mixed bag of ages, class status and ethnic backgrounds. There were also individuals with disabilities, whether mental or physical, who also took part in the demonstrations. An issue relating to mental impairment proved critical during one arrest on Day 6, which will be explored further in the next section.

Day 5 was attended predominantly by young middle-class students, where there was a Working Group meeting (tailored at individuals involved in academia) acting as a guide on how to successfully facilitate a meeting, and then acting as a forum for students involved in Occupy to update the group on developments in occupations of their university premises. The topics that were raised throughout the update meeting involved university policies which were fairly trivial and not related to the financial issues. This, again, signifies that there has been a big shift from the traditional Occupy movement aims at focusing on global financial issues, which saw

students occupying university buildings to desperately draw attention to the injustices of the raising of tuition fees in the UK (Aitchinson, 2011), to university policies that invoke certain student rights. On the other end of the demographic spectrum, the participants attending Day 2 (Climate Change) and Day 4 (Live at Parliament Square) were predominantly working-class, but a mix of ages.

A significant issue, which was also highlighted in previous research into the Occupy movement (see Costanza-Chock, 2012; Juris, 2012; Pickerill & Krinsky, 2012), is that there seemed to be an over-dominance of men taking part in the occupation. There were several women also present, but on the main part the men vastly outnumbered women attendees. Although this is something that cannot be controlled, the movement has been criticised for its lack of attention to the fact that men's views are over-represented during Occupy movement demonstrations and meetings. This has largely been linked to the failure of two of their core values; *leaderlessness* and *structurelessness*. As has been noted, lacking these values leads to difficulties in adapting the movement to include views that sufficiently represent not only issues specific to women, but also those relating to LGBT participants. This failure of the two core values lead to inevitable difficulties in Occupy Democracy's ability to represent gender differences within occupations.

Similarly, the lack of representation of particular demographics was not restricted to gender differences. On the third day of occupations, one female "organiser", a disabled former volunteer support worker for the Occupy Wellbeing Working Group, mentioned the need for the sub-group to embrace simplicity in their promotional techniques. Concluding a speech held by a representative of Reclaim the Power, she claimed that there are difficulties related to the understanding of particular wording printed on Occupy leaflets, and there should be efforts made to simplify the language in order to cater for those readers with disabilities, and those whose first language may not be English. She also pointed out that individuals reading the leaflets might find more use from them if the main points were bullet-pointed rather than paragraphed. This was a very important request (one which was received with understanding by other participants) as it indicated that the Occupy Democracy sub-group had, at least until that point, not catered to the needs of disabled or ethnically diverse demographics. Indeed, the wording on some of the leaflets was a little advanced for some who may not use English as their first language. However, as this study did not use discourse analysis to analyse the

wording of the leaflets in greater detail, this may be useful for those wishing to conduct further research into these issues.

In essence, the Occupy Democracy sub-group has been generally successfully representative of class and ethnic differences, but has failed, largely due to the utilising of core Occupy values of *leaderlessness* and *structurelessness*, in preventing the over-dominance of men participating in marches, occupations and meetings. In the technical promotion of the movement, the sub-group has been unable to cater for the needs of those of different ethnic backgrounds whose first language may not be English, and of certain types of disabilities that may hinder their methods of reading. In the first instance, Occupy will arguably be unable to hinder the underrepresentation of women without putting in place some form of structure to ensure that women's views are adequately represented and taken into account. In the case of taking into account ability and ethnicity differences, it is clear that the movement should ensure that their promotional techniques are of satisfactory simplicity that would cater to those for whom they may be of use.

3.4. Law Enforcement

The Parliament Square occupation was attended by two types of law enforcement officers: police constables (mostly in yellow high-visibility jackets, but some without) and Police Liaison Team (PLT) officers (in blue jackets). An additional form of law enforcement included the local Heritage Warden of Westminster Council. Police presence varied depending on the plans that were made for the day. Intelligence gathered throughout the occupation seemed to have a large impact on how Occupy Democracy's events were policed. The presence was excessive on the first day, where officers greatly outnumbered demonstrators. Gradually throughout the week the presence decreased, but backup was arranged at times where there was heightened tension between demonstrators and officers already on the scene.

Due to the role of the researcher acting as participant as well as observer, there was immense difficulty in establishing positive rapport with police constables throughout the occupation. Many were hesitant to provide opinions or comment on specific policies, and the general attitude of demonstrators towards law enforcement present during demonstrations proved so negative that maintaining a good rapport with demonstrators far outweighed on-the-spot communication with officers.

Following the occupation, however, there were numerous attempts to contact police constables, PLT officers and the local Heritage Warden, all of which were continuously ignored or completely obstructed by local police station staff and representatives of the Metropolitan Police Press Office. In part, this was due to legal reasons as several arrests had taken place throughout the occupation. On the other hand, unrelated attempts to discuss general policies that were enforced during the occupation were also ignored in the aftermath. It is clear that there is an active attempt on the part of the Metropolitan Police to avoid providing any information relating to the ways in which Occupy London demonstrations are policed.

Despite this, there have been several useful sources that have been located, which have been made public due to a Freedom of Information Act (FOI) request that shed some light on the tactics the Metropolitan Police utilise in both attempting to build rapport with demonstrators, and gathering intelligence during events.

Police-Demonstrator Relationships

Communication between the demonstrators and the law enforcement officers largely depended on the situation at hand; when tensions were at their peak, there was very little communication on the part of the demonstrators. When events were running at ease, there was a higher level of communication between demonstrators and the police. However, the bridge of communication was two-fold: PLT officers and the legal observer.

PLT officers are trained by the Metropolitan Police, and are police constables selected by their respective line managers ‘with the understanding that they can be released for PLT duties when required’ (Statewatch UK, 2013a). They are then provided a one-day training course lasting six hours, which covers a range of topics such as communication and dialogue, crowd psychology and dynamics, role of PLT’s, human rights, and tactical awareness. These are then put into practice through ‘scenario-based workshops’ (Statewatch UK, 2013b). Following training, they are deployed on several occasions annually to act as PLT officers during demonstrations, focusing primarily on effective communication with demonstrators, diffusing of difficult situations when they arise, and gathering intelligence on the demographics of individual attendees. They act not as independent observers or communicators, but on behalf of the Metropolitan Police as rapport-building law enforcement officers.

As a result of their tactics of building rapport with demonstrators, the communication between demonstrators and the PLT officers were of higher frequency than with regular police constables. There is a significance in the utilising of PLT officers during Occupy demonstrations. Throughout the May occupation, there was only once instance where law enforcement deployed the use of police trained for situations of rioting, and this was the final day during the Anti-Tory March. In effect, the tactical use of PLT officers by the Metropolitan Police in order to gather intelligence from Occupy London demonstrators indicates that they view the movement with the same level of seriousness as low-level terrorism. On the other hand, their attempts to restore peace when tensions were heightened among demonstrators and the police were not successful. Demonstrators had been continuously informed by the legal observer that they should avoid cooperating or conversing with the PLT officers, as their sole purpose is to gather intelligence on the demographics and opinions of demonstrators.

Legal observers for most activist demonstrations, such as the Occupy movement, are provided by a grassroots organisation known as the Green & Black Cross. They are trained to act as independent observers focusing specifically on inappropriate policing, and Stop & Search law and procedure (Green & Black Cross, n.d.). As such, they must ensure that the notes they are taking on policing tactics are objective and not swayed by either demonstrator or police bias. The legal observer present during the Occupy Democracy occupation was, however, a member of the Occupy movement and not an independent “outsider” to the sub-group. As another legal observer and adviser for the Occupy London movement, Matthew, claimed, the legal observer during the May demonstrations was not a very good example of what a legal observer should be. His claim is that she takes the role of legal observer merely as an attempt to avoid being the subject of arrest (10533 Interview). She has had some training in legal observing but does not have enough experience in order to fully understand the nuances of the role, thus rendering her a weak candidate for the role of legal observation for the Occupy London movement. Her relationship with both police officers and PLT officers was tense, and her communication with both was minimal. At some points she would actively ignore law enforcement officers addressing her so successfully that officers would turn around and walk away without further questioning.

In many cases the role of the legal observer shifts to the responsibility of an independent witness in support of defendants who are arrested during demonstrations. Their observations of the arrest and detainment of demonstrators becomes crucial in aiding cases for releasing defendants arrested using excessive policing measures. On most occasions, the relationship between demonstrators and police were severed when the local Heritage Warden scolded demonstrators who used megaphones, claiming that he is enforcing byelaws relating to Parliament Square which outlaw “noise pollution”. These byelaws, passed by the Greater London Authority (GLA) in 2012, prohibit the transmitting of amplified noise without written permission (Greater London Authority, 2012: 3)

Arrests

Throughout the May occupations, there was one attempt to erect a tent occupying a particular area of Parliament Square; the area directly underneath the statue of Gandhi (see **Figure. 8**). This occurred on the 3rd day of the occupation (4th May) before Reclaim the Power began speaking on the topic of environmental issues. At first glance, it was difficult to establish the details of the situation, but it later became clear that several demonstrators were sat inside the tent peacefully meditating when a large number of police constables surrounded the tent and created a barrier blocking others from entering the space (see **Figure. 9**). After several minutes of shouting and heckling on the part of demonstrators, the police began “evicting” those in the tent by pulling them out by their arms and using pressure points in order to cause pain. It was evident that the demonstrators were in immense pain as they each screamed continuously when being handled by officers, shouting ‘they’re hurting me! They’re hurting me!’. The scenes were difficult to witness as an independent observer, let alone a member of the Occupy London movement. A long-running participant with Occupy spoke of the incident later:

‘How awful was that? You could literally hear your friends screaming in pain because...why? They set up a tent? It was the smallest tent, I mean I didn’t even see it until the cops surrounded it.’

(10532 Interview)

The legal observer was immediately at the scene, making frantic notes of the arrest with a pen and notepad. Immediately, demonstrators as well as other members of the public began shouting 'shame on you!' and pointing at the officers making the arrests. One member of the public, a middle-aged female joining in the shouting was asked how she felt about the police's actions regarding the tent eviction. She explained:

'Never in my fifty-three years could I have imagined that the our national police service would ever come to a point where they arrest poor young people...our future generation for something as stupid as setting up a piece of plastic on a wire in a public space'

(10583 Interview)

This was a view that was expressed similarly by other members of the public. The general view was that the police's actions were unconventional, unjust and essentially disproportionate to the acts committed by the demonstrators who were meditating in the tent. The police's response was minimal, they refused to provide any opinion or information on this matter at the time of arrest. It was clear that their response to the situation had become desperate. Some demonstrators lay on the floor by the officers' feet holding on to the tent, but this did not hinder them in ripping the tent apart and, in the process, injuring demonstrators' hands and eventually accidentally hitting a fellow colleague in the eye with the tent wire. Evidently, the situation was not in control and their negative attitudes to the situation were heightened by the public's disappointment and accusations of injustice.

Despite this, one participant spoke of the benefits of the police's erratic behaviour at the scene:

'The police are human...and I know how humans think. So the events of today were good, because the police were thinking "why are we doing this? Who's telling us to do this? What are we doing? What are they doing wrong?'. In one hand, they're arresting them because they're being told to arrest them (even though they haven't really broken any laws). On the other hand, it is also feeding the Occupy movement'

(10531 Interview)

This suggestion is very significant as it responds to the reasoning behind maintaining a peaceful stance while conducting demonstrations. While participants are not

showing aggression, and are remaining peaceful in their actions, there is a high likelihood that the officers involved in the arrests will eventually alter their own points of view on the subject and understand the situation from the perspective of those being arrested. When speaking of ‘feeding the Occupy movement’, the participant referred to both the police’s outlook on demonstrations as well as media attention that could potentially improve public relations of the movement.

The arrests of the meditating demonstrators saw no attempt on the part of PLT officers to negotiate with those being arrested. There was immediate action on the part of police constables in upholding the Parliament Square byelaw set by the GLA. The second wave of arrests, however, illustrated an alternative sequence of events. On Day 6 of the occupation (Election Day), a non-regular demonstrator, X, who was very clearly intoxicated had a verbal altercation with a police officer after he scolded Adam Ramsey for using a megaphone in Parliament Square. Following the altercation, X approached the officer and casually flicked his hat off his head while laughing. Within a couple of seconds, the officer’s facial expression changed, he frowned deeply and pushed X to the ground in a very over-dramatic way. The legal observer, at this point, was not at the scene but approached the group of officers after their colleague’s actions saying ‘you’re ridiculous! Get off our square!’. As mentioned previously, legal observer duties generally prohibit taking part in activism while acting as independent witness. In this case, the legal observer put this aside and cautioned officers not to assault their demonstrators. This indicated that the legal observer’s role as independent observer was compromised by the need to respond to the actions of the police. She was also observed earlier on that day cautioning officers for not wearing their name badges or hiding them behind their chest-mounted radios.

Following the incident, PLT officers quickly entered the crowd speaking to demonstrators about what had happened, and attempting to provide a logical alternative viewpoint to the actions of the police officer in pushing X to the ground. One of them said ‘well you can understand why, you flicked his hat off...would that not tick you off if you were him?’ This seemed to be a ridiculously unjustified reason in responding with violence toward a demonstrator that was clearly very intoxicated. When PLT officers retreated from the scene, they returned explaining that the police would like to question X on an alleged assault on a police officer. Demonstrators very quickly surrounded X and began singing *People Got The Power*, a token protest

song by *Daznez* released in 2014. The PLT officers attempted every means possible in convincing X to turn himself in to the police for questioning; from addressing him directly, to attempting to go through the legal observer gatekeeper, to speaking to friends who ignored their requests by singing louder. Eventually, X attempted to flee the scene with a couple of other demonstrators who were dressed in fancy-dress animal jumpsuits. In total, there were five individuals running away from Parliament Square towards Parliament tube station. The police very hastily signalled for backup on their radios and chased after the group. 4 police vans arrived at the scene with over 40 officers surrounding the individuals, an excessively high police-demonstrator ratio. While running, one officer continuously addressed his colleagues with ‘bad move guys...this was a very bad move’, indicating that their actions were excessive and could have been avoided without public awareness (see **Figure. 10**).

Despite this, X and another demonstrator were arrested. It was unclear why the demonstrator dressed in a polar-bear jumpsuit was also subject to arrest as he had had no involvement in the actions that precipitated the officers to attempt to question X. This individual’s friend, who was severely autistic, began screaming and crying ‘he’s done...nothing...wrong!’ which sparked a huge amount of attention from passers-by who stopped to document the incident on their smartphones. The police seemed to take no notice of the individual who left-wing demonstrator, D, constantly emphasised was severely autistic and experiencing intense trauma as a result of the incident. Evidently the police were not organised and lost control of a situation that could have easily been avoided if there were no attempts made to question the intoxicated demonstrator for a seemingly minor incident. Despite this, both X and his friend dressed as a polar-bear were detained and driven away in a Metropolitan Police van.

Both arrests made are currently still awaiting trial, and evidence is being gathered in an attempt to convict the first group of demonstrators of breaching a byelaw relating to Parliament Square, and the second group for assaulting a police officer. As there has been no direct contact with law enforcement officers at the scene, it has not been possible to secure specific information about how and why the occupation was policed in such an uncontrolled and erratic manner. In technicality, the enforcement of the Parliament Square byelaws must begin with a request from the Heritage Warden of the area to cease the act breaching a specific section of the byelaw. The legal observer made this clear at the end of Day 6, when tensions

between demonstrators and the police were lower. Whilst addressing police constables and PLT officer at the scene, stating that they were not welcome and that they should vacate the square, two officers approached her claiming that she was not to use a megaphone. One of these officers was overtly documenting the conversation on a small camcorder. The observer replied:

‘You have to follow due process. A Heritage Warden has to give me friendly advice, and if I don’t do as I’m told they have to give me a direction, and then if I don’t do as I’m told they have to ask for my details to summon me to court. And then...if I refuse to give my details to summon me to court, they can ask you to arrest me, and I still won’t give you my details. But I’d appreciate it if you’d follow due process guys. Thanks.’

(Legal Observer)

This simple response illustrated the level of disorganisation on the part of the police officers at the scene, who attempted on occasion to enforce policies without a request from the Heritage Warden of the area. The two officers responded by nodding their heads and saying ‘I know, I know’. Although the byelaws in question are policies that must be legally adhered to, they can be overridden by other forms of legislation. As Matthew noted when asked about the Parliament Square byelaws:

‘Byelaws are secondary legislation, created by local authorities and open to challenges. The byelaws in this case relating to Parliament Square have previously been challenged and this challenge has failed. The courts accepted the byelaws in a previous case, and deemed them appropriate in maintaining order in the area’

(10533 Interview)

In relation to the enforcement of the Parliament Square byelaws on the first set of arrests at the occupation named #OccupyGandhi, there was no attempt by police constables, PLT officers or the Heritage Warden to politely request the removal of the tent before it was surrounded by officers and the “eviction” process began. The removal was justified through, again, the byelaws relating to Parliament Square made official by the GLA in 2002. Despite this, the law enforcement agencies responsible for maintaining this byelaw did not follow the correct procedure of initial request to remove the encampment. In an unsigned previous document of correspondence between the GLA and the Mayor of London regarding an incident in 2009, the GLA

claimed that their Heritage Warden's initial requests by those camping at the time were ignored (Greater London Authority, 2009: 2). This document, as well as the response by officers to the legal observer who explained the process of arrests when there has been a breach of the Parliament Square byelaws, makes it clear that law enforcement agencies are well aware of the process they must follow.

Court Representation

As mentioned previously, the defendants in this case are still awaiting trial. Occupy London demonstrators who are arrested are normally put in touch with the Green & Black Cross, the organisation that trains those wishing to act as legal observers for demonstrations. The Green & Black Cross have links with London's best law firms for these sorts of cases and many of these law firms will support protestors, often covered by legal aid or otherwise pro bono. This is, however, becoming increasingly difficult due to government cuts to legal aid budgets in recent years. Occupy London demonstrators on trial have often requested for the attendance of legal observers as independent witnesses in their defence. However, as Matthew noted in his experience, on most occasions cases have been discontinued due to 'half-time submissions' made by defence representation (10533 Interview), which argues that the prosecution's case is thin in evidence and not worthy to be pursued (Welsh, 2003: 137; Roberts & Zuckerman, 2010: 79; McPeake, 2015: 174; Gillespie, 2015: 449; Monaghan, 2014: 9). In some instances, cases are discontinued due to the prosecution of the defendants being deemed not to be in the public interest. In a previous case relating to demonstrators arrested from the Occupy London Stock Exchange occupations, the court found that the police's use of pressure points as a first resort was unlawful and, thus, the case was discontinued.

In cases relating to the Occupy London movement, courts are known to follow guidelines issued in 2011 by the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) Keir Starmer QC relating to the prosecution of offences committed during public protest. These guidelines indicate that it is only in the public interest to arrest participants of a protest if their actions are related to violence, or promotion of violent acts (CPS, 2012). In the case of Occupy London Stock Exchange, the actions of the demonstrators were not of a violent nature. Similarly, the May occupation below the statue of Gandhi saw no acts committed by the Occupy Democracy sub-group that

could have been deemed as violent or of a violence-promoting nature. Therefore, it is likely that this case will also follow previous trends of Occupy London cases, and be discontinued on half-time submission grounds.

It is clear, therefore, that the relationship between Occupy London demonstrators and the police have been rocky. In this case, there are two issues; firstly, the legal observer does not always act as a fully independent witness to communication between demonstrators and the police, and secondly, the PLT officers' attempts to diffuse heightened tensions are ineffective due to the solidarity of demonstrators in ignoring law enforcement. This is contributed to, in part, by the legal observer's negative attitude towards PLT officers and her continuous announcements to demonstrators requesting for them not to communicate with them. Since the bridge of communication between the police and Occupy Democracy is weak and faulty, it is hardly surprising that there have been instances where police have reacted using excessive force and bypassing regulations in order to arrest demonstrators. Nevertheless, these are issues that have always existed during public demonstrations, also reinforcing issues relating to new social movement, but the strictly peaceful stance of participants of Occupy London may work towards their advantage in allowing officers to question their actions more widely.

3.5. Sousveillance & New Media

While the legal observer was using a notepad and pen to document demonstrator-police communication, other participants in the May occupations made use of several forms of technology acting as both resistance techniques, and for personal record keeping. The use of technology for events was limited, the movement's lack of financial capability and resources only allows for certain technologies to be utilised. The Occupy London movement has been able to use new media technology in order to keep all participants and "organisers" updated of meetings and developments. They make use of live-streaming websites such as Bambuser, social networking site Facebook and video-streaming site YouTube to network their occupations globally.

Live-Streaming & Uploading

The Occupy London movement is networked successfully using new media technology. Networking is key in Occupy London's presence. It is a method through which they are able to maintain contact with other participants, "organisers" and members of the public sympathetic to their cause. As other contemporary new social movements, its use of network globalisation proves vital in allowing all individuals involved (and also those who are not yet aware) to remain up to date with developments. This is done through two channels: live-streaming and social networking. Most members of Occupy London use social networking websites such as Facebook and Twitter in order to communicate with one another. The importance of social networking in the advancement of a movement such as Occupy cannot be understated. Castells emphasised that the Occupy Wall Street movement was 'born digital' creating an online network that allowed members to mobilise in physical form (Castells, 2015). In the same way, the Occupy London movement networks through social networking site pages attributed to their sub-groups, as well as through the sharing and contributing to other similar activist pages such as Anonymous UK. One non-regular Occupy demonstrator mentioned that his involvement in the movement began from reading shared links between Occupy and Anonymous UK pages on Facebook (10530 Interview). Similarly, another less active Occupy demonstrator spoke of her links with the Occupy-specific Twitter pages:

'It's easy...movements with similar views tend to retweet each other's tweets and so you can gather so much information on what's going on without even realising. If I can't attend something that's organised, I just jump onto Bambuser and see what's happened and where we are.'

(10938 Interview)

As well as specifying that the ways in which demonstrators communicate with one another is made simple and easy by the availability of new media, the participant mentioned using the online live-streaming website Bambuser in order to keep up to date with events. Bambuser is a live-streaming website, but different to many others of its kind, as it filters broadcasts on its site down to location and type of device used for broadcasting (Bambuser, n.d.). It is a popular live-streaming site used by activist

organisations and movement, and is known for its usefulness of ‘placing technology in a social context’ (Ehn et al., 2014). The use of the website as a source for watching live-stream broadcasts is known by most members of Occupy London. Only a few demonstrators use live-streaming during events and occupations. A long-running participant in Occupy London mentioned:

‘Well, a lot of people want to be here and can’t, so at least they get encouraged by seeing that 110 of us did show up and did get it together...the importance is that we get the information out there, and that people keep getting the same message consistently so that hopefully they, themselves, will get down here and help us to do it. That’s a key thing.’

(10532 Interview)

This indicates that live-streaming is used for two distinctive reasons; firstly, in order to allow those unable to physically attend a sense of mental presence and solidarity, and secondly, to continuously spread the same message to those using new media channels in question. Four other regular participants also claimed that when they are not able to physically attend demonstrations, they maintain their solidarity through watching live-streaming broadcasts of events on Bambuser (10583; 10893; 10460; 10938 Interviews).

Most demonstrators interviewed, however, document occupations via their smartphones and upload them on social networking and video-streaming sites once they are at home. A demonstrator observed to be using his smartphone excessively throughout the occupations mentioned:

‘Yeah some people here live-stream on Bambuser or something. Personally, I don’t have the time or the energy to sit there for hours constantly recording what’s going on, I wanna experience it for myself. I normally record stuff or take pictures that can incriminate the police, stuff that will ruffle some feathers in the media’

(10730 Interview)

Indeed, the act of live-streaming requires a great deal of time and effort in order to continuously process the events of the night. Unless the movement’s resources allow for tripods or professional recording equipment, there are few participants that would use their own time during occupations to live-stream without pause. Many of the video and photographic footage captured during demonstrations appears on the

Occupy movement's social networking site pages. The significance of this is that the footage is more accessible by general members of the public than they would be if they appeared on traditional media platforms. In this way, both videos and photographs can be downloaded, stored and shared in many different ways, rendering it almost impossible to lose. This act is most commonly known as 'citizen journalism', where regular citizens are able to act as amateur journalists, but where their footage becomes even more powerful and reliable than that produced by professional media organisations (Allan & Thorsen, 2009). Where this footage ultimately ends up, or how it is used by others, is another issue. The non-regular demonstrator, also a member of Anonymous UK, mentioned that he sends his footage to mainstream media organisations, who do nothing with the information (10530 Interview). He, along with many others questioned about this topic, firmly believe that social media and video-streaming sites such as YouTube are the best platform to share footage of occupations, as they generate viewing from the widest possible audience.

However, the catering of YouTube videos to particular demographics is an issue that can be explored in further research studies, perhaps in the form of a content analysis of the analytics available to the "uploader" of the videos.

Surveillance vs Sousveillance

Law enforcement use of surveillance techniques was fairly overt throughout the May occupation. Police constables made use of body-cams, technology issued in recent years in order to 'improve public scrutiny' of officers carrying out their duties (The Guardian, 2015), police camcorders and PLT officers. These overt forms of surveillance intend to document interaction between police officers and demonstrators. The use of body-cams, however, during demonstrations is problematic. Firstly, it is unclear which information is used, where it is stored and how it will be used in the future. As the Metropolitan Police have been uncooperative in providing information or commenting on specific issues relating to the policing of the May occupation, it has been difficult to establish these facts. Perhaps this is an issue that can be explored in further research into this topic.

Police surveillance throughout the May occupations was used for a number of potential reasons; as a method of deterring demonstrators from committing certain

acts, as a method of intimidation and pressure, as a means of collecting intelligence of the demographic makeup of those attending, and as a means of collecting evidence used against demonstrators during trials. However, the use of police body-cams as an overt form of surveillance potentially poses a threat to demonstrator rights to privacy. As there is no information on how this footage will be used or what intelligence the Metropolitan Police gathers on demonstrators, it still remains a possibility that the intelligence gathered would be used as a method of controlling and policing future Occupy demonstrations. Several demonstrators have expressed their views on this issue, including Matthew:

‘There are not only practical concerns whereby officers may cover or misalign their cams at particular points that may be of use to a court, but there are concerns about how this footage is used. When there is not a case to bring to court, the footage of the body-cams could potentially be processed using the Metropolitan Police’s facial recognition software in order to collect information on those who attend protests on a mass scale. There is no evidence that this is the case, but it remains a possibility.’

(10533 Interview)

Other demonstrators questioned regarding this issue also spoke of their discontent with police surveillance techniques, and that these were an invasion of privacy due to the lack of consent provided for officers to document demonstrations in such a way. The body-cams were utilised by several officers throughout the occupation, not only throughout trivial events and speeches, but also during confrontations. On one occasion, while police constables were attempting to address X in order to question him regarding the alleged assault, one participant using his smartphone to document the situation told the officer that he was filming. The officer replied ‘don’t worry, I do have my camera running as well, so it’s OK’, and the legal observer responded with ‘I don’t give a shit about your camera’. It was clear at this point that the body-cam was being used in order to counter the counter-surveillance (*sousveillance*) technique employed by the participant using his smartphone to document the event. This was used as a method of almost arrogant intimidation, a way of suggesting ‘mine is bigger than yours’ or ‘mine has more power than yours’.

In addition to body-cams, the police (as mentioned previously) made use of camcorders to document certain events, like that of the legal observer using a megaphone during the demonstration to address officers on the legal processes

surrounding breaching of the Parliament Square byelaws. During the #OccupyGandhi “evictions”, a police constable was observed standing directly underneath the statue of Gandhi, on a step, filming the process. These camcorders were used on numerous occasions throughout the May occupation, and at one point were clearly used as a means of psychological intimidation, which proved to be unsuccessful. During the “Free the Weed” march on Day 3, police constables were observed simulating hiding behind a pillar near the Embankment Pier with a camcorder recording demonstrators as they marched past. Immediately, it seemed that this tactic was intended to give the impression of covert surveillance due to the complete visibility of the officer behind the pillar. Despite this, demonstrators seemed to be familiar with this tactic as one shouted ‘it’s an intimidation tactic, don’t show them you’re intimidated...that’s what they want!’ Another participant replied ‘nah they’re just taping the demographics, they’re getting information about everyone, so they know who they’re dealing with’. In either scenario, it is evident that the police attempted to use surveillance technology in this way in order to spark some form of reaction from demonstrators, whether this be conversation, debate or a change in their behaviour. In line with the sousveillance literature of Mann & Ferenbock (2013), law enforcement use of overt surveillance technology is a clear demonstration of power status by a group situated higher on the power incline.

The third form of surveillance utilised by law enforcement was through the deployment of the PLT officers. Although not technological or intended as a tactic of intimidation, the officers were used as a form of intelligence collection and evidence gathering. Merely the involvement of PLT officers in recent years as a method of intelligence gathering indicates that police strategies of on-the-ground surveillance are slowly failing, and although the officers also act as peaceful communicators during difficult situations, this seems like a desperate attempt on the part of the Metropolitan Police to understand insider details of Occupy demonstrators. However, this will prove difficult as the movement’s *structurelessness* and *decentralisation* ensures that it is impossible to predict in advance the demographics that will attend each occupation. Nevertheless, the surveillance utilised by the Metropolitan Police was continuously countered by demonstrations throughout the May occupations.

A significant practical disadvantage of the police’s use of both body-cams and camcorders is that there is a need to preserve the technology successfully throughout conflicts to ensure that the data is not lost before it can be transferred and

used. In contrast, the demonstrator use of smartphones in documenting law enforcement is much more secure and reliable. As mentioned in the **Methodology** chapter, a significant advantage in the use of smartphone technology both for observation notes and interviewing audio recording is that there is security and ease of backup transfer. This ensures that if smartphones are confiscated by officers, there will always be virtual backup of the footage recorded. In this sense, although demonstrators are on a lower position on the power status incline, their prospects of preserving more secure and reliable sources for defence in court are higher. Furthermore, it seemed as though the relationship between surveillance and sousveillance during the May occupations reflected the findings of Shaw's research on the Occupy Sydney demonstrations. In a sense, the technological conflict between demonstrators and law enforcement imitated a dance of cameras. At all points where camcorders were utilised by the police, the demonstrators hastily took out their smartphones in order to counter the surveillance.

The use of smartphones as a method of sousveillance proved to, at times, damage the relationship between demonstrators and police. During several incidents, police constables asked not to be filmed while they were addressing demonstrators regarding breaching of the Parliament Square byelaws. These requests were ignored by demonstrators as they continued recording police-demonstrator communication. Where incidents were more than trivial, such as those on Day 7 (Anti-Tory March) where the police practically instigated a riot among demonstrators outside the gates of Downing Street, there was little attention paid to those who were documenting footage. Counter-surveillance techniques not only went unnoticed, but law enforcement reinforced their power by violently pushing away a member of the Press who was documenting their arrests of innocent demonstrators merely standing nearby the rioting. However, since the march of that day involved many different activist movements, not just Occupy London, it is difficult to establish whether any incidents of violence can be linked directly to Occupy participants.

Similar to the bridge of communication on the law enforcement side, the PLT officers, on the other end of the "watching" spectrum is the legal observer acting as the non-technological form of sousveillance for the Occupy London members. Although the legal observer for the May occupations was supposed to act as independent witness, it was clear that her involvement in activism with the Occupy London movement hindered her abilities to act as an effective objective individual.

In this sense, her shortcomings as an independent witness proved useful for the Occupy Democracy sub-group in their own gathering of intelligence of law enforcement officers. The information she gathers on police constables, PLT officers and the Heritage Warden can prove invaluable for the movement's future planning of similar occupations.

Legal Observation as Sousveillance

As the use of traditional documenting methods of notepad and pen has been critiqued as an unreliable method of participant observation in the **Methodology** chapter, it is worth noting that its use for legal observing is just as unreliable. The fact that this was the prime method for the legal observer in documenting arrest procedures and law enforcement leads one to question the reliability of the information that is available in the case of acting as independent witness for the defence of arrestees. It is inconceivable that those with such little practical training as that provided for legal observers by the Green & Black Cross could successfully note all nuances relating to arrest procedures and verbatim communication between law enforcement officers and demonstrators. Thus, new media technology can ensure that all nuances of observation are noted reliably and can be efficiently presented as dependable sources in the defence of those arrested. Matthew, legal observer and adviser for Occupy London, spoke of technological advancement of the movement in terms of legal observation techniques. Currently, the movement is trialling a new smartphone app known as Self-Evidence, a piece of technology that allows the user to audio-record using their smartphones while taking part in demonstrations, which acts as a more effective technique for sousveillance. The app had proven to be successful in a previous Occupy London demonstration in March 2015. An incident had occurred with a particular police officer who was using excessive force in order to disperse demonstrators. At one particular point during the demonstration, a demonstrator struck the officer in self-defence after being knocked to the ground. The officer claimed this to be an assault without mentioning that it was as a result of his own excessive use of force. A combination of both photographs and the audio time-stamped footage (which was later transcribed) supported the fact that the officer had been abusing his powers throughout the entire protest, and the incident of the assault was not an isolated one. As a result of the footage becoming available during the

trial, the officer in question, known as Constable Pickering, was dismissed from the Metropolitan Police for his actions.

The audio footage that is taken using this app and transcribed, accompanied by photographs and/or alternative video footage can prove revolutionary in the defence of Occupy arrestees during their court proceedings. Due to the increased use of the app and smartphones in general, it is potentially becoming more difficult for the police to abuse their powers, thus increasing the demonstrators' power of resistance against law enforcement. As research has found, footage captured of police brutality and excessive policing tactics through counter-surveillance methods and, subsequently, shared online by demonstrators could prove useful in resisting authority (Bradshaw, 2013; Shaw, 2013; Wilson & Serisier, 2010; Milberry, 2013; McLaughlin, 2012; Petrosian, 2014). Therefore, the use of technology as a form of legal observation is not only necessary but crucial. On several occasions following incidents with law enforcement, the Occupy Democracy legal observer was heard asking individuals for any footage they may have that they could provide. As the legal observer has not yet been called to act as a witness to the defence of those arrested during the occupation, it is not yet clear how this footage was used. However, the use of this footage, as well as the eye-witness accounts of an independent witness could prove to be an essential asset to the Occupy movement if this were employed successfully. Not only this, the combination of cross-platform new media technology as a method of legal observation ensures security and protection from confiscation of the footage by law enforcement agents.

In addition, the Occupy London movement is currently seeking legal advice on Litigation Privilege, where to use footage and documents seized by police as evidence can potentially be used for the purposes of litigation. In this case, however, further steps must be taken until this technology can be used against law enforcement agents legally without interference or tampering of the evidence. If this proves successful, then the information seized by the police could become legally available in the defence of demonstrators arrested during occupations. However, this assumes that the information seized is insecure and not copies of the information exist. If technological advancement allows for the combination of legal observation and digital recording, then the issue of police confiscation for the purposes of evidence would be less complex due to the secure nature of digital technology.

Technological Advancement

Technology is a key aspect in the movement's techniques of resisting law enforcement when abuses of power or authority are evident. The Occupy London movement is not only advancing in technology utilised for the purposes of sousveillance, but also in ways that allow for further legal challenges to the policing of the movement. A recent Sky News investigation uncovered the presence of counterfeit mobile phone towers situated around the country, which essentially track the International Mobile Subscriber Identity (IMSI) numbers of innocent individuals' mobile phones and collect their data (Sky News, 2015). These revelations suggest that governments are essentially engaging in a course of conduct that could be referred to as "spying" on regular citizens without criminal justification. Occupy London has embraced the findings of this investigation and legal observer and adviser, Matthew, is setting out to prove that law enforcement agencies are also transporting these devices using vans driven into areas where demonstrations take place. Indeed, Privacy International found one of these devices outside St Paul's Cathedral in 2011, and another was found several months later outside the Ministry of Defence. Undoubtedly, these so-called "sting-rays" have important roles in interfering with terrorist activities. However, a big concern here is that the police are increasingly considering direct action protesting as a form of mild terrorism, an issue that must be successfully overcome if the Occupy movement is to flourish and develop. In order to tackle this, the movement is in the process of ordering a telephone device from an undisclosed security company that will assist in analysing airwaves as demonstrations take place. The tracker will then have the ability to identify the proximity of the stingrays to the area in question. It will not necessarily be clear whether the protests themselves are being targeted, but they can nonetheless be useful in order to challenge inadvertent capturing and storing of demonstrators' phones and phone data, leading to more serious questions on how Occupy demonstrations are policed. Further studies in relation to this could explore how this technology is eventually used in order to increase Occupy London's power of resistance against excessive surveillance attempts.

As technology continuously advances, the Occupy London movement seems to be drifting away from their traditional roots of resistance to the current system, to working within the legal system in order to challenge policies and procedures that

they find to be unjust. However, it is clear that as the situation stands there is still a long and difficult path until an equal playing field between the law enforcement surveillance and demonstrator sousveillance can be established. As Mann & Ferenbok illustrated, the distance between the “guard” and “prisoner” will always remain as a power status incline, where neither can take the role of the other, but each can simultaneously challenge the other through the use of sousveillance techniques.

4. Conclusions

It is clear that Occupy London has developed since its birth from Occupy London Stock Exchange and Occupy St Paul's, both in terms of its networking and technological advancement. This study focused on the Occupy London sub-group Occupy Democracy's occupation in Parliament Square in May 2015, using participant-as-observer ethnographic participant observation and semi-structured interviewing, in order to explore the research questions emerging from the review of literature into "new" social movements and Occupy. The May demonstrations have been vital in revealing the transformation of the Occupy movement from a contemporary social movement focusing on global economic issues to one centring on more localised political concerns. A combination of the movement's desire for freedom and symbolic change, and their utilisation of network globalisation in order to create and maintain communication with one another and the public, reinforces the movement's placement within the realm of "new" social movements. Similarly, the left-wing and liberal political standpoint of many of the Occupy Democracy participants connects Occupy London with much of the research conducted on other "new" social movements throughout the 1960s and 70s, which were associated with values of liberalism.

The demographic makeup of the London-based movement, however, has very much shifted from the dominant presence of white, middle-class and intellectually advanced individuals emphasised in previous research on new social movements and Occupy, to a fairly even mixture of middle-class and working-class individuals, and those from BME backgrounds. However, there is still a consistent over-representation of white men, and an under-representation of those with disabilities. It has been noted, and will be reinforced in the concluding comments of this study, that the reasons for this are the movement's values of *structurelessness* and *leaderlessness*, which render it almost impossible for "organisers" to cater for increased representation of one group of people at occupations, and limit those who are over-represented. In order to improve this, however, it was suggested that the information provided and circulated in public be worded in a way that cater for both those with disabilities and those from BME backgrounds. The adoption of these

suggestions is crucial for the Occupy London movement if they wish to remain representative of the “99%”.

The Occupy London movement reinforces the general Occupy values of *structurelessness*, *leaderlessness* and *decentralisation* greatly. Structurelessness is the primary aspect of the movement’s continued sense of uniqueness, and the combination of making spontaneous decisions throughout the occupation and lack of identification of participants with particular roles, strengthened the notion that the movement is highly unstructured. This is not to say that the movement was unorganised or disorganised. Quite the contrary, there was a large amount of organisation required for the occupations to run in the ways that they did. From social networking, to the invitation of speakers, live-streaming and the use of sousveillance techniques in resisting law enforcement, there was organisation of all aspects of the occupation that contributed to its smooth operation throughout May. Participants who contributed in the administration of the events, however, did not refer to themselves as “organisers” and were hesitant in embracing any title that may have compromised the values of leaderlessness of the movement. Even the notion of organising an occupation in the name of a sub-group of a UK-based Occupy movement strengthened Occupy’s own value of decentralisation; the importance remaining that any hindering of a sub-group in their activities or events would not harm or affect the movement as a whole, allowing for participants to continue challenging the political system as it stands.

However, the sub-group has been unable to clearly distinguish between the almost complete system overhaul they proposed initially through Occupy Wall Street, and their embracing of the current political process in order to maintain the movement’s standpoint. Their association with the Green Party, and invitation of a Green Party activist as a speaker at the May occupations, is questionable. It demonstrates the contradiction between what their overall principles claim to be, and what they display in action throughout demonstrations. Association with an existing political party indicates that there is hope among the movement that the current political system may be able to provide the alternative that may be beneficial to the “99%”. This being the case, then the potential of the movement to remain unique and different to other social movements is little, as they could simply be considered a political movement that will compromise effortlessly with a party reinforcing their political views. This is an issue that should be investigated further through,

potentially, interviewing those who are activists in the Green Party of England and Wales. In doing so, one could uncover relationships that may suggest that the Occupy movement's general political stance is no longer shaped around a desire for revolutionary change, but has weakened substantially by the growing presence of a political party that may unofficially support its ideology.

The relationship between Occupy Democracy participants and “organisers” with law enforcement officers was sour throughout the May occupations. There was little effort in the building effective communication on the part of the members of the sub-group, primarily due to repeated instructions by their bridge of communication; the legal observer. As the role of the legal observer is to act as an independent witness, and not take part in activism while in their role, it is clear that the legal observer for the Occupy Democracy sub-group was not representative of the Green & Black Cross training regulations. Similarly, interviews with another legal observer and adviser for the Occupy London group, Matthew, rendered her an inexperienced and ineffective independent observer. Thus, had there been less involvement by the legal observer in the general decision-making of participants in the movement, there would have been more effective communication between demonstrators and PLT officers wishing to relieve tensions when they arose. In seeking to maintain an oblivious attitude towards law enforcement, the legal observer continuously hindered the bridge of communication between demonstrators and the police. In the case of policing, the May occupation saw law enforcement's continuous attempts to enforce Parliament Square byelaws introduced in 2011 without following the correct procedures of request from the Heritage Warden. On several occasions, the police used excessive force in order to enforce these byelaws, such as pressure points during the “eviction” of the meditating demonstrators during #OccupyGandhi and the arrest of two individuals for a self-defensive assault. These arrests harmed the relationship further between demonstrators and law enforcement, leading to eventual chaos during the Anti-Tory march – though very little of this can be ascribed to the Occupy London movement.

In countering excessive police arrest tactics and methods of overt surveillance, demonstrators often used the legal observer as a non-technological method of sousveillance along with smartphone technology used to capture police behaviour. In combination, both approaches to data collection can be fairly effective in the defence of those arrested during Occupy demonstrations, though in reality it is

argued that the legal observer's use of notepad and pen is out-dated as a form of data collection. Indeed, in line with the comments provided in the **Methodology** section of this study, it is much more efficient and secure to record observational data using digital technology. In relation to technological conflict, there was clear reinforcement of Shaw's findings from his study of Occupy Sydney and the "dance of cameras" between law enforcement's use of surveillance (through PLT officers, body-cams and police camcorders) and demonstrators' use of sousveillance (through the legal observer, and smartphones). Despite the fact that the police often used their surveillance techniques as methods of intimidation, such as during the "Free the Weed" march or the attempts at questioning X for the alleged assault, the relationship between police and demonstrators remained unchanged. The act of sousveillance itself at times soured the relationship between demonstrators and the police, but for the most part, it did not have specific positive or negative effects on police-demonstrator relationships. This is not to say that effects of sousveillance on the behaviour of the police are non-existent, but rather that there was little change in behaviour on the part of law enforcement as a result of demonstrators using counter-surveillance techniques.

The Occupy London movement not only uses methods of social networking and live-streaming in order to maintain its continuous presence, it is also trialling a piece of technology used during legal observation. This time-stamped audio recording technology can be revolutionary in combining the physical act of legal observation with technological methods of sousveillance, thus strengthening the overall account of events during which demonstrators are abused by police officers, or unjustly arrested. Its use will alter the methods of legal observing from traditional use of notepad and pen to the use of technology made possible through new media and cross-platform synergy, where data remains secure and protected from confiscation by the police. In the current social landscape, where technological advancement is at its peak, the movement's ability to remain up to date with these developments contributes to their powers (as the actors in Mann & Ferenbok's sousveillance power status incline) in holding law enforcement into account for acts of injustice, thus maintaining and strengthening their continued presence. In addition, sustained attempts in proving unjust and excessive surveillance techniques aimed at capturing mobile phone data of social movement participants is being intensified through the acquiring of intelligence equipment. If the equipment successfully

identifies the close proximity of police stingrays capturing IMSI data from activists within London, then the Occupy London movement will be at a significant advantage in its ability to potentially alter policies on policing and surveillance of contemporary social movements.

4.1. Future Recommendations

In further studies relating to the Occupy London movement, it may prove useful to combine the methodologies used in this study with a form of online discourse analysis of networking practices. This includes social networking, live-streaming and the appearance of footage captured as counter-surveillance. In doing so, one could delve further into how Occupy London cater for particular demographics through social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter, how their use of these sites are promoted, how they are received and what comments are available by other users of the site who may not necessarily be familiar with the movement and its aims. Similarly, the availability of sousveillance footage on user-generated content sites such as video-streaming website YouTube could shed light into the types of debates sparked as a result of this footage becoming available. Linking to studies around citizen journalism and video activism more generally, this footage can be analysed in terms of its views, comments and efforts to target particular demographics or network with mainstream media organisations.

If additional studies are to be conducted using ethnographic participant observation of the Occupy London movement, it may be worthwhile to spend a more excessive length of time on the field, taking into considering numerous different demonstrations and occupations organised within London. The Occupy Democracy occupation analysed in this study was more or less representative of different classes and ethnic backgrounds, but this should be continuously studied and noted, linking demographics to the themes of the day. Discourse analysis of the print texts (leaflets, cards, brochures) may prove useful in establishing whether there have been changes in order to cater for both those with disabilities and those from BME backgrounds.

Additionally, due to the ways in which the Occupy London movement's new media practices are advancing, there will undoubtedly be revelations of attempted resistance against policing practices of contemporary social movements. This may provide useful for future research, where content analysis of legislation and

interviews with law enforcement who were uncooperative in this study may further information relating to the policing of Occupy, and the successes/failures of PLT officer deployment. In doing so, it may be useful to conduct perhaps structured interviews with law enforcement officers, making use of photo elicitation techniques relating to specific points throughout demonstrations.

5. Appendix


<div><div>PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET</div><div></div></div> <div><p>OCCUPY LONDON: SOUSVEILLANCE AS RESISTANCE?</p><p>Who is this project for?</p><p>This project is in fulfilment of an MA by Research thesis in Criminology at the University of Kent. It is being supervised by two leading academics in the study of Criminology, and will be officially submitted at the end of September 2015. It has been approved by the SSPSSR (School of Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research) Research Ethics Committee of the University of Kent.</p><p>What is the purpose of this project?</p><p>The project aims to understand how sousveillance techniques are used within the Occupy London movement, how this impacts on the relationship between movement participants and the police, and whether it reinforces the general values of the movement. In this way, one can study whether Occupy's use of sousveillance, as a strategy, is effective.</p><p>What is <i>sousveillance</i>?</p><p><i>Sousveillance</i> is the act of "watching from below" – as opposed to <i>surveillance</i> which is defined as "watching from above". In a nutshell, sousveillance is the capture of images and footage by those considered to have a low power status.</p><p>Why have I been chosen?</p><p>The research benefits from a variety of interviews with participants, organisers and "outsiders" to the demonstrations, in order to understand whether views and opinions differ depending on the type of relationship to the movement. Your views are highly valued and will contribute to the depth of research in the study of new social movements within Britain.</p><p>Do I have to take part?</p><p>No. You are under no obligation to take part in the interview. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you have the right to stop and withdraw at any point.</p><p>How long will it take?</p><p>The interview length is entirely dependant on how much information you would like to provide. There are a series of questions; the exact number depends on whether you are an organiser/participant in the protest, or a bystander. The length/depth to which you go in order to answer them is up to you.</p><div><div>ARC: Macintosh HD:Users:Dan:OneDrive:MA by Research:Dissertation:3. Methodology:Ethics:Application:2. Information Sheet.docx</div><div>28.08.13</div></div></div>
--

Figure 1a: *Participant Information Sheet (1st page)*

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET



How will my participation be documented?

The researcher will take notes while you respond to the questions. On occasion he may voice-record the interview, but you will be informed and asked to provide consent if this is the case.

Do I have to give personal information?

No. The researcher may ask you some general demographic questions at the end of (or throughout) the interview, but you do not need to answer these if you consider them too personal. You will be assigned a unique number for the purpose of the research. This will not identify you personally.

What will happen to my data?

Any relevant information or response provided throughout the duration of the interview will be noted and may be included in the thesis. The researcher will be unable to tell you exactly what will be included, or how it will be presented, at this point in time. All data collected will be kept in a locked cupboard in a secure residency. This will be subsequently destroyed once the thesis has been submitted and approved.

What are the risks/benefits of my participation?

There are no foreseeable risks to your participation in the research. The project is safe and does not carry any ethical implications that result in harm or distress to yourself or the researcher. The project hopes to contribute to the wider knowledge of social movements within Britain and your participation is very beneficial to this production of new knowledge.

You may stop at any point if you feel distressed from the questions or the research conduct. If you then wish to speak to somebody about this, there are some contacts listed below.

Will I get to see the results of the research?

Yes, you may ask to be sent a copy of the thesis once this has been submitted and approved. This would be between September and November 2015.

Contact

Dan Petrosian (Researcher): vp208@kent.ac.uk / 07891069722

Contacts for concerns regarding the research

Dr Phil Carney (Supervisor): p.carney@kent.ac.uk / 01227 824162

Prof Roger Matthews (Supervisor): r.a.matthews@kent.ac.uk / 01227 827477

Claire Smith (Research Ethics Coordinator): c.e.smith@kent.ac.uk / 01227 823072

ARC: Macintosh HD:Users:Dan:OneDrive:MA by Research:Dissertation:3. Methodology:Ethics:Application:2. Information Sheet.docx 28.08.13

Figure 1b: *Participant Information Sheet (2nd page)*

CONSENT FORM



Title of project: OCCUPY LONDON: SOUSVEILLANCE AS RESISTANCE?

Name of investigator: DAN PETROSIAN

Participant Identification Number for this project:

Please initial box

1. I confirm I have read and understand the information sheet for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily.

☐

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason.

☐

3. I understand that my responses will be anonymised before analysis. I give permission for members of the research team to have access to my anonymised responses.

☐

4. I agree to take part in the above research project.

☐

Name of participant

Date

Signature

Name of person taking consent
(if different from lead researcher)

Date

Signature

To be signed and dated in presence of the participant

Lead researcher

Date

Signature

Copies:

When completed: 1 for participant; 1 for researcher site file: 1 (original) to be kept in main file

ARC: Macintosh HD:Users:Dan:OneDrive:MA by Research:Dissertation:3. Methodology:Ethics:Application:3. Consent Form.docx 28.10.13

Figure 2: *Participant Consent Form*



Figure 3: *Demonstrator with Palestinian solidarity scarf watches police scuffle*



Figure 4: *Peace flag behind the Occupy Democracy banner*



Figure 5: *Anti-TTIP speaker addresses the crowd*



Figure 6: Demonstrators sing along to "Fuck Off Back to Eton" behind Occupy Democracy banner



Figure 7: "Free the Weed" activist posing with a bag full of cannabis



Figure 8: *Tent is erected underneath statue of Gandhi*



Figure 9: *Police surround the tent as demonstrators sit on the ground*



Figure 10: *Police chase after X towards Parliament tube station*

6. Bibliography

6.1. Interviews

10043. (2015, May 2). Face-to-face Interview. *Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-Branch of the Occupy London Movement*. (V. Petrosian, Interviewer)
10111. (2015, May 2). Face-to-face Interview. *Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-Branch of the Occupy London Movement*. (V. Petrosian, Interviewer)
10284. (2015, May 1). Face-to-face Interview. *Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-Branch of the Occupy London Movement*. (V. Petrosian, Interviewer)
10374. (2015, May 4). Face-to-face Interview. *Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-Branch of the Occupy London Movement*. (V. Petrosian, Interviewer)
10460. (2015, May 2). Face-to-face Interview. *Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-Branch of the Occupy London Movement*. (V. Petrosian, Interviewer)
10530. (2015, May 4). Face-to-face Interview. *Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-Branch of the Occupy London Movement*. (V. Petrosian, Interviewer)
10531. (2015, May 4). Face-to-face Interview. *Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-Branch of the Occupy London Movement*. (V. Petrosian, Interviewer)
10532. (2015, May 4). Face-to-face Interview. *Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-Branch of the Occupy London Movement*. (V. Petrosian, Interviewer)
10533. (2015, July 13). Telephone Interview. *Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-Branch of the Occupy London Movement*. (V. Petrosian, Interviewer)
10583. (2015, May 4). Face-to-face Interview. *Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-Branch of the Occupy London Movement*. (V. Petrosian, Interviewer)
10662. (2015, May 2). Face-to-face Interview. *Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-Branch of the Occupy London Movement*. (V. Petrosian, Interviewer)
10730. (2015, May 6). Face-to-face Interview. *Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-Branch of the Occupy London Movement*. (V. Petrosian, Interviewer)
10893. (2015, May 7). Face-to-face Interview. *Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-Branch of the Occupy London Movement*. (V. Petrosian, Interviewer)
10923. (2015, May 2). Face-to-face Interview. *Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-Branch of the Occupy London Movement*. (V. Petrosian, Interviewer)
10938. (2015, May 2). Face-to-face Interview. *Occupy Democracy: A Study of New Media Use by a Sub-Branch of the Occupy London Movement*. (V. Petrosian, Interviewer)

6.2. Academic

- Adler, E. S., & Clark, R. (2008). *How It's Done: An Invitation to Social Research* (3rd ed.). California: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Aggleton, P., Davies, P., & Hart, G. (Eds.). (1992). *AIDS: Rights, Risk and Reason*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Aitchinson, G. (2011). Reform, Rupture or Re-Imagination: Understanding the Purpose of an Occupation. *Social Movement Studies*, 10 (4), 431-439.
- Albon, A. (2007). *Introducing Psychology Through Research*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Allan, S., & Thorsen, E. (Eds.). (2009). *Citizen Journalism: Global Perspectives*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Archer, M. S. (2014). *Late Modernity: Trajectories towards Morphogenic Society*. London: Springer International.
- Atkinson, P., & Hammersley, M. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice* (3rd ed.). Oxon: Routledge.
- Auerbach, C. F., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative Data: An Introduction to Coding and Analysis*. New York: New York University Press.
- Azab, N. A. (Ed.). (2013). *Cases on Web 2.0 in Developing Countries: Studies on Implementation, Application, and Use*. Pennsylvania: IGI Global.
- Babbie, E. (2008). *The Basics of Social Research* (4th ed.). California: Thomson Higher Education.
- Babbie, E. (2013a). *The Practice of Social Research* (13th ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth Cengage.
- Babbie, E. (2013b). *The Practice of Social Research*. Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Bailey, K. D. (1994). *Methods of Social Research* (4th ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Balutis, A. P., Buss, T. F., & Ink, D. (Eds.). (2011). *Transforming American Governance: Rebooting the Public Square*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Bambuser. (n.d.). *Broadcasts*. Retrieved August 25, 2015, from Bambuser website: <http://bambuser.com/broadcasts>
- Bannister, J. (2014). *Thatcher*. New World City.
- Banyard, P., & Flanagan, C. (2005). *Ethical Issues and Guidelines in Psychology: Perspectives and Research*. East Sussex: Routledge.
- Barker, C., Cox, L., Krinsky, J., & Nilsen, A. G. (2013). *Marxism and Social Movements*. Brill.
- Bebawi, S., & Bossio, D. (2014). *Social Media and the Politics of Reportage: The 'Arab Spring'*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Becker, S., Bryman, A., & Ferguson, H. (Eds.). (2012). *Understanding Research for Social Policy and Social Work: Themes, Methods and Approaches* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.
- Bernard, R. H. (2006). *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (4th ed.). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bernard, R. H. (2013). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Blaikie, N. (2010). *Designing Social Research*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Blau, J. (2007). *The Dynamics of Social Welfare Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blessing, A. F., & Tomei, L. (Eds.). (2014). *Effects of Information Capitalism and Globalization on Teaching and Learning*. Pennsylvania: IGI Global.

- Boggs, C. (1986). *Social Movements and Political Power: Emerging Forms of Radicalism in the West*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bradshaw, E. A. (2013). This is What a Police State Looks Like: Sousveillance, Direct Action and the Anti-Corporate Globalization Movement. *Critical Criminology* , 21 (1), 447-461.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* , 3 (2), 77-101.
- Braunstein, P., & Doyle, M. W. (Eds.). (2002). *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960's and 70's*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Breinlinger, S., & Kelly, C. (2012). *The Social Psychology of Collective Action*. East Sussex: Routledge.
- Brian, C. (2002). *Advanced Psychology: Applications, Issues and Perspectives*. Cheltenham: Nelson Thornes.
- Bright Green. (2015). *Green Parties*. Retrieved August 18, 2015, from Bright Green website: <http://bright-green.org/category/greenparties/>
- British Society of Criminology. (2006, February). *Code of Ethics for Researchers in the Field of Criminology*. Retrieved August 24, 2015, from British Society of Criminology: <http://www.britisoccrim.org/docs/CodeofEthics.pdf>
- Brown, W. (2011). Occupy Wall Street: Return of a Repressed Res-Publica. *Theory & Event* , 14 (4).
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buchanan, E. A. (Ed.). (2004). *Readings in Virtual Research Ethics: Issues and Controversies*. Hershey: Idea Group.
- Burgmann, V. (2003). *Power, Profit and Protest*. Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin.
- Byrne, P. (1997). *Social Movements in Britain*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Cargan, L. (2007). *Doing Social Research*. Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Castells, M. (2012). *Networks of Outrage and Hope: Social Movements in the Internet Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Castells, M. (2015). *Networks of Outrage and Hope: Social Movements in the Internet Age* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Chandra, R. (2004). *Globalisation, Liberalisation, Privatisation, and Indian Polity: Communication*. Delhi: Isha Books.
- Cheek, J. (2004). At the Margins? Discourse Analysis and Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Health Research* , 14 (8), 1140-1150.
- Chou, M. (2014). From Crisis to Crisis: Democracy, Crisis and the Occupy Movement. *Political Studies Review* .
- Clark, D. (2003). The Death and Life of Punk, The Last Subculture. In D. Muggleton, & R. Weinzierl, *The Post-Subcultures Reader* (pp. 223-236). Oxford: Berg.
- Coker, C. (2014). *Globalisation and Insecurity in the Twenty-First Century: NATO and the Management of Risk*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Copes, H., & Miller, J. M. (Eds.). (2015). *The Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Criminology*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Costanza-Chock, S. (2012). Mic Check! Media Cultures and the Occupy Movement. *Social Movement Studies* , 11 (3-4), 375-385.
- Coy, P. G. (2013). *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* (Vol. 36). Bingley: Emerald Group.

- CPS. (2012, March 6). *DPP issues guidance to prosecutors in public protest cases*. Retrieved August 25, 2015, from Crown Prosecution Service website: http://www.cps.gov.uk/news/latest_news/dpp_issues_guidance_to_prosecutors_in_public_protest_cases/
- Crabtree, B. F., & Miller, W. L. (Eds.). (1999). *Doing Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Craig, R. J. (Ed.). (2005). *Clinical and Diagnostic Interviewing* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Curry, C. (2011, October 4). *Wall Street Protester Seeks "Cute Anarchist" on Craigslist Missed Connection*. Retrieved January 20, 2015, from ABC News: <http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/headlines/2011/10/wall-street-protester-seeks-cute-anarchist-on-craigslist-missed-connection/>
- Dahlgren, P. (2013). *The Political Web: Media, Participation and Alternative Democracy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dalton, R. J., & Kuechler, M. (1990). *Challenging the Political Order: New Social and Political Movements in Western Democracies*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Darke, S. (2014). Managing Without Guards in a Brazilian Police Lockup. *Focaal*, 68 (1).
- David, E. (2007). Signs of Resistance: Marketing Public Space Through a Renewed Cultural Activism. In G. C. Stanczak (Ed.), *Visual Research Methods*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- David, M., & Sutton, C. D. (2011). *Social Research: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Dawson, C. (2002). *Practical Research Methods: A User-friendly Guide to Mastering Research Techniques and Projects*. Oxford: How To Books.
- de Ruggiero, G. (1942). Liberalism. In *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*. New York: The MacMillan Company.
- DeLuca, K. M., Lawson, S., & Sun, Y. (2012). Occupy Wall Street on the Public Screens of Social Media: The Many Framings of the Birth of a Protest Movement. *Communication, Culture & Critique*, 5 (1), 483-509.
- Dempsey, J. S., & Forst, L. S. (2014). *An Introduction to Policing* (8th ed.). Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Diani, M., & McAdam, D. (Eds.). (2003). *Social Movements and Networks : Relational Approaches to Collective Action*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Donati, P. (2011). *Relational Sociology: A New Paradigm for the Social Sciences*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Ebaugh, H. R. (2010). *The Gülen Movement: A Sociological Analysis of a Civic Movement Rooted in Moderate Islam*. London: Springer.
- Edwards III, S. B., & Santos, D. (Eds.). (2015). *Revolutionizing the Interaction between State and Citizens through Digital Communications*. Pennsylvania: IGI Global.
- Ehn, P., Nilsson, E. M., & Topgaard, R. (Eds.). (2014). *Making Futures: Marginal Notes on Innovation, Design, and Democracy*. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Ellens, J. H. (Ed.). (2014). *Winning Revolutions: The Psychosocial Dynamics of Revolts for Freedom, Fairness, and Rights*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.
- Ellis, S., & Kessel, I. V. (Eds.). (2009). *Movers and Shakers: Social Movements in Africa*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV.

- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (2011). *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes* (2nd ed.). London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Enyedi, Z., & Deegan-Krause, K. (Eds.). (2013). *The Structure of Political Competition in Western Europe*. Routledge.
- Evans, E. J. (1997). *Thatcher and Thatcherism* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Ezekiel, E. J., Grady, C., Crouch, R. A., Lie, R. K., Miller, F. G., & Wendler, D. (Eds.). (2008). *The Oxford Textbook of Clinical Research Ethics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farimond, H. (2013). *Doing Ethical Research*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ferrell, J. (2006). The Aesthetics of Cultural Criminology. In B. Arrigo, & C. Williams (Eds.), *Philosophy, Crime, and Criminology* (pp. 257-278). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Fetterman, D. M. (2010). *Ethnography: Step-by-Step* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.
- Feye, H. (2011). *Occupy the World: From the Heart of the Protesters*. Lulu.com.
- Fiala, A. (2013). *Against Religion, Wars, and States: The Case for Enlightenment Atheism, Just War Pacifism, and Liberal-Democratic Anarchism*. Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Firmino, R. J., Duarte, F., & Ultramari, C. (Eds.). (2010). *ICTs for Mobile and Ubiquitous Urban Infrastructures: Surveillance, Locative Media and Global Networks* (Illustrated ed.). New York: IGI Global.
- Fischer, C. T. (Ed.). (2006). *Qualitative Research Methods for Psychologists: Introduction Through Empirical Studies*. London: Academic Press.
- Fitzgerald, M., & Rayter, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Queerly Canadian: An Introductory Reader in Sexuality Studies*. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.
- Fominaya, C. F., & Cox, L. (2013). *Understanding European Movements: New Social Movements, Global Injustice Struggles, Anti-austerity Protest*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Fontana, A., & Prokos, A. H. (2007). *The Interview: From Formal to Postmodern*. California: Left Coast Press.
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Penguin Books.
- Foweraker, J. (1995). *Theorizing Social Movements*. London: Pluto Press.
- Fragkou, M., & Hager, P. (2012). Staging London: Participation and Citizenship on the Way to the 2012 Olympic Games. *Contemporary Theatre Review*, 23 (4), 532-541.
- Frankel, S., & Gervais, D. (Eds.). (2014). *The Evolution and Equilibrium of Copyright in the Digital Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Freeman, J. (1970). *The Tyranny of Structurelessness*. Retrieved January 20, 2015, from Struggle: <http://struggle.ws/pdfs/tyranny.pdf>
- Frickell, S., & Moore, K. (Eds.). (2006). *The New Political Sociology of Science: Institutions, Networks, and Power*. London: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Frost, J. (2001). *An Interracial Movement of the Poor: Community Organizing and the New Left in the 1960s*. London: New York University Press.
- Fuchs, C. (2015). *Culture and Economy in the Age of Social Media*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Głowacki, M., & Jackson, L. (Eds.). (2014). *Public Media Management for the Twenty-First Century: Creativity, Innovation, and Interaction*. Oxon: Routledge.

- Gamson, W. A., & Sifry, M. L. (2013). The #Occupy Movement: An Introduction. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 54, 159-228.
- Gelder, S. V. (Ed.). (2011). *This Changes Everything: Occupy Wall Street and the 99% Movement*. California: Berrett-Koehler.
- Giddens, A., & Sutton, P. W. (Eds.). (2010). *Sociology: Introductory Readings* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gillespie, A. (2015). *The English Legal System* (5th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gillham, B. (2000). *The Research Interview*. London: Continuum.
- Gilliom, J., & Monahan, T. (2013). *SuperVision: An Introduction to the Surveillance Society*. London: University of Chicago Press.
- Gitlin, T. (2013). Occupy's Predicament: The Moment and the Prospects for the Movement. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 64 (1), 1-25.
- Gledhill, J. (2012). Collecting Occupy London: Public Collecting Institutions and Social Protest Movements in the 21st Century. *Social Movement Studies*, 11 (3-4), 342-348.
- Gomm, R. (2004). *Social Research Methodology: A Critical Introduction*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Goodwin, J., & Jasper, J. M. (2009). *The Social Movements Reader: Cases and Concepts* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gottlieb, R., Freer, R., Vallianatos, M., & Dreier, P. (2006). *The Next Los Angeles: The Struggle for a Livable City*. London: University of California Press.
- Gould-Wartofsky, M. A. (2015). *The Occupiers: The Making of the 99 Percent Movement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Greater London Authority. (2012). *Parliament Square Garden Byelaws 2012*. Local Government Act 1972, Section 236B, Greater London Authority Act 1999, Section 385(1), (2) and (4). London: Greater London Authority.
- Greater London Authority. (2009, November 24). *Request for Mayoral Decision - MD483*. Retrieved August 25, 2015, from Greater London Authority website: <http://legacy.london.gov.uk/mayor/mayor-decisions/docs/20091124-md483-enforcement-action-byelaws.pdf>
- Green & Black Cross. (n.d.). *Legal Observer Training, London*. Retrieved August 21, 2015, from Green & Black Cross website: <https://greenandblackcross.org/events/lo-london-150228/>
- Green Party. (2006). *Drug Use: Part of the Green Party Policies for a Sustainable Society*. Retrieved August 20, 2015, from Green Party: <https://policy.greenparty.org.uk/assets/images/policy/pdfs/Drug.pdf>
- Greer, C., & McLaughlin, E. (2012). This Is Not Justice: Ian Tomlinson, Institutional Failure and the Press Politics of Outrage. *British Journal of Criminology*, 52 (1), 274-293.
- Gregory, I. (2003). *Ethics in Research*. London: Continuum.
- Häyhtiö, T., & Rinne, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Net Working/Networking: Citizen Initiated Internet Politics*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Hai-Jew, S. (2015). *Enhancing Qualitative and Mixed Methods Research with Technology*. Hershey: IGI Global.
- Hall, D., & Hall, I. (1996). *Practical Social Research: Project Work in the Community*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Hall, S. (2011). *American Patriotism, American Protest: Social Movements Since the Sixties*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Hall, W. (2009). The Adverse Health Effects of Cannabis Use: What Are They, and What Are Their Implications for Policy. *International Journal of Drug Policy* , 20, 458-466.
- Hall, W., & Degenhardt, L. (2009). Adverse Health Effects of Non-Medical Cannabis Use. *The Lancet* , 374, 1383-1391.
- Hall, W., & Solowij, N. (1998). Adverse Effects of Cannabis. *The Lancet* , 352, 1611-1616.
- Halvorsen, S. (2012). Beyond the Network? Occupy London and the Global Movement. *Social Movement Studies* , 11 (3-4), 427-433.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1995). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Harrington, M. (2011). *Socialism: Past and Future*. New York: Arcade.
- Harvey, K. (Ed.). (2014). *Encyclopedia of Social Media and Politics* (Vol. 1). London: Sage.
- Hayward, K. (2009). Visual Criminology: Cultural Criminology-Style. *Criminal Justice Matters* , 78 (1), 12-14.
- Hayward, K., & Presdee, M. (2010). *Framing Crime: Cultural Criminology and the Image*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Heath, R. G., Fletcher, C. V., & Munoz, R. (Eds.). (2013). *Understanding Occupy from Wall Street to Portland: Applied Studies in Communication Theory*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Heberle, R. (1951). *Social Movements: An Introduction to Political Sociology*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2011). *Qualitative Research Methods*. London: Sage.
- Hersen, M., & Turner, S. M. (Eds.). (2003). *Diagnostic Interviewing* (3rd ed.). New York: Kluwer Academic.
- Hesse-Biber, S. N. (Ed.). (2011). *The Handbook of Emergent Technologies in Social Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2011). *The Practice of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Holmes, D. (Ed.). (2001). *Virtual Globalization: Virtual Spaces/Tourist Spaces*. London: Routledge.
- Horrigan, P. G. (2007). *Epistemology: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Knowledge*. Lincoln: iUniverse.
- Howard, N., & Pratt-Boyden, K. (2013). Occupy London as Pre-figurative Political Action. *Development in Practice* , 23 (5-6), 729-741.
- Howard, P. N., & Hussain, M. M. (2013). *Democracy's Fourth Wave?: Digital Media and the Arab Spring*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Humphries, B. (2008). *Social Work Research for Social Justice*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Huss, M. T. (2009). *Forensic Psychology: Research, Clinical Practice, and Applications*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Inglehart, R. (1977). *The Silent Revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jones, J. S., & Watt, S. (Eds.). (2010). *Ethnography in Social Science Practice*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Jongerden, J., & Ruivenkamp, G. (2008). Quality Agriculture and the issue of technology: a short note on reconstruction. In G. Ruivenkamp, S. Hisano, & J. Jongerden (Eds.), *Reconstructing Biotechnologies: Critical Social Analyses* (pp. 217-228). Wageningen: Wageningen Academic Publishers.

- Jorgensen, D. L. (1989). *Participant Observation: A Methodology for Human Studies* (Vol. 15). London: Sage.
- Junker, B. H. (1960). *Field Work: An Introduction to the Social Sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Juris, J. S. (2012). Reflections on #Occupy Everywhere: Social Media, Public Space and Emerging Logics of Aggregation. *American Ethnologist* , 39 (2), 259-279.
- Köskal, I. (2012). Activist Intervention: Walking in the City of London. *Social Movement Studies* , 11 (3-4), 446-453.
- Kalant, H. (2004). Adverse Effects of Cannabis on Health: An Update of the Literature Since 1996. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology & Biological Psychiatry* , 8, 849-863.
- Kelly, C. A. (2001). *Tangled Up in Red, White, and Blue: New Social Movements in America*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kern, T., & Nam, S. (2013). From 'Corruption' to 'Democracy': Cultural Values, Mobilization, and the Collective Identity of the Occupy Movement. *Journal of Civil Society* , 9 (2), 196-211.
- Keshtiban, A. E. (2014). Leadership, Leaderlessness and Social Media: The Case of the Occupy Movement. In A. Rospigliosi, & S. Greener (Ed.), *Proceedings of the European Conference on Social Media* (pp. 257-262). Reading: Academic Conferences and Publishing International Limited.
- Kimmel, A. J. (1989). *Ethics and Values in Applied Social Research*. Sage.
- King, M. (2013). Distruption is Not Permitted: The Policing and Social Control of Occupy Oakland. *Critical Criminology* , 21 (1), 463-475.
- Klandermans, B., & Oegema, D. (1987). Potentials, Networks, Motivations, and Barriers: Steps Towards Participation in Social Movements. *American Sociological Review* , 52 (4), 519-531.
- Klandermans, B., & Staggenborg, S. (Eds.). (2002). *Methods of Social Movement Research*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Klatch, R. E. (1999). *A Generation Divided: The New Left, the New Right, and the 1960s*. London: University of California Press.
- Kleinwächter, W. (Ed.). (2012). *Human Rights and Internet Governance* (Vol. 4). Berlin: Internet & Gesellschaft Collaboratory.
- Klenke, K. (2008). *Qualitative Research in the Study of Leadership*. Bingley: Emerald Group.
- Klitzman, R. L. (2015). *The Ethics Police?: The Struggle to Make Human Research Safe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Korn, J. H. (1997). *Illusions of Reality: A History of Deception in Social Psychology*. New York: University of New York.
- Koskal, I. (2012). Activist Intervention: Walking in the City of London. *Social Movement Studies* , 11 (3-4), 446-453.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques* (2nd ed.). Delhi: New Age International.
- Kuumba, M. B. (2001). *Gender and Social Movements*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kvale, S. (2007). *Doing Interviews*. (U. Flick, Ed.) London: Sage.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. London: Sage.

- Landau, S. E. (2010). *Surveillance Or Security?: The Risks Posed by New Wiretapping Technologies*. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- LeCompte, M. D., & Schensul, J. J. (2015). *Ethics in Ethnography: A Mixed Methods Approach*. London: AltaMira Press.
- Lee, M., & McGovern, A. (2014). *Policing and Media: Public Relations, Simulations and Communications*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Lefait, S. (2013). *Surveillance on Screen: Monitoring Contemporary Films and Television Programs*. Plymouth: Scarecrow Press.
- Lemley, M., Levine, D. S., & Post, D. G. (2011). Don't Break the Internet. *Stanford Law Review Online* , 64, 34-38.
- Levy, P. B. (1994). *The New Left and Labor in the 1960s* (Illustrated ed.). University of Illinois Press.
- Liboiron, M. (2012). Tactics of Waste, Dirt and Discard in the Occupy Movement. *Social Movement Studies* , 11 (3-4), 393-401.
- Loue, S. (2002). *Textbook of Research Ethics: Theory and Practice*. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Lubin, J. (2012). The 'Occupy' Movement: Emerging Protest Forms and Contested Urban Spaces. *Berkeley Planning Journal* , 25 (1), 184-197.
- Lupton, D. (2015). *Digital Sociology*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Maguire, M., Morgan, R., & Reiner, R. (Eds.). (2012). *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (5th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maharawal, M. M. (2013). Occupy Wall Street and a Radical Politics of Inclusion. *The Sociological Quarterly* , 54, 159-228.
- Mann, S., & Ferenbok, J. (2013). New Media and the Power Politics of Sousveillance in a Surveillance-Dominated World. *Surveillance & Society* , 11 (1/2), 18-34.
- Mann, S., Nolan, J., & Wellman, B. (2003). Sousveillance: Inventing and Using Wearable Computing Devices for Data Collection in Surveillance Environments. *Surveillance & Society* , 1 (3), 331-355.
- Marcus, A. (2006). *Where Have All the Homeless Gone?: The Making and Unmaking of a Crisis* (Vol. 1). Berghahn Books.
- Martell, L. (2010). *The Sociology of Globalization*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1988). Social Movements. In N. J. Smelser (Ed.), *Handbook of Sociology* (pp. 695-737). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- McCall, G. J., & Simmons, J. L. (1969). *Issues in Participant Observation: A Text and Reader*. Michigan: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- McKinney, M. S., Kaid, L. L., Bystrom, D. G., & Carlin, D. B. (Eds.). (2005). *Communicating Politics: Engaging the Public in Democratic Life*. New York: Peter Lang.
- McPeake, R. (Ed.). (2015). *Criminal Litigation and Sentencing* (27th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McStay, A. (2010). *Digital Advertising*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Meneklis, V., & Douligeris, C. (2010). Next Generation Society: Technological and Legal Issues. In A. B. Sideridis, & C. Z. Patrikakis (Ed.), *Third International Conference, e-Democracy* (pp. 79-88). Athens: ICST.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Mertens, D. M., & Ginsberg, P. E. (Eds.). (2009). *The Handbook of Social Research Ethics*. London: Sage.

- Michael, M. G., & Michael, K. (Eds.). (2014). *Ubervveillance and the Social Implications of Microchip Implants: Emerging Technologies*. Pennsylvania: IGI Global.
- Milberry, K. (2013). We Are Big Brother: Is Social Media Surveillance a Threat to our Sense of Community? In J. Greenberg, & C. Elliot, *Communication in Question: Competing Perspectives on Controversial Issues in Communication Studies* (2nd ed., pp. 181-189).
- Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral Study of Obedience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 371-378.
- Miller, J. M. (Ed.). (2014). *The Encyclopedia of Theoretical Criminology* (Illustrated ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Mirror. (2010, April 4). *David Cameron's MP candidate's list has 21 Eton old boys on it*. Retrieved August 18, 2015, from Mirror website: <http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/david-camersons-mp-candidates-list-212454>
- Moghadam, V. M. (2013). *Globalization and Social Movements: Islamism, Feminism, and the Global Justice Movement* (2nd ed.). Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Monaghan, N. (2014). *Criminal Law Directions* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morris, A. D. (1984). *Origins of the Civil Rights Movements: Black Communities Organizing for Change*. New York: The Free Press.
- Murchinson, J. (2010). *Ethnography Essentials: Designing, Conducting, and Presenting Your Research*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Murray, S. J., & Holmes, D. (Eds.). (2009). *Critical Interventions in the Ethics of Healthcare: Challenging the Principle of Autonomy in Bioethics*. Surrey: Ashgate.
- Naegler, L. (2012). *Gentrification and Resistance: Cultural Criminology, Control, and the Commodification of Urban Protest in Hamburg*. Hamburg: LIT Verlag Münster.
- Nagel, M. E., & Nocella III, A. J. (Eds.). (2013). *The End of Prisons.: Reflections from the Decarceration Movement* (Illustrated ed., Vol. 261). Rodopi.
- Nail, T. (2012). *Returning to Revolution: Deleuze, Guattari and Zapatismo*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Naples, N. A., & Mendez, J. B. (Eds.). (2015). *Border Politics: Social Movements, Collective Identities, and Globalization*. London: New York University Press.
- Nastasi, B. K. (2013). Using Multimedia Techniques in Ethnographic Research. In J. J. Schensul, & M. D. LeCompte, *Specialized Ethnographic Methods: A Mixed Methods Approach* (pp. 318-355). Plymouth: AltaMira Press.
- Neklin, D., & Pollock, M. (1980). Ideology as Strategy: The Discourse of the Anti-Nuclear Movement in France and Germany. *Programs on Science, Technology, and Society*.
- Newman, I., & Benz, C. R. (1998). *Qualitative-quantitative Research Methodology: Exploring the Interactive Continuum*. Illinois: Southern Illinois University.
- Obach, B. K. (2004). *Labor and the Environmental Movement: The Quest for Common Ground*. MIT Press.
- Occupy Democracy. (2015, February 20). *Occupy Democracy - The May Occupation of Parliament Square*. Retrieved August 18, 2015, from Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/events/1542806512652040/>

- Occupy Democracy. (2014, March). *What Occupy Democracy is About*. Retrieved August 18, 2015, from Occupy Democracy: <http://occupydemocracy.org.uk/about-occupy-democracy/>
- Om-Ra-Seti, K. K. (2012). *Global Economic Boom and Bust Cycles*. KMT Publications.
- O'Reilly, K. (2012). *Ethnographic Methods* (2nd ed.). Oxon: Routledge.
- Pakulski, J. (1991). *Social Movements: The Politics of Moral Protest*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.
- Palmer, C. (2001). Ethnography: A Research Method in Practice. *International Journal of Tourism Research* , 3 (1), 301-312.
- Panagiotis, G. (2007). *When Christianity Matters: The Production and Manipulation of Communalism in Damascus, Syria*. School of African and Oriental Studies, Department of Anthropology. London: University of London.
- Parker, M., Cheney, G., Fournier, V., & Land, C. (Eds.). (2014). *The Routledge Companion to Alternative Organization*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Petrosian, V. (2014). *A Study of Citizen Journalism: Challenging the "Official Truth"?* University of Westminster, Social Sciences, Humanities and Languages. London: University of Westminster.
- Phillips, L., & Jørgensen, M. W. (2004). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage.
- Pickerill, J., & Krinsky, J. (2012). Why Does Occupy Matter? *Social Movement Studies* , 11 (3-4), 279-287.
- Pink, S. (2007). *Doing Visual Ethnography* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Pleyers, G. (2010). *Alter-Globalization: Becoming Actors in a Global Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Pollock, J. C. (Ed.). (2013). *Media and Social Inequality: Innovations in Community Structure Research*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Porta, D. D. (2014). *Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Porta, D. D., & Diani, M. (2006). *Social Movements: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Porta, D. d., & Mattoni, A. (Eds.). (2014). *Spreading Protest: Social Movements in Times of Crisis*. Colchester: ECPR Press.
- Powell, F. W. (2007). *The Politics of Civil Society: Neoliberalism Or Social Left?* Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Rand, D. H. (2013). *Roots of the Arab Spring: Contested Authority and Political Change in the Middle East*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Razsa, M., & Kurnik, A. (2012). The Occupy Movement in Zizek's Hometown: Direct Democracy and a Politics of Becoming. *American Ethnologist* , 39 (2), 238-258.
- Reclaim the Power. (2013). *Who We Are*. Retrieved August 18, 2015, from Reclaim the Power Website: <http://www.nodashforgas.org.uk/who-we-are/>
- Reis, H. T., & Judd, C. M. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of Research Methods in Social and Personality Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richardson, D., & Rootes, C. (Eds.). (1995). *The Green Challenge: The Development of Green Parties in Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Rieger, J. (1996). Photographing Social Change. *Visual Sociology* , 11, 5-49.
- Ritzer, G., & Dean, P. (2015). *Globalization: A Basic Text* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

- Roberts, P., & Zuckerman, A. (2010). *Criminal Evidence* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rocher, G. (2004). *A General Introduction to Sociology: A Theoretical Perspective*. Calcutta: B.K. Dhur.
- Roffe, P., & Seuba, X. (Eds.). (2015). *The ACTA and the Plurilateral Enforcement Agenda: Genesis and Aftermath*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Russell, D. E. (1974). *Rebellion, Revolution, and Armed Force: A Comparative Study of Fifteen Countries with Special Emphasis on Cuba and South Africa*. London: Academic Press.
- Santos, A. C. (2013). *Social Movements and Sexual Citizenship in Southern Europe*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Saunders, C. (2013). *Environmental Networks and Social Movement Theory*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Schensul, J. J., & LeCompte, M. D. (Eds.). (2013). *Essential Ethnographic Methods: A Mixed Methods Approach* (2nd ed.). Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Schlembach, R. (2014). *Against Old Europe: Critical Theory and Alter-Globalization Movements*. Surrey: Ashgate.
- Schuerkens, U. (Ed.). (2008). *Globalization and Transformations of Local Socio-economic Practices*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Scott, D., & Usher, R. (Eds.). (1996). *Understanding Educational Research*. London: Routledge.
- Seligman, B. Z. (1951). *Notes and Queries on Anthropology* (6th ed.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Shaw, F. (2013). "Walls of Seeing": Protest Surveillance, Embodied Boundaries, and Counter-Surveillance at Occupy Sydney. *Transformations: Journal of Media & Culture*, 3 (1), 1-9.
- Sieber, J. E. (Ed.). (1982b). *The Ethics of Social Research: Fieldwork, Regulation, and Publication*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Sieber, J. E. (Ed.). (1982a). *The Ethics of Social Research: Surveys and Experiments*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Sieber, J. E., & Tolich, M. B. (2013). *Planning Ethically Responsible Research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Siurala, L. (2002). *Can Youth Make a Difference?: Youth Policy Facing Diversity and Change*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Sky News. (2015, June 10). *Fake Mobile Phone Towers Operating In The UK*. Retrieved August 29, 2015, from Sky News website: <http://news.sky.com/story/1499258/fake-mobile-phone-towers-operating-in-the-uk>
- Smaligo, N. (2014). *The Occupy Movement Explained* (Vol. 13). Carus.
- Smith, J., & Glidden, B. (2012). Occupy Pittsburgh and the Challenges of Participatory Democracy. *Social Movement Studies*, 11 (3-4), 288-294.
- Smith, J., & Johnston, H. (Eds.). (2002). *Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Snape, D., & Spencer, L. (2003). The Foundations of Qualitative Research. In J. Richie, & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice. A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers* (pp. 1-23). London: Sage.
- Sommeiller, E., & Price, M. (2014). *The Increasingly Unequal States of America: Income Inequality by State, 1917 to 2011*. Economic Analysis and Research Network. Washington: Economic Analysis and Research Network.

- Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant Observation*. London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College.
- Statewatch UK. (2013a, September 17). *Public Order Courses - Police Liaison Team Course*. Retrieved August 21, 2015, from Policing of protest: documents on Police Liaison Officers released following Freedom of Information request: <http://www.statewatch.org/news/2013/sep/uk-met-plo-foi-course-advert.pdf>
- Statewatch UK. (2013b, September 17). *Timetable - Protestor Liaison Officer Course*. Retrieved August 21, 2015, from Policing of protest: documents on Police Liaison Officers released following Freedom of Information request: <http://www.statewatch.org/news/2013/sep/uk-met-plo-foi-training-timetable.pdf>
- Steger, M. (2013). *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Fiske, S. T. (Eds.). (2015). *Ethical Challenges in the Behavioral and Brain Sciences: Case Studies and Commentaries*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, A. (2011). *Occupy!: Scenes from Occupied America*. Brooklyn: Verso.
- The Guardian. (2013, September 15). *Legal cannabis market 'would be worth £1.25bn a year to government'*. Retrieved August 20, 2015, from The Guardian: <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2013/sep/15/legal-cannabis-market-worth>
- The Guardian. (2015, June 3). *Met police to issue body cameras to majority of officers by next year*. Retrieved August 25, 2015, from The Guardian: <http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2015/jun/03/met-police-to-issue-body-cameras-to-majority-of-officers-by-next-year>
- The Guardian. (2015). *Profile: Adam Ramsay*. Retrieved August 18, 2015, from The Guardian website: <http://www.theguardian.com/profile/adam-ramsay>
- The Independent. (2013, September 16). *Legalising cannabis: £1.25bn tax benefit - without necessarily damaging public health*. Retrieved August 20, 2015, from The Independent: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/legalising-cannabis-125bn-tax-benefit--without-necessarily-damaging-public-health-8818064.html>
- The Independent. (2014, October 7). *What is TTIP? And six reasons why the answer should scare you*. Retrieved August 18, 2015, from The Independent: <http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/comment/what-is-ttip-and-six-reasons-why-the-answer-should-scare-you-9779688.html>
- The Telegraph. (2015, March 4). *The economic case for legalising cannabis*. Retrieved from The Telegraph: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/health/11446882/The-economic-case-for-legalising-cannabis.html>
- Thorson, K., Driscoll, K., Ekdale, B., Edgerly, S., Thompson, L. G., Schrock, A., et al. (2013). Youtube, Twitter and the Occupy Movement: Connecting Content and Circulation Practices. *Information, Communication & Society*, 16 (3), 421-451.
- Tilly, C. (1978). *From Mobilization to Revolution*. McGraw-Hill.
- Tilly, L. A., & Tilly, C. (Eds.). (1981). *Class Conflict and Collective Action*. London: Sage.
- Tkacheva, O. (2013). *Internet Freedom and Political Space*. Cambridge: RAND Corporation.

- Todd, M., & Taylor, G. (2004). *Democracy and Participation: Popular Protest and New Social Movements*. London: Merlin Press.
- Toussaint, L. (2009). *The Contemporary US Peace Movement*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Tsatsou, P. (2014). *Internet Studies: Past, Present and Future Directions*. Surrey: Ashgate.
- Uitermark, J., & Nicholls, W. (2012). How Local Networks Shape a Global Movement: Comparing Occupy in Amsterdam and Los Angeles. *Social Movement Studies*, 11 (3-4), 295-301.
- Vahabzadeh, P. (2003). *Articulated Experiences: Toward a Radical Phenomenology of Contemporary Social Movements*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Van de Voorde, C. (2012). Ethnographic Photography in Criminological Research. In D. Gadd, S. Karstedt, & S. F. Messner (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Criminological Research Methods* (pp. 203-217). London: Sage.
- van der Heijden, H.-A. (Ed.). (2014). *Handbook of Political Citizenship and Social Movements*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Vogt, W. P., Gardner, D. C., & Haeffele, L. M. (2012). *When to Use What Research Design*. New York: The Guildford Press.
- Walliman, N. (2006). *Social Research Methods*. London: Sage.
- Webster Jr, M., & Sell, J. (Eds.). (2014). *Laboratory Experiments in the Social Sciences* (2nd ed.). London: Academic Press.
- Weiner, I. B., & Graham, J. R. (2003). *Handbook of Psychology: Assessment Psychology* (Vol. 10). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Weir, R. F., & Olick, R. S. (2004). *The Stored Tissue Issue : Biomedical Research, Ethics, and Law in the Era of Genomic Medicine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weiss, J. (2008). *Under the Radar: School Surveillance and Youth Resistance*. Graduate Faculty in Urban Education. New York: ProQuest LLC.
- Welsh, J. (2003). *Advocacy in the Magistrates' Court*. London: Cavendish Publishing.
- Welty, E., Bolton, M., Nayak, M., & Malone, C. (Eds.). (2012). *Occupying Political Science: The Occupy Wall Street Movement from New York to the World*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Werbner, P., Webb, M., & Spellman-Poots, K. (2014). *The Political Aesthetics of Global Protest: The Arab Spring and Beyond*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Wiles, R. (2013). *What are Qualitative Research Ethics?* London: Bloomsbury.
- Wilson, D., & Serisier, T. (2010). Video Activism and the Ambiguities of Counter-Surveillance. *Surveillance & Society*, 8 (2), 166-180.
- Writers for the 99%. (2011). *Occupying Wall Street: The Inside Story of an Action that Changed America*. OR Books.
- Young, J. (2007). *The Vertigo of Late Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Zayfert, C., & Becker, C. B. (2007). *Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy for PTSD: A Case Formulation Approach*. New York: The Guildford Press.
- Zimbardo, P. G. (1972). *The Stanford Prison Experiment: A Simulation Study of the Psychology of Imprisonment*. Philip G Zimbardo, Inc.