

SYNOPTIC PRUDENTIALISM: THE POLICE, SOCIAL MEDIA, AND BUREAUCRATIC RESISTANCE

MICHAEL ADORJAN

ROSEMARY RICCIARDELLI

Abstract. In the current article, we examine police officer perceptions of risk when using (often official police) social media sites. We argue that for police it is not the ‘few observing the many’ model of panoptic surveillance that matters most; rather, it is the *synoptic gaze* of the ‘many observing the few.’ We propose a new concept, that of *synoptic prudentialism*, which we argue involves an individual’s or organization’s reflexive actions and adjustments in response to an acute awareness of ubiquitous social surveillance. Interviews with officers serving in rural areas of an Atlantic Canadian province reveal expressions of vulnerability in relation to potentially antagonist audiences online. From the perspective of front-line officers who express a desire to use social media more informally to connect with online audiences, bureaucratic procedures and other formal regulations governing official police social media use constrains the potential to harness the synoptic gaze in productive ways.

Keywords: Synopticon; surveillance; prudentialism; police; social network sites

Résumé. Cet article examine la perception du risque par les policiers lors de l’utilisation (souvent officiels de la police) de sites de médias sociaux. Nous disputons que pour la police, ce n’est pas le modèle de surveillance panoptique des « quelques-uns observant les nombreux » qui importe le plus; mais plutôt le regard synoptique des « nombreux observant les quelques-uns » qui compte le plus. Nous proposons un nouveau concept, celui du prudentialisme synoptique, qui, selon nous, implique une approche réflexive et les ajustements d’un individu ou d’une organisation en réponse à une conscience aiguë de la surveillance sociale omniprésente. Des entrevues avec des agents servant dans les régions rurales d’une province atlantique du Canada révèlent des expressions de vulnérabilité par rapport au public potentiellement antagonistes en ligne. De plus, du point de vue des agents de première ligne qui expriment le désir d’utiliser les médias sociaux de manière informelle pour se connecter avec le public en ligne, les procédures bureaucratiques et autres réglementations officielles qui régissent l’utilisation des médias sociaux policière officielle limitent le potentiel d’exploiter le regard synoptique de manière productive.

Mots Clés : Synoptique; surveillance; prudentialisme; police; sites de réseaux sociaux

INTRODUCTION

New forms of internet connectivity, in particular social network sites (SNS) and the ubiquitous presence of video-capturing smart-phones, have created new challenges and opportunities for police. In this article we argue that contemporary police communications on SNS evidence a wider permutation of a globalized ‘new prudentialism’ (O’Malley 1992), one that we dub ‘synoptic prudentialism.’ Here, drawing from scholarship on the synoptic form of surveillance (i.e., where many people observe the few; Lee and McGovern 2013; Mawby 2012; Reiner 2008), we examine how police are themselves responding to challenges of social network sites. Synoptic prudentialism refers to how an individual or organization responds (e.g., their reflexive actions) to pervasive and omnipresent social surveillance (i.e., the many observing the few). Prudentialism more generally refers to an orientation where one takes preemptive actions to avoid or ameliorate an anticipated negative outcome or impact. Theoretically, we draw connections between the synoptic form of prudentialism and theories of police image work. While the police project a primary role as crime fighters buttressed by media representations and widespread shared understandings, their role as “knowledge workers,” especially with the advent of social media, has become their primary *modus operandi* (Ericson and Haggerty 1997). Social media has been hailed as potentially emboldening efforts to engage with publics and instill ‘community policing’; defined as “a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime” (United States Department of Justice 2014: 3). Yet, several studies have explored if social media helps, or hinders, efforts at community policing (Beshears 2017; Brainard and Edlins 2015; Schneider 2016b); an alignment that is obviated when community policing is seen as a form of “risk communication policing” (Ericson and Haggerty 1997: 5).

In the current article, we present findings from interviews (n=104) with Canadian police officers working in rural areas of an Atlantic province. Our work responds to a lacuna in knowledge given most researchers examining police use of social media center on analyses of posts

themselves, with a few studies including key informant interviews. Canadian studies are few and often exclude the voices of police officers themselves. In response, we present one of the first studies on police officer interpretations of social media, specifically the experience of those on the front lines who themselves may use social media with accounts linked to their policing identities. The police officers we spoke with, both those who used and did not use social media, are at degrees of distance from national command levels. Thus, officers in our study are removed from wider decisions on social media policy (which can be national) that inform regional officers' own experiences and opinions about the effectiveness of the police's online communications. A central theme we highlight is the tension that comes from balancing the formal organizational role of the police with the desire to connect more informally, and arguably authentically, with public audiences. In what follows, we highlight research examining police use of social media, and elaborate on theoretical work in the area of the police's 'new visibility' as well as synoptic surveillance.

POLICE USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA – AN EMERGING AREA OF RESEARCH

Many police services have adopted social media communication policies as part of their general communications policy framework, and most of the scholarship examining police communications on social media has been published in the 2010s. In these studies, scholars tend to conduct content analyses of social media posts or wider internet searches (e.g., Brainard and Edlins 2015; Dai et al. 2017; Goldsmith 2015; O'Connor 2017; Schneider 2016b; Van De Velde, Meijer and Homburg 2015). Content analyses produce knowledge about the general themes and styles police use on SNS. For instance, Van De Velde et al. (2015) found that the Dutch police service most frequently report crime and incidents (25%), followed by small talk (15%), and posts alerting the public to persons wanted by the law and/or seeking witnesses (11%). Of note, requests for tips from the public represented the highest frequency of posts on Facebook from some U.S. police departments (Dai et al. 2017).

Some scholars examine Twitter and/or Facebook posts during exceptional events such as riots (e.g., Deneff, Bayerl and Kaptein 2013; Procter et al. 2013). Deneff and colleagues, for instance, found that prior to the London riots, the London Metropolitan Police and Greater Manchester Police did not differ in their communications strategies. Following the riots, the former developed a formal, instrumental and impersonal style,

while the latter issued tweets with a more expressive style, marked by a “personal touch” (Denef et al. 2013: np.). The messages included reassurances of safety and security, as well as attempts to “fight rumors,” either by commenting directly on news reports deemed inaccurate, or by ‘direct messaging’ users; i.e., responding to specific questions they posed about the riot. Such studies indicate non-unidirectional SNS use by police services (see also Procter et al. 2013). Citizen interactions involving weather updates and information on school closings were also more popular than posts “related to police functions” (e.g., requests for crime tips) (Dai et al. 2017: 792-793).

Studies focusing on content analyses of social media posts provide some useful data on how the police communicate with their publics, both for dissemination of crime-related information as well as responding to events related to police professionalism and image. Dai and colleagues (2017: 793) conclude, based on their content analysis, that “citizens are not likely to engage with police departments who solely post crime-related information,” on social media, and suggest that while police cannot avoid posting crime-related information, more informal posts geared to enticing publics to engage are more effective. Nevertheless, a key finding from content analyses is that police emphasize information dissemination through social media, much more than “expressive” and engaged conversations and outreach (Crump 2011; O’Connor 2017). Communication over social media, moreover, tends to be predominantly unidirectional and disengaged with public audiences (Brainard and Edlins 2015). Police emphasize requests for assistance, dissemination of crime-related information, and providing crime prevention tips over “interaction, debate and collaborative problem-solving” (Bullock, 2018a: 247). Exceptions exist; for instance, police may draw on ‘crowd sourcing’ from their followers, i.e., using social media to broadcast requests for information, such as seeking tips on solving crimes (Denef, Bayerl and Kaptein 2013; O’Connor 2017). Members of the public can, through SNS like Twitter, actively seek to engage with police, especially during public order incidents like riots (Procter et al. 2013).

A smaller subset of studies examines SNS use tied to key informant interviews with police or police public relations officials, again often finding SNS geared toward informing the public (Bullock 2018b; Lee and McGovern 2013; Meijer and Thaens 2013). Recent studies also have employed mixed method approaches, combining interviews with analysis of social media posts and news articles in order to triangulate findings (Ellis 2020). Interviews reveal, for instance, that Twitter is “predominantly—almost exclusively—used for an external audience” (Meijer and Torenvlied 2016: 155).

Overall, scholars examining police use of SNS underscore the centrality of “enlisting public confidence” and maintaining the police’s reputation linked to the police’s corporate “brand” (Lee and McGovern 2013: 110). Unlike formal police strategic or official communications, some see informal community policing communications online to be best applied through individual, rather than official, police accounts; such communications are even encouraged in select police organizations (e.g., Bullock 2018: 351). Still, the tension centers on how informal accounts are linked to formalized ones (often recognizable by a police badge and authenticated ‘blue check’ on Twitter indicating a verified account), where opinions posted should not be “detrimental” to the police or suggest a “reputational risk” (ibid.). As direct surveillance of police officer accounts by senior members is unlikely, front line officers are ‘responsibilized’ to post content in line with their organization’s wider mandate (Bullock 2018). The Toronto Police Service, for instance, issued guidelines in 2012 that do not bar police officers from using SNS, and in fact encourage ‘free comment’ on issues they “have an expertise or working knowledge of” but police are reminded that they are “not official spokespersons of the Service” and are directed not to “comment on policy or procedures” (Toronto Police Service 2012, quoted in Schneider 2016b: 135). The tension is thus tied to police having the freedom to post, but, simultaneously, being confined in what can be posted without risking their employment or the wider reputation of their police organization. This is evidenced in how police must calibrate the extent of their agency to post either through informal, personal accounts or, in a similar vein, posting to police accounts but while off-duty. Such a tension transcends the posted content to include posting in the right ‘tone of voice’ or finding the right balance between formal and informal styles online (Bullock 2018: 354).

It is also likely that the larger the police organization, the more impetus there will be to formalized processes, including bureaucratic oversight of social media usage. The Toronto Police Service, which seems to welcome more informal, community-linked use, may differ from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), which arguably requires greater organizational control over a wide array of jurisdictions, and where variation in population density and demographics influences best practices for localizing police practices.

POLICE INDISCRETION, SYNOPTIC PRUDENTIALISM AND THE POLICE'S 'NEW VISIBILITY'

The widespread adoption of social media and camera-enabled smart-phones, among other devices, presents new opportunities and challenges for police organizations, given the significance of information communications technologies (ICTs) to mediate police image work. Online audiences are “diverse, substantial and often hidden” and present “a major risk to officer reputations, agency legitimacy and operational effectiveness” (Goldsmith 2015: 249-250; Lee and McGovern 2014). The risks largely center on images (rapidly and widely disseminated) which may reveal police indiscretion, defined as “a failure to act discreetly in the course of police work or one’s life as a police officer” (Goldsmith 2015: 252). Mawby (2012: 53) also observes that “each event which brings into question police integrity and competence, for example, ill-disciplined public order police or alleged racist behaviour, communicates particular images and threatens to undermine police legitimacy.” Images which appear to display police misdeeds, corruption or neglect may permanently besmirch the reputation and legitimacy of individual officers and stigmatize police organizations as a whole (Goffman 1963; Goldsmith 2010, 2015). Ubiquitous access to smartphone videos creates a new ‘social media test’ for police, whereby cases that indicate excessive use of force may “permanently shame the police” (Ellis 2020: 16). Recent events, notably in the United States, involving police officers’ alleged anti-Black racism and excessive use of force, have drawn greater critical attention to policing around the world. In light of these events, police image work becomes not just “one mechanism by which the police seek to foster and maintain legitimacy” (Mawby 2012: 54), but, we argue, the *central* mechanism, given the rise of citizen journalism and its synoptic audiences (Goode 2009).¹

From a Goffmanian (1959) perspective, synoptic audiences draw a new visibility to the ‘front stage’ what may have often remained in the organizational ‘back stage.’ As noted by Goldsmith (2015: 252), “as police actions become more vulnerable to external assessment, their own claims to acting consistently, fairly and without corruption become more fragile and tenuous.” For police and other public-facing and serving or-

1. Relatively novel risks introduced by the police’s ‘new visibility’ also include potential compromise of undercover operations, ‘oversharing’ of personal information on social media, and breaches of privacy regarding individual officers and their families, including the ‘doxing’ of officers’ personal addresses and other identifying information online (e.g., Goldsmith 2010: 929; 2015: 255).

ganizations, it is not the ‘few observing the many’ model of panoptic surveillance that may matter most; rather, it is the synoptic gaze of the ‘many observing the few’ (Mathiesen 1997). Social media amplifies police visibility, and behooves the police to place greater attention upon the scrutiny their projected imagery produces (Lee and McGovern 2013; Mawby 2012; Reiner 2008). The synoptic gaze may be the most relevant mode of surveillance for organizations, like the police, because it is the projected power of the cyber-mediated majority and their hearts and minds that has become core to police image and image management (Manning 1997).

Theoretical approaches to understanding police work and communications often emphasize the significance of the collective moral conscience of communities in affecting perceptions of police rather than sentiments related to risk and crime *per se* (Jackson and Sunshine 2007; Sunshine and Tyler 2003). The greater emphasis on police presentational strategies in their ‘organizational front stage’ communications (Manning 1997; 2008) evokes a Goffmanian approach attuned to the positional dynamics in managing image on the front lines (Bullock 2018b; Goffman 1968; Goldsmith 2015). As we explore, anxieties among police officers regarding public perceptions and responses are often directed to the ‘image work’ embroiled on social media online, including Facebook, Twitter and other sites (Mawby 2012). The medium matters here – ICTs – considering the likely influence social media has on users’ perceptions of police, with wider impacts on their willingness to cooperate with the police and feel that the police are approachable (Bradford 2014; Manning 2010).

Theoretically, these trends may be situated as part of a ‘new visibility’ for organizations like the police, with their public-facing profiles and high importance placed on garnering public trust and confidence. At a time well before our current high-speed internet and social media landscape, Mawby (1999: 268) argued, the synopticon “has great relevance to the police service in that it is amongst the most watched institutions in our contemporary society.” This echoes Brown (2016: 295), who shows that the amplified visibility of police actions today has impacted police work “through entrenchment of a pervasive disciplining influence in the consciousness of most front-line officers.” Consider here Ericson and Haggerty (1997: 45):

Police social interaction for the purpose of security provision transpires within the communications circuitry of other institutions. The communications media and circuitry become part of the system of interaction, establishing patterns of knowledge flow and therefore patterns of interaction itself.

Building on these theoretical inroads, *synoptic prudentialism involves an individual's or organization's reflexive actions and adjustments in response to an acute awareness of ubiquitous social surveillance*. In other words, it involves “[on]going concerns” catered for the internet age (Hughes 1971).

While some policing scholars uncritically accept the application of the synopticon model to understanding contemporary police communications and actions, others, like Doyle (2011) do not. Doyle rightly notes that Mathiesen's (1997) original emphasis in applying the synopticon to television is outdated. He points to rapid advances on the internet, which problematize the ‘top down’ nature of power and social control which are often presumed in both models of the panopticon and synopticon. Surveillance scholars have identified many forms of resistance, Doyle observes, challenging top-down models of social control and power (e.g., Bruno 2012; Hope 2009; Marx 2003). Resistance at the level of audiences, toward whom communications are directed, is of central relevance here (Doyle 2011: 292); resistance which is amplified by contemporary ICTs. *Sousveillance*, for instance, where those traditionally under surveillance instead place authorities themselves under surveillance, is becoming an increasingly salient form of ‘counter power,’ especially regarding cases involving allegations of excessive use of police force, racial profiling, and so forth (Castells 2007; Mann, Nolan and Wellman 2003; Miller 2016; Sandhu and Haggerty 2015). The ‘definitions of the situation’ found in police image work have become “routinely questioned and challenged by a much larger, interactive audience in publicly accessible online social spaces” (Schneider 2016a: 21).

While pointing to areas Mathiesen glossed over in his model of synoptic surveillance, Doyle's (2011: 295) conclusion that we should thus “reconsider strongly the notion of a synopticon” and its “claim ... that the central element of social control is that the ‘the many’ watch ‘the few’” is, we argue, premature. However, Doyle correctly suggests that empirical studies should be attuned to the continual braiding of panoptic and synoptic modes of surveillance (see also Brown 2016: 306). It is not just that the many (here, the ‘community’) can observe the few (here, the police), it is that the few, even the one, can take actions online which are taken up by the many, and subsequently may impact the operations of organizations such as the police.

Given the current landscape of synoptic audiences and seemingly normalized *sousveillance*, Thompson (2005: 40-41) observes that it is “those who exercise power, rather than those over whom power is exercised, who are subjected to [this] new kind of visibility.” This ‘complaint’ or ‘gotcha culture,’ which appeared to be emerging in the late

2000s (see Brown 2016: 293), is now a central mode of response online. However, research highlights continual permutations of power related to police-public relations and the dynamics of surveillance. Lee and McGovern (2014: 128), for instance, see social media use by police services as a means to augment their power by defining risk and the optimal responses to said risk, arguing that “policing organizations are thus in an even stronger position when it comes to this exercise of power, becoming primary definers of risk” (see also Trottier 2012: 415). Police use of social media is also motivated by the development of community connections and responsabilizing the public to risk (O’Connor 2017). The “integration of functions” (Shearing and Stenning 1985), such as “image management, risk reduction, responsabilisation, and (cyber-) community building” (O’Connor 2017: 909) mutually reinforce one another through their coexistence; but, moreover, “the effect is... to embed the control function into the ‘woodwork’ where its presence is unnoticed but its effects are ever present” (Shearing and Stenning 1985: 430). The motive of public outreach, where it serves to ‘align’ publics with the organizational doxa of police, may buttress the police’s effective management of synoptic prudentialism. This may also be the case where police *actively embrace* sousveillance and develop a “camera friendly” form of what seems to be “counter-sousveillance,” as Sandhu (2016: 80) argues from a participant observation study with police in Edmonton, Alberta. Sandhu (2016: 84) suggests that,

rather than trying to prevent themselves from being recording, police officers begin to adjust the way they present themselves. By doing so, the officers try to influence how they will be perceived by viewers, and to make footage appear as favourable to themselves as possible.

Motivations here are complex, and at the individual level such strategies may well be genuine efforts to instill more positive public relations. However, Sandhu (2016: 88) also suggests that an emphasis on projecting camera-friendly speech and body language may “offer the police a sophisticated mechanism with which to conceal undisciplined police work.”

Our focus here is understanding police perceptions of risks associated with social media use and examining how police aim to use social media in productive and prudential ways; ways which manage the synoptic mode of surveillance directed at police. Scholarship on the ‘new visibility’ of policing often bifurcates attention between audiences and police themselves, but here we also attend to dynamics, and in some cases friction, between officers and police management. Front line of-

ficers are our focus here; officers who must navigate image work projected to not only wide public audiences but their superiors as well.

CURRENT STUDY

We attend to the understandings, intentions, and behaviours of police regarding social media use in a rural Atlantic province (Beshears 2017; Van De Velde, Meijer and Homburg 2015). Recognizing experiences tied to police social media use, whether positive or challenging, we unpack the scope of diverse challenges police officers feel when using or considering using social media or as a consequence of how other officers use social media. Specifically, we examine officer perceptions regarding how social media is thought to impact images of police professionalism, officer experiences in using social media themselves, and their views of organizational policies and practices regarding social media use. While a content analysis of social media posts would complement these goals, our focus here is to provide a voice to police officers and listen to their experiences via semi-structured in-depth interviews.

METHOD

For the current study, between 2014 and 2018, we conducted 104 semi-structured initial and follow-up interviews. Recruitment involved reliance on a key contact who assisted in arranging interviews with police officers attending the regional headquarters as well as multiple trips (e.g., drives and flights) to select detachments that represented the diversities in the province, including Northern, rural, Indigenous and other areas. As such, our sample strives to reflect the larger police community in terms of police perceptions, experiences, and identity. Police officers serving in an Atlantic Canadian province participated in interviews that ranged in length from 30 to 90 minutes. The participating police officers were all rank and file or front-line officers, at the rank of constable, corporal or sergeant and largely saw themselves as distanced from 'headquarters' and required to adjust to administrative decisions regarding social media usage. Participants were interviewed in their detachment or at the regional headquarters.

An interview guide was employed during all interviews. The guide constituted a conversational 'check list,' to ensure all central topics were covered, rather than a structured guide. Such a process ensured that we followed participant-led conversation paths, prioritizing participant voices and providing each with an opportunity to speak to whatever

was most pressing on their minds. Prior to each interview, participants completed a short demographic survey and provided informed consent. The sample included male- and female-identifying officers, whose ages ranged from 24 to 49 years old at the time of their participation. Their length of service within the police organization ranged from days to over 26 years of experience. Our data is limited in that we did not collect information consistently about SNS use, the number of officers who have SNS accounts, are regular users (however operationalized), and whether patterns of use have changed since their employment with the police organization.

Our approach to the data analysis and data collection was entirely grounded; we had no pre-conceived notions about SNS use among police, as the study emerged from a larger study involving the police organization in the province. We assigned pseudonyms to all officers, digitally voice recorded each interview which were then transcribed verbatim. We first read interview transcripts to construct a comprehensive applied and empirical codebook driven entirely from the data. We then took analytic directions directly from the data, operationalizing and recording emergent themes, to allow for a focused emergent theme-driven semi-grounded approach. We imported transcripts into QSR NVivo Pro software and coded data into parent (central emergent themes) and child (subthemes within central emergent themes) nodes. The coding process adhered to a constructed but semi-grounded thematic approach (Charmaz 2006). We coded themes selectively to unpack areas of focus (e.g., we used child nodes in NVivo, and employed axial coding) (Charmaz 2006). The resulting thematically analyzed data that we present in the current article is edited for readability and grammar but only when necessary. Vernacular, use of profanity, and meaning are left untouched.

RESULTS

The Amplification of Scrutiny

A prominent theme from our interviews is the lack of control officers feel when trying to manage their professional image and reputation on social media. For instance, some officers established links between traditional media representations and new iterations such as ‘citizen journalism’ (Allan and Thorsen 2009; Goode 2009). Officers expressed a lack of control given the synoptic surveillance of police themselves by members of the public (i.e., taking on forms of ‘sousveillance’). Participant 28, asked if there are any kinds of legal risk related to police work today,

referring to concerns for legal repercussions of doing police work, responded “oh, absolutely.” Asked to speak about that further, they said

Well, everybody has a smartphone, everyone is recording what’s going on. And not that you have necessarily done anything wrong, but someone could start recording at a particular instance and not capture the full thing, you know what I mean?

Participant 28’s remark is situated in between Sandhu and Haggerty’s (2015) ‘camera shy’ and ‘habituated’ orientations, though the former, referring to officers who are “anxious and annoyed about being filmed on the job” (Sandhu and Haggerty 2015: 5), is emphasized in their remark that only “the first part that led up to you doing something is captured” by a person with a smartphone. Evidencing the lack of control is the ambiguity regarding how best to respond to this situation: “And I just... I don’t know.”

Legal risk “is to be expected with policing,” another officer says, related to “the way social media puts us out there now. ... You know I mean we can do everything by the book but ... the public is still going to look at everything and criticize us for it” (Participant 29). Of note, participants 28 and 29 were not asked about the implications or professional risk of using social media; they were asked about the legal risks facing police today in general. Both respond by referring to the public’s use and consumption of social media in steering public perceptions of police. We argue such concerns evidence anxieties related to synoptic prudentialism and in consequence, when applied to officers’ daily occupational responsibilities, routine police work now involves police taking control over communications and engaging in ‘image work’ (Ericson and Haggerty 1997; Mawby 2012).

Another related challenge involves complaints against the police and the ‘net widening’ potential of social media to increase the frequency at which complaints are registered, given more widespread visibility and the relative ease of filing complaints online (Sandhu and Haggerty 2015). Participant 16 notes:

Social media wise there’s always a lot of complaints going on in [town name redacted]. People just like to go online and spill everything. Three hundred comments later it can get messy. But they blow over quick. It could have an explosion one day and then next week no one wants to talk about it anymore.

The amplification of scrutiny combined with the perpetually moving target of the public’s attention (Tufekci 2013; Zuboff 2019) present paradoxical challenges for police. The challenges of engaging with publics

through social media present themselves readily, however questions remain. Should police merely wait until complaints ‘blow over,’ assuming a narrowed attention span linked to social media affordances? What are the risks associated with ignoring such input? For the officers we interviewed, challenges also related to the widespread sentiment that the police organization command imposed too much control over social media, making it less likely to be amenable for community policing. For instance, the need to post in both official languages in Canada may be a hindrance for posting due to the required translation and permissions.

Command Directives: Managing the Formal-Informal Spectrum

Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube are the most frequently used SNS by police both in Canada and in many western liberal democracies. Across Canada the RCMP have Twitter accounts, with at least one account per province, usually used to disseminate crime incident information (Schneider 2016a: 84). Interviews also suggest that Facebook is being used, albeit informally and without official organizational sanctioning. As previously noted, many police organizations readily adopt social media but retain a relatively rigid, formal use of it, that some observers suggest is not conducive to community policing and building more informal social connections (Dai et al. 2017). Some researchers have documented the challenges officers face when posting personal content from an account either formally or informally linked to an official service account (e.g., Schneider 2016a). Among Canadian police organizations in particular, there may be differing expectations regarding formal use of social media. The Toronto Police Service, for instance, may embolden police-citizen trust through informal posts of officers (e.g., a tweet about enjoying a dinner at home with family; Schneider 2016b). Such posts may help personalize the police ‘beyond their uniforms.’

Police organizations, however, may experience pressure to retain a formal image. Formality in social media usage may be considered necessary for limiting the risks posed to police image (e.g., professionalism) from the synoptic gaze of the public online. Formality is seen as a method for upholding professionalism – a key theme raised among many of the officers interviewed. For instance, one officer underscored the importance of maintaining “professionalism,” which they argue is “the big thing” online (Participant 84). They offer the example of an officer blending personal life with police-associated Twitter posts while attending a friend’s child’s party:

You can’t be at a youth party with kids [and be] drinking [and say] ‘Hey, I’m a get a selfie.’ [laughs] ... You know what I mean? But some, we’ve

had it done before ...on Facebook. ...Member in uniform and here's kids around, there's one or two parents, but the kid's got liquor in front of them, daytime, they're at a beach whatever, and then here's our member. ... What were you thinking? So those types of things.

Participant 84's criticism over officers using official police Twitter accounts unprofessionally implies risks from the widespread (synoptic) audience who may respond to police posts and amplify criticisms against the police as a whole. Participant 84, echoing others, mentions that police are given "guidance on what they can and can't do" on social media, "just for their own protection." The crux of the problem, though, is, "you don't want to be seen as condoning certain things that you're duty-bound to enforce. Common sense is one of the most uncommon things." Despite the push for more informal police use of social media, with the goal of enhancing police image and public perceptions (e.g., in Toronto), our participants did not feel a sense of agency in presenting their informal lives online. Participant 89 expresses this: "I mean I would be taking selfies with the kids. When I go to the school, the kids are playing floor hockey or basketball, I join in. People don't understand that we're human."

Never far from such concerns is how police representations online are taken up by publics consuming and reacting to social media. "I can see it going both ways," reflects Participant 60,

because the public, some of them, the ones that don't particularly like police, would take it and be like, 'How come they're not working? Is that all they got to do?' stuff like that. It's just the mentality that can be out there.

Participant 60's remark reflects concerns situated on how an individual officer's social media posts can be misconstrued, or even willfully interpreted in a negative way, regardless of what is depicted. Participant 60 does acknowledge a variegated audience, where only "some of them" are more actively critical online, but the impetus for prudential (here, professional) social media use is primarily preemptive with respect to those audiences that are perceived to unfairly 'spin' informal use as unprofessional and ultimately inept.

Police administrators are, in some police organizations, wary of permitting their front-line officers to use social media informally. Bullock's (2018a: 250) interviews with British officers revealed that communications and public relations apply, quoting one police officer, "different levels of organizational control and laissez faire." The control is primarily directed at "decisions regarding who has access to which kinds of official police Twitter accounts" (ibid.). Moreover, officers feel that ex-

isting policies on how to use social media professionally are of “limited use”; largely built on “trial and error” (Bullock 2018a: 251). Similarly, Crump (2011: 241) notes that, in the context of the U.K., “responsibility for managing reputational risk is generally devolved to the local level,” though protocols have been developed requiring “officers to be authorized by the central media team before they can operate accounts which represent the force.”

A number of the officers interviewed expressed frustration at the forced formality of their social media engagement, based on the need to adhere to directives from their superiors. One officer posted to a small rural town felt “there’s no reason” for officers to set up more localized and informal social media accounts, given the bureaucratic hurdles: “Everything has to be filtered,” they disclosed (Participant 90). Participant 90 continued to speak of the attitude from headquarters as

you’re just a constable, so you don’t know. If you want to send something out, you have to send it to [headquarters]. Someone has to review it and send it back. It’s like, why is this so – but that’s the process. You need to get stuff translated. And anything that we post should be in both languages.

Given the need for the police organization to post material in both English and French, it may be expected that there is some degree of oversight with respect to ensuring bilingual compliance – a dynamic particular to Canada. However, officer frustration extends beyond such requirements. Beyond simple restrictions on investigations, bureaucratic blocks to accessing social media stymie its potential, from these officers’ perspectives, for informal communication with publics. This relates back to the general theme of the police maintaining control over their image, and boosting public perceptions through greater, informal dialogue with the publics they serve. The need for more informal (yet always professional) use of social media was most apparent in the views expressed by Participant 130, who complained about Facebook being blocked in their office:

I’d love to be able to access it and have a community, an [police organization] community page, where you could say whatever. Just put out things. Put out pictures of when we did the Christmas float this year, we did the [police organization], the Christmas parade, we put a float in it. To be able to put pictures on there... [but] you have to do that at home.

Similar restrictions on their behaviour were noted by Participant 1: “We would never get the freedom to do that; to be interactive on social media.” Participant 1 also expressed an acute relative deprivation when

it came to other police services, such as in the U.S., which they felt were much more liberally minded when it comes to social media use:

Other police agencies do it [use social media] all the time. I follow U.S. police forces on Twitter and Facebook and they are always posting you know, such and such thing happened, or funny pictures or they get a new police dog. You know just ways to get the general public to see what they do. I don't see the [police organization] doing that, we're too archaic.

These discussions reveal support for both professional and informal usage. Informal use that may more effectively underscore positive police image may also enhance public perceptions of police professionalism. Front line officers thus point to 1) an awareness and anxiety regarding critical synoptic audiences, and 2) resistance towards bureaucratic formality, with the view that informal social media use – greater personal agency – would help officers better control and adapt to critical and/or antagonistic synoptic audiences. From the perspective of the officers interviewed, formal usage belies efforts to productively appropriate the synoptic mode of surveillance online. Using social media informally, for community outreach and showing the 'human side' of police takes advantage of the synoptic affordances of technology by embracing that mode of surveillance; a sort of 'if you can't beat 'em' response (see also Sandhu 2016).

While informal online outreach has potential benefits, it also brings risks associated with the wider synoptic public gaze. Some officers begrudged the directives and formal screening of their social media usage, though others expressed understanding about the motivations for doing so. One officer, for instance, expressed partial sympathy:

They frown on us having any pictures [taken] at special events. They say that's for our protection cause the criminal element is polling Facebook and Twitter to find any information on us. In some ways I think it's bull-shit but... they [the criminal element] probably are (Participant 2).

The officer continues with reference to the potential public sousveillance of police based on their informal use of social media:

...anybody could go in, look at [an officer's] profile page, see all the pictures of their kids, what they're doing from one minute to the next, what their personal views are, their opinions, pictures of their house, their cars, what's in their house, the valuables, where their kids go to school.

Bullock (2018a: 249) found that chief officers in England expressed concerns about security and "reputational risk," including the disclosure

of confidential information related to criminal investigations, revealing operational tactics, as well as exposing offensive attitudes and behaviours. Among our participants the most salient concerns related to exposure of officers' personal lives, evoking Sandu and Haggerty's (2015) 'camera shy' orientation. Concerns regarding discreditable behavior that becomes revealed online, which would denigrate both police officers' and wider police services' reputation, did not appear to be prominent (cf. Goffman 1963).

Concerns and anxieties among the officers we interviewed over their superiors' ostensibly overbearing oversight of social media were part of a wider set of concerns regarding rigidity in policy and directives from the organization. For instance, one officer felt that the administration is "so caught up in policy and the way things are in policy" (Participant 10). Such sentiment relates not only to social media but to a lack of confidence from front line officers in their superiors to support their investigative work. Participant 10, for instance, feels that their organization would "throw [an officer] out to pasture" who "just strays a little bit off policy." They surmise that "the majority of the [police organization] population; they have no faith in the force to protect them." Such concerns may amplify those related with wider public dialogue and perceptions, producing new anxieties and questions regarding police role, organizational culture and one's own agency in a wider organizational context.

Relatedly, some officers felt that command directives and restrictions on social media use also detracts from the police's ability to harness social media to help with investigations. Our participants made it clear that officers, at least in rural Atlantic Canada, are "not allowed to use any investigation tool of any type of social media outlets right now" (Participant 17), despite the potential of obtaining "very valuable information if we were allowed to look to social media." Despite official restrictions, officers disclosed that social media continues to be used for investigations: "I mean we all use Facebook for investigations, whether people will admit it or not, we do" (Participant 1). To counter official restrictive policies, participant 130 says officers "have to" set up "fakebook" (i.e., alternative personal Facebook profiles not linked to one's real identity) accounts and "use our personal Facebook" accounts, "which is not the safest." The organization "hasn't given us the freedom to do anything else," and adds, "and how do you expect us to investigate crime in this day in age without those resources?" Dummy Facebook (i.e., fakebook) accounts were being used by a few of our participants, such as one officer who disclosed that they "used my own cell phone with my dummy Facebook account that I made myself to go check on guys [i.e., suspects]

that we're trying to find or stuff that is getting posted to Facebook. I use it on my own" (Participant 2). We do not elaborate on concerns over police investigations further here, since it is not quite as directly linked to synoptic prudentialism. Participants' responses reveal that access to social media searches to conduct investigations, coupled with the benefits of informal community outreach, makes restrictions on access disabling and frustrating when engaging in 21st century 'informational' policing.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Most scholarship in the area of police SNS use employs content analysis; few researchers have focused on police social media communications drawing from interviews and observational data, especially in Canada (O'Connor 2017; Schneider 2016a). We respond to this lacuna in knowledge by unpacking how police interpret and use social media in a rural Atlantic province. What is apparent from our interviews is how, for front-line police officers, organizational directives about how to use social media appropriately dictates acceptable use, often creating a complicated condition with 'too many cooks in the kitchen' when trying to engage publics on social media. Yet, with any large organization, sheer size and the need for systematic bureaucratic order may explain the seemingly rigid structure enforced from commanding officers in each region and authorities in headquarters nationally.

Synoptic prudentialism involves perceptions of police effectiveness, assessed in the eyes of audiences beholding the simulacra of modern ICTs. As Lee and McGovern (2014: 103) note, "public support or consent for policing may rest as much on what police are *perceived* to be doing as what they *actually do*" [added emphasis]. Decades prior, in the late 1970s, Manning (1997: 282) articulated that police are unable to uphold the mandate proscribed to them in terms their role as crime fighters; rather, the police are embroiled with "the dramatic management of the *appearance* of effectiveness" [original emphasis] (see also Mawby 1999). Being online is one more way the police must engage in impression management—creating the "appearance of effectiveness"—but they are now recorded and even more susceptible to public criticism. Being aware of the risk of public criticism creates, ironically, greater vulnerabilities for police when using social media as it remains that "knowledge of risk is a producer of risk" (Ericson and Haggerty 1997: 450).

Our respondents clearly demonstrated that they are all too cognizant of the risks involved with social media communications, where messages are comparable to "firing a scattergun" (Lee and McGovern 2014:

125). Lee and McGovern (2014: 125) use the scattergun analogy in a positive way, to suggest “the more platforms used, and the greater styles of communication employed, the more chance of reaching the desired audience.” Yet the flip side to the analogy is, despite rules and procedures in place governing even informal content posted for public consumption online, the directions the messages take and the unpredictable ways such messages are interpreted and responded to are, likewise, ‘scattershot.’ Interviewees shared awareness and concern about the nuances of social media use, often citing stories of media engagement that went astray. Schneider (2016b: 139) notes that a Deputy Chief of the Toronto Police Service, in 2011, stated:

The biggest change for us (with the new technology) is our culture. We are not used to this type of decentralised, high-speed, highly interactive information-sharing environment. Traditionally, policing is a very hierarchal and para-military culture. We don’t give our frontline people a lot of opportunity to speak on behalf of our organisation. [Use of social media as a communications tool] is changing all of that and because of that radical change, it made people like me very nervous. (see also Bullock 2018a).

Despite their reference to nervousness and organizational culture as impediments, the Canadian Deputy Chief remained seemingly optimistic, noting retrospectively their change of attitude and “love” for the “bottom up ... approach” the Toronto police are able to draw from to engage with their communities. There are thus both optimistic and pessimistic visions of the utility of SNS to service police communications (e.g., Sandhu and Haggerty 2015). Consistently, interviews revealed the ongoing presence of nervousness and tension regarding individual officers’ role in using SNS, but also a measure of understanding for the motives of command to impose certain restrictions – albeit reluctant understanding. With this in mind, we encourage future researchers to shed light on the detailed ways officers employ techniques of prudentialism; for instance, do officers edit/remove images and content? How does the command structure impose any restrictions? Moreover, how does SNS use impact professional risk, referring to the potential for police to be internally disciplined, as opposed to legal consequences.

Further research is required with broad samples, and which analyzes perceptions in light of gender, age and ethnicity or race, ascertaining the degree people use social media to engage with police or how social media influences their perceptions of police. It may well be true that only a few people end up contacting police through SNS (Grimmelikhuisen and Meijer 2015). This does not, however, undercut the potential of police posts on social media to have a positive, albeit more passive

influence on public perceptions and ‘hearts and minds.’ Most people’s perceptions come not from direct encounters with police but through mediated sources (Weitzer and Tuch 2005). Further research is also warranted with police themselves to further illuminate knowledge regarding any differences between front-line versus senior officers, urban versus rural contexts, and the impacts of using particular platforms (e.g., Twitter vs. YouTube vs. Facebook). In particular, the performative dynamics of ‘doing police culture’ warrant further attention (see Campeau 2015: 682). Numerous studies focus on relatively junior-ranked, front-line or ‘new generation’ officers, though there is also a need for research with high-ranking officers (Campeau 2019). Such research, after first unpacking the nature of police officers’ use of SNS, would tease out potential disparities between practices and public-facing discourses (i.e., of community policing, transparency, etc.). As Campeau (2019: 70) notes, “high-rank officers [may] display to outsiders their ‘social fitness’ as a progressive police department while simultaneously maintaining the old-school status quo within.”

To understand contemporary organizational anxieties related to image and reputation among online-mediated cultures requires a focus on the synoptic mode of observation and response. Synoptic prudentialism, of course, applies to other organizations, individuals and groups, and research is required to explore both questions of extent and frequency, and mine questions of perception and experiences that will illuminate knowledge on the emerging social phenomenon. Thompson (2005: 46) comments at the end of their article about the “politics of trust” becoming “increasingly important, not because politicians are inherently less trustworthy today than they were in the past, but because the social conditions that had previously underwritten their credibility have been eroded.” These observations are easily extrapolated to police. Faith in transparency as a solution for social problems facing police such as racial profiling and excessive use of force are backdropped by declining trust in governments more generally (Birchall 2011; Brucato 2015; Goldsmith 2005). Solutions to police image, trust, and wider questions of police legitimacy rest upon effective use of social media communications and from deeper wells of social capital which perpetually replenish police and organizational cultures.

REFERENCES

- Allan, Stuart, & Einar Thorsen (Eds.). 2009. *Citizen journalism: Global perspectives*. New York: Peter Lang.

- Beshears, Michael L. 2017. Effectiveness of police social media use. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(3): 489-501.
- Birchall, Clare. 2011. Transparency, interrupted: Secrets of the left. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 28(7-8): 60-84.
- Bradford, Ben. 2014. Policing and social identity: Procedural justice, inclusion and cooperation between police and public. *Policing and Society*, 24(1): 22-43.
- Brainard, Lori, & Mariglynn Edlins. 2015. Top 10 US municipal police departments and their social media usage. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 45(6): 728-745.
- Brown, Gregory R. 2016. The blue line on thin ice: Police use of force modifications in the era of cameraphones and YouTube. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 56(2): 293-312.
- Brucato, Ben. 2015. The new transparency: police violence in the context of ubiquitous surveillance. *Media and Communication*, 3(3): 39-55.
- Bruno, Fernanda. 2012. Surveillance and participation on Web 2.0. In K. Ball, K. Haggerty, K. & D. Lyon, *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies* (pp. 343-351). New York: Routledge.
- Bullock, Karen. 2018. The police use of social media: Transformation or normalisation? *Social Policy and Society*, 17(2): 245-258.
- Bullock, Karen. 2018. (Re) presenting 'order' online: the construction of police presentational strategies on social media. *Policing and Society*, 28(3): 345-359.
- Campeau, Holly. 2015. 'Police culture' at work: Making sense of police oversight. *British Journal of Criminology*, 55(4): 669-687.
- Campeau, Holly. 2019. Institutional myths and generational boundaries: cultural inertia in the police organisation. *Policing and Society*, 29(1): 69-84.
- Castells, Manuel. 2007. Communication, power and counter-power in the network society. *International Journal of Communication*, 1(1): 238-266.
- Charmaz, Kathy. 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Crump, Jeremy. 2011. What are the police doing on Twitter? Social media, the police and the public. *Policy & Internet*, 3(4): 1-27.
- Dai, Mengyan, Wu He, Xin Tian, Ashley Giraldi, & Feng Gu. 2017. Working with communities on social media: Varieties in the use of Facebook and Twitter by local police. *Online Information Review*, 41(6): 782-796.
- Denef, Sebastian, Petra S Bayerl, & Nico A Kaptein. 2013. Social media and the police: Tweeting practices of british police forces during the August 2011 riots. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human*

factors in computing systems. ACM. (pp. 3471-3480) <https://doi.org/10.1145/2470654.2466477> [Accessed March 2021]

- Doyle, Aaron. 2011. Revisiting the synopticon: Reconsidering Mathiesen's 'The Viewer Society' in the age of Web 2.0. *Theoretical Criminology*, 15(3): 283-299.
- Ellis, Justin R. 2020. More than a trivial pursuit: Public order policing narratives and the 'social media test'. *Crime, Media, Culture*. Available online <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741659020918634>
- Ericson, Richard, & Kevin Haggerty. 1997. *Policing the Risk Society*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Stigma*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Goffman, Erving. 1968. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Penguin.
- Goldsmith, Andrew. 2005. Police reform and the problem of trust. *Theoretical Criminology*, 9(4): 443-470.
- Goldsmith, Andrew. 2010. Policing's new visibility. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 50(5): 914-934.
- Goldsmith, Andrew. 2015. Disgracebook policing: Social media and the rise of police indiscretion. *Policing and Society*, 25(3): 249-267.
- Goode, Luke. 2009. Social news, citizen journalism and democracy. *New Media & Society*, 11(8): 1287-1305.
- Grimmelikhuijsen, Stephan, & Albert Meijer. 2015. Does Twitter increase perceived police legitimacy? *Public Administration Review*, 75(4): 598-607.
- Hope, Andrew. 2009. CCTV, school surveillance and social control. *British Educational Research Journal*, 35(6): 891-907.
- Hughes, Everett C. 1971. *The Sociological Eye: Selected Papers*. Chicago: Aldine/Atherton.
- Jackson, Jonathan, & Jason Sunshine. 2007. Public confidence in policing: A neo-Durkheimian perspective. *British Journal of Criminology*, 47(2): 214-233.
- Lee, Murray, & Alyce McGovern. 2013. Force to sell: Policing the image and manufacturing public confidence. *Policing and Society*, 23(2): 103-124.
- Lee, Murray, & Alyce McGovern. 2014. *Policing and Media: Public relations, simulations and communications*. London: Routledge.
- Mann, Steve, Jason Nolan, & Barry Wellman. 2003. Sousveillance: Inventing and using wearable computing devices for data collection in surveillance environments. *Surveillance & Society*, 1(3): 331-355.
- Manning, Peter. 1997. *Police Work: The Social Organization of Policing (2nd Ed.)*. Illinois: Waveland Press.

- Manning, Peter. 2010. *Democratic Policing in a Changing World*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- Manning, Peter. 2008. Goffman on organizations. *Organization Studies*, 29(5): 677-699.
- Marx, Gary. 2003. A Tack in the Shoe: Neutralizing and Resisting the New Surveillance. *Journal of Social Issues*, 59(2): 369-390.
- Mathiesen, Thomas. 1997. The viewer society: Michel Foucault's 'Panopticon' revisited. *Theoretical Criminology*, 1(2): 215-234.
- Mawby, Rob. 2012. *Policing Images: Policing, communication and legitimacy*. New York: Routledge.
- Mawby, Rob. 1999. Visibility, transparency and police-media relations. *Policing and Society*, 9(3): 263-286.
- Meijer, Albert Jacob, & René Torenvlied. 2016. Social media and the new organization of government communications: An empirical analysis of Twitter usage by the Dutch police. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 46(2): 143-161.
- Meijer, Albert, & Marcel Thaens. 2013. Social media strategies: Understanding the differences between North American police departments. *Government Information Quarterly*, 30(4): 343-350.
- Miller, Kirk. 2016. Watching the watchers: Theorizing cops, cameras, and police legitimacy in the 21st century. In M. Defflem, *The politics of policing: Between force and legitimacy* (pp. 257-276). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- O'Connor, Christopher. 2017. The police on Twitter: image management, community building, and implications for policing in Canada. *Policing and Society*, 27(8): 899-912.
- O'Malley, Pat. 1992. Risk, Power and Crime Prevention. *Economy and Society*, 21(3): 252-275.
- Procter, Rob, Jeremy Crump, Susanne Karstedt, Alex Voss, & Marta Cantijoch. 2013. Reading the riots: What were the police doing on Twitter? *Policing and Society*, 23(4): 413-436.
- Reiner, Robert. 2008. Policing and the Media. In T. Newburn, *Handbook of Policing (2nd Ed.)* (pp. 313-336). Collumpton: Willan.
- Sandhu, Ajay. 2016. Camera-friendly policing: how the police respond to cameras and photographers. *Surveillance & Society*, 14(1): 78-89.
- Sandhu, Ajay, & Kevin D Haggerty. 2015. High-visibility policing: policing on camera and the crisis of police legitimacy. *Oxford Handbooks Online*.
- Schneider, Christopher. 2016. *Policing and social media: Social control in an era of new media*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.
- Schneider, Christopher J. 2016. Police presentational strategies on Twitter in Canada. *Policing and Society*, 26(2): 129-147.

- Shearing, Clifford, & Phillip Stenning. 1985. From the Panopticon to Disney World: The development of discipline. In A. Doob & E. Greenspan, *Perspectives in Criminal Law* (pp. 335-349). Ontario: Canada Law Book Inc.
- Sunshine, Jason, & Tom Tyler. 2003. The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review*, 37(3): 513-548.
- Thomas, William I., & Dorothy Swain Thomas. 1928. *The Child in America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Thompson, John B. 2005. The new visibility. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 22(6): 31-51.
- Trottier, Daniel. 2012. Policing social media. *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie*, 49(4): 411-425.
- Tufekci, Zeynep. 2013. "Not this one": Social movements, the attention economy, and microcelebrity networked activism. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(7): 848-870.
- US Department of Justice. (2014). *Community Policing Defined*. <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/lbrr/archives/cnmcs-plcng/cn32080-eng.pdf> [Accessed March 2021].
- Van De Velde, Bob, Albert Meijer, & Vincent Homburg. 2015. Police message diffusion on Twitter: analysing the reach of social media communications. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 34(1): 4-16.
- Weitzer, Ronald, & Steven A Tuch. 2005. Determinants of public satisfaction with the police. *Police Quarterly*, 8(3): 279-297.
- Zuboff, Shoshana. 2019. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. New York: PublicAffairs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the Editor-in-Chief, Kevin Haggerty, and anonymous reviewers for their supportive and detailed comments on an earlier version of this paper, which greatly helped improve it.

Michael Adorjan is an Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Calgary. His research and teaching centers on youth and 'technoconnectivity,' including the role of technology in teens' lives, as well as parental and educator responses. Recent publications address social problems related to youth including cyberbullying, sexting, privacy and 'online addiction'. His research appears in *Learning, Media and Technology*, *British Journal of Criminology*, *Theoretical Criminology*, *The Prison Journal*, and *Canadian Review of Sociology*.

Email: madorjan@ucalgary.ca

Dr. Rosemary Ricciardelli is Professor of Sociology, the Coordinator for Criminology, and Co-Coordinator for Police Studies at Memorial University. Elected to the Royal Society of Canada, her research is centered on evolving understandings of gender, vulnerabilities, risk, and experiences and issues within different facets of the criminal justice system. Her research appears in *British Journal of Criminology*, *Sex Roles*, *Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, *The Howard Journal of Crime and Justice* and *Theoretical Criminology*.

Email: rricciardell@mun.ca

