

May 01, 2011

Celebratory parade violence: an exploratory study of the role of impression management and deindividuation

Tonn Q. Cao
Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Cao, Tonn Q. "Celebratory parade violence: an exploratory study of the role of impression management and deindividuation" (2011). *Sociology Dissertations*. Paper 9. <http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d20000993>

This work is available open access, hosted by Northeastern University.

**CELEBRATORY PARADE VIOLENCE:
AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE ROLE OF IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT AND
DEINDIVIDUATION**

A dissertation presented by

Tonn Q. Cao

Submitted to
The Department of Sociology and Anthropology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Northeastern University
Boston, MA
April, 2011

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This dissertation would not have been possible without the guidance and the help of individuals who contributed and extended their valuable assistance in the preparation and completion of this study.

First and foremost, I give my utmost gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Jack Levin, Co-Director and Professor at the Brudnick Center on Conflict and Violence at Northeastern University. Dr. Levin's encouragement, supervision, and expertise from the preliminary to the concluding level enabled me to develop an understanding of the subject.

I would also like to thank co-advisor, Dr. Steven Vallas, Professor and Chairperson of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Northeastern University. Dr. Vallas had kind concern and consideration regarding my academic requirements, and extended his knowledge in aiding the completion of this dissertation.

Additionally, I would like to show my gratitude to co-advisors, Dr. Gordana Rabrenovic, Associate Professor of Sociology and Education and Associate Director of the Brudnick Center on Violence and Conflict at Northeastern University, and Dr. Richard Rowland, Associate Professor for Macro Practice of the Graduate School of Social Work at Boston College. Dr. Rabrenovic and Dr. Rowland were patient and steadfast in their encouragement to complete this study.

Lastly, I offer my regards and blessings to all of those who supported me in any respect during the completion of the project.

Tonn Q. Cao

**CELEBRATORY PARADE VIOLENCE:
AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE ROLE OF IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT AND
DEINDIVIDUATION**

by

Tonn Q. Cao

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology
in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of
Northeastern University, April, 2011

ABSTRACT

Each year, it is estimated that nearly 1500 incidents of violence occur during parades worldwide. However, little is known about the conditions in which these acts occur, particularly during celebratory parades. Traditionally, researchers in the area of interpersonal violence have attempted to explain acts of aggression in large crowds through the theories of deindividuation and impression management. This research sought to explore to which extent each of these two theories play in celebratory parade violence (CPV).

This project has two components: content analysis and interactive interviews. The content analysis of 50 parades reveals general information about CPV not previously known. More importantly, it shows that men under age 25 are usually the perpetrators of CPV.

The interactive interviews of 30 assailants present many interesting propositions. First, CPV tends to involve more impression management than deindividuation. Second, CPV with evidence of impression management typically involves just a few individuals committing the violence. The violence is goal oriented, generally intended to intimidate, to self-promote, or to exemplify. In contrast, CPV with evidence of deindividuation tends to involve a large number of people in an almost euphoric and mindless state, and the violence tend to be expressive. These individuals also report evidence of reduced accountability and reduced self-awareness. Furthermore, evidence of strains only appears in the impression management group, with acute strains acting as triggers. Additionally, all cases report alcohol consumption. However, strains and alcohol consumption must not be seen as root causes of CPV, but as variables that make CPV more likely to occur.

The conclusion posits that individuals engage in CPV more so through self-presentation than deindividuation, and they do so based on the context of their situations. Limitations of the present research and implications for future studies and practice are offered.

TABLE OF CONTENT

	Acknowledgment	2
	Abstract	3
Chapter I:	Introduction and Overview	8
	<i>Situating the Problem</i>	8
	<i>Methodological and Theoretical Overview</i>	10
	<i>Defining Celebratory Parade Violence</i>	14
	<i>Dissertation Overview</i>	16
Chapter II:	Literature Review	17
	<i>Overview of Literature on Parade Violence</i>	17
	<i>An Overview of Symbolic Interactionism</i>	20
	<i>Impression Management</i>	29
	<i>Impression Management and Masculinity</i>	36
	<i>Deindividuation</i>	44
	<i>The Etiology of Strain Theories</i>	50
	<i>Alcohol and Aggression</i>	58
Chapter III:	Parade Etiology and Categories	62
	<i>History of Parades</i>	62
	<i>Parade Categories</i>	66
Chapter IV:	Methods	70
	<i>Content Analysis</i>	71
	<i>Interactive Interviews</i>	73
	<i>Chapter Summary</i>	75
Chapter V:	Results	76
	<i>Quantitative Results: Content Analysis</i>	76
	<i>Qualitative Results: Interactive Interviews</i>	91
	<i>Evidence of Impression Management</i>	94
	<i>Evidence of Deindividuation</i>	111
	<i>Presence of Strains</i>	119
	<i>Alcohol Consumption</i>	122
	<i>Summary of Results</i>	125

Chapter VI:	Discussion	126
	<i>Cases of Impression Management</i>	127
	<i>Cases of Deindividuation</i>	130
	<i>Presence of Strains</i>	132
	<i>Alcohol Consumption</i>	134
Chapter VII:	Conclusion	137
	References	147
	Appendices	161

Chapter I: Introduction

Situating the Problem

Few of us ever think that a celebratory parade could turn violent. When we do, we tend to remember high profile ones, such as the New York City Puerto Rican Day Parade of 2000, where over 60 women filed complaints about being molested.

[T]wo teenagers from Long Island walked into the park and were surrounded by a group of 15 to 20 men at Simon Bolivar Plaza... . . . [T]he men rushed the women, spraying them from plastic water bottles and squirt guns before groping them on the outside of their clothes. The older victim . . . was pushed to the ground. One attacker stole a pocketbook from the pair... .

Within minutes, another attack began, apparently by the same group. . . . [A] couple from France on their honeymoon were surrounded by 25 men... . . . The group splashed water on the 28-year-old woman... . The men chanted, "Soak her! Soak her!" Then the scene turned violent, as the men pulled off her skirt and underpants, and yanked two gold chains from her neck.

... [T]he husband struggled to protect his wife, forcing his way into the crowd and lying on top of her until the group backed off. . . . (Chivers and Flynn, 2000, A:1).

Violence erupting during celebratory parades is not confined to large cities. During the 2003 St. Patrick Day's Parade in Holyoke, Massachusetts, a town with a population under 50,000, "...18-year-old Felix Rodriguez fired a gun seven times into the crowd as he took aim at a man he'd argued with earlier... . Police say he shot his alleged target, who remains hospitalized, along with three bystanders, two women and a man..." (Schweitzer, 2003).

More than ever, celebratory parades are fast becoming a favorite past time for many Americans. For example, the Mardi Gras in New Orleans draws about 250,000 people each year (Mardi Gras in the United States 2011). The attendance for the Phillies Championship parade in 2008 has been estimated to be over 2 million (Phillies Parade). And, The Macy's Thanksgiving

Day parades draw about 3.5 million people to its route each year with an additional 50 million watching from home (Suddath 2008). Furthermore, there is an increasing number of audiences who are viewing celebratory parades through the internet. With so much interest placed on celebratory parades, special attention needs to be paid to the violence that occurs during their processions.

Unlike demonstrations, rallies and marches, celebratory parades are meant to be convivial gatherings and celebrations marking particular momentous occasions, such as holidays and homecomings. They attract hundreds, sometimes thousands of parade-goers to join in on their festivities. Some parades, such as the ones celebrating Mardi Gras, attract many youths looking for harmless fun, while others attract families and children, such as Thanksgiving Day parades. Thus, celebratory parades are peaceful and joyous; at least that is our notion.

A search of major world publications on the LexisNexis News Database using the terms *parade* and *violence* revealed nearly 1500 results during the year of 2010 only. This indicates that there is a staggering amount of violence that occurs during celebratory parades each year; yet, we have very little information on celebratory parade violence or CPV. Why are celebratory parades such hotbeds for violence? What are some of the characteristics of CPV? What are the reasons that individuals commit CPV? What are the conditions that lead to CPV? Finally, what roles do alcohol and strain play in contributing to CPV? The purpose of this research is to explore these questions.

Methodological and Theoretical Overviews

Traditionally, aggression theorists have turned to deindividuation and self-presentation when looking at collective behaviors, such as interpersonal violence that occurred during large scale events where crowds gather (Blumer 1957; Dodd 1985; Good 1992; Hayes 1992; Johnson and Downing 1979). This research explores how much each theory contributes to this violent form of collective behavior that occur during celebratory parades.

Deindividuation has been described as a psychological state whereby personal restraints are lost as the individual experiences a psychological merging of identity with the crowd. People are no longer seen or paid attention to as individuals; rather, they experience a sense of anonymity amongst the members of the crowd. A large number of studies have shown that deindividuation is likely to motivate individuals to behave in abnormal ways, including participating in violence and aggression during large scale episodes of collective behavior.

While many studies of collective behavior have looked at the ways individuals lose their identity to the crowd when committing violence, a few studies have examined the ways individuals manage their impressions through violence in order to influence the crowd. From this standpoint, individuals tend to consciously or unconsciously shape their self-presentation for specific reasons and through strategic tactics in order to present a favorable image to their audiences. Thus, through impression management, one may gain the benefits from specific impressions, such as position, promotion, and friendships.

Felson first posited impression management theory in 1978 to explain interpersonal violence. In *Aggression as Impression Management*, he suggests that, “initial attacks are often inadvertent and that retaliation is often an attempt to reinstate a favorable situational identity when one has been attacked” (205). In contrast to deindividuation whereby the individual has no

agency or control over his own behaviors and is influenced by the crowd, impression management poses that the individual actually does have agency and works to influence the crowd's perception of him. In social situations, the individual is aware that he is categorized by his external audience, so he behaves in ways that make those categorizations favorable.

Impression management has its roots in symbolic interactionism. However, while symbolic interactionism posits that the individual acts in ways that are influenced by an internalized audience¹, impression management suggests that the individual acts to influence the external audience. Thus, according to impression management, though the individual's behaviors are influenced by his own internalized values and identities, his main goal is to act in ways that present a perceived favorable image to his external audience.

The decision to utilize the theoretical foundations of deindividuation and impression management rests on the notion that CPV is a form of collective behavior and not random acts of violence.² They occur only when there is a crowd present; in other words, these are violence that occurs during parades where there are large crowds, who may observe and/or participate in the violence. Thus, deindividuation explains the ways in which individuals lose his self to the crowd's identity and behavior, while impression management explains the ways in which individuals attempt to influence the crowd's perception and behavior.

While gender and strain theories are used in this dissertation as contributing factors, they cannot fully explain the occurrence of CPV. For example, general sociological literature supports that violence is a masculine pursuit; gender is a factor in many forms of violence, not just CPV. In addition, while strain theories have been used to explain interpersonal violence, they are not particularly useful when it comes to explaining collective behaviors. As explored in the literature

¹ See Mead (1934) on the "generalized other".

² See *Defining Celebratory Parade Violence* on page 14 of Dissertation.

review of this dissertation, individuals respond to strains very differently; some respond through violence, while others do not. Also, not everyone who commits CPV experience strain. Strain theories may only be useful in explaining a part, not the whole, of the occurrence of CPV. Thus, the aforementioned reasons exclude gender and strain theories from being used as the main factors explaining CPV.

There are two research components to this project: content analysis and interactive interviews. The content analysis is meant to yield an overview of information on CPV that had not been gathered prior to the completion of this project; it presents descriptive and frequencies on celebratory parade violence. Overall, 50 parades were reviewed in the United States, with 351 incidents of violence recorded. Data were collected from U.S. newspapers and wires, between 1996 and 2009, using the LexisNexis News Database. The content analysis particularly aimed to answer the following research question: What are some of the characteristics and relevance of CPV?

The interactive interviews examined 30 offenders of CPV throughout the United States. These interviews posed questions to explore attitudes, behaviors and experiences of individuals, who engaged in violence during celebratory parades. More importantly, the interactive interviews assessed the individuals' degrees of impression management and deindividuation.

To conclude this section, there are two main traditional approaches to studying violence as a form of collective behavior: deindividuation and impression management. This research explores how much each theory contributes to this violent form of collective behavior that occurs during celebratory parades. It also looks at other contributing variables, such as strains and alcohol. It should be noted that these are *contributing* variables and not *causal* variables. Their presence may influence the probability of the occurrence of CPV, but there is no evidence to

suggest that CPV would not occur without these variables. Likewise, there is no evidence to suggest that even with their existence, CPV would occur. Differences in the ways individuals manage their emotions and behaviors may account for these contributing variables' level of influence.

Defining Celebratory Parade Violence

Before proceeding, it is necessary to define celebratory parade violence, or CPV. Here, I separate celebratory parades, which are convivial events, from religious and political parades, including marches and demonstrations. I give a more detailed discussion of these differences in Chapter III.

Celebratory parades are collective behaviors, but they are not collective actions. Loosely defined, collective behaviors refer “to the behavior of two or more individuals who are acting together or collectively...” (Blumer 1957, pp. 128). Collective behaviors may be expressive or instrumental. Collective actions, however, are forms of collective behaviors that are strictly instrumental or involve directed end-goals, such as social or economic change (Smelser, 1963). An example of collective action is collective violence. These types of violence often occur during demonstrations and rallies, whereby the violence is instrumental; thus I would not consider them to be CPV.

CPV differs from collective violence.

As conceptualized by social scientists, collective violence ... has the ... goal of aiding or impeding change in the social, political, and economic arenas of society. The targets of collective violence typically are only a means to an end, and that end is social change, broadly defined. Acts of violence are not examples of collective violence unless they have this goal. (Barkan and Snowden, 2001, 5)

Thus, CPV is not collective violence by definition because it does not have instrumental or intended goals of social, political or economic changes. CPV incidents are not always expressive, however; those involving robberies or turf wars, for examples, are instrumental in nature. Furthermore, CPV may also be instrumental as when individuals use violence to self-present.

In addition, CPV is a form of public disorder, or hostile collective behavior, because it involves the actions of more than one individual, and it involves one or a series of contributing factors leading to its outbreak. Depending on the context of the situation, CPV may occur as a result of one self-presenting by using violence on his target, or as a result of one becoming deindividuated amongst the crowd.

Here, it is necessary to emphasize that CPV, in a given parade, may occur in various intensities ranging from a single incident of violence, such as an individual stabbing another, to full public disorder, such as a group of 25 attacking a group of 60 bystanders. Furthermore, CPV may begin between the participants (intragroup violence), but it may expand to involve intergroup violence with onlookers and passerby. Finally, because CPV is a form of violence, the aggression can be expressed through physical violence towards individuals, or towards objects, such as cases of vandalism. CPV also includes verbal and sexual violence towards other people.

Therefore, I define CPV as aggressive physical, verbal or sexual acts directed toward a person(s) or object(s). They occur singularly or collectively during celebratory parades. They may be intergroup or intragroup violence, and may be expressive or instrumental. CPV may occur because individuals use violence as impression management tactics, or because they become individuated. In addition, contributing factors may exist, such as strain and alcohol consumption.

Dissertation Overview

As stated earlier, research data on CPV had not been available; thus, the intention of the quantitative part of this project was to gather overall information about CPV. In addition, the qualitative part of this research sought to investigate the roles of impression management and deindividuation associated with CPV; it found that impression management was more significant in influencing the individual's engagement in CPV.

In Chapter II., I explore the social scientific literature on impression management, including its roots, symbolic interactionism. The chapter also presents the literature on impression management and masculinity; deindividuation; strain theories; and alcohol consumption and violence. Chapter III. explores the origin and structural components of parades, and presents information on parades as expressions of identity. Chapter IV. presents the methodology for the research, which contains two components: content analysis and interactive interviews. Chapter V. offers the results of both components of the research, followed by the discussion in Chapter VI., which integrates the results with theory. Finally, Chapter VII. concludes the research with a discussion of its limitations, as well as its implications for future research.

Chapter II: Literature Review

Overview of Literature on Parade Violence

Many studies have sought to understand and prevent violence that occurs during demonstrations, rallies and marches. Most of them deal with understanding police responses to the violence. Jan Terpstra (2006), for example, discussed the use of negotiating strategy by police on protesters. Terpstra suggests, however, that this non-coercive strategy is not as effective as strategies that use force.

In William Lint's article (2005), effective protest policing includes high visibility of policemen, their speedy reactions, and spatiality of their presence. Lint goes on to discuss that community involvement in protest policing is increasingly popular in democratic societies. The community, for example, might do some of its own 'policing' by recruiting volunteers to oversee the crowd and to report to the police should they observe any suspicious behaviors.

Mattias Wahlstrom (2007) finds that provocation and dialogue are the two organizing concepts to curtail protest violence. Crowds are less likely to become violent if they do not feel provoked by the police, and if there is dialogue between them and the policing authorities. Thus, there have been many recent studies conducted on protest violence looking at ways to reduce the likelihood of violence. Most of them look at the actions of the police, while a few attempt to understand the behaviors of the crowd, or the conditions in which violence erupt.

Even fewer studies attempt to understand the violence that occurs during convivial gatherings, such as celebratory parades. One study (McCarthy, Martin, and McPhail, 2000) looks at 400 disorderly convivial gatherings and confrontational protests, and found that police were more likely to use force when protesters become violent than they were when convivial gatherers

become violent. This suggests that there is a perception by the police that protests often become violent, while convivial gatherings do not. Thus, the relationship between threat and police response is heavily contingent upon the nature of the event as well as the behavior of participants, and the perception of the police. While an insightful study, it stops short at understanding why violence occur during convivial events, or offer insights on how to reduce violence during celebratory parades.

Some studies have attempted to specifically understand parade violence; however, they concentrate on violence that occurs during political parades, mainly in Northern Ireland. For over 200 years, the marching season has been a source of conflict for Northern Ireland's Protestant and Catholic communities. The Protestants organize the parades to commemorate historical events relevant to their cultural heritage. The Catholics, however, do not want to endure these parades in Catholic neighborhoods because they are reminded of the Protestants' historical oppression of the Catholics. Violence often erupts during these parades, and many scholars have examined them. (Marman and Bryan, 1996)

Neil Jarman's (1997) Material Conflicts: Parades and Visual Displays in Northern Ireland heavily delves into social memory. It discusses how cultural rituals, class and memory of historical events all contribute to the conflict in Northern Ireland. These cultural identities are reflected in items used during parades, such as banners and uniforms.

...When one moves away from an analysis of the banners as singular images, and begins to look at them as a body and in the context of the process of the parade, it becomes clear that they are being used to display a more elaborate text. The celebration and commemoration of past events and heroes aims to guide action in the present, and so the recurrent celebration of martial heroes and military victories helps to legitimize and sustain faith in a violent solution to Ulster's problems. The displays at the parades remain relatively coded behind a rhetoric of civil and religious liberty or biblical authority. ... (256)

Patrick A. Tuite (2000), in *The Biomechanics of Aggression*, focuses on the ways in which the psychology and the biochemics of the loyalists elicit violent behaviors.

These events utilize biomechanical grammars, carefully choreographed movements, gestures, and songs, which trigger a preferred emotional response in [the participants'] performance. Loyalists in Northern Ireland mobilize the passions of their community by reproducing these prescribed movements in times of crisis. More importantly, the actions that constitute these cultural productions naturalize and rehearse the ... violence. (12)

Thus, Tuite believes that the rituals of the Loyalist parades, such as singing and marching, elicit psycho-physiological responses within the participants. So, if the ritual focuses on violence (singing a song about overthrowing the government, for example), the participants' become euphoric and may elicit violent behaviors.

The works of Jarman and Tuite give an interesting overview of parade violence. However, they concentrate on the political hotbed of Northern Ireland. One may argue that these parades are in fact political marches that may not be considered convivial or celebratory because they have political agendas. In short, there is no discourse or literature on CPV.

To explore CPV, the remainder of this chapter will first present the etiology of impression management, which includes symbolic interactionism. It then gives an overview of impression management and research studies on the topic. Next, the chapter offers an overview of the masculinity literature. A presentation of the literature on deindividuation follows. Then, a review of strain theories is presented. Finally, research studies on alcohol and aggression are offered.

An Overview of Symbolic Interactionism

Symbolic interaction developed as a blend of dominant philosophical, psychological, and sociological schools of thought in the late 1800s. European sociologists Emile Durkheim, Georg Simmel and Max Weber were among the first to explore social psychological processes at a time when most sociologists were concerned with large social structures, institutions and processes. In the United States, a growing fascination in the individual and the interaction between the individual and his environment began to emerge in the early 1900s at the University of Chicago. There, sociologists used tenements, ghettos and immigrant neighborhoods as living laboratories to study social disorganization created by urbanization, immigration and industrialization. Thus, the philosophical and theoretical thought that came out of the Chicago School of Symbolic Interaction was a fusion of a diverse group of theorists whose ideas included German romantic idealism and American pragmatism. (Meltzer, Petras, and Reynolds 1975; Perry, Abbot, and Hutter 1997; Ritzer 2000)

The term symbolic interactionism was first coined in 1937 by Herbert Blumer. Its basic assumption is that individuals are seen as social beings; their interactions are based on shared meanings or symbols. Human interaction is, thus, symbolic interaction. As opposed to animals, whose behaviors are shaped by reflexes and stimuli, symbolic interactionists believe that humans do not simply respond to symbols; they also interpret them. Because human interactions are continuous interpretive processes, human life is perceived as dynamic and creative. Through their interpretations, people construct their social reality. (Meltzer, Petras, B., Reynolds, L. 1975; Perry, W., Abbot, J., and Hutter, M 1997; Ritzer 2000)

For symbolic interactionists, thinking is not possible without language. Thinking is a mental process that entails reflection, discrimination and analysis. Although thinking, perception

and other mental processes involve physiological and psychological processes, the meanings that individuals give to their experiences are social in nature. Human behavior is, therefore, viewed as a function of social process, rather than a physiological or psychological process.

The behavior of an individual can be understood only in terms of the whole social group of which he is a member, since his individual acts are involved in larger, social acts which go beyond himself and which implicate the other members of that group.
(Mead 1964, 121)

Hence, individual personality is influenced by the social structure and social processes. Since individuals reflect on their experiences, they can visualize themselves, evaluate their actions and sentiments, and willfully make changes. Reflection and evaluation give rise to self-conception, and allow individuals to experience themselves simultaneously as subject and as object. As they reflect and think about themselves, they are the object of their thoughts. Concurrently, they may also be the subject as they engage in thinking. (Abbot, Brown, and Crosby 1973; Meltzer, Petras, and Reynolds 1975; Perry, Abbot, and Hutter 1997; Ritzer 2000)

However, self-conceptions do not simply come about from intrapsychic or physiological processes. They are, instead, developed through the process of social interaction, and are shaped by the views and attitudes that others hold towards the individual. Because the individual has the ability to reflect and respond to himself as others respond to him, he has self-awareness or consciousness of his *self*. Therefore, symbolic interactionists emphasize the social and interactional processes that play a role in human development and self-conception. The process of socialization is a key concept within symbolic interactionism. For these theorists, socialization is a dynamic process that permits people to acquire the ability to think. (Meltzer, Petras, B., Reynolds, L. 1975; Perry, W., Abbot, J., and Hutter, M 1997; Ritzer 2000)

Ritzer (2000) summarizes the basic concepts of symbolic interactionism:

1. Human beings, unlike lower animals, are endowed with the capacity for thought.
2. The capacity for thought is shaped by social interaction.
3. In social interaction, people learn the meanings and the symbols that allow them to exercise their distinctively human capacity for thought.
4. Meanings and symbols allow people to carry on distinctively human action and interaction.
5. People are able to modify or alter the meanings and symbols that they use in action and interaction on the basis of their interpretation of the situation.
6. People are able to make these modifications and alterations because, in part, of their ability to interact with themselves, which allows them to examine possible courses of action, assess their relative advantages and disadvantages, and then choose one.
7. The intertwined patterns of action and interaction makeup groups and societies. (221)

As stated, although there are numerous theorists and philosophers who made earlier contributions to symbolic interactionism, two of the most influential are Charles Horton Cooley and George Herbert Mead. In his works, Cooley was highly influenced by John Dewey, James Baldwin, and William James. He viewed society as organic, and stressed the reciprocal interaction between the individual and society. According to Cooley, to understand society, one must understand the individual in society. “Self and society are twin-born, we know one as immediately as we know the other, and the notion of a separate and independent ego is an illusion” (Cooley 1964, 30).

To explain the self-society relationship, Cooley looks at the mental processes of individuals that result in self-consciousness and social consciousness. For Cooley, the *individual mind* and *social mind* cannot be separated, as self-consciousness and social consciousness are inseparable. It is through the *imaginative ideas in the mind* that we know ourselves and others. Cooley’s two main concepts to understanding the self-society relationship are the looking-glass

self and the primary group. (Meltzer, Petras, and Reynolds 1975; Perry, Abbot, and Hutter 1997; Ritzer 2000)

According to Cooley, all self-conception depends on interacting with others and are based on the actor's imagination of how he appears to them. Cooley presents a process of self-conception called the looking-glass self, which involves three stages. First, the actor imagines how he appears to others. Then, he imagines the judgments that the others make about him. Finally, he develops self-feelings that include these perceptions. The two most important self-feelings that he could develop in response to others' judgment are pride and shame. For Cooley, the desire to avoid the self-feeling of shame is the main factor that influences human behavior. (Abbot, Brown, and Crosby 1973; Meltzer, Petras, and Reynolds 1975; Perry, Abbot, and Hutter 1997; Ritzer 2000)

Cooley goes on to state that self-conception comes from interacting with groups. Primary groups are "characterized by intimate face-to-face association and cooperation" and are "fundamental in forming the social nature of the ideals of individuals" (Cooley 1962, 23). Through interacting with primary groups, actors create shared expectations that link them to the larger social structure. Individuals identify themselves in relation to primary groups and develop feeling of unity that fosters psychological *fusion of individualities into a common whole*. In contrast, secondary groups are based on more impersonal, contractual or formal relationships. Initial socialization occurs in primary groups, while later social interactions take place in both primary and secondary groups. To conclude, Cooley's concept of the primary group and the looking-glass self became the foundation for Mead's theoretical contributions to symbolic interactionism. (Meltzer, Petras, and Reynolds 1975; Perry, Abbot, and Hutter 1997; Ritzer 2000)

Like Cooley, George Herbert Mead was influenced by a number of theorists before him. For Mead, the social whole precedes the individual self. The social group is foremost important and it creates the individual's self-conscious states. In interacting with social groups, Mead distinguishes the difference between *the act*, which involves only one person, and *gestures*, which involves two or more people. (Abbot, Brown, and Crosby 1973; Meltzer, Petras, and Reynolds 1975; Perry, Abbot, and Hutter 1997; Ritzer 2000)

The act consists of four stages, which are interrelated: impulse, perception, manipulation and consummation. The first stage is impulse, which involves an immediate stimuli or sensation, such as hunger. Next is perception; the actor must react to the stimuli by searching his environment to satisfy his impulse. Then, there is manipulation; this is the maneuvering of objects in his environment in preparation of consummation, the fourth stage. Consummation is the actual act of satisfying his impulse. For example, eating satisfies the impulse of hunger. Thus, for Mead, *the act* is the most primitive of an actor's interactions with his environment. (Abbot, Brown, and Crosby 1973; Perry, Abbot, and Hutter 1997; Ritzer 2000)

Gestures, on the other hand, involve more complex interactions. Through gestures, the individual's actions both influence and is influenced by the social group. Mead distinguishes between insignificant and significant gestures. Insignificant gestures are simple reactions to the social environment, such as reacting to a physical assault. However, gestures may become significant symbols:

...when they arouse in the individual who is making them the same kind of response (it need not be identical) as they are supposed to elicit from those to whom the gestures are addressed. Only when we have significant symbols can we truly have communication; communication in the full sense of the term is not possible among ants, bees, and so on. Physical gestures can be significant symbols, but as we have seen, they are not ideally suited to be significant

symbols because people cannot easily see or hear their own physical gestures. ...

The set of gestures most likely to become significant symbols is language: a symbol which answers to a meaning in that experience of the first individual and which also calls out the meaning in the second individual. ... In a conversation of gestures, only gestures themselves are communicated. However, with language, the gestures and their meanings are communicated. (Ritzer 2000, 211)

Thus, through significant symbols, or gestures, actors convey and receive meanings with their social environment; language is the most significant of gestures.

Significant symbols also make symbolic interaction possible.

That is, people can interact with one another not just through gestures but also through significant symbols. This ability, of course, makes a world of difference and makes it possible much more complex interaction patterns and forms of social organization than would be possible through gestures. (212)

In addition, significant symbols make it possible for the actor to have mental processes.

Mead sees thinking as talking to oneself. The mind is seen in terms of process and not structure or content. The social process precedes the mind and not the product of the mind. Mead also believes that the mind and the self are dialectically related. The self, too, arises:

...with development and through social activity and social relationships. To Mead, it is impossible to imagine a self arising in the absence of social experiences. However, once a self has developed, it is possible for it to continue to exist without social contact. ... Once a self is developed, people usually, but not always, manifest it. For example, the self is not involved in habitual actions or in immediate physiological experiences of pleasure and pain. (216)

Mead goes on to suggest that the actor cannot experience himself directly. He must view himself from the standpoint of another actor or of a social group.

Mead presents the stages of development of the self in childhood. In the *play stage*, the actor learns to take on the roles of one individual in the game, while in the *game stage*, the actor learns to take on the roles of everyone else, or the generalized other. In order to have full self development, Mead says that the actor must be a member of a community and be influenced by the attitudes of that community:

So the self reaches its full development by organizing these individual attitudes of others into the organized social or group attitudes, and by thus becoming an individual reflection of the general systematic patterns of social or group behavior in which it and others are involved – a pattern which enters as a whole into the individual's experience in terms of these organized group attitudes which, through the mechanism of the central nervous system takes toward himself, just as he takes the individual attitudes of others.
(Mead 1962, 158)

However, while the individual is influenced by his social environment, Mead does not contend that he is a conformist. Selves share a common structure, but each has a unique biographical course. Furthermore, there is not one generalized other, but many, as there are many social groups in society. Thus, an individual may contain many different selves depending upon with which groups he interacts. In addition, the actor is able to change his social environment due to his capacity to think. (Abbot, Brown, and Crosby 1973; Meltzer, Petras, and Reynolds 1975; Perry, Abbot, and Hutter 1997; Ritzer 2000)

In summary, Mead's principles of the self and its interactions with the social environment through gestures gave symbolic interactionism a foundation. From this standpoint, a number of thinkers, including Herbert Blumer and Erving Goffman, have carried on this theoretical tradition.

Blumer studied under Mead. In Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method (1969), he devised a theory of society based on Mead's work. Blumer's main theory is that people "act

toward things on the basis of the meanings that things have for them” (2). The social world is made of objects that are physical (buildings) social (roles), and abstract (customs). Through interactions, individuals assign meanings to these objects, and by doing this, they actively define and create their world. Therefore, the meanings that people ascribe to these objects become the source for human action. According to this notion, society is symbolic rather than material. However, individuals do not act alone, but collectively. For Blumer, society is “created through the joint actions of group life. People make society; society does not make people” (127-130).

In an expansion of Mead and Blumer’s ideas, Erving Goffman focused on the aspects of self. In The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (1969), Goffman posits that the self is created through dramatic interaction between the individual actor and his audience. His dramaturgical model proposes that the self is not stagnant; it is impulsive and imaginative, and adapts to situations. As an actor has many roles, he may also have many selves. For Goffman, actors manage impressions of themselves during their daily interactions with other people. Impression management entails presenting oneself to others in methods that are purposely guided and controlled by the actor. The parts that individuals play during a performance are deliberately created by the actor in order to present a self that will be accepted by his audience. A latter section will explore impression management in further detail.

Goffman also made his theoretical contributions through Asylums (1961) and Stigma (1963). In Asylums (1961), he applied his analysis of the self to total institutions, where members are completely isolated from the wider society for an extended period of time. These institutions include boot camps, prisons and hospitals. Goffman looks at the ways actors transform their selves as they are rid of their standard identities, and are assigned institutional or deviant identities. These transformations require a “stripping process” that is designed to demean

and belittle the sense of self worth and identity. It is only through this process that a new identity may develop. For example, a person entering prison may be strip-searched, have his personal belongings taken away, and assigned a number in place of his name. Through this process, he loses his normal identity and develops a new institutional identity.

In Stigma (1963), Goffman looks at ways that actors with *spoiled identities* conduct impression management to shield their stigma from the audience. A stigma is an undesirable character or behavior as defined by a given society that can be attached to an actor. Goffman identifies three types of stigmas:

1. Abominations of the body, including physical deformities.
2. Blemishes of the character, including a person's behavior or past record of institutionalizations, such as mental disorder, addiction and homosexuality.
3. Tribal stigma of race, religion and nationality.

For Goffman, *normals*, or people without stigma, feel that individuals with stigmas are *not quite human*. Because of this belief system, the *normals* create stereotypes to categorize the stigmatized. The stigmatized person is then “reduced in our minds from a whole and usual person to a tainted, discounted one” (Goffman 1963, 3). Thus, it is necessary for an actor to manage his impression as to avoid or rid stigmatization. He may use a variety of techniques to do this. The actor may attempt to pass as a *normal* by concealing his disgraceful characteristics. If he cannot pass, perhaps due to visible characteristics, he may use adaptive techniques to hide the stigma and reduce tension in social interactions. An example of this is an amputee using an artificial limb. (Abbot, Brown, and Crosby 1973; Meltzer, Petras, and Reynolds 1975; Perry, Abbot, and Hutter 1997; Ritzer 2000)

However, these types of impression management may create feelings of inferiority about one's own self, and may lead to one of the following negative affects:

1. secrecy
2. anxiety (about being discovered)
3. disloyalty (to others with similar stigma)
4. dishonesty (to those who are being led to believe that one does not have stigma).

Finally, the stigmatized actor may manage his impressions by working to remove the stigma through consciousness-raising and empowerment of the stigmatized. (Abbot, Brown, and Crosby 1973; Meltzer, Petras, and Reynolds 1975; Perry, Abbot, and Hutter 1997; Ritzer 2000)

Impression Management

Erving Goffman (1959) believes that individuals perform in the world as actors perform in a play. This is known as the dramaturgical approach. “When individual plays a part, he ... implicitly requests his observers to take seriously the impression that is fostered before him” (9). People manage their actions and personas in the presence of others in order to establish a desired impression on their audience. In literature, impression management is often used interchangeably with self-presentation. Thus,

[i]mpression management is the goal directed activity of regulating or controlling information that is conveyed to audiences, thereby influencing the impressions formed by those audiences. People try to influence audiences’ opinions of individuals (e.g., self, friends and enemies), groups (e.g., clubs or organizations), objects (e.g., gifts and cars), events (e.g., transgressions and elections), and issues (e.g., prolife vs. prochoice). (Schlenker 1980, 76)

Impression management is instrumental and depends on the context of the situation. An actor, therefore, may want to develop different impressions on various audiences based on his intended goal (e.g., to be seen as masculine; to be liked; to appear as competent; to appear high in social status). Furthermore, these goals differ depending on context. For example, a young

man at a family outing may appear cordial and polite in order to impress family and relatives. However, when he is with male peers for a night out on the town, he may present stereotypical masculine traits, such as excessive drinking or engaging in lewd sexual advances toward attractive women. Thus, impression management is guided by specific goals and the context of a given situation. (Goffman 1959; Jones and Pittman 1982).

Impression management is strategic, but not deceiving. Individuals usually present facets of their selves in order to make a desired impression, but they generally do not invent such facets. For example, an man, who generally does not care for sports, and does not practice sports, will generally not join a sports team in order to present himself as being masculine to impress his male peers. He may choose another facet of his masculine identity to self-present. In literature, impression management is sometimes seen as self-serving, dishonest and deceitful. However, another perspective is that impression management varies depending on whether if it is guided by negative or positive motivations (e.g., to exploit or to help); is honest or dishonest; and is salient or non-salient. Saliency refers to whether or not the individual has conscious awareness and control of his self-presentation, or is he merely following the cues of his audience without consciously weighing the consequences for his self-presentation tactics. (DePaulo 1992; Goffman 1959; Jones and Pittman 1982; Leary 1995)

Impression Management involves an interaction between personal, audience and situational characteristics. In the literature on impression management, individuals are more likely to self-present to impress their audience when:

1. The audience is perceived to hold a higher status than the individual (e.g., powerful, attractive, esteemed).
2. There is something to be gained by swaying the audience (e.g., a job, a promotion, money).
3. Information, that is not in agreement with self-presentation, can be hidden from the audience.

4. Relevant previous self-beliefs are vulnerable, inaccessible or insignificant. (DePaulo 1992; Goffman 1959; Leary 1995)

In addition, individual differences exist in the willingness to self-present in order to meet the expectations of the audience. Individuals, who are more socially oriented, are more concerned with conformity and their social identity; thus, they are more likely to self-present in ways that suit the expectations of the audience, and they allow the audience to define the desirable behavior. In contrast, individuals, who are more inwardly directed, are more likely to hold importance their personal identity. They see themselves as independent and want their audience to see them as such. They are also more likely to utilize their prior beliefs and values to guide their self-presentation, instead of allowing the audience to guide it. In research studies on impression management, self-monitoring refers to the character trait that determines to which degree an individual self-presents in any given situation. Thus, high self-monitors are socially oriented individuals, who are able to self-present to adapt to the expectations of most given social situations. In contrast, low self-monitors, are those inwardly directed individuals, who are less able or less willing to adapt to social expectations. (DePaulo 1992; Goffman 1959; Jones 1990; Leary 1995)

Research studies have shown a number of goals and tactics associated with impression management. Earlier works from the 1960s looked at individual's compliance to exaggerate or falsify information in order to gain acceptance and to be liked. In the 1980s, studies suggest that it was possible to use impression management to meet a variety of goals, other than to be accepted by the audience. These goals included:

1. Intimidation: self-presenting as powerful or irrational in order to illicit fear in the audience.
2. Supplication: self-presenting as weak or vulnerable in order to gain sympathy.

3. Self-Promotion: self-presenting as successful and competent in order to gain respect.
4. Exemplification: self-presenting as morally worthy in order to instill guilt and sense of duty.
5. Self-Authentication: self-presenting as an ideal public image in order to gain self-validation. (DePaulo 1992; Goffman 1959; Jones and Pittman 1982; Leary 1995)

Currently, the above goals of impression management have been applied to a variety of research topics, including organizational behaviors, symptoms of mental illness, media, helping behaviors, rationalization, negotiation, and leadership.

Of importance to this thesis, impression management has also been applied to the study of aggression. In a classic paper by Felson and Richard (1978), a review of studies on interpersonal violence where there were no material gains found that initial attacks were usually unintentional. Furthermore, the individual might have retaliated in order to restore a favorable identity. For example, a man might inadvertently spill a drink on another man's shirt at a crowded event. If he does nothing, or acts in a way that seems arrogant, the other man might physically retaliate in order to self-present as the powerful male in front of the audience. Thus, violence is often used as an impression management tactic by men.

Felson and Tedeschi (1993) present three major motivations to self-present using violence.

1. Intimidation: to change others' attitudes or behaviors
2. Self-Promotion: to establish or protect their own social identities, such as masculinity
3. Exemplification: to achieve justice or retribution by becoming an agent of social control

In order to change the attitudes or behaviors of his audience, some individuals might self-present as powerful through violence in a process known as intimidation. An example of this is a

man, who abuses his intimate partner by exerting physical control over him or her. By using violence, he is conveying to his target that he is the dominant, powerful male.

An individual may also use violence to perform impression management in order to establish or protect his social identities, such as masculine or ethnic identities, through a process known as self-promotion. An example of this may be found in examining the homophobic attitudes of some heterosexual men. Homophobia so deeply threatens some men's concepts of masculinity that it may result in violent hate crimes. The perpetrator may engage in violence to self-present as hyper-masculine to his victim and his peers if they are in close proximity. A case in point is this 2007 hate crime:

Hall, 35 and all of 5'4" and 100 pounds, was allegedly beaten to death by Indiana teens Coleman King, 18, and Garrett Gray, 19. King and Gray confessed to the killing, claiming that it was triggered by Hall having made homosexual advances on them. In Indiana, there is such a thing as a "gay panic" defense - that is to say, a claim of temporary insanity triggered by the so-called horror of being subjected to a homosexual advance. (Sklar 2007)

Finally, impression management may also be performed to self-present as the hero or the agent of social control to achieve retribution or justice, a process called exemplification. The male might be seeking retribution or justice for himself, or he may act as an agent of social control for a perceived victim. An example of this is a man engaging in a physical altercation because he had assumed that another man was making sexual advances at his partner, the perceived victim, who did not deserve the aggressive conduct by the other man. By exerting violence, this individual self-presents as someone, who is strong, brave, heroic and stands up for his rights and the rights of the weak. (DePaulo 1992; Goffman 1959; Jones and Pittman 1982; Leary 1995)

Another study by Felson and Richard (1982) that linked impression management to aggression explored the escalation of violence in violent incidents where self-presentation was used:

Respondents were interviewed about incidents they had been involved in at four levels of severity: incidents in which they were angry but did nothing about it; verbal disputes; incidents involving physical violence but no weapon; and incidents in which a weapon was used. The findings generally support impression management theory: (1) respondents were more likely to express their anger when they had been insulted, particularly when they were males; (2) the probability of physical violence was lower when participants gave accounts for their actions; (3) conflicts involving same-sex participants were generally more severe when an audience was present; and (4) instigation from third parties resulted in more severe incidents while third party mediation resulted in less subsequent aggression. (245)

The study goes on to conclude that initial conflicts tend to be minor, but quickly escalate into aggressive responses as participants self-present

More recent studies include the exploration of the association between impression management and street gang violence. Stretesky et al. (2007) conducted in-depth interviews with twenty-two inmates convicted of gang-related gun violence. They found that the gangs are crucial agents of socialization that helped to form its members' sense of self and masculine identity. Furthermore, interviewees stated that they had used guns not only for protection, but also for impression management to project a sense of toughness. With this result, one may also imply using other weapons, such as knives and even fists, may be a form of impression management, as these individuals attempt to self-present in ways that intimidate others.

Interestingly, while individuals may use violence as impression management, they may also use impression management to conceal violent attributes. A clinical study compared self-reportings of individuals with varying degrees of domestic violence potential. Participants

involved in child custody cases were court ordered to participate in an anger assessment to ascertain their potential for domestic violence because they had been accused of the conduct. Then, individuals were categorized into three groups: documented domestic violence, high risk for domestic violence, and minimal risk for domestic violence. The results showed that the majority of participants in all three groups used impression management tactics in an attempt to enhance their appearance. However, documented perpetrators of domestic violence scored higher on specific measures of aggression despite their attempts to minimize. This data suggests that individuals accused of domestic violence may employ impression management regardless of their guilt or innocence. More importantly, it supports that impression management is used to create a favorable image of the individual in a given context or situation. (Hilfritz et al. 2006)

To conclude, much of the daily behaviors of an individual consist of impression-management tactics to influence the attitudes or behaviors of his audience. The goals of this self-presentation technique generally include intimidation, supplication, self-promotion, exemplification, and self-authentication. Studies also show that aggression and violence can be used as a form of impression management to influence others.

Impression Management and Masculinity

Ideal or hyper-masculinity is often used as an impression management tactic. *Masculinity* is difficult to define. The research on masculinity supports that it is a social construct and not a biological determinant. Connell (1995) suggests that there are various models of masculinity, rather than one ideal. Kilmartin (1994) states that within most Western cultures, masculinity is ascribed the following characteristics: strong, independent, successful, dominant, heterosexual, diligent, aggressive, unemotional, competitive, tough, physical, and forceful. These men initiate sex, earn money, solve problems, take action, get the work done, take risks, financially support their families, and enjoy *manly* activities, such as hunting, sports and drinking. However, this list of male characteristics speaks to what a man does, and not who he is. Therefore, it is still not clear what it means to be masculine.

This section explores, through a sociological lens, the ways in which men acquire their gender identity through socialization. A distinction is made between gender identity and other forms of gender related terms. A brief etiology is also given to the study of masculinity. Finally, this section explores the use of masculinity in self-presentation.

Gender identity is the extent that one sees himself as masculine or feminine in a given society. The notions of femininity and masculinity are social labels and not biological ones. Biology defines who is male and who is female. Respectively attached to those definitions are masculine and feminine characteristics assigned by society. Since these are social definitions, it is possible for a female to view herself as masculine, or for a male to view himself as feminine. Thus, gender identity should be distinguished from other gender concepts, such as gender roles, which are expectations of behaviors assigned to a given gender. For example, gender roles might incorporate women's performing domestic role, while men perform the worker role. The notion

of gender identity also differs from gender stereotypes, which are shared attitudes of personality traits usually tied to one's gender, such as assertiveness in men and passiveness in women. Furthermore, gender identity differs from gender attitudes, which are the views of others or situations commonly assigned to one's gender, such as men thinking in terms of justice, while women think in terms of care. Although gender roles, gender stereotypes and gender attitudes affect an individual's gender identity, they are not the same as gender identity. (Eagly 1987; Gilligan 1982; Katz 1986; Spence and Helmreich 1978; Spence and Sawin 1985)

In sociology, gender identity includes the connotations that are assigned to an individual based on his or her gender identification. Consequently, these self-meanings are a basis of motivation for gender-related behavior. An individual with a primarily masculine identity should act more masculine, or behave in ways that are more masculine as defined by society, such as acting in a more dominant, competitive, or autonomous way. The behaviors themselves are not important; it is the meanings implied by those behaviors that are significant. At birth, the self-meanings of an individual's gender are developed in social situations, stemming from interactions with others such as parents, peers, and teachers. While people draw from the shared cultural conceptions of what it means to be male or female in society which are conveyed through institutions, such as religion and schools, they may come to view themselves as departing from the masculine or feminine cultural definition. For example, a man might see himself as masculine, but instead of viewing himself in a stereotypical male manner, such as being assertive and dominant, he might view himself in a stereotypically feminine manner, such as being nurturing and passive. The emphasis is that people have notions of themselves along a feminine-masculine line of meaning, some being more feminine, some being more masculine, and some might be a mixture of the two. It is this association along the feminine-masculine line

that is the individual's gender identity, and it is this that guides his or her behavior. (Eagly 1987; Gilligan 1982; Katz 1986; Spence and Helmreich 1978; Spence and Sawin 1985)

Here, it is important to look at the brief etiology of the study of masculinity. In Western societies, men are stereotypically aggressive, competitive and goal oriented. Earlier academic work often implied that these characteristics were based on underlying innate traits and temperaments of males. In this view, measures of masculinity were often used to diagnose what were recognized as problems of basic gender identification (e.g., feminine males). Now, it is understood that masculinity is not innate but is defined by social and cultural norms. (Terman and Miles 1936)

Anthropologist Margaret Mead (1935) presented the issue of differences in temperament for men and women in Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies. This early research gave the conclusion that there are no inherent differences in traits or temperaments between the sexes. Observed differences in temperament between males and females are not a result of biological make-up; rather, they are from differences in socialization and the cultural expectations held for each sex. This is so because the three societies studied by Mead presented patterns of temperament, which were very different compared to our own. Among the Arapesh, both men and women showed what we would consider feminine characteristics (e.g., passive, cooperative, expressive). Among the Mundugamor, both men and women showed what we would consider masculine characteristics (e.g., active, competitive, instrumental). Finally, among the Tchambuli, men and women showed characteristics that were different from each other, but opposite to our own model. In that society, males were emotional and expressive, while women were active and goal-oriented. Mead's research, thus, caused scholars of masculinity to rethink in the notions of masculinity. (Maccoby and Jacklin 1974)

Currently, there are four primary theories of masculinity development. Three of which have their roots in psychology: psychoanalytic theory associated with Sigmund Freud; cognitive-developmental theory associated with Lawrence Kohlberg; and learning theories based on the concepts of behaviorism associated with B.F. Skinner. The fourth primary theory of masculinity development is sociologically rooted, and follows the symbolic interactionist perspective. (Eagly 1987; Gilligan 1982; Katz 1986; Spence and Helmreich 1978; Spence and Sawin 1985)

Symbolic interactionists place masculine identity within the context of a body of research called identity theory. According to this theory, the self is an organized set of hierarchically arranged identities (self-meanings) that act as a source of drive for people's behaviors. In recent works on identity theory, identities are arranged as control systems that work to keep congruency between the internalized self-meanings (one's identity norm) and perceptions of the meaning of the self in different social situations. The major point is one's self-meanings; the individual's masculine identity is based on the meanings he has internalized from his association with the role of male in society. Since these are self-meanings, they cannot be directly seen, but are inferred from behaviors and expressions in which the male engages. In addition, masculine identity is one of many role identities men hold. Men may also be fathers, husbands, employees, and so on. Through these roles, men develop their self-meanings or masculine identity. (Eagly 1987; Gilligan 1982; Katz 1986; Spence and Helmreich 1978; Spence and Sawin 1985)

In sociology, one believes that roles do not stand alone but assumes and are related to counter-roles. For example, the role of husband assumes meaning in connection with the role of wife. The same can be said of gender identities; the meaning of masculinity is relative to that of femininity. To be male is to not be female, and vice versa. However, young children do not at first see masculine and feminine characteristics as opposites. As they are socialized, their outlook

on genders becomes gradually more distinct. And, unfortunately, many learn to associate inferior characteristics to femininity, and superior characteristics to masculinity, creating a bias for masculinity. (Eagly 1987; Gilligan 1982; Katz 1986; Spence and Helmreich 1978; Spence and Sawin 1985)

To illustrate the prejudice for masculinity, Burke and Tully's (1977) conducted the classic study which found that boys with cross-sex identities (who thought of themselves in ways similar to the way most girls thought of themselves) were more likely than their counterparts with gender-appropriate identities to have been called derogatory names, like “tomboy”, “homo” or “sissy”. These boys were also cautioned by others about performing these so-called gender-inappropriate behaviors. Thus, not surprisingly, these boys were more likely to have low self-esteem. Numerous, more current research (e.g., Blazina and Watkins 2000; Bergman 1995; Pollack 2000) support the idea that boys and men suffer psychological distress when their masculine identity is threatened.

Thus, masculinity is a concept derived through socialization. In most societies, it holds inherently positive or more desirable characteristics in comparison to femininity. These characteristics or self meanings are assigned by societal members and are internalized by the individual. When there is a disconnect between what is performed by the individual and what is expected by society, the individual, particularly the male (because society holds a higher ideal for masculinity), is likely to suffer psychological distress. He must find ways to reconcile this disconnect, and one of the ways is through impression management of his masculine identity.

An example of impression management of masculinity can be seen in working class men as they attempt to project an impression of hyper-masculinity toward their peers. Mosher and Sirkin (1984) devised a Hyper-masculinity Inventory to measure the macho personality group,

containing three components: Calloused Sex Attitudes, Danger as Exciting, and Violence as Manly. Thus, characteristics of hyper-masculinity are: a lack of empathy or sensitivity especially in regard to sex; pursuing excitement, adventure, and sensation seeking; and adopting the belief that violence is normal and acceptable for men. Hall (1992) added a fourth component, Toughness as Self Control Over Emotions, to explain the notion that hyper-masculine males attempt to control their own emotions by hiding opposing emotions associated with femininity or sensitivity, like fear, distress and compassion.

Working class men often perform impression management by being hyper-masculine. The working class consists of individuals characterized by having little or no formal education, with modest means. Their jobs are usually laborious work, and they have very little control or power in the workplace (Leondar-Wright 2005; Lubrano 2004). Working class men attempt to achieve many roles in society; the most important one is that of provider: husband and father. During their gender socialization, the importance of these roles is acquired through observing role models in their primary group. According to Roy (2004), blue collared men believe that a good father financially supports his children; thus work is an important part of a working class man's masculine identity.

Blue collared men define themselves through manual labor and through their physical strength, often commenting that work performed by middle class men is soft, and not for real men. While one may move from working class to middle class by completing college, bell hooks (2000) argues that many working class individuals are reluctant to leave behind their working class background. In addition, Marks (2000) found that there is an inherent hostility or ambivalence among working class men towards higher education because education and middle class work are seen as feminine. Furthermore, Archer, Pratt and Phillips (2001) found in their

study that working class men view middle class college students as immature, lacking common sense, and unable to perform *real men's work*. In summary, the self-presentation of hyper-masculinity among working class men allows them to project and maintain their social status among their working class peers.

Unfortunately, these forms of impression management may lead to violence. As stated earlier, aggression is generally a valued characteristic in masculine men. Thus, expressing aggression through violent behaviors is acceptable for those who attempt impression management of their masculine identity.

The study of the association between masculine identity and violence is not new. Talcot Parsons (1964) suggested that masculine identity was learned in adolescence. During this time, boys learn to perform in more delinquent ways than girls. Sutherland and Cressey. (1924) explored notions of masculinity by suggesting that boys are taught to be *rough and tough*, making them more likely to become delinquent. Furthermore, Cloward and Ohlin's (1960) proposed that new gang members learn legitimate and illegitimate behaviors from older male role models. Common masculine traits, including aggressiveness and dominance, which are considered necessary in order to obtain a strong masculine identity, are learned through contacts with these older males.

More recent research by Miedzian (1991) explores the socialization, peer pressure, media, and military influences that influence violent behaviors in males. Another study on dating violence, Thompson (1991) showed that men with more masculine gender identity were more likely to be engaged in violent interactions. Other research that associates violence to masculinity includes analyses of films and media, as well as in sports events. These studies found that stereotypical masculinity is both informed by and perpetuated by films, media, and sports. To

summarize, concepts of masculinity are acquired through socialization. (Wilson and Daly, 1985; Gruneau and Whitson, 1993; Weinstein, et al., 1995)

Deindividuation

To this point, we have examined the role that self-presentation has been suggested to play in the onset of violence. This section presents an alternative conception; namely, the social phenomenon of deindividuation, which is defined as the loosening of normal constraints on behavior, leading to an increase in impulsive and deviant acts when in the presence of others in a group. In other words, getting lost in a crowd of strangers may lead to an unleashing of behaviors that one would never perform in normal circumstances. First, a brief review on *group* is presented. Then, deindividuation is explored along with a review of literature on the subject matter. The section goes on to discuss the roles of reduced accountability and reduced self awareness in fostering deindividuation.

In its most basic definition, a *group* is two or more people who are simultaneously in the same place. Groups can be divided into social and non-social groups. Social groups are those with individuals working together to achieve a common goal. Examples include community task forces, jurors, and protestors. These individuals typically work together and rely on one another to achieve an end goal. In contrast, non-social groups consist of individuals, who do not interact with one another, nor do they have goal-oriented behaviors as a whole. Examples are a crowd gathered for a parade, shoppers inside a store, fans at a ball game, and passengers in an airplane. Non-social groups are most interesting for sociological studies as simply being in the presence of strangers can have a variety of interesting effects on the individual's behavior. One of these effects is deindividuation. (Ajzen 1988; Eagley and Chaiken 1993; Petty and Cacioppo 1986; Pratkanis and Aronson 1991)

There have been many infamous historical examples of deindividuation. In the Mai Lai incident during the Vietnam War, a group of American soldiers systematically murdered

hundreds of defenseless women, children and elderly men. In Europe and South America, scores of soccer fans regularly attack and bludgeon each other. In the United States, hysterical fans at rock concerts have trampled each other to death. Furthermore, the United States has a shameful history of whites lynching African Americans, often dressed in white sheets to protect their identity.

Mullen (1986) conducted a content analysis of newspaper accounts of sixty lynching committed in the United States between 1899 and 1946, and found an interesting fact: The more people there were in the mob, the greater the savagery and viciousness with which they killed their victims. In addition, Robert Watson (1973) conducted his content analysis of ethnographic files on twenty-four cultures and discovered that warriors who changed their appearances before going into battle (e.g., changing face and body paint, or face masks) were significantly more likely to kill, torture or mutilate captive prisoners than were warriors in cultures that did not mask their identity in battle. These content analyses suggest that when a mob consists of a large number of people, or when warriors disguise their identities, group members feel more anonymous and feelings of deindividuation are likely to occur.

Prentice-Dunn and Rogers (1989) found that deindividuation leads to impulsive behaviors for two reasons. First is the occurrence of reduced accountability. In the cases above, the large number of people in the crowd and the wearing of the disguises increase anonymity, which reduces accountability, or the likelihood of being caught or recognized. Secondly, the presence of others reduces self awareness, thereby shifting people's attention away from their moral standards. The remaining part of this section explores the association of deindividuation with reduced accountability and reduced self awareness.

In reduced accountability, the less likely one is to be caught, the more likely he is to engage in illegal or immoral acts. Dodd (1995) illustrated this point in his study by asking participants to describe what they would do if they were completely invisible for twenty-four hours, with no possibility of being detected. Interestingly, more than half of the respondents stated that they would commit a deviant or illegal act, such as robbing a bank or going into a locker room to view people getting undressed. Even more fascinating, college students were more likely to state that they would engage in illegal behaviors than criminals in maximum security prisons. Thus, being anonymous, either because one is part of a huge crowd or because one's identity is concealed, means that one can divorce himself from the consequences of his actions. For example, the larger a lynch mob, the less likely one would feel that he would personally be held responsible for the heinous act.

Laboratory experiments have also supported the notion of reduced accountability in association with deindividuation. In a classic experiment by Philip Zimbardo (1970), for example, female undergraduates participated in one of two conditions. In the deindividuated condition, the participants were asked to put on lab coats and hoods as soon as they arrived. No names were used, and the room was darkened to prevent identification. In the comparison condition, the participants wore their normal clothes, put on large name tags, were in a brightly lit room, and thus were easily identifiable. All the participants were then asked to administer (false) electric shocks to another woman. Those in the anonymous, deindividuated condition were considerably more aggressive toward the experiment's confederate, delivering more and longer shocks, than were those who could be easily identified.

Another study by Jurgen et al. (1987) looks at the ways in which wearing uniforms affects deindividuation. The researchers randomly assigned fifth-graders in German schools to

various five-person teams and then watched the teams play handball against each other. In each game, all the members of one team wore orange shirts, while members of the other team wore their normal street clothes. Those who wore the orange shirts (which made them more difficult to be distinguished from each other) played the game significantly more aggressively than the children who wore their everyday clothing did. Additional studies suggest that military appearances, including their uniforms and haircuts, also create reduced accountability in deindividuation. (Eagley and Chaiken 1993; Pratkanis and Aronson 1991)

In addition to reduced accountability, the presence of others can cause reduced self-awareness, which can also lead to impulsive acts or deindividuation. When individuals are tempted to behave in deviant or antisocial manner, the more self-aware he is, the more his moral values and principles will be kept in check. However, when there is a reduced state of self-awareness, individuals typically do not think about their values, thus are more likely to act inconsistently with those values. (Ajzen 1988; Eagley and Chaiken 1993; Petty and Cacioppo 1986; Pratkanis and Aronson 1991)

Reduced self-awareness is likely to occur based on three factors. First, the less one feels that other people are focusing their attention on him, the less self-aware he becomes. For example, an actor in a play is likely to be more self-aware than an audience member watching the play. Second, the more stimulation there is in the environment to capture one's attention, the less self-aware he is. In other words, when attention is focused outward at the excitement, such as at a large, crowded parade, individuals typically do not pay attention to their own inner consciousness or feelings, thus are less self-aware. Finally, there is evidence that drugs and alcohol also reduces self-awareness. (Ajzen 1988; Eagley and Chaiken 1993; Petty and Cacioppo 1986; Pratkanis and Aronson 1991)

As stated earlier, deindividuation may lead to an increase in impulsive or deviant act. However, it is important to note that not all impulsive acts are deviant or violent. Examples include eating too much and dancing wildly at a party. Deindividuation increases the occurrences of these impulsive acts as well. It is the context or the situation that encourages a negative or a positive impulsive behavior. For example, if one feels angry toward someone, then being deindividuated will lower his inhibitions, allowing him to act more aggressively. If an individual is hungry and is at a party where food is available, then being deindividuated will increase the likelihood that he will eat large portions of food. In other words, if inhibitions prevent one from doing something non-aggressive, such as eating, or something pleasant, such as hugging someone, the more one is deindividuated, the more likely he is to overcome these inhibitions. (Eagley and Chaiken 1993; Gergen, Gergen, and Barton 1973; Pratkanis and Aronson 1991)

In a study by Johnson and Downing (1979), a follow-up of Zimbardo's study (1970), participants wore a costume that resembled that of the Ku Klux Klan or a nurse's uniform. After putting on the costumes, the participants were then individuated by having a Polaroid taken of them with their name attached, or deindividuated by wearing no name tag. They then perform the procedure similar to Zimbardo's, whereby the participants had to administer (false) shocks to another individual. When the participants were individuated, the clothes they wore had little effect on the amount of shock they delivered. However, when participants were deindividuated, the situational cue provided by the clothes made a difference. Those wearing the Ku Klux Klan costume, with its negative connotations, administered higher shocks than those wearing nursing uniforms, with its prosocial connotations of caregiving and nurturance.

In summary, deindividuation, then, is most likely to occur when people feel that they are not accountable for their actions (e.g., when it is unlikely they will be caught) and when they are

in a state of reduced self-awareness. The conditions that lower accountability and self-awareness are precisely those in which mob violence and other impulsive, deviant acts tend to occur. However, deindividuation does not always lead to negative behaviors. It may also lead to positive acts, depending on the context of the situation.

The Etiology of Strain Theories

As suggested in the introduction of this dissertation, there are often contributing factors that accompany CPV; one of which is strain. This section gives an overview of strain theories, which will be useful in exploring CPV in the discussion section of this paper.

Strain theories stem from Durkheim's theory of anomie, or normlessness. According to Durkheim, crime is normal, and punishing criminals is necessary in order to keep social order. Thus, the function of law becomes a regulatory act. When regulation is inadequate, social problems arise, including crime. This causes a state of normlessness. Anomie may also occur when individuals fail to internalize societal norms or adjust to changing norms. (Farnworth and Leiber, 1989; Featherstone and Deflem, 2003; Ostrowsky and Messner, 2005)

In modern urban societies, individuals move away from the solidarity of the family, community and traditions, to achieve individualism. Without these mechanical solidarities, which confine and define the individual, he gains greater freedom; however, he also risks becoming deviant without these constraints. For example, without much individual constraints (morality) or social constraints (laws and regulations), he may resort to crime as a way to achieve monetary success, which is valued in most societies. Thus, Durkheim views anomie in modern societies as created by individual aspirations and ambitions, and the search for new pleasures and sensations; the individual may not achieve these even when times are prosperous. (Adler and Laufer (Eds.), 1995; Agnew 1990; Farnworth and Leiber, 1989; Featherstone and Deflem, 2003; Ostrowsky and Messner, 2005).

The notion of anomie goes on to influence later criminologists, including Robert Merton, Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin, Albert Cohen, and Robert Agnew. For Robert Merton, anomie occurs when there is a discrepancy between aspirations and attainment of goals. In

American society, for example, individuals place a high value on material success. We are taught to believe that the American Dream is available to and attainable by all, when in reality, the opportunities or the means to achieve material success are limited. Individuals, then, turn to antisocial behaviors, such as crimes and violence, to achieve their aspirations. (Adler and Laufer, 1995; Merton, 1964; Merton 1968; Rosenfeld, 1989)

Merton goes on to describe five modes of personality adaptations through which individuals move as they strive to achieve their aspirations. The first mode is conformity; that is when people adhere to social standards and practices because they believe that their aspirations are achievable. The second is innovation; people still strive to attain success, but they begin to do so in illegal ways. Next is rebellion; individuals reject the belief that success is attainable, and seek to overthrow the system altogether. Fourth is retreatism. Here, individuals become recluses to society; they have completely given up on their aspirations, viewing them as impractical and imaginary. These are individuals on the far fringes of society, such as drug addicts and the homeless. Finally, during ritualism, individuals accept that opportunities do not exist for them, so they attempt to retain their possessions, and focus on attaining a lower level of success. Here, they return to conforming to conventional societal standards. (Adler and Laufer, 1995; Merton, 1964; Merton, 1968; Rosenfeld, 1989)

Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin extend Merton's strain theory to focus on lower class youths. These youths are unable to attain material success in legitimate ways, so they choose a subcultural adjustment, such as joining a gang, to achieve material success in illegitimate ways, such as selling drugs. Interestingly, some also fail to illegitimately achieve success, so they retreat from society altogether; these individuals may become drug addicts or alcoholics.

(Cloward, 1959; Cloward and Ohlin, 1950; Farnworth and Leiber, 1989; Featherstone and Deflem, 2003; Ostrowsky and Messner, 2005)

Cloward and Ohlin identify three groups of illegitimate youth subcultures: the criminal, conflict and retreatist. The criminal subculture exists in neighborhoods where a high level of criminal opportunities exists. These neighborhoods tend to have an organized hierarchy of criminals and criminal behaviors; thus this group is given illegitimate means to attain material success. In contrast, the conflict subculture exists where there is a disorganized hierarchy. This may occur where there is a turnover of ethnic group in neighborhoods. The conflict subculture is denied legitimate and illegitimate means of success attainment, so they often resort to violence, such as turf defense. Finally, the retreatist subculture is for those who have been unable to achieve success in legitimate and illegitimate ways, so they resort to drug abuse in order to escape their reality. (Cloward, 1959; Cloward and Ohlin, 1950; Farnworth and Leiber, 1989; Featherstone and Deflem, 2003; Ostrowsky and Messner, 2005)

Albert Cohen's strain theory is similar to Cloward and Ohlin's in that it describes the ways in which lower class youths ascribe to middle class values, such as ambition, verbal skills and academic achievement, but are unable to attain them because of social structures (or the lack thereof). As a result, they act out their frustrations in crimes. More importantly, Cohen goes on to explain that these youths may not be acting criminally because of necessity, but they may be acting out in order to achieve social status. For example, a crime that may seem purposeless, such as throwing bottles and rocks at a parade, may not be purposeless at all. The individual may be acting out his status frustration in a crowd in order to gain social acceptance amongst his peers. Thus, Cohen's strain theory may be helpful in explaining what may seem to be purposeless crimes, such as those occurring at parades. (Cohen, 1955; Cohen, 1965; Cohen,

1977; Farnworth and Leiber, 1989; Featherstone and Deflem, 2003; Ostrowsky and Messner, 2005)

Earlier strain theorists, such as Merton, Cloward and Ohlin, and Cohen, argue that strain is defined by the disjunction between aspirations and expectations. These theories focus on goal blockage; an individual may resort to crime if he is unable to achieve or attain what he values. In the 1980s, Robert Agnew began to add to this focus. He suggests that strains are not only present when the individual fails to achieve positively valued goals, but they are present in all situations where the individual feels mistreated or loses something that is of value to him. The individual may resort to crime to reduce these strains. Integrating previous strain, biopsychological, social control and social learning theories, Agnew developed the General Strain Theory. (Agnew, 1990; Agnew 1992; Agnew, 2007)

According to Agnew, when individuals experience one of the above strains, they also experience negative emotions, which they then seek to reduce. Some may choose to reduce their negative emotions by escaping the strains. Drug use is an example of this behavior. Others may attempt to reduce their negative emotions through crime. For example, a man, who believes his wife is unfaithful, may resort to violence to reduce his anger. Anger and frustrations are the most common negative emotions elicited by strains. Different types of emotions lead to different types of crimes. For examples, frustration may lead to robbery, while anger may lead to violence. Additionally, it is important to note here that not all strains lead to crime. Crime is merely one way that an individual may react in order to reduce the stress caused by a strain. Most people act in legal and socially acceptable manners to escape a strain. (Agnew, 1990; Agnew 1992; Agnew, 2007)

For Agnew, strains may be subjectively or objectively perceived. Objectively perceived strains are those that produce negative emotions in most individuals. Everyone, for example, feels a high level of negative emotions when being assaulted by someone, or when a loved one suddenly passes; these would be considered objectively perceived strains as most individuals, if not everyone, experiences a high level of stress when they are experienced. Subjectively perceived strains, on the other hand, are those seen by the individual as presenting a high level of negative emotions; however, not everyone may feel that same level of negative emotions. Divorce is an example. While it could elicit a high level of negative emotions for some, others may feel little to no negative emotions because the marriage was an unhappy one. (Agnew, 1990; Agnew 1992; Agnew, 2007)

Certain strains are more likely to cause crime. Strains that are perceived as high in magnitude are one type. Examples of these strains are poverty, physical abuse and job loss. These strains tend to have a large, long-term impact on the individual's life, thus causing strong negative emotions, such as anger, fear and depression. A second type of strains that cause crime is those that are seen as unjust. These strains tend to foster anger and resentment, which reduce tolerance and self-constraints. An example is an individual, who feels that he is wrongfully terminated from his job. He might seek to reduce his negative emotions by acting out his anger in a shooting rampage. Strains lacking in social control are also more likely to cause crime. Child abuse by a parent is an example. Presumably, the parent does not care about the child, thus giving very little supervision or social control. This not only allows the troubled child the opportunity to engage in crime, but the child may view the costs of crime to be low (He is not risking to lose a relationship with his parent, since there is no relationship). Finally, strains that create some pressure or incentive to commit crime also increase the likelihood that one might

engage in crime. For example, if an individual has been chronically unemployed, he may choose to rob a bank as the incentive (money) is high. (Agnew, 1990; Agnew 1992; Agnew, 2007)

Agnew points out that certain factors influence an individual's likelihood of engaging in crime. One is poor coping skills. These are generally personality traits, such as low-self control, high temperament and low social skills. Another factor is lack of resources, such as education or access to information. The third factor is low levels of conventional social support, such as family, community and government. Low conventional social support usually leads to the fourth factor – low social control. Without much control from peers, family and community, the individual is able to freely react to strains, as he will suffer few consequences. Finally, the association with other criminals is also a factor, which influences crime. Drawing from the social learning theory, individuals are taught and encouraged to engage in crime through their association with criminals. (Agnew, 1990; Agnew 1992; Agnew, 2007)

It is important to note here that the aforementioned strains, that are most likely to cause crime, are also interconnected and interdependent creating a sort of downward spiraling effect for the individual. For example, a teen, who experiences the strain of child abuse, generally lacks supervision and social control. Thus, he may join a gang, which introduces, teaches and encourages crime. This might cause him to become involved with the legal system. He may also be influenced into dropping out of school. Without an education and with a criminal record, he may not find employment. Thus, his strains now consist of abuse, illegal gang related activities, interactions with the legal system and poverty. All of these strains may brew crime as a mean to escape from them. Thus, many strains are connected and interdependent causing a spiraling-down effect for the individual. (Agnew, 1990; Agnew 1992; Agnew, 2007)

Strain theories primarily focus on the individual; however, in 1999, Agnew presented an extended version of the GST in *The General Strain Theory of Community Differences of Crime Rates*. This article addressed the use of GST to explain community or macro level differences in crime and delinquency. Agnew suggests that communities experiencing high levels of strains, such as unemployment and discrimination, are more likely to act out in anger and frustration, which lead to criminal and delinquent behaviors. This Macro Strain Theory (MST) has been useful for sociologists and criminologists to explain differences in criminal and delinquent behaviors among communities and sub-cultural groups. (Agnew, 1999; Brezina, Piquero, and Mazerolle, 2001; Kaufman, et al., 2008)

Additionally, Levin and Madfis have added *acute* and *chronic* strains to the discourse. In their manuscript, “School Massacres and Strain, A Sequential Model”, Levin and Madfis distinguished between the two types of strains:

The chronic, acute/distinction is akin to that found in medical nomenclature between chronic and acute illness. While chronic illness refers to a persistent and long –standing medical condition, which has developed slowly over time, acute symptoms develop rapidly and have a substantially shorter lifespan. Likewise, while chronic strains are fairly persistent and long-term, acute strains are short-term but particularly troubling situations or events which seem catastrophic to an already beleaguered frustrated, and isolated individual who has lost the ability to cope with adversity.
(13)

Relevant to this research project, in the case of CPV, chronic strains are strains that may have relatively long lasting effects on the individual, causing enduring discomfort or distress. Examples of these are financial hardships and racial oppression. In contrast, acute strains for CPV are those that are briefly encountered by the individual and that cause relatively minor discomfort or distress. These include accidental bumps and pushes by strangers, derogatory

comments, and minor misunderstandings. The annoyance or minor discomfort caused by acute strains may act as a trigger to violence.

To summarize, traditional strain theories drew from the notion of anomie, the state of normlessness that occur when society and individuals experience strains. Earlier strain theories, such as those of Merton, Cloward and Ohlin, and Cohen, focus on goal blockage as the source of strain. Agnew, however, goes on to present the General Strain Theory, which adds perceived mistreatment by others and the loss of something valued as sources of strains. Agnew also extended the GST to explain macro differences in criminal and delinquent behaviors, suggesting that communities and sub-cultural groups who experience high levels of strains are more likely to commit crime and delinquency; this theory is known as the Macro Strain Theory. Finally, Levin and Madfis made the distinction between chronic and acute strains.

Alcohol and Aggression

We have explored strains as a contributing factor to CPV. Alcohol consumption is also another well-known contributing factor. An association between alcohol use and violence has long been noted by researchers. This section explores the associations between alcohol consumption, violence, environmental influences, and the role of the brain in regulating aggressive behaviors. Understanding the nature of these associations is essential to understanding the role of alcohol consumption in contributing to CPV.

In a study published by Roizen (1998) the percentages of violent offenders who were drinking at the time of the crime may be summarized here: up to 86% of homicide offenders; 37% of assault offenders; 60% of sexual offenders; up to 57% of men and 27% of women involved in marital violence; and 13% of child abusers. These figures are the upper limits of a wide range of estimates. In another study that's community-based, Pernanen (1991) found that 42 % of violent crimes reported to the police involved alcohol; however, 51% of the victims interviewed believed that their perpetrator had been drinking.

Many scientists and academics have looked at the relationship between alcohol and aggression using a variation of a research project developed over than 35 years ago. For example, an individual believes he is giving electric shocks to participant. Unknown to that participant, the reactions of the nonexistent victim are simulated by a computer. The individual delivers this task while sober and after drinking alcohol. In most incidences, individuals showed increased aggressiveness, such as administering stronger shocks, in proportion to increasing alcohol consumption. These findings posit that alcohol may facilitate aggressive behavior. However, the individuals rarely increased their aggression unless they felt threatened or provoked. In addition, neither intoxicated nor sober subjects administered painful shocks when

non-aggressive means were also available. These results are consistent with the real-world observation that alcohol, by itself, does not cause violence. Intoxication must interact with other factors to influence violence. (Bushman 1997).

To explain the complexity of the relation between alcohol and aggression, several models have been offered. In the social and cultural expectancy model, alcohol usage may encourage aggression because people expect it to do so. For example, studies using real and simulated alcoholic beverages show that people who believe they have consumed alcohol begin to act more aggressively, despite which beverage they actually consumed. Furthermore, alcohol-related expectancies that encourage male aggressiveness, joined with the widespread misconception that intoxicated women are sexually receptive and less able to defend themselves, could account for the link between alcohol and date rape. (Bushman 1997)

Another model used to explore the relationship between aggression and alcohol usage is lifestyle and exposure. Women with alcohol abuse are more likely to have a history of childhood sexual abuse or neglect than women, who do not have alcohol abuse issues. Widom and colleagues (1995) discovered no relationship between childhood victimization and subsequent alcohol abuse in men. Even children who only observe family violence may learn to mimic the roles of aggressors or victims, setting the stage for alcohol abuse and violence to persist over generations. Finally, damage to the nervous system at birth, joined with subsequent parental neglect, such as those that might occur in families where alcohol abuse is present, may predispose one to violence, crime, and other behavioral problems by adulthood. Violence may precede alcohol misuse in offenders as well as victims. For example, violent people may be more likely than nonviolent people to choose or encounter social situations and lifestyles that

encourage heavy drinking. In summary, violence may contribute to alcohol consumption, which in turn may perpetuate violence. (Widom 1995)

The final model that deals with the relationship between violence and alcohol consumption is the biological model. Although individual behavior is influenced partly by the environment, it is also affected by biological factors (e.g., hormones) and ultimately planned and directed by the brain. Individual differences in brain chemistry could account for the observation that excessive alcohol consumption may consistently encourage aggression in some individuals, but not in others. For example, serotonin, a chemical messenger in the brain, is said to function as a behavioral inhibitor. Thus, a lessening of serotonin activity is associated with increased impulsivity and aggressiveness in addition to early-onset alcoholism among men. Another example is the steroid hormone, testosterone, which is responsible for the growth of male primary and secondary sexual characteristics. High testosterone concentrations in criminals have been associated with hostility, suspiciousness and violence. Furthermore, in experiments using animals, alcohol administration increased aggressive behavior in socially dominant squirrel and monkeys, who already showed high levels of aggression and testosterone. Alcohol did not, however, increase aggression in subordinate monkeys, who showed low levels of aggression and testosterone. (Rapoza and Drake 2009)

Finally, a review of literature on quantitative experiments consistently reveals that alcohol increases aggression; in addition, this effect is dependant on situational contexts. Among these are aggressive triggers in the environment. When an individual is intoxicated, he is more likely to experience displaced aggression or triggered displaced aggression (TDA). Displaced aggression occurs when an individual is provoked, but is unable to retaliate or react for whatever reason. He then displaces his aggression at an innocent target without provocation. However,

sometimes the target provides a small trigger, which sets the aggression and violence in motion. Interestingly, research shows that TDA only occurs when the trigger is minor because the initial provocation had already developed aggression-related affect, cognition and arousal. Thus, when a minor provocation is later encountered, it is experienced at a higher level of intensity. Research also shows that the intensity of aggression increases when the individual is intoxicated while experiencing the trigger. (Begue et al. 2009)

To conclude, alcohol has long been linked to violence and aggression. The section above reviewed three theories on alcohol and aggression: expectancy, lifestyle and exposure, and biological models. No one model can account for all individuals or types of violence. Alcohol apparently may increase the risk of violent behaviors only for certain individuals or subpopulations, and only under some situations and social/cultural influences. Nevertheless, researchers do see a strong relationship between alcohol consumption and violence or aggression.

Chapter III: Parade Etiology and Categories

History of Parades

In order to understand parade violence, we must first define our terms and distinguish various forms of parades in a consistent manner. Parades, loosely defined by the Encyclopedia Britannica, are “processions of people – and perhaps floats, bands, vehicles and animals – from one place to another” (Pageant and Parade, 2008). Under this definition, demonstrations, rallies and political marches may be placed alongside celebratory parades, such as Thanksgiving Day and Saint Patrick’s Day parades.

For the purpose of this research, it is important to differentiate these categories. First, I will present parades as a form of pageantry. Next, I will discuss parades as agencies to social movements, and present the ways in which celebratory parades differ from political and religious parades. Finally, I will discuss the major types of parades.

Parades are a form of pageantry, which are a series of staged dramatic performances and lavish productions dating back to ancient times when tribes held religious pageants to drive away evil spirits, or to demonstrate military strength. Pageants are used to express some sort of collective identity, such as religious, national or communal identities. (Pageant, 2008; Pageant and Parade, 2008)

Coronations, royal weddings, and state visits have been the occasions for pageantry since ancient times and were especially prominent in Europe during the Middle Ages and afterward. Such entertainments included both processions and set pieces of entertainment, the latter usually representing allegorical figures who delivered their speeches against a backdrop of spectacular mechanical effects. The marriage of Louis XII of France to Mary Tudor in 1514 and the meeting of Henry VIII of England and Francis I of France in 1520 are examples of notable occasions that were marked by sumptuous and elaborate pageantry. The elaborate

court masques staged for the English monarchs of the 16th and 17th centuries were a form of pageantry; essentially, these were entertainments that led up to a dance or a masked ball. Ben Jonson wrote and Inigo Jones designed some of the most famous of these masques, which illustrated a simple theme with lavish embellishments of music, poetry, costumes, and ever-changing scenery. (Pageant)

These extravagant pageants usually incorporated the production of lavish parades, with ornately decorated floats marching alongside skilled musicians, dancers and other exotic entertainers. Of course, only the courts and aristocrats were privileged enough to participate and witness these fabulous productions. The laborers and even the middleclass were excluded from these pageants and parades.

Things began to change, however, in the late Eighteenth Century. With the aid of printed media, which helped to inspire and spread creative innovations on public events, such as pageants and parades, the middleclass and the poor began to reinterpret these pageants and parades, making them assessable to the masses, usually in the form of political parades.

In Parades and the Politics of the Street, Simon P. Newman (1997) suggests that in early American history,

[n]ewspapers played a vital role in the transformation of the rites and symbols of festive culture into part of the currency of political exchange. A well-to-do merchant's wife in Delaware could have read of a Federalist celebration of Washington's birthday in Albany; on the Kentucky frontier a settler could read about the popular protests against the Jay Treaty in Charleston; while in the national capital a government minister could read about the actions of black and white seafarers in celebration of the French Revolution in Boston. ... Political festivals and celebrations from all over the nation were continually created and re-created in the newspapers of cities, towns and rural hamlets alike. Thus a succession of essentially non-literary political activities assumed a textual existence in the early national press... . A national popular political culture was created simultaneously on the streets in the

actions of ordinary Americans, and on the pages of the newspapers that reported them. (187)

Parades were no longer just a part of lavish pageants only assessable by the wealthy; according to Newman, they became political expressions of the masses.

However, parades, now available to the masses, are not only political, but they are also celebratory. Some of the most notable, nowadays, are carnival parades, which take place in Rio De Janeiro, New Orleans, Venice, New York City and Munich. They celebrate national and religious holidays, such as Christmas, Mardi Gras and Thanksgiving. They also celebrate victorious wins and communions, such as athletic parades, homecoming, ethnic pride parades and gay pride parades. Keeping with traditions, these parades often involve the use of colorful costumes, elaborate floats and other ornate objects, such as bead necklaces and shimmering medallions.

In summary, parades began as parts of extravagant pageants produced for the upper classes to celebrate momentous and religious occasions. With the introduction of the mass media, parades began to penetrate into the masses. As this happens, the masses were able to use parades as a form of celebratory, religious and political expressions.

As stated earlier, there is currently no coherent categorization for parades. Some think of parades as celebratory processions, such as the Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade, Mardi Gras and Gay Pride parades. Some may consider protests and demonstrations as parades, while others do not. In order to differentiate celebratory parades from other forms, here it is important to discuss the different categories. Most parades would fit into one of three major categories: Religious, Political and Celebratory. Each consists of its own goal, follows a unique historical trajectory, and utilizes specific relics, symbols, chants or slogans. For example, the historical

significance of Thanksgiving, along with symbols, such as the turkey and pumpkins to represent the bountiful harvest would place Thanksgiving Day parades into the category of Celebratory Parades. In addition, Thanksgiving Day parades have the explicit goal of celebrating the Holiday (to give thanks). However, some parades are hybrids and may be placed in more than one category. The Orange Order parades, which occur every year in Northern Ireland, for example, consist of characteristics of all three types of parades. They are organized by the Protestants to celebrate the religious defeat of the Catholics. They utilize religious relics and chants during their processions. In addition, they are very much political as they are part of a social movement that, since its inception in 1795, promoted the Protestants' interests in Ireland (Jarman, 1998; Tuite 2000).

Even more interesting, some parades may have had their roots in one category, but through time, have evolved with characteristics of another category. An example of this is the Mardi Gras parade. Originally designed to celebrate Lent, a religious holiday, it has been transformed into celebratory parades throughout the centuries. Places, like Rio De Janeiro and New Orleans, host extravagant carnivals each year to celebrate Mardi Gras. While some religious relics are used to keep with tradition, participants and organizers engage in the carnival atmosphere for pure entertainment, not to experience a religious occasion.

In summation, the three major categories of parades are Political, Religious and Celebratory with some parades as hybrids, and some, through time, that have evolved into another type.

Parade Categories

Below, I discuss the characteristics of political, religious and celebratory parades.

Political Parades

Political parades are often an integral part of any social movement. Many times, these parades take the forms of rallies, marches, demonstrations and protests, whereby participants use objects, symbols and rhetoric to express their unresists. As they saunter along a route, they carry signs, shout out slogans, chant and even display symbolic objects, such as effigies and flags.

(Jarman, 1998; Social Movement, 2008; Tuite, 2000)

As part of a social movement, political parades hold certain characteristics that other parades do not. Like social movements, participants of political parades are random individuals, who collectively share a specific dissatisfaction with a status quo, and seek to change it at the societal level. Hence, like social movements, there must be a directed goal for these parades to take place. For example, environmental activists are generally people from all walks of life, with one common interest – protecting the environment. They seek to change the status quo that nations are harming the environment. These activists may use parades in forms of marches, protests and demonstrations in order to convey their messages to governments and to the masses. Thus, social movements involve a collective group of individuals with shared values, who have one directive goal for a particular social change, and political parades are means by which their members may deliver their messages to the masses, and to express their dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs.

Also unique to political parades is that they hold certain conditions or characteristics that are more likely to foster violence. One theory, offered by Tuite (2000), is that the rituals of

political parades, such as songs and chants, elicit a biopsychological response in the participants, which may cause them to become violent. The GST, as developed by Robert Agnew (1992), is also helpful in understanding why violence is more likely to occur during political parades than other parades. When an individual experiences a strain, such as losing something he values, goal blockage or being mistreated by others, he seeks to reduce his negative emotions created by that strain. One way to do so is through violence. The GST is further discussed in the Literature Review section of this proposal. Neil Smelser's (1963) theory of collective violence may also be applied to political parade violence. Smelser devised six stages leading up to violence; they include structural conduciveness, structural strain, generalized beliefs, precipitating factors, mobilization for action and social control. Thus, political parades have certain conditions and characteristics, seldom found in other parades, which may foster violence.

Religious Parades

Religious parades are those with the expressive goal of religious worship. Pilgrimages are an example. The Hajj is a pilgrimage, which every devout Muslim must make once during his lifetime. It occurs every year on the seventh day of the last month of the Islamic year, and ends on the twelfth day.

When the pilgrim is about 6 miles (10 km) from Mecca, he enters the state of holiness and purity known as ihram and dons the ihram garments, consisting of two white seamless sheets that are wrapped around the body. The pilgrim cuts neither his hair nor his nails until the pilgrimage rite is over. He enters Mecca and walks seven times around the sacred shrine called the Ka'bah, in the Great Mosque, kisses or touches the Black Stone (Hajar al-Aswad) in the Ka'bah, prays twice in the direction of the Maqām Ibrāhīm and the Ka'bah, and runs seven times between the minor prominences of Mount Şafā and Mount Marwah. On the 7th of Dhū al-Ḥijjah the pilgrim is reminded of his duties. At the second stage of the ritual, which takes place between the 8th and the 12th days of the month,

the pilgrim visits the holy places outside Mecca—Jabal ar-Rahmah, Muzdalifah, Minā—and sacrifices an animal in commemoration of Abraham’s sacrifice. The pilgrim’s head is then usually shaved, and, after throwing seven stones at each of the three pillars at Minā on three successive days (the pillars exemplify various devils), he returns to Mecca to perform the farewell *tawāf*, or circling, of the Ka’bah before leaving the city. (Hajj, 2008)

Interestingly, most parades that were historically religious in nature, have been transformed to strictly celebratory parades in modern times; Christmas, Easter and St. Patrick Day parades are such. Christmas Day parades, for example, could be traced to medieval times when elaborate Christmas pageants were produced to honor Saint Nicholas. Now, Christmas parades, although have kept some religious relics as tradition, are strictly celebratory. Children and families of all religions attend these parades for their colorful floats and festive atmospheres.

Celebratory Parades

Many parades, of course, are strictly celebratory in nature. They generally have themes derived from their historical roots, and their main goal is to celebrate a particular occasion or holiday. Their symbols might reflect their traditions. They also sing, dance and play music to add to the festive atmosphere. Celebratory parades began in medieval Europe as parts of pageants held by and for the elites. Through time, they penetrated into the masses and have become staples of most western societies. Examples of celebratory parades include homecoming, sports victory and New Year’s parades.

The Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade has become legendary for many reasons. The parade is set in New York, which is used to large processions as it is. The Macy's Thanksgiving Day parade is also the go-to gathering to see giant, larger than life floats of cartoon characters and icons. ... Over the decades, cartoon characters like Underdog, Mighty Mouse, Donald Duck, Kermit the Frog, and especially Snoopy have been star floats at the Macy's Thanksgiving Day parade.

But floats aren't the only stars of the Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade. Miley Cyrus, David Archuleta, Sugarland, James Taylor and more will be performing throughout the day. Someone named Santa Claus is also expected to make a last minute guest star turn. (Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade, 2008)

In conclusion, by examining the goals of each parade, its historical context, and its usage of relics, symbols, chants and slogan, I have categorized them into political, religious or celebratory parades. Some are hybrids, having characteristics of more than one type; while others have been transformed from one type to another.

Chapter IV: Methods

There are two methods components to this research project: content analysis and interactive interviews. The content analysis presents data that spans the U.S. across time, from 1996 to 2009. This section not only gives relevancy, but also pertinent information about CPV, which have not previously been collected. Variables, such as number of arrests, types of arrests and percentage of CPV, age and sex of assailants, were explored. Because there is no existing data on CPV, the objective of the content analysis was to reveal any patterns and correlations. Thus, through the content analysis, we were able to view CPV from the macro-level. In contrast, the interactive interviews allowed us to view CPV from the individual level. They present information, such as impression management tactics, experiences of deindividuation, existence of strains, and alcohol consumption.

Methods: Content Analysis

The content analysis is designed to yield general data on CPV as none had been available prior to the completion of this project. It explores the following research questions: What are some of the characteristics and relevance of CPV?

The content analysis was completed by examining major U.S. newspapers between 1996 through 2009, using the LexisNexis News Database, which included major U.S. papers, such as the New York Times, The Los Angeles Time, The Washington Post, and the New Orleans Times Picayune. The parameter was set for the following search terms:

parade! AND violence OR death! OR bottle! OR rock! OR knife
OR knives OR gun! OR shot! OR injur! AND NOT iraq! AND
NOT pakistan! AND NOT palestin!

I did not review articles on political parades, which include demonstrations, rallies, marches and riots; as I had discussed in earlier sections, these processions are not considered celebratory parades, which are convivial and are meant to be joyous occasions.

Using the above search terms, and selecting *U.S. newspapers and wires*, between 1996 and 2009, over 3000 articles were generated. I commanded the system to automatically retrieve the top 850 most relevant articles. I reviewed each article, beginning with the most relevant as determined by the LexisNexis, until information on 50 celebratory parades with evidence of violence were gathered; if an article noted any incidents of violence, crime and/or arrest, information on that article was collected. A total of 212 articles were reviewed.

I devised a list of variables on SPSS that would be useful when looking at frequencies and patterns. The data collection was completed based on each individual incident.

Perpetrator ID	City	Residency of Assailant
Offense ID	State	# of Citations
Parade ID	Sex	# of Arrests
Parade Type	Age	# of Police
Date of Parade	Offense/Charge	Intergroup vs. Intragroup
Size of Parade	Behaviors/Action	Alcohol Present
Regional Location	Gang Related	Alcohol Ban

*See Appendices for variable definitions.

Methods: Interactive Interviews

The interviews gathered information on the attitudes, behaviors and experiences of 30 assailants, who were at least 18 years of age at the time of interview, and who engaged in CPV. Questions were meant to gauge their degree of self-presentation and deindividuation as well as. The format of the interviews was semi-structured and interactive. This procedure allowed me to have a list of guided questions, yet be able to conduct the interviews in a conversational format, allowing the interviewees to tell their stories. An important criteria (as for any interactive interview) was the interviewee's level of engagement with the event, and his narrative competence, or ability to articulate his story. Efforts were made to select individuals from diverse ethnic/racial, SES, geographical and generational backgrounds. The target number was set for 30. The sample questions, approved by the University's Human Subject Research Protection Department, is included in the Appendices. (Holstein and Gubrium, 2004; Holstein and Gubrium, 2003)

Interviewees were selected through a variety of tactics. Names and general locations were identified in the content analysis. This information was run through web searches, including Intelius, PeopleFinder, Facebook, LinkedIn, and Myspace. Once contact information, such as email and physical addresses were available, I contacted them using a University approved statement of request for interviews. Some follow-ups were made for individuals, who did not respond. Once an individual responded and identified himself to be the correct individual who participated in CPV, I briefed him by phone on the project as well as his rights to confidentiality and to decline participation. Interviews were all done by telephone, and recorded using an iPhone app. A guided questionnaire, approved by the University was used. Each interview was later transcribed.

Additionally, recruitment efforts were also made via posting an I.R.B. approved recruitment statement on internet sites, such as Craigslist, Twitter, Facebook, VolunteerMatch, and SmartVolunteer.org, targeting a number of large cities, including Boston, New York City, Miami, Las Vegas, Los Angeles, and Dallas. Those individuals who responded to these recruitment efforts followed the above briefing and interviewing process. There was no snowballing effect.

As stated above, this project was conducted within university requirements for human subject research. The Application for Approval for Use of Human Research, as well as all recruitment and interviewing materials were submitted and approved by Northeastern University's Division of Research Integrity. Interviewees' personal information, such as names and addresses, has been kept confidential, and their real names have been changed for the recordings and write-ups. I took into consideration that interviewing participants on this topic might prove sensitive as it involves discussion of crime; thus, the interviewees were assured that the information they gave would be highly confidential and would be held in the strictest of confidence. Upon initial contact, the interviewees were informed of the purpose of this project. They were informed of the security measures (as stated above) taken to ensure their confidentiality. A consent form, approved by the University, was given to them to review.

There was no monetary compensation provided to the interviewees, but they were offered a copy of the finished report upon request. Furthermore, interviewees have the satisfaction of knowing that this research project may help to prevent unnecessary harm to the public and lessen the likelihood that others may spend time in prison due to their illegal behaviors.

Chapter Summary

The methods employed in the present research consisted of two components: content analysis and interactive interviews. The content analysis was designed to yield an overview of basic characteristics involved in CPV, while the interactive interviews were intended to explore generally the attitudes, behaviors and experiences of CPV of the assailants, and more specifically to gauge their levels of impression management and deindividuation as well as. Because this project focused on sensitive legal matters, special precautions were taken to protect the interviewees' identities.

Chapter V: Results

This chapter is organized into two major sections: Quantitative Results of the Content Analysis, and Qualitative Results of the Interactive Interviews.

Quantitative Results: Content Analysis

To explore the characteristics of the parades in the sample, frequency and crosstabulation tables on some key variables, including parade type, region, and size are presented. A total of 50 parades that were held between 1996 and 2009 were examined with 27 types of parades, including St. Patrick's Day, Christmas, Mardi Gras, Columbus Day, Sox Victory, and Caribbean American Day³. Parades with available data were later collapsed into four categories: *Ethnic Pride*, *Sports Victory*, *Patriotic Celebrations*, and *Festivals*.

As Table I shows, nearly half of the sample was *Festivals*, while relatively few were *Patriotic Celebrations* and *Sports Victory* celebrations. *Festivals* included processions, such as Lilac Parades, Rose Parades, Summer Sunset Festivals, Music Festivals, and Mardi Gras. Next was *Ethnic Pride* parades which consisted mostly of St. Patrick's Day Parades, but also included others, such as West Indian and Puerto Rican Day Parades. *Patriotic Celebrations* came in third; most of these were Fourth of July, Memorial Day and Columbus Day Parades. Finally, *Sports Victory* came in last. These included Super Bowl victories, and baseball and basketball playoff victories.

Table I: Frequency of Parades by Category

³ Refer to Appendices for complete list of original parade types that were collected.

	Frequency	Percent
Festivals	24	48
Ethnic Pride	11	22
Patriotic Celebrations	8	16
Sports Victory	7	14
Total	50	100

In Table II, each of the 351 incidents recorded was categorized into four regional locations (Northeast, Midwest, South, West) where they had occurred. The highest frequency of incidents occurred in the Northeast at almost 50%. This was followed by the West at about a third of the total. Next was the South at just under 20%. Finally, the Midwest appeared under-represented coming in at less than 6%.⁴

Table II: Frequency of CPV Incidents by Regional Location

	Frequency	Percent
Northeast	153	43.6
West	116	33.0
South	62	17.7
Midwest	20	5.7
Total	351	100.0

As presented in Table III below, *Sports Victory* parades had the highest mean number of arrests at 23.4, followed by *Patriotic Celebrations* and *Festivals*. *Ethnic Pride* parades had the least mean number of arrests at just under six. The difference was significant. Interestingly, when compared to Table I, which showed the frequency of parades by category, *Patriotic Celebrations* and *Sports Victory* had the lowest counts; yet, their average means of arrests in this table were

⁴ As consistent with the U.S. Census, the Northeast region includes Conn., Maine, Mass., N.H., N.J., N.Y., Pa., R.I., and Vt. The Midwest includes Ill., Ind., Iowa, Kans., Mich., Minn., Mo., Neb., N.D., Ohio, S.D., and Wis. The South includes Ala., Ark., Del., D.C., Fla., Ga., Ky., La., Md., Miss., N.C., Okla., S.C., Tenn., Tex., Va., and W.Va.. The West includes Alaska, Ariz., Calif., Colo., Hawaii, Idaho, Mont., Nev., N.M., Ore., Utah, Wash., and Wyo.

about quadrupled that of the mean of arrests for *Ethnic Pride*, which had slightly more counts in Table I. This indicates that arrests were disproportionately higher during *Sports Victory* and *Patriotic Celebrations*.

Table III: Mean Number of Arrests in Parades by Category

Parade by Category	Mean
Sports Victory	23.41
Patriotic Celebrations	20.02
Festivals	19.33
Ethnic Pride	5.15

$F(df= 334, 3)= 24.14, p< .05$

There was not only a disproportionately large mean number of arrests in *Sport Victory* parades, but there was also a disproportionately large frequency of violence committed by individuals under 25, as Table IV below shows. Of the individuals under age 25, one third of them committed violence during sports victory parades compared to other venues. However, of the individuals age 25 and over, only about 8% committed violence during sports victory parades compared to other parades. In other words, where evidence of violence occurred, sports victory parades were significantly more likely to have attendees under age 25 making CPV more likely to occur during sports victories. This data indicates that sports victory parades have a higher frequency of violent incidents, and is consistent with the general sociological literature suggesting that individuals under age 25 are more likely to commit violence. The

disproportionate amount of violence associated with sports victory celebrations may be at least partially explained by the presence of large numbers of *under 25* year old attendees.

Table IV: Parade by Category, Age Range and Evidence of Violence

Age Range				Evidence of Violence		Total
				No Evidence of Violence	Evidence of Violence	
under 25	Parade by Category	sports victory	Count	2	28	30
			% within Evidence of Violence	10.5%	33.7%	29.4%
	others	Count	17	55	72	
		% within Evidence of Violence	89.5%	66.3%	70.6%	
	Total	Count	19	83	102	
		% within Evidence of Violence	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
25 and over	Parade by Category	sports victory	Count	2	3	5
			% within Evidence of Violence	40.0%	7.9%	11.6%
	others	Count	3	35	38	
		% within Evidence of Violence	60.0%	92.1%	88.4%	
	Total	Count	5	38	43	
		% within Evidence of Violence	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Under 25: Chi Square= 4.11, df= 1, p< .05

25 and over: Chi Square= 4.43, df= 1, p< .05

One possible explanation as to why *Sports Victory* parades have a higher mean of arrests and a higher frequency of violent incidents is that the structure and atmosphere of *Sports Victory* parades offered a sense of reduced accountability and reduced self-awareness, which led to deindividuation in some of the people involved. As reported in the qualitative interviews, many individuals who attended sports victory parades described feelings of heightened excitement and being “lost in the crowd”. They often committed CPV with friends and other parade-goers. In contrast, those who attended other parades, such as festivals and ethnic pride parades, tended to direct their violence toward one target. Thus, it was likely that more arrests

occurred in parades where deindividuation occurred because there were more people involved in the CPV as their behaviors became one with the crowd. As market research in sports advertising supports (Dortch 1996; Fan Frenzy 2007; Snipes and Ingram 2007), sports victory parades tend to attract males under 25; this population is more prone to committing violence.

Table V shows that of the 27 parades that had information about the number of individuals in attendance, more than half had less than 200,000 attendees, and about a fourth of the total had between 200,001 and 400,000 attendees. In stark contrast, less than 8% had between 400,001 and 600,000 attendees, and less than 4% had between 600,001 and 800,000 attendees. Only about 11% had more than 1.4 million attendees.

Table V: Frequency of Parade Sizes

	Frequency	Percent
Less than 200,000	14	51.9
200,001 - 400,000	7	25.9
400,001 - 600,000	2	7.4
600,001 - 800,000	1	3.7
More than 800,000	3	11.1
Total	27	100

Table VI shows that about 75% of violent incidents occurred in parades where there were fewer than 400,000 people in attendance, compared to only 25% where there were 400,000 or more attendants. Non-violent incidents, on the other hand, dominated the 400,000 plus category. The results of Tables V and VI appear to indicate that the majority of CPV occurred during smaller parades; however, the data could have also resulted from an absence of larger size parades given that they are more difficult to organize.

Table VI: Parade Size and Evidence of Violence

			Evidence of Violence		Total
			No Evidence of Violence	Evidence of Violence	
Parade Size	under 400,000	Count % within Evidence of Violence	12 27.9%	98 74.2%	110 62.9%
	400,000 and over	Count % within Evidence of Violence	31 72.1%	34 25.8%	65 37.1%
Total		Count % within Evidence of Violence	43 100.0%	132 100.0%	175 100.0%

Chi Square= 29.82, df= 1, p< .05

To get a better understanding of the characteristics of the offenders and their crimes, the following tables represent frequencies of key characteristics of the offenders and their behaviors. For example, Table VII shows that there was nearly 150 individuals identified by age. Of these individuals, an overwhelming 70% were under the age of 25. These results indicate that violence and arrests decrease as age increases. Again, this finding is entirely consistent with existing sociological data which show that young people in general are disproportionately more involved than their older counterparts when it comes to committing acts of violence.

Table VII: Frequency of Age Range of Offender

	Frequency	Percent
Under 25	103	70.0
25 - 34	23	15.6
35 - 44	6	4.1
45 - 54	11	7.5
55 - 64	2	1.4
65 and older	2	1.4
Total	147	100

Table VIII shows the frequency of the offenders' sex. Of the offenders, 171 had references to his or her sex. Of these individuals, men disproportionately outnumbered women by over 90%. These results are consistent with the larger criminological literature suggesting that men disproportionately commit more violence than women in general.

Table VIII: Frequency of Sex of Offender

	Frequency	Percent
Male	158	92.4
Female	13	7.6
Total	171	100

The mean number of arrests, as shown in Table IX, was highest among the youngest age group. Those under 25 had a mean of about 12, while the total mean for all groups was only 9.5. In addition, the average mean of arrests for age 25 to 44 is 4.9, while the mean for age 45 and over is 1.9. These results are again consistent with extant literature suggesting that youths under age 25 are more likely to commit and to be arrested for CPV, and that violence and arrests tend

to decrease with age. The mean number of arrests dramatically decreases at age 25, indicating that in general criminal violence is a pursuit of the young. The difference between means was significant.⁵

Table IX: Mean Number of Arrests by Age Group

Age Range	Mean
under 25	12.03
25-44	4.86
45 and over	1.93
Total	9.51

$F(df= 137, 2)= 11.76, p< .05$

Table X shows the type of behaviors engaged by the offenders. Of the 351 incidents recorded, nearly 200 referenced the type of behavior leading to the offender’s arrest. Of these behaviors, an overwhelming 40% were *Throw Bottle/Can*, followed by *Physical Altercation (fistfight, punch, push, shove, etc.)* at about 19%. Vandalizing Car was next at 14%, followed by *Confrontation with Police* at 10%. These results indicate that the majority of the CPV in the sample were minor violent episodes, such as throwing a bottle or can, and trivial physical altercations with fellow parade-goers. Extremely violent incidents, such as stabbing, shooting, sexual assault and murder comprised of less than 7% of all incidents. The results also indicate that much of parade violence is spontaneous rather than planned. The types of violence that predominate tend to be committed using objects that are close at hand (e.g., a beer bottle or can). Relatively few acts of violence seem premeditated (e.g., throwing an egg). Furthermore, as discussed in Table V, the majority of the arrests were made during *Sports Victory* parades. These

⁵ Age Range was collapsed into four categories: Under 25; 25-34; 35-44; and 45 and older.

parades were more likely to brew deindividuation, which would explain why there would be more spontaneous violence, rather than planned ones. People who are deindividuated do not plan their behaviors, but “go with the flow of the crowd”.

Table X: Type of Behavior

	Frequency	Percent
Throw Bottle/Can	78	39.6
Physical Assaults (fistfight, punch, push, shove, etc.)	37	18.9
Vandalizing Car	27	13.7
Confrontation with Police	20	10.2
Verbal Assault	7	3.6
Stabbing	6	3.0
Threats with Gun	6	3.0
Resist Arrest	5	2.5
Throw Eggs	4	2.0
Shoot with Gun	4	2.0
Sexual Assault (groping, rape, etc.)	2	1.0
Murder	1	.5
Total	197	100

In addition, when examined by parade category, *Sports Victory* parades had the highest number of incidents with *Festivals* trailing behind. Interestingly, *vandalizing car* occurred 92%

of the time within sports victory parades than other parades.⁶ Vandalism is typically a collective behavior. This again suggests that deindividuation may be more likely to occur during sports victory parades as the individual become a part of the group. This is also consistent with the interview sample in that most of the participants who deindividuated did so during sports victory parades.

In order to develop a clearer view, behaviors were categorized into *no violence*, *moderately violent*, and *extremely violent*.⁷ While *Festivals* had the most incidents out of all parade types, they consisted of 80% of the non-violent incidents. Of the moderately violent incidents, *Patriotic Celebrations* took the lead at 44%. Finally, *Sports Victory* parades led the extremely violent category with over 50%; most of these incidents comprised of *physical assaults* and *vandalizing car*.⁸ Thus, Table XI suggests that sports victory parades not only produced more incidents and arrests, but they also produced more extremely violent incidents than other parades. As stated earlier, assailants who commit CPV during sports victory parades are likely to experience deindividuation. These results suggest that people experiencing deindividuation may commit more violent crimes than those who self-present.

⁶ See Table on Type of Offensive Behavior and Parade by Category in Appendices.

⁷ Type of behaviors was recoded to *Degree of Violence*, aggregated under *no violence*, *moderately violent* and *extremely violent*. *No violence* included indecent exposure, public intoxication and drinking in public. *Moderately violent* included *verbal assaults*, *throw egg*, and *throw bottle/can*. *Extremely violent* included *physical* and *sexual assaults*, *vandalizing car*, *stabbing*, *shoot with gun* and *murder*.

⁸ See table on Type of Offensive Behavior and Parade by Category in Appendices.

Table XI: Degree of Violence and Parade by Category

			Degree of Violence			Total
			No Violence	Moderately Violent	Extremely Violent	No Violence
Parade by Category	Ethnic Pride	Count	6	21	13	40
		% within Degree of Violence	12.0%	22.3%	13.5%	16.7%
	Sports Victory	Count	4	9	49	62
		% within Degree of Violence	8.0%	9.6%	51.0%	25.8%
	Patriotic Celebrations	Count	0	41	5	46
		% within Degree of Violence	.0%	43.6%	5.2%	19.2%
	Festivals	Count	40	23	29	92
		% within Degree of Violence	80.0%	24.5%	30.2%	38.3%
Total		Count	50	94	96	240
		% within Degree of Violence	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square= 120.09, df= 6, p< .05

There was strong evidence that alcohol played a large role in contributing to CPV. Table XII presents evidence of alcohol presence during the sample of parades. Those with no evidence of alcohol were just slightly higher in number than those with evidence of alcohol. *Evidence of Alcohol Presence* included articles that noted individuals having been arrested for alcohol related misdemeanors, such as public intoxication and drinking in public. *No Evidence of Alcohol Presence* indicates that there was an absence of evidence of alcohol presence in the article.

Table XII: Evidence of Alcohol Presence

	Frequency	Percent
Evidence of Alcohol Presence	23	46.0
No Evidence of Alcohol Presence	27	54.0
Total	50	100.0

Furthermore, of the nearly 200 incidents with evidence of violence, a whopping 63% also had evidence of alcohol along the parade routes. By contrast, only 37% had no evidence of alcohol along the parade routes. Furthermore, where there was no evidence of violence, only 26% of non-violent incidents had evidence of alcohol along the parade routes, compared to a surprising 74% with no evidence of alcohol along parade routes. The association between evidence of alcohol along parade route and CPV was significant. These data suggest that alcohol strongly influenced the frequency of CPV. The data is also consistent with the interview cases because alcohol was present in all 30 cases.⁹

⁹ Type of behaviors was recoded to CPV, aggregated under *evidence of violence* and *no evidence of violence*. *Evidence of violence* included verbal, physical and sexual assaults, and vandalism. *No evidence of violence* included indecent exposure, public intoxication and drinking in public.

Table XII: CPV and Evidence of Alcohol along Route

			Evidence of Violence		Total
			No Evidence of Violence	Evidence of Violence	
Evidence of Alcohol along Route	evidence of alcohol	Count % within Evidence of Violence	13 26.0%	120 62.8%	133 55.2%
	no evidence of alcohol	Count % within Evidence of Violence	37 74.0%	71 37.2%	108 44.8%
Total		Count % within Evidence of Violence	50 100.0%	191 100.0%	241 100.0%

Chi-Square= 21.73, df= 1, p< .05

Finally, Table XIV shows that where *alcohol presence*, *age range* and *parade category* could be accounted for, there were doubled the amount of attendees where alcohol was present along parade routes. Furthermore, individuals under age 25 accounted for about 70% of the total attendees in all parades with and without evidence of alcohol presence. Interestingly, individuals who attended sports victory parades where alcohol was present were all under age 25, while only about 60% of individuals attending all other parades were under age 25. In parades where there was no evidence of alcohol presence, there was virtually no difference between the percentage of attendance within sports victory parades and other parades, even when age range was taken into account; those under age 25 accounted for about 70% of the attendance in both sports victory parades and other parades. Table XIV indicates that alcohol presence and the large number of parade-goers under age 25 contributed to the explanation for why sports victory parades had a disproportionately higher number of incidents and arrests. This is consistent with general

sociological literature that violence is linked to youths, and that alcohol contributes to the occurrence of violence.

Table XIV: Parade by Category, Age Range and Evidence of Alcohol along Route

Evidence of Alcohol along Route				Age Range		Total
				under 25	25 and over	
evidence of alcohol	Parade by Category	sports victory	Count % within Parade by Category	16 100.0%	0 .0%	16 100.0%
		others	Count % within Parade by Category	52 62.7%	31 37.3%	83 100.0%
	Total		Count % within Parade by Category	68 68.7%	31 31.3%	99 100.0%
no evidence of alcohol	Parade by Category	sports victory	Count % within Parade by Category	14 73.7%	5 26.3%	19 100.0%
		others	Count % within Parade by Category	21 72.4%	8 27.6%	29 100.0%
	Total		Count % within Parade by Category	35 72.9%	13 27.1%	48 100.0%

Evidence of Alcohol: Chi Square= 8.70, df= 1, p< .05

No Evidence of Alcohol: Chi Square= 0.00, df= 1, p> .05

In summary, 50 parades between 1996 and 2009 were examined using the LexisNexus. Most of these parades took place in the Northeast and West and had fewer than 200,000 people in attendance. There was a total of 351 incidents. Consistent with the qualitative sample and with the literature review, most of the offenders were young males under age 25, and alcohol presence seemed to influence the frequency of CPV. The highest mean of arrests and the highest

frequency of incidents occurred in sports victory parades. Finally, most of the violent behaviors were spontaneous rather than planned.

Qualitative Results: Interactive Interviews

A total of 30 individuals were interviewed for the qualitative data, nineteen of whom were recruited through online postings, primarily through Craigslist.org. It should be noted here that it was not possible to estimate the response rate from these online postings because I had no way of measuring the number of those who decided to not respond to the postings.

Approximately 60 individuals were contacted by searching names identified through the LexisNexis News Databases. These names were run through search engines, such as Google and Facebook. Most of these individuals either did not respond or responded by informing me that he/she was not the individual in question. There were 18 males who responded stating that he was the correct individual, seven of whom declined the interview. In summary, where the response rate could be determined, it was approximately 30%.

In summarizing the data collected from the 30 interactive interviews with assailants, all were males, and most were between ages 20 and 30, with 19 individuals under age 25 at the time of their arrests. In addition, one individual was in his 30s, and two were in their 40s. Their ages and gender are consistent with the findings of the content analysis; men under age 25 tend to be the largest group of CPV assailants. Most identified themselves as Caucasians, while seven were African Americans. Three were either Asians or Asians/Caucasians, and three were Hispanics/non-Whites. Most reported high school as their highest level of education; two reported having a G.E.D., and one did not complete high school or G.E.D.. Nine had college degrees, and two were students in college. Most individuals were working class (e.g., waiters, machinists, construction workers), seven worked as professionals (e.g., software development, management, accounting), and five were unemployed with working class backgrounds at the

time of interview. All, but one participant, attended their parades with friends. The parades they attended consisted mostly of Saint Patrick's Day parades at nine counts, with Mardi Gras trailing behind at seven counts, and sports related parades at six counts. Other parades included Fourth of July and ethnic pride parades (e.g., Puerto Rican Day, Caribbean Day). Most individuals were arrested for assault and battery, with disorderly conduct in second place. There were some arrests for vandalism and public intoxication. There were no extremely violent crimes, such as shootings, stabbings or murders.

In addition, based on their self-reported behaviors, assailants may be placed in one of two categories: those who showed evidence of impression management, and those who showed evidence of deindividuation. I used several criteria to place individuals in the impression management category. First, their violence had to be instrumental and not expressive; they wanted to achieve something through violence. Once it was determined that their violence was instrumental, I had to decipher which end-goal they wanted to achieve.

Looking back at the literature review, individuals who self-present, do so for these reasons:

1. Intimidation: self-presenting as powerful or irrational in order to illicit fear in the audience.
2. Supplication: self-presenting as weak or vulnerable in order to gain sympathy.
3. Self-Promotion: self-presenting as successful and competent in order to gain respect.
4. Exemplification: self-presenting as morally worthy in order to instill guilt and sense of duty.
5. Self-Authentification: self-presenting as an ideal public image in order to gain self-validation. (DePaulo 1992; Goffman 1959; Jones and Pittman 1982; Leary 1995)

Felson and Tedeschi (1993) further refined this list to explore self-presentation through violence, and found that individuals who utilize violence to manage their impressions tended to do so for the following reasons:

1. Intimidation: to change others' attitudes or behaviors
2. Self-Promotion: to establish or protect their own social identities, such as masculinity
3. Exemplification: to achieve justice or retribution by becoming an agent of social control

With these instrumental goals as guideposts, I dissected the interviewees' statements to see whether or not they had self-presented through violence for the above reasons.

To determine whether or not an individual experienced deindividuation, I first looked for evidence of expressive rather than instrumental violence. Individuals in this category tended to not have any specific goals or reasons for committing the violence. Instead, they reported feeling the excitement and the energy of the crowd and the event. Once I had determined that their actions were expressive, I had to decipher whether they experienced a sense of reduced self-awareness and/or reduced accountability. Examples of these statements were, "I got caught up in the whole event," and "People started getting wired up and it was just a snowball effect... You can't really kinda control the outcome of the situation. It just kinda happened."

Finally, strains were explored in both groups. Assailants who showed evidence of impression management, and some in the deindividuation category, reported having experienced some degree of strain. Also, all assailants reported having consumed alcohol during their incident or shortly before their incident. The remaining section of this chapter further explores the findings of impression management and deindividuation in detail, as well as the contributions of alcohol and strains.

Qualitative Results: Evidence of Impression Management

As explored in the literature review, impression management is a self-presentation tactic performed by an individual to portray himself in a favorable light to his audience. Twenty-two interviewees showed evidence of self-presentation. As noted, impression management is instrumental; the data from this research project yielded three main goals for using CPV as impression management:

1. Intimidation: to influence others' attitudes or behaviors (to get them to do something or to change their opinion)
2. Self-Promotion: to establish and protect masculinity
3. Exemplification: to achieve justice or retribution (to become an agent of social control)

This section explored each of these goals, and their subcategories. Two common occurrences of these cases were also presented: the involvement of only two or a few individuals, and the escalation of a minor discord into a violent response. Furthermore, all participants in this group reported evidence of having experienced an acute strain, such as a bump or a verbal insult, which instigated the incident. Interestingly, this was not reported among the eight individuals who presented evidence of deindividuation.

Evidence of Impression Management, Intimidation: Using violence to influence or control others' attitudes and behaviors

Many of the participants presented evidence that they attempted to influence or control the behaviors or attitudes of their targets, friends and bystanders. This goal of intimidation often falls into one of two categories: dispute related, or predatory. In other words, assailants utilizing this approach attempted to influence their audiences and targets by remedying or creating a dispute through violence. *Target* refers to the individual whom the assailant is assaulting, while

audience refers to the individual(s) who are watching the assault (to whom the assailant is self-presenting).

Some assailants attempted to influence attitudes or behaviors of their friends and audience, while others attempted to control the attitudes or behaviors of their targets. For example, Kyle, a 23 year old, Caucasian, did not like the way his target, who was wearing a Yankees hat, was “trash-talking” about the Sox, so Kyle decided to assert control over his target’s behaviors by physically attacking him:

It wasn't even a big deal. I don't know what the cops were making out of this. You know, this punk from New York comes over. I'm having a good time with my buddy. We just got out of the bar after the parade. I'd been waiting all my life for the Sox to win this, OK? And this guy is trash- talking about them right outside my place. Now, normally, I'm not a very, you know, pull the trigger kinda guy. I just kinda brushed this stuff off. But, uh, I got a couple of drinks in me. ...So I socked him in the mouth. He had a Yankee's hat on. What does he expect?...

When asked, “What would have prevented the incident...?”, Kyle responded, “I don’t know, ... (m)aybe if that guy wasn’t wearing that Yankees hat,” hinting that he was trying to control his target’s behavior and opinion by using violence.

Similarly, Harlen, a 27 year old, African American, talked about controlling the target’s behavior because “there was something about his attitude” that Harlen found offensive:

It was just one of those things. I was walking around with friends. I guess it might have been hot that day. This guy, he bumped into me. There was something about his attitude... . He didn't, I don't know, he didn't say excuse me or anything like that. I brought it up with him and he gave me an attitude about it. I mean, I don't remember what was going through my mind at that time, but uh, yea, something set me off about him.

Similarly, Maleke, a 23 year old, African American, spoke about controlling his target's behavior and attitude through violence because he did not like the target's reaction after he had bumped into Maleke:

... While we was walking, some dude took it upon himself to bump me. And, I turned around and waitin' for him to say something, you know what I mean? And, he basically just kept walking. I said, 'What the fuck you doing'? And, he turned around and he basically said, 'Fuck you' and he kept walking. So, you know, I took it upon myself to grab him upon the shoulder and when he turned around, he swung on me. So after that, you know, I just did what I had to do. I guess I got the upper hand on him. You know what I mean? And they just try to make it look like I set it on him first. You know, I guess you could say I started the conflict. To me, he really started the conflict. I just handed over my business. That's how I was taught, you know?

Maleke went on to describe the root of his annoyance with his target's behavior. To him, the inconsiderate "bump" was enough to justify exerting violence to control or change his target's behavior:

Yea, well, where I'm from, if you bump somebody, first of all, you better apologize for that, off top and say, 'My fault. I ain't know where I was going'. But if you bump me and felt like you did that purposefully, you know what I mean? Like you trying to get the upper hand on me, and I'm not with all that. That's not how my mother raised me, you know what I mean? My mother raised me ... to throw that first punch at the end of the day. ... I'm just not with that shit, you know what I mean? That's all I know, respect.

While some assailants presented evidence of their desire to control the behaviors or attitudes of their targets, some showed evidence of their desire to influence the attitudes of their audience, which included their friends and bystanders.

Wesley, a 23 year old African American, for example, had this to say about feeling the pressure to self-present in front of his friends and girlfriend to influence their opinion of him after having heard a racial slur directed towards him:

So, I let him know where I was coming from, so I told him, 'Look, I don't appreciate you saying those things'. And, he let me know where he was coming from and it was pretty much like, I don't care what you're talking about. ... All my friends saying, 'You gonna let him talk to you like that?! You gonna let him talk to you like that?!' And so naturally, I wasn't (chuckle).

Wesley, then punched his target. He went on in the interview to justify his actions, alluding to his desire to influence the attitudes of his girlfriend and bystanders:

Well, you know, like they always tell us when we're kids, 'Just walk away'. You know, it wasn't anything. Like, I didn't feel threatened at all. It was just some words that I didn't want to hear, but I was also a little bit intoxicated. I had my girl around, and, you know, the crowd. So, I didn't want to seem like a little punk, you know?

Similarly, Matt, a 24 year old, felt the pressure to self-present a sense of toughness to influence the opinions that his friends have on him:

Well, you know, it was all a little silly, but it was Mardi Gras and people, you know, just kinda let themselves loose. I was with my buddies. We were just walking around drinking, feeling pretty carefree. And, uh, I didn't really know what came over me, but these three dudes started yelling at us, and we got going back and forth just saying pretty pointless stuff. I guess they didn't like where we were coming from and one thing led to another. We were just throwing stuff. ... I thought I had something to prove in front of all my friends. I didn't want to be made to look like some freaking; you know I just wanted to look good in front of my friends.

Thus, while some assailants showed evidence of attempting to control the attitudes or behaviors of their targets, others showed evidence of attempting to influence their audience. When they did the latter, they typically attempted to influence their attitudes, rather than their behaviors. For example, they attempted to persuade their audience that they are tough, rather than attempted to get the audience to join in the violence.

Interestingly, assailants, who used violence to self-present in order to influence the attitudes or behaviors of others, did it for one of two reasons: to predatorily create a dispute, or to remedy a dispute created by another. Here, Harlan describes a dispute that that he had created over an accidental “bump”.

It was just one of those things. I was walking around with friends. I guess it might have been hot that day. This guy, he bumped into me. There was something about his attitude... . He didn't, I don't know, he didn't say excuse me or anything like that. I brought it up with him and he gave me an attitude about it. I mean, I don't remember what was going through my mind at that time, but uh, yea, something set me off about him. ... You know, I want to say that he [threw the first punch], but I remember that I just got hit once. I remember when that happened. (Chuckle) But, uh, I want to say that he punched first. No, he dived at me. He dived at me, I'd say. So, I guess that did it.

Harlan went on to say that he could have avoided the incident by ignoring the accidental “bump”, and not having created a dispute by instigating violence:

You know, I mean, I was a bit younger then. And, I had a tendency to lose my cool a lot faster. It was really nothing, what had happened, but it just escalated into this whole thing because there were these two young guys who were trying to one up each other a bit. I mean, if I had to do it all over again, I'd say I wouldn't. I wouldn't do it, but, yea, I would have just walked away instead of trying to get respect out of it or something.

Jackson, on the other hand, talked about using violence to remedy a dispute provoked by another man over “flirting with this girl”:

Well, yea, I mean I really didn't do anything. I was there with some of my friends. And, you know, we were having a good time, and ... this dude just kinda walked up to me. I guess. ... I was flirting with this girl. I didn't know that ... he knew her and not that it should matter. Anyway, he just kinda end[ed] up walking up to me and just starts ... yelling at me, being in my face. And, I told him to back off. He kept coming at me, so I had to defend myself. So, you know, ... I just defended myself....

...Well, he swung at me, so he didn't hit me. So, I guess technically, I threw the first punch because he swung at me. I ducked and I hit him. So, I mean, again, I was defending myself... . If I didn't defend myself, I would have gotten hurt, you know?

I followed up by asking, “Did a fight actually break out or was it just a punch?”.

Jackson's answer further hinted that the conflict was provoked, and that he was merely attempting to resolve the conflict through violence.

Well, it was a little bit of a fight. I mean, it lasted for a little while, but um, again, it wasn't something that I had started. I wasn't really aware of what was going on. It was kinda a heightened awareness kinda thing. You know, I hit him a couple of times, and someone called the cops.

Similarly, Gavin described how the dispute over his daughter's reputation was provoked.

He, too, attempted to remedy the dispute through violence:

It was about midway through the parade and one of these very drunk characters to my right kept calling my daughter a whore. I didn't see any reason for him to keep doing that, so I challenged him on it, and he whacked me, so I whacked him back. It grew into a complete boxing match. Some people tried to break us up. Some people got injured and falling down and stuff like that. And, that's when the police got involved. ... You know, my daughter is very important to me.

Gavin went on to justify using violence to resolve the dispute.

I don't like it when people start calling her a whore. She's not that way at all. And, it was probably a case of mistaken identity or something, but the guy, he was not rational.

Finally, after having given “the right hand” to a man, whom he claimed was “disrespectful” towards him and his girlfriend, Nafie justified his violent act by saying that he was provoked and that he was defending himself in the dispute:

I don't condone violence, but one must protect themselves when they're faced with a situation with hostile men, not so friendly people. Maybe alcohol and any other things are involved, but it doesn't make it OK for anyone to bully anyone else and I will protect myself and my friends and my girlfriend. Anyone else that push me, I don't tolerate being bullied. ... (So) I gave them the right hand. He fell to the ground.

To conclude this section, *Evidence of Impression Management, Intimidation: Using violence to influence or control other's attitudes and behaviors*, most of the interviewees showed evidence that they tried to influence or control the behaviors or attitudes of their targets, friends or bystanders. This goal can be placed into one of two categories: dispute related, or predatory. Participants, who used violence to self-present in an attempt to influence others' behaviors or attitudes, did so to resolve a dispute or to predatorily create a dispute.

Evidence of Impression Management, Self-Promotion: Using violence to establish or protect masculinity

Many of the assailants committed CPV in order to self-promote, or more specifically, to establish or protect their masculine identity in order to self-present a more favorable image of themselves to their audience. These individuals noted that their masculine identity was jeopardized by their target(s). They felt it was necessary for them to establish or protect their masculine identity by using violence. Moe, for example, talked about having to react through violence in order to “show [his target] that [he] was a man”:

[W]e were going to the parade, and this asshole started to get my attention. You know, started to say a few profanities, and you know, I of course was drinking beer all day. I didn't like what he was saying, so [I] clocked him across the face with a bottle, you know.

I asked, “What was he saying that caused you to get that angry?”

He was talking about [my girl's] ass. He was saying, you know, she was looking good and that he was gonna get her in bed and make her happy, and those kinda shits. And, I wasn't gonna have that, you know. I'm a man, and I'm going to show him that I'm a man. I busted his head. If I could kill him, I would have done that too, you know?

I followed up by asking, “Looking back on it, is there anything that you would have done differently, or that would have prevented the incident?”. He responded by exerting more machismo:

Hell no! If somebody is gonna talk about my girl. I'm gonna bust your ass. That's just the way I am. ... [b]ecause I'm a man and because I have to show that I'm strong. ... That's the way I am. That's what I was taught. Where I come from, that's how we deal with things.

Likewise, Patrick, a 24 year old, Irish American, described a similar situation where he felt he had to assert his masculinity through violence when another man made a comment about his girlfriend:

I was at the parade and I saw some guy, and they were dissing my girlfriend, so I felt like I had to step in, you know, to defend her. So that's what I did. ... The guy was saying my girlfriend was a slut and, uh, I wasn't going to stand for that. So I went over and I just decked him.

I probed on the masculinity issue, "It sounds like there were some issues with masculinity. Did you feel as if you had to assert that when ... the other guy came over?". He responded:

Well, yea, I mean, you can't stand there and take that kind of shit. You know? ... You know, it's my girlfriend. It's her honor, and you know, that's that. ... The only thing is, I would have hit the guy harder, maybe. That would have been the only difference.

I asked, "Was there anything that could have prevented the incident?", and he said, "Yea, if the guy kept his mouth shut."

Bill, a 25 year old Caucasian male, described the pressure he was feeling when his "manhood" was at stake. That pressure, according to Bill, led him to commit the violence in order to protect his manhood:

...I could have walked away from the whole thing and taken Julie [my girlfriend]. We could have left. I could have fixed her up and we could have taken the day somewhere else. But, I felt: A- someone had to stand up to these guys; and B- I felt that with her there watching, that my kind of, um, I guess I felt that my manhood was at stake. So, I leapt into the fray and in retrospect, I was kinda defending her physically. At the time, I really just wanted to sock each one of those guys square in the nose, but I now look back on it, I see that it was a bit of an Alpha Alpha exchange, and I felt that I had to take care of them personally. I actually was the first person to aggress. I shoved the person first and I'm not usually a violent person, but I did it, and it was probably because she was watching.

Finally, Nafie, a 26 year old, who identified himself as Guyanese, articulated that his aggression came as a result of an insult to his masculinity. Interestingly, according to him, it was his ethnic heritage that drove him to commit the violence in order to establish and protect his masculinity:

It started that me and my girlfriend were attending the parade and a group of guys came up towards me and was disrespectful and was saying rude comments towards my girlfriend, and I felt intimidated. The only way that I can prove to myself that this isn't going to happen right now is that I had to knock someone out. So someone approached me. I gave them the right hand. He fell to the ground. Then, his boys came and jump on my back, and I knocked him out too. ...

I followed up by asking, “Why was it important for you to respond to that? Why couldn't you and your girlfriend just walk away?”. Nafie responded by talking about the importance of claiming his masculinity through violence within his ethnic heritage:

Well you have to understand that this West Indian culture is more than just fun and games. A lot of times, you have to flex your muscles stand up your chest a little bit when everyone is looking because it's a clash of all the West Indian islands and everyone wants to dig up their own land, and the only way to do it is to hang in your own clicks and group. And, if you're not in a click and you're not in a group, you're just walking with your girlfriend, the guys might say something, and you gotta protect yourself and your woman. It's one of those primal things that happen. And, unfortunately, they messed with the wrong guy. I had to take care of my woman. I knocked them out; clocked them all.

Thus, many of the interviewees used violence to establish or protect their masculine identity. By self-presenting in an aggressive manner, they had hoped to construct or restore their alpha male status.

Evidence of Impression Management, Exemplification: Using violence to achieve justice or retribution for himself or for a perceived victim

While some interviewees used aggression to influence others, or to establish and protect their masculine identity, many used it to exemplify or to achieve justice or retribution for a perceived victim, or to protect his own values and beliefs. Felson and Tedeschi (1993) would describe these assailants as agents of social control.

Leo, a 39 year old father, illustrated his desire to achieve retribution for his daughter; he spoke about how he had attempted to seek an apology from someone who had knocked his daughter's ice cream onto the ground. When the individual did not comply, Leo's aggression escalated into violence:

... I was there with my daughter. She was turning 7 that day and I wanted to show her what Puerto Rican Day was like, to her pride and everything like that. You know, for her to be very proud of her heritage. We went over there, and she was buying an ice cream from one of the vendors and this guy bumped into her and knocked her ice cream all over her. I gave the guy a look. He looked at me and he didn't say he was sorry. He didn't say he was sorry at all to my daughter. She was just sitting there, covered with ice cream. She just started crying. I couldn't even get her another ice cream, so I just said to the guy, 'Hey, listen, you just knocked over my kid's ice cream cone. You didn't even say you were sorry. Can you buy her a new one?' He just said to shut the fuck up and then he just shoved me. And, I just said, 'Please don't do that. My little girl is right here.' And he just started to call me names... . Next thing you know, I was throwing a punch, and a fight broke out. And, all I heard was my little girl screaming to the side of me and there was all this commotion. It was a big blur and next thing I knew there were these guys holding me back and ... he was a 25 year old, a wasted 25 year old kid. All he needed to say was 'I'm sorry', but he didn't. ...

Leo went on to talk about the perceived victim's experience, alluding to how unfortunate it was that her day was ruined by the *other* person's inconsiderate behavior:

I had to get the wife to come over to pick up Jess. It was a mess. It was just a huge mess, the entire thing. She didn't even get to finish the parade. She had to sit in front of the police car, which she had never done before, thankfully. ... She didn't even get her ice cream, you know? ... She didn't even get to see the Grand Marshall, who was supposed to be with some clown or something, and she didn't even get to see her. She was so excited about that; she had balloons and it kinda ruined the entire weekend.

Similarly, Anthony, a 30 year old welder, also explained the way he had sought retribution for a woman, a perfect stranger, walking through a parade, whom he claimed was being harassed:

... I came out of this bar on St. Patrick's Day, and these guys were kinda messing around with this woman. She was just trying to pass along the sidewalk during the parade. You know, with the parade going. And these guys start hassling her and I said, 'Come on, guys. She's just trying to get back to work'. You know, it was just after lunch time, and she was trying to get back to work and they were like, 'Hey, mind your own business'. I said, 'Look guys, it's St. Patrick's Day. Just chill. Come on, have a drink.' I even offered to buy them a drink, but one guy threw a drink at me. It was in a paper bag and it smashed against the wall. I said, 'That was very uncool'; then the other guy shoved me. So I smacked them. ...

Bill, a 25 year old Caucasian, also recounted an incident where he acted as an agent of social control and used violence to protect the perceived victim, his girlfriend:

I was there with my girlfriend. We were just watching the parade. ... All of a sudden, my girlfriend got hit with ... almost a full can of Pepsi, right in the head. And, so obviously, we turned to find out what had happened. And, there were a bunch of kids about ... 15-20 yards away from us, causing a great deal of noise ... throwing all of their belongings around. It looked like that they were having some sort of contest to see which person they could hit with their belongings because they were just throwing things all over the place. And the soda got all over me and it hit my girlfriend all over the forehead and it immediately created a bump, so I went over there and tried to talk to them about it.

... I said, 'Excuse me. Do you realize you just hit somebody in the head? You could have caused a major accident. As it is, she may have a concussion.' Then the guy said, 'Hey, take it easy there buddy. Just back off, back off. Alright?'. The other guys were laughing, so ... I said, 'I demand an apology. This is completely unacceptable. We're in a public place, and we're having a perfectly nice time, and you guys are out here clearly causing problems.' And, that only made them laugh harder.

... [T]hen one of the guys turned to me and he said, 'Hey, buddy, don't feel so bad. We're trying to throw things at the prettiest people we could find and so the fact that we chose your girlfriend is actually a compliment.' And, so ... that just absolutely set me through the roof. Well, I got the guy who'd said that. I got right in his face. I said, 'That is completely unacceptable and that's misogynistic and I won't take that, and I demand that you apologize to me and then to her.' And, he got right up to my face, and then we were chest to chest, and we were staring each other down. And, so I pushed him. His friends jumped in next to him and in about 2 or 3 seconds, I was suddenly throwing punches with 3 or 4 different guys.

Protecting the perceived victim is not the only reason for the agent of social control to become violent. He may also be protecting his own values and beliefs. Evidence to this arose when some interviewees described their feelings as they experienced perceived racial tension. As a result, they acted as an agent of social control to protect their own values. Wesley, a 23 year old, African American male, described a conflict at a Mardi Gras parade in New Orleans, during which he had used violence to protect his ethnic pride:

... You know I wasn't about to have the guy talk to me like the way that guy was talking to me. He was saying some things I didn't really agree with. ... It was a white guy, so it was... I don't remember the exact words, but it was definitely some prejudice stuff, some racial stuff that I really didn't like. So, I let him know where I was coming from, so I told him, 'Look, I don't appreciate you saying those things'. And, he let me know where he was coming from and [he] was pretty much like, "I don't care what you're talking about". ... And, I pretty much just blew up after that. ... I [threw] the first punch.

Robert, a 26 year old, African American male, best summarized how he had used violence to remedy a verbal, racial assault in order to protect his ethnic pride:

... I'm a black male ... [y]ou know, I'm going to have my ... black boys and boys of different ethnicity, different races. After the pub, we went out to the parade. And, at the parade, we had fun. We had been drinking too much. You know, I had been drinking too. I feel like maybe ... we had an altercation that was so silly, that I don't even know why we were fighting.

But, long story short, when he approached me during the parade, it was more like he was arguing with me during the parade. ... [b]ecause I'm with a group of my friends. They're partying; I'm partying. We're at the parade. We're having fun. No one said any shit. He walked over. He started trouble saying, 'You Niger this; you Niger that'. I'm like OK, my friends were pretty upset. I'm upset at the situation. You know, one thing leads to another. ... We start to shuffle. You know, scuffling around. And I, of course, I had to defend myself, so I defend myself accordingly. I mean, the cops came, but by this time, he had his friends starting to come over. My friends were starting to come over. And, you know, we were scuffling. It's what we do. ...

Thus, many assailants acted as agents of social control by using violence to achieve justice or retribution for a perceived victim, or to protect his own values and beliefs.

Evidence of Impression Management: Perceived wrong doing leading to escalated violent response

To conclude this portion of the Results section, *Evidence of Impression Management*, it is important to note that two common threads were found in these cases where there was evidence of impression management. First, as presented in the above excerpts from the transcripts, is that the violence typically only involved the perpetrator and his target. A few of the interviewees noted that a small group of their friends and/or their target's friends were also involved. However, these are very different scenarios from the incidents where deindividuation occurred, whereby the violence typically involved a large number of people.

The second common thread among cases where self-presentation occurred is that most of the incidents were perceived by the interviewees as wrongdoings, and that they usually began as arbitrary, minor conflicts that quickly escalated into violent responses. Some examples of perceived wrongdoings, such as assaults on masculinity, perceived victims, and interviewees' values, were already presented above. Many of them clearly showed minor conflicts escalating into full-fledged violence as the interviewees responded to the conflict. Below are additional examples of perceived wrongdoings escalating into violent responses.

Kenley, a 24 year old male from Connecticut, described a situation where he perceived his competition to be keeping him away from his girlfriend. The conflict began with some minor verbal exchanges, but escalated into physical assault:

I saw a girlfriend of mine and she was with a particular individual that I did not like, and I just went off. ... I went to speak with her. And her date just wouldn't allow me to speak to her and I just had to get something off my chest, but ... he was protecting her. And, I kept trying, telling him that I knew her and it's OK, that I just wanted to speak with her. But ... not knowing what level my tone was at that time, I was pretty much speaking with everyone around me. And, everyone around us heard what I was saying. And, if you can imagine the volume of my voice; if 10 was the highest, I was at 11. ...

... At that moment, I wanted to fight him. Someone called the police. ... I got a lot more upset. I felt like I wasn't in the wrong. I felt like he was in the wrong. So that's when the physicality occurred. I struck him, struck him in the face. ... The police came and I was just tussling. And, me being under the influence, I just wasn't thinking. I'm wrestling. I'm pushing police officers when I know it was wrong. I got emotional, so I definitely, definitely, definitely regret that moment.

Similarly, Ramon, a 47 year old from California, described an incident where the conflict began as a fairly common verbal exchange between parade-goers. Some individuals behind Ramon could not see the parade because he had his daughter on his shoulders. When they had

complained to him, he took it as their being unreasonable in not empathizing that his daughter could not see the parade at ground level:

Well, you know we were watching the homecoming parade. ... [M]y little daughter, at that time, she was 3 years old. She was very excited about it. She liked everything about cheerleaders, and was dreaming about becoming a cheerleader. And, she couldn't really see. There were a lot of people in front of us, so I put her up on my shoulders so she could see. And, this jerk, ... [w]ell, this person behind me started complaining that they couldn't see. And, you know, I got into an argument with him because, you know, she's 3 years old, and she deserves the right to see it, and she couldn't see over everybody else's ... head. And, we ended up getting into an argument, an altercation. And, then one thing led to another, and then the police came. And, uh, they told me that I was being out of line. And you know, honestly, the person who started the confrontation was the person behind me. And, you know, and just you know. I don't see how I was out of line by my just trying to make sure that my little girl enjoys a parade. I don't get it. I don't get it.

Ramon went on to describe how the conflict quickly escalated into a physical altercation:

So anyway, the policeman started getting abusive with me and getting all macho and you know, 'You will stop this, sir'. Whatever. My girl started crying. Then, you know, we started having an argument and before you know it, he's got me in handcuffs and he's taking me away. He said that I'd disrespected him. Whatever that means. ... We got into each other's face. But, I didn't really... (grunted). I don't know. Maybe our chests might have been touching, but I had no intention of, you know, hitting a police officer or striking a police officer. ...

Thus, interviewees who perceived a wrongdoing, also often caused the minor conflict to quickly escalate into violence. Harlan best summarized this assertion, "It was really nothing, what had happened, but it just escalated into this whole thing because there were these two young guys who were trying to one up each other a bit".

To conclude, individuals who used CPV to self-present typically did it for intimidation, self-promotion or exemplification. Furthermore, commonalities in these cases included the

involvement of only two individuals or a small group of individuals in the physical conflict, and the escalation of the conflict from a minor, perceived wrongdoing to a violent response.

Qualitative Results: Evidence of Deindividuation

While evidence of impression management pointed to participants' attempts at controlling their self-presentations to their audience, evidence of deindividuation pointed to the participants' being influenced by the crowd; there were only eight individuals, who showed evidence of deindividuation (in contrast to the 22 who were motivated by impression management). As stated in the literature review, individuals become deindividuated when there is a reduction of accountability and/or self-awareness. There were also two commonalities among these cases: aggression was expressive and violence typically erupted quickly into large scale incidents involving many participants; and they were usually non-predatory in nature or dispute related. Interestingly, none of the participants reported having experienced strains, and four of the five cases involving sports victory parades showed evidence of deindividuation.

Individuals, who experienced reduced accountability, generally noted to feeling a sense of anonymity in a large crowd. Here, I gauged A.J.'s sense of accountability; his answers suggest a sense of perceived immunity from consequences:

Researcher: So did you feel that because you were part of the crowd that you weren't going to get caught?

*A.J.: Yea, you know, it's like, ... it wasn't just one person. If everyone else was doing it, you might as well just jump in.
(Chuckle)*

Researcher: What did you think about the consequences? Or, were you thinking about the consequences as this was happening?

A.J.: To be honest with you, I wasn't even thinking about it. You know, that was the last thing on my mind (laugh).

Similarly, Johnny talked about not thinking about the consequences, which suggested a feeling of reduced accountability. He stated experiencing a sense of anonymity in a large crowd with “so many people”:

To be honest with you, no, [I wasn't thinking about the consequences]. There were so many people over there, you know. I didn't even [think about it]. One, I wasn't even thinking about consequences. Two, I didn't even know how I would get caught, you know. There were so many people around. It was hard to get around, you know. I didn't know cops could get you so easily, like that.

Zach also talked about how the energy and size of the crowd created a sense of anonymity, which led to reduced accountability. When asked, “So did you feel that because you were with the crowd that you weren't going to be singled out?”, he replied:

... You know, you just get caught up in [the energy of the crowd]. It moves you. It takes you along with it. I mean, there's an energy. I guess there's a sense of anonymity that comes from being in a crowd... .

Troy gave a similar response about the crowd offering anonymity and reduced accountability:

The way I saw it, if one person got in trouble, everybody was getting into trouble. You know, there were so many people doing it, I didn't think they would bother to take everyone down. ... Honestly, I did not think about [the consequences]. It was just an afterthought. Obviously, I wasn't thinking at all. Obviously, I mean, I was going through a lot of stuff, you know. I was out of my mind, going crazy.

Nick, a 23 year old, also mentioned feeling anonymous because “it was crowded”, and “the scene was pretty packed”:

Yea, well, it was crowded. You know, the scene was pretty packed and busy, people pushing up on me. Everything was going kinda crazy. So, I mean I was drinking for a little bit. I was drinking for while, you know, whatever. And, then I had people pushing on me and I was getting irritated, so I started pushing back and then people pushing more. And, ... I ended up throwing a couple of bottles in to the crowd. Guess I'd cut up some people.

Thus, consistent with the research presented in the literature review, many of the individuals, who had experienced deindividuation, reportedly felt a sense of anonymity in a large crowd, which reduced their feeling of accountability.

In addition to feeling reduced accountability, this group of deindividuated individuals also experienced reduced self-awareness. As discussed in the literature review, reduced self-awareness occurs when individuals perceive that the attention is focused on others (not them), and/or when there is too much excitement or stimuli in the environment. Johnny talked about the escalation of the incident where he slowly became part of the crowd and lost self-awareness:

You know, [my friend] started messing around little by little. You know, he was drunk also. Then, it escalated. Then, it wasn't just him. It started with more of our friends. And then, it was like the spur of the moment. You know? Where it just happened and then I got involved also.

I followed up by asking, "So did you feel as though you were part of the crowd and that you weren't an individual anymore when that started to happen?". He replied:

Actually, yea. I did. You know, ... I did feel like that, as wrong as that sounds. I did feel like that, but that I was... thinking about it now, that was just a huge mistake, and to do something like that, to feel like the crowd, you know? It's a bit crazy.

Thus, when Johnny felt as though he was at one with the crowd, he may have also perceived that the attention had been shifted away from him onto the crowd as a whole.

Likewise, when I asked A.J., “Did you feel as if you were lost in the crowd and that you were no longer an individual as all this was happening?”, he replied hinting that he had felt the attention was being shifted away from him to the crowd:

I guess you can say that because once you get a couple of drinks in there, a little adrenaline rush going. You and the crowd kinda become one, if that makes sense. You kinda lose it, kinda go with it. Does that make sense? It's kinda hard to remember. You know, saying I did this, I did that. It's kinda like a group effort. If that makes any sense. (Chuckle)

Similarly, Vincent also described a sense of reduced awareness as he talked about how he became one with the crowd:

Well, listen, man. When it came down to it, it wasn't a matter of me going out of my way, causing trouble. I had a lot of alcohol. I got mixed up with the crowd. You know, I don't know man. It just the way it worked out. I was going with the flow, you know. And, they didn't appreciate it.

As consistent with the literature, individuals, who felt a sense of reduced self-awareness, also reported experiencing too much stimuli, or being “caught up in the crowd” or “excitement”. Here, Zach, a 26 year old male, talked about the over excitement at a Super Bowl parade, which led to CPV:

Everyone was getting really excited. You know, hitting this and that. You know, next thing I know, we were kicking a car, and it was a nice car. We were just having fun. It was all in the spirit of revelry, I guess. I don't know. It was just there. ... It was the alcohol to blame, I guess. Same as 'in the moment', [a] kinda 'everyone is doing it' mentally. You know, it was just what was going on. That car just got in the way. I don't know why. ... That's my general take of what [had] happened. It's a shame I got arrested. It's unfortunate, but I think it's part of what happens when you celebrate an event like that. You're drinking. You're having a good time, and I don't know. You see people hitting things, the excitement ... over everything.

Likewise, Troy, a 25 year old, described the excitement that was generated by the crowd, which caused reduced self-awareness:

... You know, it was a celebration. We were all out there having a lot of fun. Things got a little crazy. People got a little out of control. They tried to stay away from the term riot, but, you know, there was many people. I wasn't the only one partaking in this event in particular. But everybody, you know, they were excited. Things got lit on fire. Things got crazy. What can I say? I got swept away by the crowd.

When asked, "What if the crowd wasn't there?", Troy relied:

Well, if the crowd wasn't there, that's a completely different story. I mean, yes, I had been drinking. I was intoxicated, but still, the enticement of the crowd. You know, there's multiple people, you know. Everybody's doing it, and when everyone's doing something, you know, it seems like it's the right thing to do, or it's OK to do. Now, I know that that is not the case, but had there not been a big crowd, and had there not been a lot of people, you know, vandalizing, breaking stuff, and what not, and just going crazy, no, I would not have gone crazy too. You know that's not my, I don't do that stuff normally, you know?

Johnny, a 26 year old, also talked about the escalating excitement as the crowd and event became "a little crazy". He admitted to the excitement having led to his committing CPV:

... It was me and a couple of friends. You know, getting a little rowdy. Had ... too many beers, just hanging out. And, ... a few of my friends started to become a little crazy, and I don't know, just looking at them. It wasn't even like I was doing it purposefully, that it was for a reason. You know? It just kinda happened. I was pushed, you know. Everybody was doing it. I kind ... felt left out. I felt like I kinda wanted to be in with them. ...

You know, they were throwing bottles at the cars. You know, jumping on top of it. And, I just felt like a loner, you know. It's weird. It's weird to say it that way, you know, but I felt like I needed to do what I needed to do to fit in. ...

We did get into a couple of brawls. I'm not gonna lie. You know, it was intense. It was like in the heat of the moment. Things were

getting kinda crazy. Our friends were throwing bottles. Kids were just fighting. ...

In addition to these individuals' experiencing reduced accountability and self-awareness, two common threads existed among these cases. One is that they were typically large scaled incidents that erupted quickly into riot-like states; they also involved many participants. Another commonality is that they were often not predatory in nature, nor dispute related. Rather, Individuals reported "getting caught up in the excitement" and "going along with the crowd". Many of the above examples confirmed these propositions; below are additional examples:

You know it started off as a fun day. ...I went off with ... my friend Joe. You know, he was the only one I was close with, and the other kids were his friends, you know. They all seemed ... cool, like you know, just a bunch of kids trying to hang out, happy at the parade. And then everybody just got a little too wasted and things just started to go crazy. And, it really got into me. I never thought, you know, I just never thought it would be like that. It really got into me. That's when the riot just started happening. You know, breaking car windows, fighting with kids. It was just a bunch of rage.

Zack described a similar turn of event:

It's pretty ridiculous. I mean, it was at the parade. Everyone had a little to drink and we're just having fun. And, one thing led to another... . There were posters and signs, and stuff like that. ... Well, [people] started out by carrying posters, 'Go Giants', and stuff like that. As it kinda evolved, people were using them to hit cars. Stuff like that. Hit street signs. ... Everyone was getting really excited. You know, hitting this and that. You know, next thing I know, we were kicking a car, and it was a nice car. We were just having fun. It was all in the spirit of revelry, I guess. I don't know. It was just there.

Additionally, participants were able to distinguish the difference in the level of excitement between celebratory parades that they had attended, and those that were more family oriented. When asked, "Had it been a different parade, say for example, a Christmas Day parade

or a Thanksgiving parade, do you think that this [violence] might have happened? Do you think that the crowd might have created the same type of energy?”, Russ replied:

Oh, no, there wouldn't be. On a Christmas Day parade? No. Well, you're not going to get the rocking of the cars on Christmas Day. You might get, you might get, people drinking alcohol, people getting drunk. That sort of things. Maybe at the most, you're gonna see someone throwing up on the sidewalk but you're not gonna get mass mayhem on Christmas Day. I just think it's a different kinda of party. It's a different kinda crowd, and I just don't think you would get the same kinda of response out of a Christmas parade than a Lakers Game at the Coliseum.

Troy gave a similar response:

Completely different. Completely different circumstances. I mean, this was not Thanksgiving parade. It was not a huge family parade, or a family affair. You know, if there were a bunch of little kids around, I wouldn't have been drinking. Everyone wouldn't have been drinking so heavily. You know, we might have tipped a few bags. You know, I'm not completely crazy. I 'm not gonna do that stuff around children. Come on. Forget about it.

Zack, too, distinguished the level of reduced excitement during family oriented parades:

I mean, I don't really see why if that would be at a Christmas Day parade, but I think, you know, when there's a celebration, when you're celebrating, that's just how things move. But, at a Christmas parade, it's a different crowd too. You know, a lot of little kids, stuff like that. I mean not that there weren't little kids there, but you know you're celebrating something that hasn't happened in a long time. Christmas comes every year.

To conclude, as consistent with the literature on deindividuation, individuals who experienced it reported a sense of reduced accountability and/or reduced self-awareness. Those who reported feeling a reduction in accountability reported feeling a sense of anonymity because of the size of the crowd. Those who reported feeling a reduction in self-awareness suggested that they felt attention was being focused on the crowd (and not on them). They also reported feeling too much stimulation, feeling ‘swept away’ by the excitement of the crowd or event. In addition,

these cases tended to be more expressive in nature, and involve large scale incidents that erupted quickly with many participants. Four of the five cases involving sports victory parades showed evidence of deindividuation. These cases were also not predatory in nature, nor dispute related. Furthermore, participants were able to distinguish the differences in the level of excitement between the parades that they had attended and more family oriented parades.

Qualitative Results: Presence of Strains

Interestingly, while none of the individuals who experienced deindividuation also reported having experienced an acute strain, all of the individuals who self-presented reportedly underwent some sort of acute strain that instigated the violence; examples included, a bump, a disrespectful comment or action, or some other type of minor provocation. These acute strains tended to act as triggers to the CPV, particularly for those who used violence to self-present. In addition, five of the twenty-two individuals who self-presented hinted that they were experiencing chronic strains, such as financial stress and racial oppression; when combined with an acute strain, violence was triggered. None of the individuals who deindividuated gave evidence that they were experiencing some sort of chronic strain.

Gerald, a 26 year old, African American, mentioned having been “going through some tough situation” when he had committed CPV. When pressed, he stated:

Well, just some financial problems. It had been pretty difficult, especially being a young man trying to make it, still going to school, still trying to work and go to school full time. It's been pretty difficult.

He went on to discuss the acute strain that triggered the CPV:

So, I was out with my friends then. We were just having a few drinks, you know, just trying to drink our problems away. ... We were having a few drinks. He was pretty drunk, I must say. I was out talking to my friends. This young man that was drunk, he approached me and I didn't like what he was saying. I was trying to avoid this situation by being a little calm and rash, you know, but he proceeded to push me and that kinda ticked me. ... [And, he threw] a drink in my face. So, I, of course, had to defend myself... .

Furthermore, when asked, “What do you think might have been different had you not been experiencing that stress?”, Gerald replied by associating alcohol with the chronic strain and the violence:

First off, I probably wouldn't have been drinking as much. I definitely wouldn't have had that many drinks. You know, when you're going through certain financial situations, you know, it's pretty tough and you definitely want to take yourself out of the element, your element. And, drinking tends to do that, so I think things would have been very different. Things would have been much different.

Similarly, Jay, a 24 year old, Asian American, described the chronic strain associated with the pressure of his educational attainment:

You know, I had some classes to study for, and uh, I was distressed, and I was wanting to go out and have a good time. Get my mind away from books. ... [I]t was the 3rd year of college, I finished up my prerequisites. I was getting to get ready to go to, you know, med school, or some kind of further education. I was really, you know, trying to hamper down because I wanted to make my parents proud, to make my family proud. I was studying and school over all was getting harder. Classes were getting harder. Study groups were coming up and I just couldn't find the time to balance everything out. ...

It's really intimidating to go to the next level of higher learning. I'm the first in my family to go to college and then to go even forward. So with that, it's a lot more intimidating than a lot of other people think. It's harder to take all this pressure

Jay, then goes on to talk about the acute strain, an accidental “bump” by a stranger, that triggered the violence.

...I was drinking. I was having a good time. This other gentleman was coming towards me. We bumped. We had a few words. [It] was going everywhere. We had an exchange of words. [Then] we had an exchange of ... physicality.

Also, as noted earlier, there was evidence that some of these CPV arose due to verbal assaults on the interviewees' ethnic identity. These interviewees said that they had been experiencing chronic strains due to perceived oppression based on their ethnicity.

Chris, a 28 year old Irish American, nonchalantly stated experiencing chronic strains because of his ethnic background and because he was experiencing financial problems:

Well, it was a bad time. ... I'd lost my job. Wasn't working and uh, I got a little rowdy at St. Patrick's Day parade, drinking a lot of beers with my buddies. ... [T]here were a couple of guys who were busting my chops and my buddy's chops, and we were ... just standing there, trying to have a good time. And, then they just started insulting us, and talking about us, calling us shampy Irish and why are we wearing the stupid green stuff. Hey, we're Irish. We're wearing green. What do you expect?

He went on to describe how the racial comment led to CPV:

Things got out of hand and they yelled at us, and we threw some beer bottles at them. We missed. ... [The cops] were some big guys, you know. ... [O]ne grabbed one arm. One grabbed the other arm. Next thing, I know, they're hulling me down the street. And, I'm yelling and cursing, and kicking at them. ... St. Patrick's parade is a dangerous place for a shampy Irish person who's out of work.

To conclude, all of the individuals who self-presented, committed CPV after being the recipients of a triggering acute strain, such as an accidental bump, or a verbal insult. Only five out of twenty-two people who self-presented showed evidence that they had been experiencing chronic strains, such as financial hardships and ethnic oppression. No acute or chronic strains were found in cases where deindividuation occurred.

Qualitative Results: Alcohol Consumption

All 30 interviewees stated that they had been drinking prior to the incident. Some attempted to minimize the effects of alcohol on their behaviors by stating that they only had a few drinks and that it did not have an effect on their involvement in the violent conflicts. Maleke illustrated this point:

... We stopped at the corner store. I got a Deux Deux, a little Heineken. We weren't really drinking like that but, you know what I mean, I guess I knocked that down. Then, we were drinking like a half pint of Hennessy but nothing crazy. I wouldn't say that I was drunk. ... I got a high tolerance. You know, like a Deux Deux in the morning is regular for me. You know what I mean? So, I didn't feel like I was drunk. You know what I mean? But, I was definitely was drinking, cause that's what I do.

Similarly, when asked if he had been drinking at the time, Ramon, who was with his 3 year old daughter at the parade, responded:

No, not at the time. You couldn't drink on the streets. You know, we had a little picnic, a little BBQ at my house a little earlier, you know, making sausages, making hamburgers. I had a couple of beers with my friends, and then we went over there. That's all that happened.

Gilbert also minimized the effects of alcohol on his behavior. When asked, "Had you not been drinking, do you think you would have reacted differently?", he responded:

Maybe my friend, the one who actually pushed that guy, you know. Maybe if he hadn't been drinking, he wouldn't have pushed the guy. We were all sober, you know. Like I'd said, we weren't really drunk. We just had a few drinks. Either way, we wanted to watch the parade and these jerks... Well, whatever, we still would have had the same situation.

Bill also had a similar response:

I wouldn't say that I was drinking. I had a beer or two, but I wasn't intoxicated. I wasn't really that buzzed. I had had, I don't know, maybe 2 drinks in the last hour. I had my wits about me, but of course, they breathalyzed me and told me that I had a blood alcohol level and that just changes the complexity of the whole thing.

While some interviewees minimized the influence of alcohol on their actions, others blamed alcohol for their behaviors. These individuals suggested that alcohol lowered their inhibitions and enhanced their mood. For example, when asked, “What do you think led to the incident?”, Zach replied, “It was the alcohol to blame, I guess”.

Similarly, Wesley, a 23 year old, illustrated this point:

[W]hat it was, it was pretty much like any other incident where two drunk people get into it. ... I mean, I don't drink anymore. I don't drink anymore because that wasn't the first time something like that happened with me being intoxicated. In retrospect thinking, every time I start drinking a little too much, some things like this happens. It's easier for me to get into trouble when I'm drinking than when I'm not. It's like I don't know my limits, you know. And, I've been sober for about 6 months now. So that's a work in progress, and there hasn't been any type of altercations, so I'm doing pretty good now.

Leo also blamed alcohol for lowering his inhibition and increasing his aggressive behavior; he expressed his regrets in acting out of anger influenced by the alcohol:

Well, if I would have never drank, I would have been fine. Cause I always tell [my daughter], you know, if someone makes fun of you, you just turn and walk away. But then I was drinking and if I didn't respond, we would have finished off the day. Maybe I would have had to buy her another shirt or something then, you know, I wouldn't have, I wouldn't have ended up in jail. My little girl could have seen the full parade. ... I only get to see that girl ... every other weekend or so. Yea, if I would have had it my way, I would not have done anything. She would have been a little sticky, but she would have been a lot better.

Nick, a 23 year old, also talked about how alcohol contributed to escalating his irritable mood into violence:

Yea, well, it was crowded. You know, the scene was pretty packed and busy. People pushing up on me. Everything was going kinda crazy. So, I mean I was drinking for a little bit. I was drinking for while, you know, whatever. And, then I had people pushing on me and I was getting irritated, so I started pushing back and then people pushing more. And, ... I ended up throwing a couple of bottles in to the crowd. Guess I'd cut up some people. ...

Well, now that I think about it, it probably just was crowded; [people weren't purposefully pushing on me]. But, I was really just kind of, I was drinking for a while and I was kinda intoxicated so I was just getting kinda irritated with the situation just because there were so many people.

Nick went on to blame the alcohol for his behavior:

I mean, I guess, I should have just stayed under more control with all my drinking. I shouldn't have had so many so fast. I think that was the problem. Maybe I was just irritated with the crowd, but the drinking was what caused me to, um, get irritated in the first place.

To conclude, all participants were drinking shortly before or at the time their incident occurred. Some attempted to minimize the effects of alcohol in their recounting of the incidents, while others blamed alcohol for their behaviors, stating that alcohol had lowered their inhibitions and heightened their mood. A.J. summed up this point, "Well, you know, with the alcohol, a little ruckus with the music and everything, it's like those things get you going."

Summary of Results

This chapter presented results from the content analysis and interactive interviews. The content analysis looked at 50 parades and gave an overview about CPV. Most notably, men under the age of 25 were most likely to commit CPV.

Results obtained in the interactive interviews suggested that presentation of self may be a much stronger factor than deindividuation with respect to explaining CPV. The interactive interviews illustrated that an overwhelming 22 (73%) males showed evidence of having used CPV to engage in impression management, while only 8 (27%) males showed evidence of deindividuation. The first group indicated that they had self-presented in order to intimidate, self-promote or exemplify. The latter group indicated that they had experienced reduced accountability and reduced self-awareness. Everyone in both groups reported alcohol consumption during or shortly before the incident. Interestingly, everyone who reported evidence of self-presentation noted that they had experienced an acute strain that instigated the incident, and only five of these twenty-two individuals reported that they had been experiencing chronic strains, which also fueled their reactions. None of the individuals who reported evidence of deindividuation stated having experienced any type of strains.

Chapter VI: Discussion

Traditionally, studies of collective behaviors have suggested that deindividuation occurred where interpersonal violence, such as CPV, erupted among large crowds of people. Individuals lost their sense of identity and felt a reduction in accountability; they had no agency and the crowd controlled their behaviors. However, the results of this research indicated that impression management, and not deindividuation, was actually more significant when it came to an individual's engagement in CPV. The individual did have agency and instrumentally acted to self-present a favorable image through violence in order to influence his audience. Of the 30 interviewees, an overwhelming 22 (73%) presented evidence of impression management, while only 8 (36%) presented evidence of deindividuation, supporting that impression management occurred more frequently in cases of CPV.

Upon first assessment, CPV seemed like random, senseless violence. On closer examination, however, clear patterns and characteristics could be established. First, as stated, CPV fell into one of two explanatory categories: those that involved impression management and those that involved deindividuation. CPV with evidence of impression management typically involved just a few people committing acts of violence. Their illegal behavior was instrumental, intended to intimidate, to self-promote, or to exemplify. In contrast, CPV with evidence of deindividuation tended to involve large crowds in euphoric and mindless states, with many individuals committing the violence. These individuals also reported evidence of reduced accountability and reduced self-awareness. In addition, evidence of strains only appeared in the group of individuals whose CPV was self-presented. Chronic strains were reported by only five out of the twenty-two individuals motivated by self-presentation to instigate their incidents. In both groups, however, consumption of alcohol appeared in all cases.

Cases of Impression Management

Several criteria were used to determine whether an interviewee had self-presented. First, their violence had to be instrumental and not expressive; they wanted to achieve something through violence. Once it was determined that their violence was instrumental, I had to decide what their motive was for self-presenting.

As stated in the literature review, individuals who self-present, do so for these reasons:

1. Intimidation: self-presenting as powerful or irrational in order to illicit fear in the audience.
2. Supplication: self-presenting as weak or vulnerable in order to gain sympathy.
3. Self-Promotion: self-presenting as successful and competent in order to gain respect.
4. Exemplification: self-presenting as morally worthy in order to instill guilt and sense of duty.
5. Self-Authentication: self-presenting as an ideal public image in order to gain self-validation. (DePaulo 1992; Goffman 1959; Jones and Pittman 1982; Leary 1995)

Felson and Tedeschi (1993) went on to refine this list in order to discuss violence as self-presentation. They found that individuals who self-presented through violence tended to do so for the following reasons:

1. Intimidation: to change others' attitudes or behaviors
2. Self-Promotion: to establish or protect their own social identities, such as masculinity
3. Exemplification: to achieve justice or retribution by becoming an agent of social control

Using these instrumental goals as guidelines, I examined the interviewees' responses to see if they had self-presented through violence.

Of the 30 interviewees, 22 cases presented evidence of impression management. Interestingly, all respondents were males and under age 25 at time of incident. This is consistent with the general sociological literature and with the quantitative data that violence is disproportionately committed by young males. Additionally, it supports studies done by Felson and Richards (1982), which showed that most individuals who used aggression as a self-presentation tactic were males, as stated in the literature review. Thus, impression management involves the attempt to self-present in a favorable light by using strategic methods, in this case, violence. Because impression management tactics are instrumental, in the cases of CPV, the data shows that the perpetrators fall into one of three categories of goals consistent with the research by Felson and Tedeschi (1993): to intimidate, to self-promote, and to exemplify.

Those who fell into the *intimidation* category typically wanted to self present as powerful in order to influence or control the attitudes and/or behaviors of others. Some of these individuals wanted to influence the attitudes of their friends and bystanders, while some wanted to control the behaviors of their targets. They accomplished these by using violence as an impression management tactic. Furthermore, some used violence to either remedy a dispute or to create a dispute. By doing so, they are able to influence or control the attitudes and/or behaviors of their audience.

Those who fell into the *self-promotion* category typically wanted to establish or protect their masculine identity. As explored in the literature review, Kilmartin (1994) states that Western cultures' ideals of masculinity include strong, independent, dominant, heterosexual, aggressive, unemotional, competitive, tough, physical, and forceful. Also consistent with the literature, working class men, whom the majority of the participants are, tend to self-present their masculinity by using violence, force and intimidation (Archer et al. 2001; Leondar-Wright 2005;

Lubrano 2004; Marks 2000). When their masculine ideals were jeopardized, the interviewees' reactions were consistent with the research presented in the review; they self-presented through violence to reestablish their masculinity in front of their targets and audience.

Finally, individuals who fell into the category of *exemplification*, attempted to act as agents of social control; they wanted to be seen as the hero who steps in to correct injustices or to receive vengeance for themselves or for a perceived victim. By self-presenting as this hero, who is protecting his own values or the values and safety of a victim, he is able to be seen in a more favorable light by his audience, or at least that is his logic.

A last note on the cases of impression management must be presented here. In contrast with incidents involving deindividuation, all of these incidents typically began as arbitrary discords, such as a bump on the shoulder, a spilt drink, or a disrespectful comment (acute strains). In addition, as the perpetrator began to self-present within one of the above categories, the conflict began to quickly escalate into violence. At times, the perpetrators reported not being aware of what was going on, or that "it was a blur" because the incident had escalated so quickly. This is consistent with the discussion from the literature review suggesting that incidents tend to quickly escalate from minor conflicts to aggressive responses when self-presentation is involved (Felson and Richards 1982; Felson and Tedeschi 1993). Furthermore, participants in this group, who self-presented, also tended to partake in the violence individually or with a small group of friends. While they may have had an audience, the audience did not join in the commission of illegal behavior. Finally, while all individuals in the group experienced acute strains, only five of the twenty-two experienced chronic strains that may have contributed to their self-presentation through violence. However, this small number is not significant in determining whether or not chronic strains played a strong role in CPV.

In summary, those who self-presented generally fell into one of three categories when it comes to their motivations: intimidation, self-promotion and exemplification. Furthermore, acute strains instigated their reactions in all cases, and a rapid escalation from minor conflict to violent response was noted. Only a few experienced chronic strains making it unlikely that chronic strains played a large role in CPV. In addition, participants tended to engage in these violence with their targets, or with a small group of individuals. Overall, the findings were consistent with previous research on aggression as impression management.

Cases of Deindividuation

To determine if an individual deindividuated, I first looked for evidence of expressive rather than instrumental violence. Here, individuals tended to not have any specific goals or motives for committing the violence. Instead, they stated having felt the excitement and the energy of the crowd and the event. Once I had determined that their behaviors were expressive, I had to decipher whether they experienced a sense of reduced self-awareness and/or reduced accountability. I looked for statements, such as, “I got swept away by the crowd,” and “I didn’t think anyone would notice. There were too many people.”

Of the 30 cases, only eight showed evidence of deindividuation. All eight individuals were under age 25 at time of incident, again consistent with the sociological literature and the quantitative data which support that violence is a young man’s pursuit. None of these individuals reported having experienced chronic strains, or acute strains or triggers that instigated their involvement. Their violence tended to be more expressive than instrumental. In addition, consistent with the literature (Prentice-Dunn and Rogers 1989), individuals who belonged in this category also experienced a sense of reduced accountability and/or reduced self-awareness. In

cases of reduced accountability, individuals reported feeling “lost in the crowd”, or “at one with the crowd”. They felt a sense of anonymity and reported that they did not think that they would get caught, or that there would be any consequences. Their experiences of reduced accountability are consistent with previous research on deindividuation presented in the review (e.g., Dodd 1995; Jurgen 1987; Zimbardo 1970).

In cases of reduced self-awareness, individuals reported that they felt a sense of excitement in the event or in the crowd. This, in addition to the sheer size of the crowd or event, gave them a feeling that attention was not being placed on them, but on the crowd as a whole, or at the event itself. Consistent with the literature (e.g., Gergen, Gergen, and Barton 1973, Hall 1981; Johnson and Downing 1979), these individuals felt “as one with the crowd”.

Interestingly, in contrast to the cases of impression management, individuals who experienced deindividuation often reported the incident as having rapidly occurred, almost explosively, instead of experiencing an acute strain, which triggered the incident leading to an escalation of the event as reported by those who self-presented. Four of the five sports victory parades in this sample showed evidence of deindividuation; sports victory parades offer a heightened sense of cohesive identity (as members root for the same team) and a euphoric atmosphere (as members celebrate the victory of their team). These variables produce a loss of self-awareness and reduced accountability. In addition, contrasting the impression management group, people who experienced deindividuation reported that others in their surroundings also became involved in the violence. This is consistent with the literature on deindividuation whereby individuals lose accountability and self-awareness when others are performing the same crime. (e.g., Gergen, Gergen, and Barton 1973, Hall 1981; Johnson and Downing 1979; Prentice-Dunn and Rogers 1989; Zimbardo 1970)

Presence of Strains

As stated in the literature review, Levin and Madfis introduced chronic and acute strains into the discourse on strain theories. All of the participants who self-presented also reported acute strains that triggered the incident. Acute strains for CPV are those that are briefly encountered by the individual immediately prior to his act of violence and that cause relatively minor discomfort or distress. These include accidental bumps and pushes by strangers, derogatory comments, and minor misunderstandings. Although these acute strains may seem arbitrary and minor in nature, they are typically enough to set off an individual to commit CPV. These strains tend to act as triggers for those who are perhaps already inclined to self-present, thus acting as a pretext. As presented by Agnew (Agnew 1990; Agnew 1992; Agnew 2000), strains, acute strains in these cases (e.g., accidental bumps, derogatory comments, etc.) create negative emotions. Individuals seek ways to reduce those emotions; some choose violence.

In addition, only five of the twenty-two individuals in the impression management group reported experiencing chronic strains. In the case of CPV, these are strains that may have relatively long lasting effects on the individual, causing enduring discomfort or distress. Examples of these are financial hardships and racial oppression. Individuals, who experienced these chronic strains, suggested their distress as an underlying reason for their having committed CPV. As Cohen (Cohen 1955; Cohen 1965; Cohen 1977) points out, when individuals cannot attain societal ideals, such as financial stability and high social status, they act out their frustrations in crimes. In addition, these individuals may not be acting criminally because of necessity, but they may be acting out in order to achieve social status. Thus, for Cohen, a crime that may seem purposeless, such as throwing bottles and rocks at a parade, may not be

purposeless at all. These individuals may be acting out their status frustration in a crowd in order to gain social acceptance amongst their peers. Agnew (Agnew 1990; Agnew 1992; Agnew 2000) might also consider some chronic strains as strains of injustices. These strains tend to foster anger and resentment, which reduce tolerance and self-constraints. Some individuals who experience chronic strains might be more likely to commit violence as a way to reduce their negative emotions.

Although the traditional sociological literature supports the notion that chronic strains may play a role in violence, it is not the case for CPV. Only five (less than 17%) of the thirty participants stated that they were experiencing chronic strains. Moreover, these five individuals were in the impression management group; none were in the deindividuation group.

Additionally, not everyone who experiences chronic or acute strains commit CPV. As noted in the literature review on strain theories, violence is only one way to reduce negative emotions (Agnew 1990; Agnew 1992; Agnew 2000). Thus, strains should not be seen as antecedents or causes of CPV. Rather, they make it more likely that CPV may occur. Furthermore, this may only be true in cases where self-presentation is used.

In summary, individuals who self-presented reported that acute strains caused their aggressive responses. In addition, a few individuals from that group also reported having experienced chronic strains, which increased their frustration and aggression levels. However, strains should not be seen as major factors in causing CPV. Not everyone reacts to chronic strains through violence, and the data from the qualitative interviews only yielded five individuals who stated that they were experiencing chronic strains at time of incident. Instead, strains should be seen as an overarching occurrence that might make CPV more likely for those who self-present.

Alcohol Consumption

Consistent with sociological literature and the quantitative data for this research, alcohol played a role in the interviewees' participation in the violence. All 30 participants disclosed having consumed alcohol during or shortly before the incident. Some did not feel that alcohol was a contributor to their behaviors, while others were adamant that alcohol was responsible for their committing violence.

It is a common belief that alcohol is the source of the violence when it comes to CPV. It is the reason why many large cities instigate alcohol bans and early liquor store closings on days when alcohol consumption is known to be high during certain celebratory events, such as the St. Patrick's Day parades. However, this is a misconception; alcohol is most likely not a cause of CPV. Although it is a common denominator among interviewees in this sample, many people who drink alcohol at parades, never commit CPV. In addition, some individuals who consume alcohol in other contexts other than at parades, also engage in violence; alcohol consumption has been strongly linked to violence in many contexts as shown in the literature review (e.g., Bushman 1997; Rozen 1998; Widom 1995). Moreover, one cannot explain a variable with a constant; and many individuals who drink alcohol at the time they become violent at parades also drink alcohol when they peacefully go to work, play with their children, and are intimate with their partner. Therefore, alcohol cannot be definitively stated as the root of CPV, although that is a common misconception.

Furthermore, the expectation that alcohol increases aggression may have an effect on CPV regardless of whether or not alcohol physiologically or psychologically increased the individual's aggression. As presented in the literature review, the social and cultural expectancy

model suggests that alcohol usage may encourage aggression because people expect it to do so. For example, studies using real and simulated alcoholic beverages show that people who believe they have consumed alcohol begin to act more aggressively, despite which beverage they actually consumed (Bushman 1997). Thus, individuals who consume alcohol and then engage in CPV may do so because they expected the alcohol to increase their aggression regardless of whether or not the alcohol actually affected their physiology or psychology; thus, alcohol may not have an affect on the rate CPV at all.

As consistent with the literature, alcohol consumption during parades acts as a mood enhancer and inhibition diffuser. For example, when there is a large crowd and excitement is high, an individual is likely to experience deindividuation and commit violence. However, if he is intoxicated, he is even more likely to experience deindividuation and commit CPV because his excited mood is enhanced and his inhibition is loosened by the alcohol. Coupled with a sense of reduced accountability and self-awareness, he is more likely to engage in violence than someone who is not intoxicated. As Bushman (1997) suggests, alcohol, by itself, does not cause violence. Intoxication must interact with other factors, such conditions that lead to deindividuation (e.g., large crowd, exciting atmosphere, sense of anonymity, etc.) to influence violence.

In addition, an individual who is intoxicated is more likely to engage in self-presentation by using intimidation, self-promotion and exemplification. The alcohol makes it easier for the individual to self-present through violence because, as Begue et al. (2009) suggest, the intensity of aggression increases when the individual is intoxicated while experiencing a trigger. As noted, participants in the sample who engaged in self-presentation often reported acute strains or triggers that initiated the violent episodes. Moreover, as Begue et al. point out, only a minor

trigger is needed to initiate the aggressive response when alcohol is involved. This supports the participants' reports that minor triggers (acute strains) quickly escalate into violent responses.

To conclude, consistent with sociological literature and the quantitative data, alcohol played a role in violence. However, although alcohol consumption was present in all cases, it was probably not a root cause of CPV. Instead, alcohol is more likely to act as a mood enhancer, which heightens the emotions of the already excited, and perhaps aggressive or frustrated, individual. It also lowers the inhibitions of the individual to engage in violence.

While celebratory parade violence might appear as random, senseless violence, upon closer examination, clear patterns and characteristics could be seen to emerge. First, CPV tended to fall more into the category of *impression management* rather than *deindividuation*. This contradicted traditional thoughts about mass violence whereby it was believed that the individual engaged in violence because he experienced deindividuation. The results of this study clearly showed that individuals who engaged in CPV actually had agency and were performing CPV in order to manage their impressions to their audience. Second, CPV with evidence of impression management typically involved just a few individuals committing the violence. The violence was goal oriented; generally intended to intimidate, to self-promote, or to exemplify. In contrast, CPV with evidence of deindividuation tended to involve a large number of people in an almost euphoric state. These individuals also reported evidence of reduced accountability and reduced self-awareness. Furthermore, evidence of strains appeared in the impression management group, with acute strains acting as triggers. However, only a few individuals reported chronic strains. All cases reported alcohol consumption. However, strains and alcohol consumption must not be seen as root causes of CPV, but as variables that made CPV more likely to occur.

Chapter VI: Conclusion

Celebratory parades have been a favorite past time for the masses for centuries. Historically, they began as an accessible way to emulate the extravagant pageants of the elite class. They became a mean to escape from the mundane existence of everyday life. Parades later became an expression of political aspiration for the common people. Today, celebratory parades are more popular than ever with not only a growing live audience, but an audience whose members view these parades through their television and the internet. For example, the Macy's Thanksgiving Day parade attracts over 3.5 million people along its route each year, with an additional 50 million television viewers (Suddath 2008). Celebratory parades continue to be a favorite past time for many Americans. However, violence sometimes accompanies these parades. Little was known about their occurrences or about their perpetrators.

Through this exploratory research, one now has a clearer picture of CPV and the individuals who engage them. However, the question remains – Why do these individuals engage in violence during certain celebratory parades? For example, some of them noted that they would not commit violence at other types of parades, such as Thanksgiving Day or Christmas Day parades. In addition, most people who drink and/or experience strains during a celebratory parade do not self-present or deindividuate, and commit CPV

The answer is clear. Parades, especially certain ones, such as St. Patrick's Day, Mardi Gras and sports victory parades, have characteristics and are structured in ways that offer opportunities and motives for individuals to either self-present or deindividuate. As presented in the research conducted by Jarman (1997) and Tuite (2000), these parades, with their heightened visual and auditory stimuli (e.g., signs, banners, costumes, songs, etc.), offer a type of euphoric

experience for their participants, who many times, lose themselves in the excitement. Most of these parades are large scale events, with many people in attendance, offering lots of stimulation. This is a perfect combination for individuals to loosen their sense of accountability and self-awareness. In addition, they offer individuals an opportunity to self-present because of the large audience that is available to view their perceived favorable image.

Furthermore, the atmosphere of certain parades, as reported by the interviewees in this research, is much different from other more conservative and subdued, family oriented parades, such as Thanksgiving Day and Christmas Parades. The atmosphere is almost euphoric, with many excited people, perhaps in costumes and body paints, singing, dancing, chanting – celebrating. Alcohol, which is often present at these types of parades (and not family oriented ones), heightens their excitement or enhances their already euphoric mood. In addition, the sheer size of the crowd not only creates a sense of anonymity, but also increases the likelihood that one might experience an acute strain from another individual, such as a derogatory comment, or an accidental bump. Thus, with the lowered inhibition, heightened excitement, and size of the crowd, some parades create a perfect storm of events that might lead an individual to self-present, or to deindividuate.

Why do some individuals deindividuate, while others self-present? The data shows that the answer lies in the context of the situation or incident. Those who self-presented tended to engage in CPV with a target, whom they perceived as having wronged them or someone else; the violence was either dispute related, or predatory in nature. Thus, the context of these violence typically only involved the assailant and their target (a few noted that a small number of their friends and/or their target's friends had joined in), and were thus instrumental.

In contrast, those who deindividuated tended to have engaged in the CPV with many others; these individuals included their friends and perfect strangers. The violence tended to be at a larger scale, almost riot level, whereby participants were vandalizing properties, setting fires, and throwing objects at bystanders. Most of these individuals reported having “joined in” the event as apposed to instigating it; they did not suggest their engagement was dispute related, or predatory in nature (at least not toward another individual). Additionally, these parades may offer Thus, the context of these types of violence typically involved large scale, riot-like situations, and were not instrumental to the extent that they involved another individual as a target.

Strong examples of deindividuation could be found in sports victory parades. As noted in the quantitative data, sports victory parades took the lead amongst other parades in extremely violent incidents, and they have the highest mean of arrests. Additionally, four of the five cases involving sports victory parades in the qualitative interviews showed evidence of deindividuation, and half of the cases where deindividuation occurred involved those attending sports victory parades. This is perhaps because sports victory parades offer the correct conditions that brew CPV. Attendees experience heightened visual and auditory provocations (e.g., signs, banners, costumes, songs, etc.), which give them a euphoric experience causing them to get lost in the excitement and become one with the crowd. In addition, attendees may identify with the players they support, thus heightening their euphoria in the midst of their team’s exciting victory. Participants may also become one with the crowd as they dress in costumes and body paint to identify with their team. As Zimbardo (1971) points out, this uniform effect creates a sense of reduced self-awareness and accountability. Finally, as market research in sports advertising supports (Dortch 1996; Fan Frenzy 2007; Snipes and Ingram 2007), sports victory parades tend

to attract males under 25; this population is more prone to committing violence. Thus, sports victory parades contain a myriad of ingredients that brew CPV.

Although sports victories are good examples of parades where deindividuation is likely to occur when CPV is present, they are few in frequency of occurrence. My quantitative and qualitative data showed that they only occur 14% and 16% of the time, respectively. One reason might be that large scale victory parades are only organized once a year (e.g., Super Bowl). According to the quantitative and qualitative data, these tended to be the type of sports victory parades where CPV occurred, as apposed to smaller collegial ones. Therefore, the relatively small frequency of occurrence of these parades may explain the frequency of deindividuation. Sports victory parades, while offering the perfect ingredients for CPV, simply are not organized that often.

Given the above insights, a conclusion can be made that the structure or context of most celebratory parades may lend itself to individuals engaging in CPV as a result of impression management rather than deindividuation. Most celebratory parades involve hundreds or thousands of parade-goers confined and restricted in movement by each other. It is likely that an individual would experience an acute strain, such as a bump or a verbal insult from another parade-goer. This might be enough to trigger a dispute and violence as the assailant attempts to self-present a favorable image to the large surrounding crowd. Thus, because most parades consist of the above characteristics, most individuals will self-present when engaging in CPV.

On the other hand, there are few celebratory parades, such as sports victories, which offer a heightened sense of cohesive identity (as members root for the same team) and a euphoric atmosphere (as members celebrate the victory of their team). They also tend to attract more male youths. These factors will support deindividuation. However, these types of parades are

relatively few in occurrences when compared to other celebratory parades, such as festivals, ethnic pride and patriotic celebrations.

Before concluding this section, the issue of class and gender needs to be addressed. As noted, there were no women in the qualitative sample, despite efforts to recruit them. Few names were found during the searches, and none responded to postings about the research. Of the 171 offenders whose sex could be identified in the quantitative portion, less than 8% were women. The absence of women who committed CPV is consistent with the general sociological literature which supports the finding that men are usually the perpetrators of violence. Additionally, most of the men in the qualitative sample were working class men; eighteen had occupations, such as waiters, machinists and construction workers. Five were unemployed, and only seven of the thirty interviewees had professional backgrounds, such as software developers, managers and accountants. Only nine had college degrees, two were in college, and nineteen had a high school education or less. This sample characteristic is consistent with the literature suggesting that working class men are more likely than their middle class counterparts to use violence as an acceptable form of settling disputes.

As stated in the literature review, Mosher and Sirkin (1984) created a Hyper-masculinity Inventory containing three elements: Calloused Sex Attitudes, Danger as Exciting, and Violence as Manly. They found that characteristics of hyper-masculinity are: a lack of empathy or sensitivity especially in regard to sex; pursuing excitement, adventure, and sensation seeking; and adopting the belief that violence is normal and acceptable for men. All of the men in the sample where deindividuation occurred talked about experiencing the excitement of the parade which led them to *getting carried away* and becoming violent. These men engaged in the violence with their male friends and acquaintances which indicates they felt that the violence was

a normal and acceptable form of behavior. Additionally, men in the impression management group reported feeling the pressure to uphold the belief that violence was an acceptable and preferable way to perform masculinity, particularly when their masculinity was threatened. Thus, CPV may be the actions resulting from working class men's belief that violence is a normal and acceptable form of behavior.

Although this research offers some insight into CPV and its participants, it was strictly an exploratory research project. This left some limitations and additional questions to be addressed in future studies. One question that remains is - *Why do some people deindividuate or self-present at these parades, while others, who experience the same parades, do not?* Using the literature review on symbolic interactionism and impression management (e.g., DePaulo 1992; Goffman 1959; Jones 1990; Leary 1995), one might infer that individuals are socialized differently and have different inherent personality traits. Some might be more inwardly directed, while others are more outwardly directed; those who are in the latter group might be more prone to self-present. Moreover, individuals have varying degrees of self-monitoring ability, which determines to which degree they will self-present to conform to their audience's expectations. In addition, some personality traits are more susceptible to experiencing reduced accountability and reduced self-awareness than others. Although these propositions are plausible, the current research was not designed to assess them; thus the data cannot be employed to support those points.

Another question that is raised from this research is - *To what extent do women participate in CPV and for what reasons?* It would be interesting to explore to what degree women self-present, and for what purpose – intimidation, self-promotion, exemplification, etceteras. In addition, are women more or less susceptible to deindividuation? Although the

quantitative data shows that a small number of women engaged in CPV, the study is not able to investigate further. No women were found in the recruitment efforts for the interviews; thus additional studies will need to be conducted to address the above questions.

Furthermore, respondents in this research project participated in relatively minor crimes, such as assault and battery, disorderly conduct and public intoxication. Although the content analysis found individuals with more serious offenses, such as stabbings, shootings and murders, these individuals did not respond to the recruitment efforts. Thus, it would be interesting to conduct research on these individuals exploring their motives for their crimes, and gauging whether or not impression management and deindividuation would apply.

Thus, while this exploratory research offers important insights into celebratory parade violence, most notably its association with impression management, deindividuation, strains and alcohol consumption, it leaves some questions to be answered in future studies.

Finally, practical implications may be drawn from this research. Traditionally, theories of deindividuation have been used to explain and prevent mass violence. However, through this project, we now understand that theories of impression management are more likely to explain violence that occurs at celebratory parades. Through this understanding, new practical implications may be developed to prevent CPV. In order to reduce its frequency of occurrence, attention must be paid to reducing or diffusing the conflicts created by acute strains. Some of these strategies are already utilized during protests and rallies. However, they have not been widely implemented during celebratory parades because of the perception that celebratory parades are often peaceful. For example, the literature review cited one study (McCarthy, Martin, and McPhail, 2000) that looks at 400 disorderly convivial gatherings and confrontational protests, and found that police were more likely to use force when protesters become violent than

they are when convivial gatherers become violent. This suggests that there is a perception by the police that protests often become violent, while convivial gatherings do not. For this reason, effective policing strategies have not been utilized during celebratory parades to the extent that they are being utilized during protests and rallies.

This research has provided evidence that violence is a common occurrence during many celebratory parades and thus similar strategies used during protests and rallies should be employed during celebratory parades. For example, William Lint (2005) suggests that effective protest policing includes high visibility of the police, their speedy reactions, and spatiality of their presence. Similarly, celebratory parades should utilize an increased number of police, who should be placed in areas where they are easily visible and accessible to the parade-goers. These police should also be trained in rapid and effective responses to diffuse minor conflicts so that they do not escalate into CPV. Lint goes on to discuss that community involvement in protest policing is increasingly popular in many countries. This strategy can be utilized during celebratory parades, For example, the community might do some of its own monitoring by instating volunteers to supervise the crowd and to report to the police should they observe any dubious behaviors.

Furthermore, Mattias Wahlstrom (2007) finds that lack of provocation and increased cordial dialogue are the two effective tools that prevent protest violence. Crowds are less likely to become violent if they do not feel provoked by the police, and if there is effective dialogue between them and the policing authorities. Police and volunteer monitors should be trained to use effective dialogue and cordial interactions with parade-goers when supervising celebratory parades. Thus, strategies already used during protests and rallies are also effective strategies to employ during celebratory parades given that CPV is a concern.

In parades where deindividuation could be expected to occur, such as sports victories, surveillance cameras could be used to diffuse the perceived loss of accountability and self-awareness. However, there should be extensive media campaigns, such as posters and frequent speaker announcements, to make the parade-goers aware that they are being surveilled. It would be a futile effort if parade-goers are not aware that they are being surveilled as that will combat their loss of self-awareness and sense of reduced accountability.

This research also gives a new perspective on the control of alcohol consumption during parades. Much effort has already been placed by some parade committees to ban alcohol and to control its consumption by limiting the operation hours of bars and pubs, and fining individuals for drinking in public. However, additional efforts could be made in the areas of alcohol containment and scheduling of events.

While speaking with the committee for the Boston Gay Pride parade in preparation of this research, I noted two effective strategies of controlling alcohol consumption. Despite its forty year history and the fact that it is the third largest Pride parade in the United States, there have been no incidents of violence associated with Gay Pride celebrations except for those conducted by anti-gay protesters earlier in its history. One strategy that the Boston Pride parade practices is containment. Alcohol consumption is not allowed along the parade route; however, for those who choose to drink, they may enter an area where alcohol is served by professional bartenders and businesses promoting their alcoholic beverages. Parade-goers must present proper identification and may not bring the alcohol outside of the designated area. Another strategy the committee practices is scheduling events after the parade where alcohol is made available. After the parade, there are several official sponsored block parties where parade-goers may enter and buy drinks. The practice of containment may reduce the likelihood that alcohol could act as a

contributing factor in CPV during the parade. Furthermore, the expectation by the parade-goers that alcohol will be available to them at designated areas and after the parade may also reduce their urge to bring their own alcohol to the parade. These tactics offer the parade committee more control over alcohol consumption thus lowering the likelihood of CPV occurrence.

To conclude, in some ways, CPV is similar to other types of violence. This research showed that men under age 25 are more likely to commit the violence than other age groups. Social scientists have traditionally used theories of deindividuation and presentation of self to explain these types of collective behaviors; this research suggested that theories of impression management apply more widely when explaining CPV. Whether an individual engages in CPV through deindividuation or impression management depends on the context of the parade. He is more likely to self-present when acute strains are present, and is more likely to deindividuate when the conditions and structures of the parade create a sense of reduced accountability and self-awareness.

REFERENCES

- Adler, F., and Laufer, W. (Eds.) (1995). *The Legacy of Anomie Theory*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Agnew, R. (1990, August). The Origins of Delinquent Events: An Examination of Offender Accounts. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 27(3), 267-295.
- Agnew, R. (1992, February). Foundation for a General Strain Theory of Crime and Delinquency. *Criminology*, 30(1), 47-87.
- Agnew, R. (1999, May). A General Strain Theory of Community Differences in Crime Rates. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 32(6), 123-126.
- Agnew, R. (2007). *Pressured into Crime: An Overview of the General Strain Theory*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Agnew, R. and White, H. (1992, November). An Empirical Test of General Strain Theory. *Criminology*, 30 (4), 475-500.
- Agnew, R., T. Brezina, J. Wright and F. Cullen. (2002, February). Strain, Personality Traits, and Delinquency: Extending General Strain Theory. *Criminology*, 40(1), 43-72.
- Agnew, R. (2007). *Why Do Criminals Offend? A General Theory of Crime and Delinquency*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Ajzen, I. (1988). *Attitudes, Personality, and Behavior*. Chicago, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Akers, A. (1994). *Criminological Theories: Introduction and Evaluation*. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Alford, R. and Friedland, R. (1992). *The Powers of Theory: Capitalism, the State, and Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alpert, G. and Dunham, R. (1999). *The Force Factor: measuring Police Use of Force Relative to Suspect Resistance*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Archer, L., Pratt, S., and Phillips, D. (2001). Working Class Construction of Masculinity and Negotiation of (Non)participation in Higher Education. *Gender and Education*. (13(4), 431-449
- Aronstein, D. (2009, June 4). Decades of Pride: time marches on...and so will we. Bay Windows, pp. A6, A22-A23.
- Babbie, E. (1992). *The practice of social research*. (6th ed.). Chapter 11. California: Wadsworth.
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Barkan, S. and Snowden, L. (2001). *Collective Violence*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

- Baron, S. (2003, November). Self-Control, Social Consequences, and Criminal Behavior: Street Youth and the General Strain Theory of Crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 40(4), 403-426.
- Baron, S. (2006, March/April). Street Youth, Strain Theory and Crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(2), 209-224.
- Bartholow, B., and Heinz, A. (2006, January). Alcohol and Aggression Without Consumption: Alcohol Cues, Aggressive Thoughts, and Hostile Perception Bias. *Psychological Science*, 17(1), 30-37.
- Begue, L. et al. (2009). A message in a bottle: extrapharmacological effects of alcohol on aggression. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(1), 137-142.
- Begue, L., et al. (January, 2009). A Message in a Bottle: Extrapharmacological Effects of Alcohol on Aggression. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(1), 137-142.
- Belenky, M. et al. (1986). *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice and Mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Birchall, Jenny. (2006, April). The Carnival Revels of Manchester's Vagabonds': Young Working-Class Women and Monkey Parades in the 1870s. *Women's History Review*, 15(2), 229-253).
- Blum, P. (2006). The Democratic National Convention Protests in Los Angeles: August 12-17, 2000. *Guild Practitioner*, 63(1), 47-56.
- Blumer, H. (1957). Collective Behavior. In J. Gittler (Ed.), *Review of Sociology: Analysis of a Decade*, (pp. 127-158). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Blumer, H. (1969). Society as Symbolic Interaction. In H. Blumer, *Symbolic Interaction*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall: 78-89.
- Bond, M. (July, 2009). Why Cops Should Trust Wisdom. *New Scientist*. 2717.
- Borders, B., S. Barnwell, and M. Earleywine. (2007, July/August). Alcohol-aggression expectancies and dispositional rumination moderate the effect of alcohol consumption on alcohol-related aggression and hostility. *Aggressive Behaviors*, 33(4), 327-339.
- Boudreau, V. (2001). *Contentious Interactions and State Repression: Toward an Interpretive Framework*. Paper presented at the Conference on Mobilization and Repression: What we know and where we should go from here? June 22, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.
- Boyd, A. (1994, August). The Marching Season in Northern Ireland. *Contemporary Review*, 265(1543), 81-86.
- Brezina, T., A. Piquero, and P. Mazerolle. (2001, November). Students Anger and Aggressive Behavior in School: An Initial Test of Agnew's Macro-Level Strain Theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 38(4), 362-362.

- Brodeur, J. (1998). Introduction: The Policing of Protest in Western Democracies. In D. Della Porta and H. Reiter (Eds.), *Policing Protest: The Control of Mass Demonstrations in Western Democracies*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Broidy, L. A. (2001, February). Test of General Strain Theory. *Criminology*, 39(1), 9.
- Broidy, L., and Agnew, R. (1997, August). Gender and Crime: A General Strain Theory Perspective. *Journal of Research and Delinquency*, 34(3), 275-307.
- Brown, B. (2006). *Policing Crowds and Controlling Collective Violence: An examination of Police Crowd Control in the United States*. Paper presented at the 11th International Conference: Toward Peaceful Mass Demonstration and Public Protection. November 8, The Korean National Police Agency and The Korea Association of Police Science, Seoul, South Korea.
- Brown, E., and Greene, S. (1999, Winter). From Private Clubs to Parades: How Accommodating are State Laws?. *New York Law School Law Review*, 42(1), 125-145.
- Burke, P., and Tully, J. (1977). The Measurement of Role/Identity. *Social Forces* (55) Pp.880-897.
- Bushman, B. (1997). Effects of alcohol on human aggression: Validity of proposed explanations. In: Galantar, M. (Ed.) *Recent Developments in Alcoholism, Vol. 13: Alcohol and Violence*, New York: Plenum Press, 227-243.
- Cernkovich, S., P. Giordano and J. Rudolph. (2000, May). Race, Crime and the American Dream. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 37(2), 131-171.
- Chermack, S., and Taylor, S. (1995). Alcohol and Human Physical Aggression: Pharmacological versus Expectancy Effects. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 56(4), 449-456.
- Chivers, C., and Flynn, K. (2000, June 13). 35 Scary Minutes: Women Tell Police of Assaults in Park. *New York Times*, Late Ed., p. A1.
- Cloward, R. (1959). Illegitimate Means, Anomie and Deviant Behavior. *American Sociological Review*, 30, 164-176.
- Cloward, R. and Ohlin, L. (1960). *Delinquency and Opportunity*. New York: Free Press.
- Cohen, A. (1955). *Delinquent Boys*. New York: Free Press.
- Cohen, A. (1965). The Sociology of Deviant Act: Anomie Theory and Beyond. *American Sociological Review*, 30, 5-14.
- Cohen, A. (1977). The Concept of Criminal Organization. *British Journal of Criminology*, 17, 97-112.
- Connell, R. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Conteh-Morgan, E. (2003). *Collective Political Violence: An Introduction to the Theories and Cases of Violent Conflicts*. Routledge.
- Cooley, C. (1964). *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York: Scribner's.

- Corsano, E. (2009, October 19). How Gay is Southie?. Phoenix, pp. A32, A43-44.
- Cramer, M. (2009, March 8). *Police to Crack Down on Drinking at Boston's St. Patrick's Day Parade: Complaints from residents spur effort.* *Boston Globe*, http://www.boston.com/news/education/higher/articles/2009/03/08/police_to_curb_drinking_at_parade/
- Crang, J. *The Abolition of Compulsory Church Parades in the British Army.* *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. 56.n1 (Jan 2005): p92(15).
- Cushion, S. (2007, September). Protesting Their Apathy? An Analysis of British Press Coverage of Young Anti-Iraq War Protestors. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 10(4), 419-437.
- Das, V. (2006). *Life and Words: Violence and the Decent into the Ordinary.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- DeKeseredy, W., E. Desmond and S. Alvi. (2005). *Deviance and Crime: Theory Research and Policy.* Lexis Nexis Matthew Bender.
- DePaulo, B. (1992). Nonverbal Behavior and Self-presentation. *Psychological Bulletin*, III, 203-243.
- Dodd, D. (1985). Robbers in the Classroom: A Deindividuation Exercise. *Teaching of Psychology*, 12, 89-91.
- Donovan, J. (2000). *Feminist Theory: The Intellectual Traditions, 3rd Ed.* New York: Continuum.
- Dortch, S. (1996). The Future of Baseball. Retrieved from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m4021/is_n4_v18/ai_18142072/pg_4/?tag=content;coll
- Duncan, D. (1996, Spring). Parading the First Amendment through the Streets of South Boston. *New England Law Review*, 30(3), 663-694.
- Eagley, A., and Chaiken, S. (1993). *The Psychology of Attitudes.* Fort Wroth, TX: Hartcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Eagly, A. (1987). *Sex Differences in Social Behavior: Social Role Interpretation.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Press.
- Ertz, M. (1993, Spring). The Supreme court Confines a County's Right to Regulate Parades and Demonstrations (Case Note). *Washburn Law Journal*, 32(3), 431-449.
- Exum, M. (2006, March/April). Alcohol and aggression: an integration of findings from experimental studies. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 34(2), 131-146.
- Fan Frenzy: NCAA Football Attendance Demographics (2007). Retrieved from <http://www.sportsbusinessdaily.com/Daily/Issues/2007/08/Issue-235/College-Football-Preview/Fan-Frenzy-NCAA-Football-Attendance-Demographics.aspx>
- Farnworth, M., and Leiber, M. (1989, April). Strain Theory Revisited: Economic Goals, Educational Means and Delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 54(2), 263-275.
- Featherstone, R., and Deflem, M. *Anomie and Strain: Context and Consequences of Merton's Two Theories.* *Sociological Inquiry*. 73.4 (Nov 2003): pp471(19).

- Felson, R. (1978). *Aggression as Impression Management*. *Social Psychology*, 41:213.
- Felson, R. and Ricard, B. (1978, September). Aggression as impression management. *Social Psychology*, Vol 41(3), pp. 205-213.
- Felson, R., and Richard, B. (1982, December). Impression Management and the Escalation of Aggression and Violence. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 45 Issue 4, p245-254, 10p.
- Felson, R., and Tedeschi, J. (1993). *Aggression and Violence: Social Interactionist Perspectives*. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Ferguson R. (2002). *State, Identity and Violence: Political Disintegration in the Pos-Cold War Era*. Taylor and Francis, Inc.
- Gaubatz, K. (1995). *Crime in the Public Mind*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Gergen, K., Gergen, M., and Barton, W. (1973). Deviance in the Dark. *Psychology Today*, 7, 129-130.
- Giancolar, P. (2002). Alcohol-Related Aggression During the College Years: Theories, Risk Factors, and Policy Implications. *Journal of Studies of Alcohol*, 14, 129-139.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Giroux, H. (1996). *Fugitive Cultures: Race, Violence and Youth*. Talyor and Francis, Inc.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylum: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Goode, E. (1992). *Collective Behavior*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Gruneau, R. and Witson, D. (1993). *Hockey night in Canada*. Toronto, Ontario: Garamond Press.
- Gurr, T. (1967). *The Conditions of Civil Violence: First tests of Causal Model*. Center of International Studies, Princeton University.
- Gurr, T. (1970). *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hajj. (2008). Retrieved November 11, 2008, from Encyclopædia Britannica Online: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/252050/hajj>.
- Hall, J. A. (1992). Development and validation of the Expanded Hypermasculinity Inventory and the Ideology of Machismo Scale. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.

- Harris, C. (1997). Causes of Civil Violence. *Berkeley McNair Journal*, 5.
- Hayes, P. (1992). *The People and the Mob: The Ideology of Civil Conflict in Modern Europe*. London: Praeger.
- Helfritz, et al. (2006, Spring). *Usefulness of self-report instruments in assessing men accused of domestic violence*. **The Psychological Record**. 56.2: p171(10).
- Henry, S., and Lanier, M. (Eds.), (2006). *The Essential Criminology Reader*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Hinduja, S. (2007, December). Workplace Violence and Negative Affective Responses: A Test of Agnew's General Strain Theory. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(6), 532-561.
- Hoffmann, J., and Cerbone, F. (1999, May). Stressful Life Events and Delinquency Escalation in Early Adolescence. *Criminology*, 37(2), 343-346.
- Holstein, J. and Gubrium, J. (2004). The Active Interview. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research Method*, (pp. 140-161). London: Sage Publications.
- Holstein, J. and Gubrium, J. (Eds.), (2003). *Inside Interviewing: New Lenses, New Concerns*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- hooks, bell. (2000). *Where We Stand: Class Matter*. New York: Routledge.
- Jacobs, E. (2009, June 17). A Proud Crowd. Bay Windows, pp. A6, A22-23.
- Jacoby, J. (Ed), (2004). *Classics of Criminology*. Long Grove: Waveland Press.
- Jarman, N. (1998). *Material Conflicts: Parades and Visual Displays in Northern Ireland*. Oxford: Royal Anthropological Institute (UK).
- Jeannotte, M. (2001). Cultural Symbiosis: Cultural Participation and Cohesive Communities. *Cultural Link Review*, 33.
- Jeannotte, S. (2001). Social Cohesion Around the World: An International Comparison of Definitions and Issues.
- Jenson, J. (2002). Identifying the Links: Social Cohesion and Culture. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 27(2).
- Johnson, R., and Downing, R. (1979). Deindividuation and Valence of Cues: Effects of Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1532-1538.
- Jones, E. (1990). *Interpersonal perception*. New York: Freeman.
- Jones, E., and Pittman, T. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological Perspectives of the Self* (Vol. I, pp. 231-262). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Kaufman, J., et al. (2008, December). A General Strain Theory of Racial Differences in General Strain Theory. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 41(3), 421-438.
- Kelly, C., and Breinlinger, S., (1996). *The Social Psychology of Collective Action: Identity, Injustice, and Gender*. London: Taylor and Francis, Ltd.
- Kilmartin, C. (1994). *The Masculine Self*. New York: Macmillin Publishing Company.
- Korobov, P., A. Kozenko, and V. Tretyakov. (2006, June). Moscow Gay Pride Parade Ends in Fiasco. *The Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press*, 58(22), 6-9.
- Krueger, R., et al. (2007, November). Linking antisocial behavior, substance use, and personality: an integrative quantitative model of the adult externalizing spectrum. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 116(4), 645-667.
- Landy, T. (1994, September). Politics of Parade (Attleboro, MA). *Commonwealth*, 121(15), 4-6.
- Langton, L., and Piquero, N. (2007, January/February). Can General Strain Theory Explain White-Collar Crime? A preliminary Investigation of the Relationship Between Strain and Select White Collar Offenses. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(1). 1-16.
- Lavallee, D., J. Kremer, A. Moran, and M. Williams. (2004). *Sports Psychology: Contemporary Themes*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Leary, M. (1995). *Self-Presentation: Impression and Management and Interpersonal Behavior*. Madison, WI: Brown and Benchmark.
- Leary, M. (1995). *Self-presentation: Impression management and interpersonal behavior*. Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.
- Leondar-Wright, B. (2005). *Class Matters: Cross Class Alliance Building for Middle-Class Activists*. Gabriola Island, BC Canada: New Society Press.
- Levin, J., and Fox, J. (2006). *Elementary Statistics in Social Research: The Essentials*. Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Levin, J., and Madfis, E. (2008). *School Massacres and Strains: A Sequential Model*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Levin, J., and Madfis, E. School Massacres and Strain: A Sequential Model. *Unpublished Manuscript*.
- Lewis, J. (2007). *Sports Fan Violence in North America*. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Lieske, J. (1978). The Conditions of Racial Violence in American Cities: A Development Synthesis. *American Political Science Review*, 72, 1324-1340.
- Lilly, J., F. Cullen, and R. Ball. (2006). *Criminological Theory: Context and Consequences, 4th Edition*. SAGE Publications.
- Lint, W. (2005, December). Public Order Policing: A Tough Act to Follow. *International Journal of Sociology of Law*, 33(4), 179-199.

- Lubrano, A. (2004). *Limbo*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lumsden, L. (1997). *Rampant Women: Suffragists and the Right to Assembly*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Luttrell, W. (1993). The Teachers, They all had their Pets: Concepts of Gender, Knowledge and Power. *Signs*, 18(3), 505-546.
- Maccoby, E., and Jacklin, C. (1974). *Psychology of Sex Difference*. Standford: Standford University Press.
- Macleod, M. (1995, November). *The Psychology of Identification Parades (United Kingdom)*. *New Law Journal*, 146(6721), 1740-1744.
- Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade*. (2008). Retrieved on November 11, 2008, from TIME Online: www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1862565,00.html
- Mardi Gras in the United States*. (2011) Retrieved on March 23, 2011, from Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mardi_Gras_in_the_United_States
- Marks., A. (2000). Lifelong Learning and “The Breadwinner” Ideology: Addressing of problems of Lack of Participation of Adults, Working-Class males on Higher Education in Merseyside. *Educational Studies*. 23(3), 303-319.
- Marston, S. (2002, March). Making Difference: Conflict Over Irish Identity in the New York City St. Patrick’s Day Parade. *Political Geography*, 21(3), 373-393.
- Martinez, T. (1995, July). Gang Innovation, Patriarchy, and Powerlessness: Expanding Theory to Reflect American Realities. *Explorations in Ethnic Studies*, 18(2), 145-159.
- Mazerolle, P., and Piquero, A. (1998, May/June). Linking Exposure to Strain with Anger: An Investigation of Deviant Adaptations. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 26(3), 295-312.
- McCarthy, J., A. Martin, and C. McPhail. (2007, August). Policing Disorderly Campus Protests and Convivial Gatherings: The Intersections of Threat, Social Organization, and First Amendment Guarantees. *Social Problems*, 54(3), 274-296.
- McCluskey, C. (2001). *Understanding Latino Delinquency: The Applicability of Strain Theory by Ethnicity*. LFB Scholarly Publishing, LLC.
- McPhail, C. (1991). *The Myth of the Maddening Crowd*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Mead, H. ((1962). *Mind, Self and Society: From the Standpoint of Social Behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meltzer, Petras, B., Reynolds, L. (1975). *Symbolic Interactionism: Genesis, Varieties and Criticisms*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Merton, R. (1938). Social Structure and Anomie. *American Sociological Review*, 3, 672-682.
- Merton, R. (1964). Anomie, Anomia and Social Interaction. In M. Clinard (Ed.), *Anomie and Deviant Behavior*, (pp. 213-242). New York: Free Press.
- Merton, R. (1968). *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.

- Miedzian, M. (1991). *Boys will be boys: breaking the link between masculinity and violence*. New York: Doubleday.
- Mihic, L., et al. (2009, March). Situational and respondent-level motives for drinking and alcohol-related aggression: A multilevel analysis of drinking events in a sample of Canadian University students. *Addictive Behaviors*, 34(3), 264-270.
- Miles, W. (2006, December). Motives for drinking, alcohol consumption, and alcohol-related problems among British secondary-school and university students. *Addictive Behaviors*, 31(12), 2147-2157.
- Miller, J. (2001). Family and Community Integrity. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 28.
- Miller, J. (2001, December). Family and Community Integrity. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 23(22).
- Morgan, W., and Clark, T. (1973). The Causes of Racial Disorders: A Grievance-Level of Explanation. *American Sociological Review*, 38, 611-624.
- Mosher, D., and Sirkin, M. (1984). Measuring a macho personality constellation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 18, 150-163.
- Moss, K. St. (1995, Fall). Patrick's Day Celebrations and the Formation of Irish-American Identity, 1845-1875. *Journal of Social History*, 29(1), 125-149.
- Mullen, B. (1986). Atrocity as Function of Lynch Mob Composition: A Self-Attention Perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 12, 187-197.
- Myers, D., and Li, Y. (2001). *City Conditions and Riot Susceptibility Reconsidered*. University of Notre Dame.
- Nagle, J. (2005, October/November/December). Everybody is Irish on St. Paddy's: Ambivalence and Alterity at London's St. Patrick's Day. *Identities*, 12(4), 563-584.
- Newman, S. (1997). *Parades and the Politics of the Street: Festive Culture in the Early American Republic*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Olzak, S. (1989). Analysis of Events in Studies of Collective Actions. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15, 119-131.
- Ostrowsky, M., and Messner, S. (2005, September/October). Explaining Crime for a Young Adult Population: An Application of General Strain Theory. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33(5), 463-477.
- Pageant and Parade*. (2008). Retrieved November 3, 2008, from Britannica Student Encyclopedia: <http://student.britannica.com/ebi/article-9276246>
- Pageant*. (2008). Retrieved November 03, 2008, from Encyclopedia Britannica Online: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/438240/pageant>
- Parsons, T. (1964). *Social Structure and Personality*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

- Pernanan, K. (1991). *Alcohol in Human Violence*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Perry, W., Abbot, J., and Hutter, M. (1997). The Symbolic Interactionist Paradigm and Urban Sociology. *Research in Urban Sociology*, 4:59-92.
- Petty, R., and Cacioppo, J. (1986). *Communication and Persuasion: Central and Peripheral Routes to Attitude Change*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Phillis Parade*. Retrieved from Life123: <http://www.life123.com/question/Phillies-Parade>.
- Plybon, L. and Kliever, W. (2001). Neighborhood types and externalizing behavior in urban school-age children: Tests of direct, mediated, and moderated effects. *J. Child Fam. Stud.* 10: 419-437.
- Pratkanis, A., and Aronson, E. (1991). *Age of Propaganda: The Everyday Use and Abuse of Persuasion*. New York: Freeman.
- Prentice-Dunn, S., and Rogers, R. (1989). Deindividuation and the Self-Regulation of Behavior. In P.B. Paulus (Ed.), *Psychology of Group Influence (2nd ed.)*. Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum.
- Rapoza, K. and Drake, J. (2009, January). Relationships of hazardous alcohol use, alcohol expectancies, and emotional commitment to male sexual coercion and aggression in dating couples. *Journal on Studies of Alcohol and Drugs*, 55-64.
- Regis, H. (1999, November). *Second Lines, Minstrelsy, and the Contested Landscapes of New Orleans Afro-Creole Festivals*. *Cultural Anthropology*, 144, 472-505.
- Regis, H. (2001, November). Blackness and the Politics of Memory in the New Orleans Second Line. *American Ethnologist*, 28(4), 752-778.
- Ritzer, G. (2000). *Modern Sociological Theory, 5th Ed.* Boston: McGraw-Hill
- Roizen, R. (1998, November). Recalling the Birth of Alcohol Science. *Journal of Studies in Alcohol*, 629-630.
- Rose, J. (1982). *Outbreaks: Sociology of Collective Behavior*. New York: The Free Press.
- Rosenfeld, P., R. Giacalone, and C. Riordan. (1995). *Impression Management in Organizations*. New York: Routledge.
- Rosenfeld, R. (1998, Fall), Robert Merton's Contributions to the Sociology of Deviance. *Sociological Inquiry*, 59(4), 453-467.
- Ross, M. (2007). *Cultural Contestation in Ethnic Conflict*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Roy, K. (2004). You Can't Eat Love: Constructing Provider Role, Expectations for Low-Income and Working-Class Father. *Fathering*. (2(3), 253-276.

- Ruddell, R., M. Thomas, and L. Way. (2005, November/December). Breaking the Chain: Confronting Issueless College Town Disturbances and Riots. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33(6), 549-560.
- Rule, J. (1988). *Theories of Civil Violence*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Runciman, W. (1966). Relative deprivation and social justice: A study of attitudes to social inequality in twentieth century England. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rutherford, R. (1996, June). Canada's August Festival: Communities, Criminality, and Social Memory (study of crowd behavior during August 1914). *Canadian Historical Review*, 77(2), -250.
- Santino, J. (1999, September). Public Protest and Popular Style: Resistance from the Right in Northern Ireland and South Boston. *American Anthropologist*, 101(3), 515-529.
- Schlenker, B. (1980). *Impression Management: The Self-Concept, Social Identity, and Interpersonal Relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Schneider, J. (1990, Spring). Defining Boundaries, Creating Contacts: Puerto Rican and Polish Presentation of Group Identity Through Ethnic Parades. *The Journal of Ethnic Studies*, 18(1), 33-58.
- Schweingruber, D. (2000). Mob Sociology and Escalated Force: Sociology's Contribution to Repressive Police Tactics. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 41(3), 371-389.
- Schweitzer, S. (2003, March 27). *Holyoke Battles Ethnic Tensions*. *Boston Globe*, Metro Region, B1.
- Shaw, C. and McKay, H. (1942) *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*: Chicago, IL: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Sherman, L. (1993). Defiance, Deterrence and Irrelevance: A Theory of the Criminal Sanction. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 30(4), 445-473.
- Singell, L. (1971). The Socio-Economic Causes of the Recent Urban Disorders: Some Empirical Evidence. *Land Economics*, 47(3), 225-231.
- Sklar, R. (2007, June). **Homophobic Hate Crime In Indiana: Torture, Beating, Death — And The Media Barely Blinks**. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2007/06/15/homophobic-hate-crime-in-n_52320.html.
- Smelser, N. (1963). *Theory of Collective Behavior*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Snipes, R. and Ingram, R. (2007). Motivators of Collegiate Sports Attendance: A Comparison Across Demographic Groups. *Innovative Marketing*. 3.2, 65-74.
- Snyder, D., and Kelly, W. (1997). Conflict Intensity, Media Sensitivity and the Validity of Newspaper Data. *American Sociological Review*, 42, 105-123.
- Social Movement. (2008). Retrieved November 03, 2008, from Encyclopedia Britannica Online: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/551335/social-movement>

- Spence, J., and Helmreich, R. (1978). *Masculinity and Femininity: Their Psychological Dimensions, Correlates and Antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Spence, J., and Sawin, L. (1985). Images of Masculinity and Femininity: A Reconceptualization. Pp.35-66 in O'Leary, V. et al. (Eds.) *Women, Gender and Social Psychology*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Earlbaum Press.
- Spilerman, S. (1976). Structural Characteristics of Cities and the Severity of Racial Disorders. *American Sociological Review*, 41, 771-793.
- Stockdill, B. (1996). *Multiple Oppressions and Their Influences on Collective Action: The Case of the AIDS Movement*. Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Sociology, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.
- Straussner, S., and Phillips, N. (2003). *Understanding Mass Violence: A Social Work Perspective*. Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Straussner, S., and Phillips, N. (Eds), (2003). *Understanding Mass Violence: A Social Work Perspective*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Stretesky, P., and Pogrebin, M. (2007, February). *Gang-related gun violence: socialization, identity, and self*. **Journal of Contemporary Ethnography**. 36.1: p85(30).
- Stychin, C. (1998, Summer). Celebration and Consolidation: National Rituals and the Legal Construction of American Identities. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 18(2), 265-291.
- Suddath, C. (2008, November 8). *Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade*. Retrieved December 3, 2008, from Time.com: www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1862565,00.html
- Sutherland, E. and Cressey, D. (1924). *Criminology*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lipencott.
- Tager, J. (2000). *Boston Riots: Three Centuries of Social Violence*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Terman, L., and Miles, C. (1986). *Sex and Personality*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thompson, E., Jr. (1991). "The Maleness of Violence in Dating Relationships: An Appraisal of Stereotypes". *Sex Roles* 24, 5-6, 261-278.
- Thornberry, T. (ed). (1997). *Developmental Theories on Crime and Delinquency*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Tilly, C., S. Farrow, and D. McAdam (eds). (2003). *The Politics of Collective Violence*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Tuite, P. (2000, Winter). The Biomechanics of Aggression. *TDR (Cambridge, Mass.)*, 44(4), 9-27.
- Turner, J., et al. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Van Ness, G. (1996, Spring). Parades and Prejudice: The Incredible True Story of Boston's St. Patrick's Day Parade and the United States Supreme Court. *New England Law Review*, 30(3), 625-662.

Vowell, P., and May, D. (2000, Winter). Another Look at Classic Strain Theory: Poverty Status, Perceived Block Opportunity, and Gang Membership as Predictors of Adolescent Violent Behavior. *Sociological Inquiry*, 70(1), 42-61.

Waddington, D. (1992). *Contemporary Issues in Public Disorder: A Comparative Historical Approach*. New York: Routledge.

Waddington, D., and King, M. (2005, December). The Disorderly Crowd: From Classical Psychological Reductionism to Socio-Contextual Theory – The Impact on Public Order Policing Strategies. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 44(5), 490-503.

Walkowski, P., and Conolly, W. (1998). *From Trial Court to United States Supreme Court*. Beacon: Boston.

Warner, B., and Folwer, S. (2003, November/December). Strain and Violence: Testing a General Strain Theory Model of Community Violence. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31(6), 511-522.

Watson, R. (1973). Investigation into Deindividuation using a Cross-Cultural Survey Technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 25, 342-345.

Weeber, S., and Rodeheaver, D. (2004). *Militias in the New Millennium*. Lanham: University Press of America.

Weinstein, M., M. Smith, and D. Wiesenhal. (1995). "Masculinity and hockey violence." *Sex Roles* 33:831-847.

Widom, C. (1994). Childhood victimization and risk for adolescent problem behaviors. In: Ketterlinus, R. and Lamb, M. (Eds.) *Adolescent Problem Behaviors: Issues and Research*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 127-164.

Wilson, M., and Daly, M. (1985). "Competitiveness, risk taking, and violence: the young male syndrome." *Ethology and Sociobiology* 6:59-73.

Wright, B., A. Caspi, T. Moffitt, and R. Paternoster. (2004). Does the Perceived Risk of Punishment Deter Criminally Prone Individuals?. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 42(2), 180-213.

Yackle, L. (1993, November). Parading Ourselves: Freedom of Speech at the Feast of St. Patrick. *Boston University Law Review*, 73(5), 791-871.

Zimbardo, P. (1970). The Human Choice: Individuation, Reason, and Order Versus Deindividuation, Impulse, and Chaos. In W.J. Arnold and D. Levine (Eds.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: 1969* (Vol. 17, pp. 237-307). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Zimbardo, P. (1971). The power and pathology of imprisonment. *Congressional Record*. (Serial No. 15, 1971-10-25). Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3, of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Ninety-Second Congress, *First Session on Corrections, Part II, Prisons, Prison Reform and Prisoner's Rights: California*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Zimbardo, P. (2007) Understanding How Good People Turn Evil. Interview transcript.
"Democracy Now!", March 30, 2007. Accessed March 31, 2007.

APPENDICES

Variable Definitions: 162

Frequency of Individual Parade Type: 163

Type of Offensive Behavior and Parade by Category: 164

Sample Interview Scripts: 165

Transcripts: 167

Variable Definitions

Perpetrator ID: Number given to identify individual perpetrator.

Offense ID: Number given to identify individual offense.

Parade ID: Number given to identify individual parade.

Parade Type: The name of parade as listed in the newspapers (e.g., St. Patrick's Day, Mardi Gras, etc.).

Date of Parade: Date the parade was held.

Size of Parade: Size of parade as reported by the newspapers.

Regional Location: If the city/town of the parade was given, I categorized it according to U.S. regions – West, South, Midwest, Northeast.

City: City or town where the parade was held.

State: State where the parade was held.

Sex: Sex of the assailant.

Age: Age of the assailant.

Offense/Charge: The charge the police brought on the assailant upon arrest.

Behaviors/Action: The behavior that brought about the charge or arrest (e.g., vandalizing car, physical fight, drinking in public).

Gang Related: Evidence that the incident may have been gang related as reported by the newspapers.

Residency of Assailant: City, Town or State where the assailant lived.

of Citations: The number of citations or tickets given by the police during the parade.

of Arrests: The number of arrests conducted by the police during the parade.

of Police: The number of police present at the parade.

Intergroup vs. Intragroup: Evidence that the incident was between parade-goers, versus between parade-goers and bystanders.

Alcohol Present: Evidence that alcohol was present along parade route.

Alcohol Ban: Reports by newspapers whether or not there was an alcohol ban during the parade.

Frequency of Individual Parade Type

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	St. Patrick's Day	9	18.0
	Caribbean American Carnival Parade	7	14.0
	Mardi Gras	5	10.0
	Fourth of July	3	6.0
	Christmas	3	6.0
	Patriot's Victory Parade	2	4.0
	Lilac	2	4.0
	Days of '47	2	4.0
	Cinco De Mayo	2	4.0
	Columbus Day Parade	1	2.0
	Memorial Day Parade	1	2.0
	Sox Victory Parade	1	2.0
	Giants Victory Parade	1	2.0
	Lakers Victory Parade	1	2.0
	Homecoming	1	2.0
	Rose	1	2.0
	Puerto Rica Day Parade	1	2.0
	Wilkens Basket Ball Victory	1	2.0
	Music Festival	1	2.0
	West Indian Day	1	2.0
	Summer Sunset Festival	1	2.0
	Beaches	1	2.0
	Riviera	1	2.0
	King's Birthday	1	2.0
	Total	50	100.0

Type of Offensive Behavior and Parade by Category

			Parade by Category				Total
			Ethnic Pride	Sports Victory	Patriotic Celebrations	Festivals	
Type of Offensive Behavior	Throw Bottle/Can	Count	13	9	34	22	78
		% within Type of Offensive Behavior	16.7%	11.5%	43.6%	28.2%	100.0%
Stabbing		Count	0	1	2	3	6
		% within Type of Offensive Behavior	.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	100.0%
Throw Eggs		Count	0	0	4	0	4
		% within Type of Offensive Behavior	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Threats with Gun		Count	0	0	1	5	6
		% within Type of Offensive Behavior	.0%	.0%	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
Resist Arrest		Count	3	0	2	0	5
		% within Type of Offensive Behavior	60.0%	.0%	40.0%	.0%	100.0%
Shoot with Gun		Count	0	0	0	3	3
		% within Type of Offensive Behavior	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Physical Altercation (fistfight, punch, push, shove, etc.)		Count	9	10	2	16	37
		% within Type of Offensive Behavior	24.3%	27.0%	5.4%	43.2%	100.0%
Murder with Gun		Count	0	1	0	0	1
		% within Type of Offensive Behavior	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Confrontation with Police		Count	4	10	1	5	20
		% within Type of Offensive Behavior	20.0%	50.0%	5.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Vandalizing Car		Count	0	25	0	2	27
		% within Type of Offensive Behavior	.0%	92.6%	.0%	7.4%	100.0%
Verbal Assault		Count	6	0	0	1	7
		% within Type of Offensive Behavior	85.7%	.0%	.0%	14.3%	100.0%
Sexual Assault (groping, rape, etc.)		Count	0	2	0	0	2
		% within Type of Offensive Behavior	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	35	58	46	57	196
		% within Type of Offensive Behavior	17.9%	29.6%	23.5%	29.1%	100.0%

Sample Script for Interactive Interview

I will now ask you a series of questions. First, I will ask questions about your background. But, remember that your identity will not be disclosed. Then, I will ask you questions regarding the incident. Please feel free to elaborate on any of the questions.

- How old are you?
- What is the highest level of education that you had completed?
- What is your occupation?
- Where do you live?
- What is your ethnicity?

Now we will move on to talk about the parade and the incident.

General Questions:

- What type of parade was this?
- Where was the parade held? (town, state, etc.)
- When was the parade held? (date, time of day, etc.)
- Can you tell me about the incident that occurred?
- What do you think caused it?
- Were you involved? How and why were you involved?
- Were there any weapons involved? What sorts?
- Were the police involved?
- About how many policemen were there?
- What did the police do?
- Did they help the situation?
- Was anyone arrested?
- About how many were arrested?
- Why do you think they were arrested?
- Was anyone injured?
- About how many were injured?
- How do you think we may prevent something similar from happening in the future?
- Is there anything the officials could have done differently?
- If you could turn back time, what would you do differently if anything?

Targeted Questions:

Machismo

Did you feel disrespected? Did you feel a need to protect your honor or your dignity? Did you feel you had to show that you're a man?

Imitation

What if your friends weren't around? What would you have done?

If the people around hadn't been vandalizing/acting rowdy, what would you have done?

Feelings of Anonymity/Reduced Accountability

What did you think would happen when you hit/shove/punched him? Did you think anything would happen? Did you think you would not get caught? Did you think at all about what the consequences would be, if any? Was there a large crowd? If there were a smaller crowd, would you have done the same? Did you feel as though nobody could single out from the other people in the crowd?

Remissive Space

If you were at a Christmas Day parade instead of _____, do you think this might have occurred just the same?

Suggestibility

At what point did you pick up the bottle/rock (did you start to hit the car, etc)? Did you see someone do it first? Were other people doing it first, or were you the first to do it?

Emotional Contagion

What if your team hadn't won/lost? What might have happened? Would you have committed the vandalism/offense, or gotten caught up in the aftermath excitement?

Convergence of Attitudes

Do you know if the other people, who were doing the same things (vandalizing, etc), were rooting for the same team as yours? Or, were they fans of the opposing team?

Deindividuation leads to good or bad behaviors depending on context of situation

How were you feeling at the time (anger, frustration, excitement, etc.)? How did you feel when your team win/lost? Did you ever feel more like one of the crowd than like a separate individual?

Wesley

T: What is your name?

W: My name is Wesley.

T: Wesley, how old are you?

W: I'm 23 years old.

T: What is the highest level of education you've completed?

W: I've finished the 10th grade, but I have my GED.

T: What kind of work do you do?

W: Um, well, right now I'm in between jobs. But my last job, I was working with a temp service just cutting lawn doing lawn work, raking leaves. Things of that nature.

T: Which city do you currently live in?

W: New Orleans.

T: What is your ethnic background?

W: African American with some Jamaican.

T: In regards to the incident at the Mardi Gras in 2009 in New Orleans, you were arrested for assault and battery. Can you tell me about that incident?

W: I mean, what it was, it was pretty much like any other incident where two drunk people get into it. You know I wasn't about to have the guy talk to me like the way that guy was talking to me. He was saying some things I didn't really agree with. You know, and I was also a little intoxicated, and he was also a little intoxicated, and my friends egged me on a little bit, so that's pretty much how it went, you know. We just say a few words and we had a few blows and that was it.

T: Do you remember what he'd said to you?

W: It was a white guy, so it was... I don't remember the exact words, but it was definitely some prejudice stuff, some racial stuff that I really didn't like.

T: Do you remember who started the first punch or the first push?

W: Oh, it was me. I always start the first punch. Always.

T: But you don't remember what angered you to the point of throwing the punch?

W: Like I'd said, I don't remember the exact words. I don't remember the exact words, but I do know that it was something racial that I did not agree with. So, I let him know where I was coming from, so I told him, 'Look, I don't appreciate you saying those things'. And, he let me know where he was coming from and it was pretty much like, "I don't care what you're talking about". And, I pretty much just blew up after that. All my friends saying, 'You gonna let him talk to you like that?! You gonna let him talk to you like that?!' And so naturally, I wasn't (chuckle).

T: So what happened when the police came?

W: Of course, they put both of us in handcuffs. They asked him what was going on. He totally told them and made it like it was my fault; like I just started everything; like I was the one who went out to him and said, 'Hey dude, say these racial things to me.' I told my side of the story. He told his side of the story. Ugh, did he get taken to jail? No. And, I think we both know why. But, I got taken to jail. I was charged with disorderly conduct, um, battery, and public intoxication.

T: So looking back on it, was there anything that you could have done differently, or was there anything that could have prevented the incident?

W: Well, you know, like they always tell us when we're kids, 'Just walk away'. You know, it wasn't anything. Like, I didn't feel threatened at all. It was just some words that I didn't want to hear, but I was also a little bit intoxicated. I had my girl around, and, you know, the crowd. So, I didn't want to seem like a little punk, you know?

T: So would you have walked away, maybe if you weren't drinking?

W: Probably so, I would have just like, 'whatever, dude. I mean I don't feel what you're saying to me right now'. But, I was just a little intoxicated. Just added a little fuel to the fire.

T: Is there anything else you'd like to tell me?

W: I mean, I don't drink anymore. I don't drink anymore because that wasn't the first time something like that happened with me being intoxicated.

T: So was this incident the reason why you stopped drinking or did other things that came after that made you stop drinking?

W: It was things that came after. In retrospect thinking, every time I start drinking a little too much, some things like this happens. It's easier for me to get into trouble when I'm drinking than when I'm not. It's like I don't know my limits, you know. And, I've been sober for about 6 months now. So that's a work in progress, and there hasn't been any type of altercations, so I'm doing pretty good now.

T: Well, thank you for your time. I appreciate the interview.

Robert

T: What is your name?

R: Robert.

T: Robert, how old are you?

R: 26

T: What is the highest level of education that you've completed?

R: High school.

T: What is your occupation?

R: I'm a construction worker.

T: Where do you live?

R: I live in Roxbury.

T: What is your ethnicity?

R: African American. Black.

T: In regards to the St. Patrick's Day Parade in 2007 in Boston, you were arrested for disorderly conduct and assault and battery. Could you tell me about that incident?

R: One of the hardest things about living in the Boston area is that I feel there is a lot of racial tension in this area because... You know, during that time... I'm a black male, so I continue to be positive. You know, I'm going to have my boys, black boys and boys of different ethnicity, different races. After the pub, we went out to the parade. And, at the parade, we had fun. We had been drinking too much. You know, I had been drinking too. I feel like maybe... you know, we had an altercation that was so silly, that I don't even know why we were fighting.

But, long story short, when he approached me during the parade, it was more like he was arguing with me during the parade. It was more like he was arguing with me because I'm with a group of my friends. They're partying; I'm partying. We're at the parade. We're having fun. No one said any shit. He walked over. He started trouble saying, 'You Niger this, you Niger that'. I'm like, OK. My friends were petty upset. I'm upset at the situation. You know, one thing leads to another. He starts gettin' in my face. And, I'm like, 'Chill out. You know, we're having fun; we're having a good time. It's the St. Patty's parade. You know, we're celebrating the Irish. Let's just have fun.'

You know, he starts to get in my face. One thing led to another. We start to shuffle. You know, scuffling around. And I, of course, I had to defend myself, so I defend myself accordingly. I mean, the cops came, but by this time, he had his friends starting to come over. My friends were starting to come over. And, you know, we were scuffling. It's what we do. But, long story short, I felt like there was a situation where my side, it didn't hold much weight next to his side. And, and, you know, I don't even know, and I was pretty upset at the situation because like I'd said, I was arrested, and he wasn't arrested. I don't get it. I don't get it. Why would they take his side. I don't get it.

T: So what did the police say when they came?

R: The police said, 'You know, you guys shouldn't be fighting'. Ok, cool. Maybe he took his side more because he was calmer. He was pretty rowdy to me when the police came, but I guess he knew how to talk to him. I'm still pretty upset, so maybe they took his side more because I'm still yelling. I'm still screaming. They came and said, 'Listen, you guys cool it out'. You know, people are drinking. People are having a good time. It's a parade. It's a party. You can have a good time, but you know. What am I supposed to say? The guy was up in my face. I was just defending myself. And, yes. Of course, I'm going to be upset because the guy came up to me. So, the police, you know, I don't know. They were doing their job. They were trying to stop the fight and, you know, maybe it was me that got rowdy a bit, but I was intoxicated, you know. It is what it is.

T: So do you remember exactly lead to the incident. You said that you couldn't remember, and that one thing led to another, but do you remember exactly what instigated it, or what they'd said to you exactly that had made you angry?

R: I think it was more we're having a good time. I was with my buddies, and the guy comes up to me and he's yelling in my face. Um, and you know, I think it was more of the issue that he'd called me a Niger to my face.

T: May I ask you why you were at the St. Patrick's Day Parade because, typically, you don't see a whole lot of African American people?

R: The thing is I'm from this area, so I don't have any problems hanging out with people of other races. You know, I'm hanging out with my buddies. I've been called a Niger before. You know, I'm an African American male. It happens. Um, but I think he took that extra step. You know, he walked over to me. He talked to me to my face. He had the arrogance, disrespecting me, calling me a Niger to my face. Ok, cool. Now, you're stepping boundaries. You're in my personal space. This is crossing my boundaries and I don't know what to do.

T: So looking back on it, would anything have prevented the incident or would you have done anything differently?

R: Uh, you know, maybe I should have walked away from the situation, but maybe my pride got in the way. And, you know, when someone steps to your face and, you know, we're all drinking. I'm not in the best of mind because, you know, I'm drinking too. I think I could have handled it

by not forcing the situation, or by not addressing the anger or aggression towards me. That, I think, would have been the best approach.

T: So is there anything you'd like to add?

R: Uh, I think it's a frustrating situation. It's a frustrating situation. It's unfortunate.

T: Well, thank you for your time. I appreciate the interview.

Gilbert

T: What is your name?

G: My name is Gilbert.

T: How old are you, Gilbert?

G: 23

T: What is the highest level of education that you've completed?

G: High school.

T: What is your occupation?

G: I work in a fast food restaurant.

T: Where do you currently live? Just the town is fine.

G: Atlanta

T: What is your ethnicity?

G: I'm half Asian, half Caucasian.

T: In regards to the 2008 St. Patrick's Day parade in Atlanta, you were arrested for assault and battery. Could you tell me about the incident?

G: There were these jerks in the crowd. They were, like, drunk. They were standing in front of me and my friends, who are trying to watch the parade. So, we asked them, you know, can you move over a little bit so we can watch the parade like everyone else? They said 'no', so we asked them again. We tried to ask them nicely. Still, they were obnoxious and rude and everything. Finally, one of us, pushed them a little bit, you know, but not too hard. Then, he went crazy, you know, and started attacking me. So we had to fight him back, you know. Then, the cops came in and all those things, you know. It was a little ridiculous.

T: What did the cops do when they arrived?

G: When they arrived? They grabbed all of us. They treated us like criminals, you know. It wasn't our fault. It was those jerks fault, but they weren't taking any excuses. They were thinking everyone is guilty. They were thinking we were all drunk. Well, we were all drinking, but those guys were drunk. Me and my friends had been drinking, but those guys were drunk. There's a difference.

T: So do you know about how many people were arrested?

G: Me and my friends, there were four of us. Then, there were like five of them. So, all together, it was nine.

T: Did anybody get hurt?

G: A little bit of bruises here and there, but nothing, nothing major.

T: So looking back on it, is there anything that you would have done different, or was there anything that would have prevented the event?

G: Uh, I guess, uh, you never know what you're going to get into. We weren't looking for anything like that. We were just trying to find the right spot. In a situation like that, you always have to find the right spot. You just hope that the people around you aren't jerks, you know. Unfortunately, on that day, the people next to us were jerks. It's really hard to have control of a situation like that.

T: Do you think that had there not been alcohol, you would have reacted differently?

G: I don't know about those guys, but had they been more sober, maybe they would have been more polite and more reasonable. I don't know those guys, personally, how they are when they're not drunk.

T: Well, I had meant you. Had you not been drinking, do you think you would have reacted differently?

G: Maybe my friend, the one who actually pushed that guy, you know. Maybe if he hadn't been drinking, he wouldn't have pushed the guy. We were all sober, you know. Like I'd said, we weren't really drunk. We just had a few drinks. Either way, we wanted to watch the parade and these jerks; well, whatever, we still would have had the same situation.

T: Is there anything else you'd like to add?

G: Nah, that is basically it. They were just being rude. Inconsiderate.

T: Thank you for your time and for the interview.

Matt

T: What is your name?

M: My name is Matt.

T: How old are you, Matt?

M: I'm 24 years old.

T: What is the highest level of education that you've completed.

M: I'm a college graduate.

T: What kind of work do you do?

M: I'm a musician, but for my day job, I just work at a coffee shop making ends meet right now, but playing in a band.

T: What is your ethnicity?

M: I'm a Caucasian male.

T: In regards to the Mardi Gras parade in New Orleans in 2009, I understand that you were arrested for disorderly conduct and also for drinking in public. Can you tell me about that incident?

M: Well, you know, it was all a little silly, but it was Mardi Gras and people, you know, just kinda let themselves loose. I was with my buddies. We were just walking around drinking, feeling pretty carefree. And, uh, I didn't really know what came over me, but these three dudes started yelling at us, and we got going back and forth just saying pretty pointless stuff. I guess they didn't like where we were coming from and one thing led to another. We were just throwing stuff. All of a sudden, the officers got involved. And, since I was the last seen throwing something, they took me in and booked me.

T: So, this group of people that you were arguing with, you didn't know them, I assume?

M: No. To be perfectly honest, I barely remember them at all. From what my friends were telling me, I got pretty wired up. At that time, it was pretty late at night.

T: You were arrested for throwing bottles. Do you remember exactly what had led you to do that?

M: I mean, I just got caught up in the heat of the moment. I thought I had something to prove in front of all my friends. I didn't want to be made to look like some freaking; you know I just wanted to look good in front of my friends.

T: Well, how did the police handle the situation when they arrived?

M: They handled it like the cops. They stopped me. They held me down, you know. They picked me up to the side and talked to me until I'd calmed down.

T: You were arrested. Was anybody else arrested?

M: No.

T: Anyone got hurt?

M: Not that I know. I assumed I would have gotten charged with more than disorderly conduct if anyone had been seriously injured.

T: Looking back on it, would you have done anything differently, or would anything have prevented what had happened?

M: Yea, I mean, certainly just staying in more control of myself. I guess just partying, but knowing my limits would have prevented it. And in the future, just not letting my emotions get the best of me.

T: Is there anything else you'd like to add?

M: Uh, no. I mean, I think the less I say on the subject, the better.

T: Ok.

A.J.

T: What is your name?

A: My name is A.J.

T: A.J., how old are you?

A: I'm 25 years old.

T: What is the highest level of education that you've completed?

A: High school.

T: What kind of work do you do?

A: I managed a pizza place.

T: Where do you currently live?

A: I live in Seattle.

T: What is your ethnic background?

A: White.

T: In regards to the Seafair Torchlight parade in 2007, you were arrested for disorderly conducted; cited for throwing bottles. Tell me a bit about that incident?

A: Well, you know, it was the heat of the moment. I guess you can call it. Got a little exited. Was a little drunk. You know, got caught up in the moment and started acting reckless. You know, who wouldn't (chuckle).

T: What were you doing exactly?

A: Eh, I guess I got a little too excited and drunk and just started throwing bottles around and I guess I hit someone and caused some damage. So, I did get arrested for that and you know, basically, had to go to trial and got found guilty and got on probation. That was pretty much it, you know.

T: So were there a lot of police there?

A: Oh yea, the place was like a mob scene. Cops were everywhere.

T: And you said you were drinking at the time?

A: Oh yea, I was wrecked. I was drinking too much, if I may say so myself. (Chuckle)

T: So, did you think that was a factor in your participation?

A: Oh yea, absolutely. You know, when you drink, you don't really think and I wasn't thinking.

T: So had you been sober, do you think this would have happened?

A: Oh absolutely not. You know, if I was sober, I think I would have hold myself, contained myself. (chuckle)

T: Now, were other people there doing the same thing?

A: Oh, absolutely. Yea, it wasn't just me doing it. There were people acting recklessly all over the place. People throwing bottles. People knocking trash cans over. You know, it was a parade.

T: So if you could turn back time, is there anything you would have done differently?

A: I wouldn't have drunk. (Chuckle)

T: Anything else you'd like to tell me about the evening or about the incident?

A: I wish it never happened. (Laugh). My life would have been different. You know, those six months of probation I was doing. (Chuckle)

T: Ok, well, I appreciate your time and your interview.

T: AJ, last we spoke, you'd mentioned a lot about getting caught up in the crowd from the excitement, so I wanted to follow-up on those questions. So, were you there by yourself or did you have a few friends with you?

A: I was with, you know, a little group of people.

T: Were they also involved with the vandalism?

A: No, they weren't like vandalizing, but you know, they were part of the ruckus.

T: At what point did you start throwing the bottles?

A: Um, you know, once everyone, you know, just got out of hand. I mean, you know, things got a little crazy. I just kinda, you know, started doing it. It's kinda hard to say, you know, like what got me to do it. I just did it.

T: I guess my question is did you see someone do it, or were you the instigator? Did other people see you do it and then they started?

A: I can't really say if it was me or someone else. It just kinda happened, you know, all together. I got a little rowdy. The crowd got a little rowdy. He did this; I did that, you know. And, it just escalated from there (Chuckle).

T: So did you feel that because you were part of the crowd that you weren't going to get caught?

A: Yea, you know, it's like, you know, it wasn't just one person. If everyone else was doing it, you might as well just jump in. (Chuckle)

T: What did you think about the consequences? Or, were you thinking about the consequences as this was happening?

A: To be honest with you, I wasn't even thinking about it. You know, that was the last thing on my mind (laugh).

T: So had the crowd not been so rowdy, so excited, do you think that you still would have gotten involved?

A: Probably. (inaudible)

T: Suppose that it was a Christmas parade. Do you think that it would still have happened?

A: Probably not.

T: Why not?

A: Well, you know, with the alcohol, a little ruckus with the music and everything, it's like those things get you going. Does that make sense?

T: It does. Did you feel as if you were lost in the crowd and that you were no longer an individual as all this was happening?

A: I guess you can say that because once you get a couple of drinks in there, a little adrenaline rush going. You and the crowd kinda become one, if that makes sense. You kinda lose it, kinda go with it. Does that make sense? It's kinda hard to remember. You know, saying I did this, I did that. It's kinda like a group effort. If that makes any sense. (Chuckle)

T: Well, that's exactly what you'd said last time, that you felt swept up by the crowd, and that you were part of it. Alright, thanks so much again.

Harlan

T: What is your name?

H: My name is Harlan.

T: How old are you, Harlan?

H: I'm 27 years old.

T: What is the highest level of education that you've completed?

H: I've got a BA.

T: What kind of work do you do now?

H: Now I'm working as a consultant in a museum.

T: Where do you currently live? Which city?

H: Currently, I live in Sand Diego.

T: What is your ethnicity?

H: I'm African American

T: In regards to the Carijama Festival in Oakland, in 2004, I understand that you were arrested for fighting and you were charged with assault and battery, and also for disorderly conduct. Can you tell me about that incident?

H: It was just one of those things. I was walking around with friends. I guess it might have been hot that day. This guy, he bumped into me. There was something about his attitude about it. He didn't, I don't know, he didn't say excuse me or anything like that. I brought it up with him and he gave me an attitude about it. I mean, I don't remember what was going through my mind at that time, but uh, yea, something set me off about him.

T: Who threw the first punch? Do you remember?

H: You know, I want to say that he did, but I remember that I just got hit once. I remember when that happened. (Chuckle) But, uh, I want to say that he punched first. No, he dived at me. He dived at me, I'd say. So, I guess that did it.

T: How did the police become involved? Do you remember that part?

H: Well, any festival like that, there are a lot of security around. I don't really remember. It happened real fast. Like, one minute, they weren't there, and the next they were there. It was a

fight. There was a bit of a crowd that came around. So there were some people there that were being encouraging. And, there were some people there, you know, egging us on. You know, it was kinda a rush. And, uh, it got some attention.

T: Had you been drinking at the time?

H: I had. Yea.

T: Would you say that you were intoxicated or drunk, or would you say that you just had a few and it didn't event affect you?

H: I was pretty tipsy. Pretty tipsy, but I don't know if that necessarily had anything to do with it though, but yea, I was drinking.

T: If you had to do it over again, would you have done anything differently, or would anything have prevented the situation?

H: You know, I mean, I was a bit younger then. And, I had a tendency to lose my cool a lot faster. It was really nothing, what had happened, but it just escalated into this whole thing because there were these two young guys who were trying to one up each other a bit. I mean, if I had to do it all over again, I'd say I wouldn't. I wouldn't do it, but, yea, I would have just walked away instead of trying to get respect out of it or something.

T: Is there anything else you'd like to add or tell me?

H: Not really. I mean, I'd paid my dues.

T: Well, I appreciate your time and the interview.

Paul

T: What is your name?

P: My name is Paul.

T: Paul, how old are you?

P: I'm 33 years old.

T: What is the highest level of education you've complete?

P: High school. High school education plus four years of college.

T: What do you do for a living?

P: I'm a draftsman.

T: I'm sorry. What is that?

P: A draftsman; architecture.

T: Where are you currently living?

P: I'm living in greater New York City. I used to live in San Diego.

T: What is your ethnic background?

P: I'm Irish and English.

T: In regards to the Cinco De Mayo parade in 2005, I see here that you were arrested for resisting arrest and for assault and battery. You had mentioned that you were involved in a fist fight. Could you tell me about that?

P: Yes, sir. I've put it into my memory. Something that I will never forget. Hostile situations are engraved in my mind. Um, I lost all track of what I was focusing on with my friends. I was standing there watching the parade, enjoying it. All of a sudden, these other guys next to us said, 'Hey, you don't belong here. This is not your element.' or something like that. And, uh they said, 'Move on', and we refused to. And, um, one shoved my friend next to me, who was much smaller. I stepped over. I honestly, I stepped over and I shoved him, and he looked very threatening. Two of them started jumping on me. And I just, by instinct, I just had to keep on punching away. I didn't want to, but I had to **protect my smaller friend**. And I was kinda **worried** about my other buddies too. I kinda lost them in the crowd. You know?

T: And then what happened after that?

P: The police resolved the whole situation. They arrested me and at least one of those guys that were next to us. They arrested me. They took us to jail, or to the station rather and questioned us. They say were... I was charged with assault and battery, and I'm not sure if they charged him, the man next to me, with assault and battery. He instigated it, sir.

T: Had you been drinking at the time?

P: Yes, uh, me and my buddies, we were at a bar earlier. And, we bought a six pack of beer. We had it in our backpack, so we were drinking just a little bit. No hard liquor. Just beer.

T: What about the other guy who instigated it. Did you get the sense that he was also intoxicated or was he sober?

P: You know, they were rough looking characters. I think that he might not have just been drinking. They might have been smoking pot or something. Something about his eyes. He was really... just a psychotic look in his eyes, I have to say.

T: Well, looking back on it, what would you have done differently, or what would have prevented the incident?

P: You know, I was still in my cocky, punky type era, when I was out with the boys, getting into a little trouble. Today, at age 33, sir, I would, uh, I would just walk away, and say, 'We don't want any trouble, gentlemen. We didn't do anything to you, so please stop shoving. I don't want to get into any trouble, sir.' You know, something like that.

T: Is there anything else you'd like to add?

P: Um, not in particular. It's best to flee sometimes, but when you're younger, you think differently, sir.

T: Actually, let me ask you this question. How so, when you're younger? Why would your viewpoint be different?

P: I guess I was, um, sorta like before, a lot of us, especially the males, we're like still in our rebel generation, in your twenties. And, it was new to us. We had to live and learn, to stay out of hostile situations, to be... You tend to want to walk on the wild side when you're younger, at least by my aspect. But, I've outgrown that. I think I have outgrown that, sir.

T: OK, well, thank you so much. I appreciate your doing the interview.

Vincent

T: What is your name?

V: My name is Vincent.

T: Vincent, how old are you?

V: I'm 23 years old.

T: What is the highest level of education you've had.

V: Well, my highest level of education? I mean, I finished high school.

T: What do you do for a living?

V: I mean, right now, I'm in between jobs, so I'm kinda doing busboy. By the same token, I'm also really into my music. You know, I wouldn't really consider that a career, but it's another thing I'm doing.

T: Where do you live currently? Which city?

V: Right now, I live in Dallas.

T: What is your ethnic background?

V: I'm Mexican and Caucasian.

T: In regards to the 2008 Mardi Gras parade in New Orleans, you were arrested for disorderly conduct, and you were throwing bottles into the crowd. Could you tell me about that incident and why it came about?

V: (Chuckle) Well, listen, man. When it came down to it, it wasn't a matter of me going out of my way, causing trouble. I had a lot of alcohol. I got mixed up with the crowd. You know, I don't know man. It just the way it worked out. I was going with the flow, you know. And, they didn't appreciate it.

T: Were other people throwing bottles?

V: Oh, everybody was throwing everything, man. I was not the only one doing it. There were a ton of people involved. I mean, I'm sure you've seen it.

T: Why do you think they were doing that?

V: Well, I mean, it all started out with a little bit of a tussle between the two guys; they got into a fight. You know, they were talking. They got a little heated, and then, you know, everybody else

was just having a good time too. And then they started throwing things. Honestly, it was just one thing escalating to another. I don't know. It's still a little bit of a blur. I was highly intoxicated.

T: How did the police become involved?

V: (Chuckle) Well, to be honest. I had a little to do with that. When I was going through the whole spiel and everything, had my staggering going on, I kinda bumped into one of the gentlemen that was out there. One of the police officers, Officer Ramos. I actually know him personally, but we're not gonna talk about that. Yea, but he just got real involved in what I was doing and in what everyone else was doing and he called some backup, and everything else got escalated. And so, that's just what it is.

T: Was there anybody else in your group that got arrested?

V: Well, the girl I was seeing at the time. I had just met her prior to that, about a week. She got arrested with me. She was trying to help me out because there was a gentleman; he got upset when I threw my bottle. He wanted to get involved and get into a tussle with me, and she didn't quite appreciate that, so she wanted to help out. So, yea, she got arrested too. And, I believe my friend John too, but I didn't get to see much of him.

T: So looking back on it, was there anything that you could have done differently, or anything that could have prevented the arrests or the incident?

V: Well, I mean, to be honest, I was 20. I was having a good time. You know, things did get out of hand, but by the same token, shits happen, you know? We were just having a good time, going through the motion in life, so I don't know if I really even would change anything. But, in a perfect world, if I could change what went down, I probably wouldn't have had as much alcohol and probably would have left earlier that day with her, and that would probably have prevented a lot, you know?

T: So you think that if you were sober at that time, you probably wouldn't have engaged in the violence?

V: Yea, I mean yea. Of course, I'm Hispanic and we're hot blooded, but still if it comes down to it, if I didn't have the alcohol, I would have had better judgment calls. Regardless, I'm still not that disappointed or too upset in the matter.

T: Anything else that you would have done differently?

V: Hm. What else would I have done differently? You know what? I probably would have been more physical in the negative route, anyway. I have already told you about my positive aspect, but in the negative sense, I probably would have went out like a champ. You know? Just going after more. Just showing them exactly what Dallas is made of.

T: What do you mean?

V: I mean, we're full of cowboys. We're full of the roughin' it, the leather necks. Good time, good old boys. So, I'm not exactly down with not showing my stuff. I feel like I kinda let myself down in that sense. I coulda done a little more.

T: So you would've reacted more manly?

V: I'm not saying I didn't act manly, man. Listen here, I didn't say I didn't act manly. I'm just saying, I would have acted more intense, more manly than I did because I was a little bit more laidback somewhat because I was having a good time. Yea, I got all worked up, but by the same token, I was 20. I didn't want to get into too much trouble. Now that I see that I didn't get locked up or anything, shit, I would have went the whole nine.

T: Anything else you'd like to add about the event?

V: Well, I mean, I kinda wish, I didn't only go with her because there were so many (chuckle) so many gorgeous women there. I'm sure you know exactly what I mean, right? (chuckle)

T: Well, thank you for your time. I appreciate your doing the interview.

Moe

T: What is your name?

M: My first name is Moe.

T: How old are you, Moe?

M: I'm 30 years old.

T: What is the highest level of education that you've completed?

M: I finished high school.

T: What is your occupation?

M: Right now, I'm a pipe-fitter at a shipping company.

T: Where do you currently live? Which city?

M: I live in Gulfport, Mississippi.

T: What is your ethnicity?

M: I'm considered a white person.

T: In regards to the 2004 Mardi Gras parade incident, you were arrested for aggravated assault, can you tell me about the incident that led up to the arrest?

M: It was a bullshit type of arrest. I was having fun. My friends, we were going to the parade, and this asshole started to get my attention. You know, started to say a few profanities, and you know, I of course was drinking beer all day. I didn't like what he was saying, so clocked him across the face with a bottle, you know.

T: What was he saying that caused you to get that angry?

M: He was talking about her ass. He was saying, you know, she was looking good and that he was gonna get her in bed and make her happy, and those kinda shits. And, I wasn't gonna have that, you know. I'm a man, and I'm going to show him that I'm a man. I busted his head. If I could kill him, I would have done that too, you know?

T: At what point did the police become involved?

M: I'm not sure. I was hitting him pretty hard. A lot of people were around him. Some of my friends were trying to pull me off. And, there was a big crowd. I would say that it was within a few minutes when the police got there. They pulled me to the ground and handcuffed me.

T: Had both of you been drinking at the time? Do you know if he was intoxicated?

M: Yea, he looked like he was intoxicated. I don't know. I can't prove it 100%, but I'm sure he had a beer in his hand.

T: Looking back on it, is there anything that you would have done differently, or that would have prevented the incident?

M: Hell no! If somebody is gonna talk about my girl. I'm gonna bust your ass. That's just the way I am.

T: Why do you feel that it's important to do so?

M: Because I'm a man and because I have to show that I'm strong.

T: So there was no other resolution? Nothing else that you could have done?

M: That's the way I am. That's what I was taught. Where I come from, that's how we deal with things.

T: Anything else you'd like to tell me about the event?

M: Well, you know, looking back on these things, you wonder if you should have some self-control. You know, there are a lot of assholes out there that say things. Sometimes, it's just uncontrollable. Maybe looking back on it, now that I'm older, I'm 30, I might have said, 'Hey let me walk away'. That kinda thing.

T: Well, thank you so much for sharing. I appreciate you doing the interview.

Leo

T: What is your name?

L: My name is Leo.

T: Leo, how old are you?

L: I'm 39.

T: What is the highest level of education you've completed?

L: Community College. I attended Spokane Community College and graduated with an associate degree.

T: What kind of work do you do?

L: I'm unemployed right now. I used to do door-to-door sales.

T: Where do you currently live?

L: I live in Jersey City.

T: What is your ethnic background?

L: I'm part Puerto Rican, part Irish.

T: In regards to the 2007 Puerto Rican Day parade, I understand that you were arrested for assault and battery and also disorderly conduct over a fight. Could you tell me more about that incident?

L: Well, I was there at the parade. I was there with my daughter. She was turning 7 that day and I wanted to show her what Puerto Rican Day was like, to her pride and everything like that. You know, for her to be very proud of her heritage. We went over there, and she was buying an ice cream from one of the vendors and this guy bumped into her and knocked her ice cream all over her. I gave the guy a look. He looked at me and he didn't say he was sorry. He didn't say he was sorry at all to my daughter. She was just sitting there, covered with ice cream. She just started crying. I couldn't even get her another ice cream, so I just said to the guy, 'Hey, listen, you just knocked over my kid's ice cream cone. You didn't even say you were sorry. Can you buy her a new one?' He just said to shut the fuck up and then he just shoved me. And, I just said, 'Please don't do that. My little girl is right here.' And he just started to call me names, and I don't know. I had a couple of beers because, you know, it was Puerto Rican Day, and there was a parade, and I was just trying to have a good time. Next thing you know, I was throwing a punch, and a fight broke out. And, all I heard was my little girl screaming to the side of me and there was all this commotion. It was a big blur and next thing I knew there were these guys hold me back and he

was a 25 year old, a wasted 25 year old kid. All he needed to say was I'm sorry, but he didn't. And, I don't know. I just let the alcohol get the best of me.

T: At which point did the police become involved?

L: Oh, well, the police probably came 15-20 minutes later. There was a uniformed officer there. I was being held back by the guy who was at the ice cream stand and by one of his friends and this cop came by. He looked at me and he looked at him. Made sure we had stopped fighting. He arrested me. I had to get the wife to come over to pick up Jess. It was a mess. It was just a huge mess, the entire thing. She didn't even get to finish the parade. She had to sit in front of the police car, which she had never done before, thankfully. I had to go down to the station. She didn't even get her ice cream, you know?

T: What would have happened had you just not responded?

L: Well, if I would have never drank, I would have been fine. 'Cause I always tell Jessica, you know, if someone makes fun of you, you just turn and walk away. But then I was drinking and if I didn't respond, we would have finished off the day. Maybe I would have had to buy her another shirt or something then, you know. I wouldn't have, I wouldn't have ended up in jail. My little girl could have seen the full parade. She didn't even get to see the Grand Marshall, who was supposed to be with some clown or something, and she didn't even get to see her. She was so excited about that; she had balloons and it kinda ruined the entire weekend. I only get to see that girl; I only get to see her every other weekend or so. Yea, if I would have had it my way, I would not have done anything. She would have been a little sticky, but she would have been a lot better.

T: Anything else you'd like to add?

L: No, I don't know. Whatever you'd like to know. I don't know. It was kinda a bad moment in my life.

T: Well, I appreciate your time and your interview.

Russ

T: What is your name?

R: I'm Russell

T: Russell, how old are you?

R: 25.

T: What is the highest level of education you've had?

R: I just graduated from UCLA

T: What is your occupation?

R: Right now, I'm part-time employed as an accountant.

T: Where are you currently living?

R: Southern California.

T: What is your ethnic background?

R: My mom is Irish. My dad is Hispanic.

T: In regards to the Lakers Championship parade, in 2010, I understand that you were arrested for disorderly conduct? Can you give me some information about the incident?

R: You know, we were just coming out of the Lakers winning over the Celtics. You know, the scene was pretty electric. I think people just started to carry it over just a little too much. People started to get a little rowdy. People started throwing bottles, rocking cars. And, even this fellow I went to the game with, he sorta got involved. And then, he sort of, I don't think he'd meant anything bad by it, but he sort of encouraged me to do the same thing. You know, I guess I got caught up in the whole event.

T: What were you doing, exactly?

R: Well, actually, my friend tossed the bottle. I found this rock. It was just sorta lying on the sidewalk. I just threw that at one of the cop cars, I guess. (Chuckle).

T: I assume that's how the police got involved?

R: Yea. I think they were macing people, just kinda breaking up the crowd. Yea, it was a pretty, it was a strange scene.

T: What happened when they actually arrested you?

R: Well, they put this plastic handcuffs; I don't know if they use the steel ones anymore because it causes too much pain, but, they used the plastic cuffs. They had me to just sit there on the sidewalk. They told me to just sit, shut the hell up, sit my ass down, and knock it off, basically. It was just myself and a couple of other guys. We were all just waiting to be placed inside one of their wagons. Yea, that's pretty much all they had to do. They tied us up and tied us down.

T: Had you been drinking at the time?

R: Oh, absolutely. We sorta did shots of tequila from this bottle that my buddy, Mark, brought into the game.

T: Do you think that the people who were involved in the crowd were intoxicated too?

R: Um, you know, I'm going to go with maybe 70% positive on that one.

T: Looking back on it, would you have done anything differently?

R: Well, you know if it wasn't, if the cameras weren't involved. I think that maybe because all the media that was there, people want to make a scene. They want to make a spectacle. They want to join in on all the hype. I'm thinking maybe if the cameras weren't there, I would have behaved in a different way. The thing is that I was just getting all caught up in the spirit and the mood of the crowd. Yea, I would have handled myself differently if there wasn't so much exposure.

T: Anything else you'd like to add?

R: No, I don't have anything else I'd like to add, other than that it was all just a blast. (laugh)

T: Well, thank you for your time. I appreciate your interviewing.

T: Last we spoke, Russ, you'd mentioned getting caught up in the crowd at the Lakers Championship parade and that's why you started to throw bottles and rocking cars and just feeling the energy of the crowd. Did you feel that you were a part of the crowd and no longer an individual at that point?

R: Well, you know when people start to get into that rowdy spirit, I have to say, yea, because you wanna feel part of the crowd, especially with cameras there, you know, especially now, everyone kind of want their 15 minutes of fame. I think with the cameras rolling, some people just can't help themselves, and yea, sort of thrown into that environment, maybe out of, I don't know. Yea, there were moments when I couldn't help getting caught up.

T: I'm a little bit confused because you also mentioned having the cameras there. Did you mean that that also created more excitement or did it have the opposite effect?

R: No, I think that having the camera there, I think it did create an element of added excitement.

T: But if there were a sense of being taped, wouldn't that prevent you from having done all of these things? If you weren't being taped, there would be a sense of anonymity.

R: Right. Well, that's a tough call. I guess if we think back to the LA riots, cameras were rolling then and people didn't care whether or not the things they were doing were caught on film or not. And, I think that there were some of that to this. Coming out of a sports arena, people were amped up and I just think that there's some element to that crowd that just can't help themselves by trying to turn over cars or by throwing bottles or by breaking windows. That sort of things. So, yea, I think having the cameras there did create an environment where, like I'd said, people want, maybe it's not 15 minutes of fame. Maybe it's 15 minutes of infamy, you know? It's like a bragging issue. It's like a bragging point for some people.

T: Did you think at all about the consequences as these things are happening?

R: No. (pause) To some, maybe, no, maybe a little bit. That whole pressure thing, and maybe there is a little of a pressure involved when you're with the crowd, when you're with your friends. You wanna look cool, and so that sort of, that part of yourself kinda get shelved somewhere, and, but for me, I'd put it out of my mind and just sort of went with the flow.

T: Well, in the earlier interview, you had mentioned that your friend started to throw a bottle and then you started throwing a rock because you saw him doing it. So did you feel as if you're friend or your friends had a lot to do with your behaviors that day?

R: Certainly. And, I think it all goes with the part of being with the crowd and wanting to fit in.

T: Had it been a different parade, say for examples, a Christmas Day parade or a Thanksgiving parade, do you think that this might have happened? Do you think that the crowd might have created the same type of energy?

R: Oh, no, there wouldn't be. On a Christmas Day parade? No. Well, you're not going to get the rocking of the cars on Christmas Day. You might get, you might get, people drinking alcohol, people getting drunk. That sort of things. Maybe at the most, you're gonna see someone throwing up on the sidewalk but you're not gonna get mass mayhem on Christmas Day. I just think it's a different kinda of party. It's a different kinda crowd, and I just don't think you would get the same kinda of response out of a Christmas parade than a Lakers Game at the Coliseum.

T: You were there for the Lakers. Suppose they hadn't won. What did you think might have happened?

R: Oh (chuckle). I think if the Lakers had lost, you might still get some type of response out of people out of anger, you know. People might want to turn over cars and smash stuff out of disgust, but I don't think it would be, the degree of mayhem wouldn't be as great as what had happened that night.

T: Thank you so much for the follow-up.

Brandon

T: What is your name?

B: My name is Brandon.

T: Brandon, how old are you?

B: I'm 23 years old.

T: What is the highest level of education you've had?

B: Some high school. Not all of high school, but some high school.

T: What is your occupation? What kind of work do you do?

B: Right now, I'm in outside sales for a company.

T: Where do you live, currently?

B: Beverly, Illinois.

T: What is your ethnic background?

B: I'm Caucasian. White.

T: In regards to the incident that happened at the St. Patrick's Day parade in 2009, in Beverly, Illinois, you were arrested for aggravated assault and drinking in public. Can you tell me about the incident?

B: Well, really what it was was really a misunderstanding if you want to get into it. I was at this St. Patrick's Day parade, like you'd said. And, of course, everybody is going to be drinking and like everybody else, I was drinking. You know, tons of people. Everybody's getting rowdy. The music is great. Everybody is celebrating; it's a drinking holiday. I kinda got wrapped up in the moment, really. You know, all of a sudden, this guy, probably around the same age as me, maybe a little older. All of a sudden, he just came up and just shoved me for no apparent reason. I'm not just going to ... (break)

T: Sorry, we got disconnected. So you were talking about the incident, how you were provoked. Can you tell me a little more about that?

B: Yea, absolutely. So, um like I'd said, I'd left off with the incident with the guy. He was basically, he was basically out of line. You know, he came out of nowhere and he shoved me. You know, I'm going to stand my own ground. I hit him. And, there were police everywhere, so basically, they kinda attacked me, you know. They wrestled me to the ground and they booked me for aggravated assault.

T: Was there a reason why that guy just came over?

B: You know, in my mind, no. Nothing had happened previously during the day with this stranger. I didn't know him. I didn't recognize him from anywhere.

T: Did he seem intoxicated?

B: Oh, yea. Clearly. Everybody was.

T: So looking back on it, what would you have done differently?

B: Um, looking back on it, I would have just blown it off as someone being drunk. In the grand scheme of things, it just wasn't worth it.

T: How did you think the police do as far as coming and intervening?

B: Well, I'm not a big fan of the police, but you know, they had to do what they had to do to protect the others and to keep things under control and in good pace. Um, I'll give them credit for that, but other than that, I don't know. I don't know. It was just me defending myself, really.

T: Is there anything else you'd like to add or to tell me about the event?

B: Yea, actually, you know, I just wanted to say that, you know, it was uncalled for. I'll admit that I did something wrong, but at the same time, I don't know. To book somebody and to arrest somebody for just basically trying to defend himself, um, you know, to me it was unnecessary on the police's part, you know? That goes on my record for forever, you know. I can't change that. I want to say that I understand it, but I think it's a little unfair.

T: Alright, well, thanks for your time. I appreciate your doing the interview.

Troy

T: What is your name?

Tr: My name is Troy.

T: Troy, how old are you?

Tr: I'm 25 years old.

T: What is the highest level of education that you've completed?

Tr: I got my high school degree.

T: What kind of work do you do?

Tr: Right now, I'm working at a chop shop; I'm working on motorcycles.

T: Where do you live?

Tr: I live in Florida. I just moved here not so long ago from New York.

T: What is your ethnicity?

Tr: My ethnicity? I'm Caucasian. You know, Italian American.

T: In regards to the 2005 incident at the Gasparilla Night Parade in Florida, I see here that you were arrested for vandalism at the parade. Can you tell me about that incident?

Tr: This again. Alright, well, this particular incident. This was about 5 years ago, but anyway. This incident, I had a lot to drink that day. Everybody did. You know, it was a celebration. We were all out there having a lot of fun. Things got a little crazy. People got a little out of control. They tried to stay away from the term riot, but, you know, there were many people. I wasn't the only one partaking in this event in particular. But everybody, you know, they were excited. Things got lit on fire. Things got crazy. What can I say? I got swept away by the crowd.

T: What did you vandalize?

Tr: Well, you know, I believe there were a couple of mailboxes that possibly got destroyed. Maybe a little bike, a couple of newspaper stands. And, I do recall that there were a couple of tires that were on fire.

T: So were you charged for these incidents?

Tr: Was I charged? Yea, I did a lot of community service for it. They gave me about 500 hours of community service, which I thought was a little extreme myself, but I'll take it over any jail time any day.

T: So how did the police become involved? Can you tell me about that?

Tr: Well the police became involved because, like I'd said, I wasn't the only one partaking in this event. There were multiple people and somebody just called the cops. They came down, all suited up in their vests and everything.

T: So the event wasn't supervised by the police?

Tr: There was a police presence there, but in the area where I was, there wasn't much of a presence.

T: Looking back on it, would you have done anything differently?

Tr: Looking back on it? Yea, I never would have vandalized anything, you know. Possibly, I wouldn't have had as much to drink. Not going to say that I wasn't going to have anything to drink because it was as celebration, you know. It was just, I was younger. Kids do these things. You gotta learn from them.

T: Is there anything else you'd like to add?

Tr: Not really. I mean, I learned my lesson and I guess it's a good key point to tell my kids that story one day so that they won't make the same mistake that I had made.

T: Well, thank you so much for your time and I appreciate your interviewing.

T: So, last time we talked a lot about being swept away by the crowd and by the emotions, and that was what caused you to do the vandalism. So, I wanted to follow-up with that and ask what if the crowd wasn't there? What if it were you as an individual or with just a few people, would you have done the same thing?

Tr: Well, if the crowd wasn't there, that's a completely different story. I mean, yes, I had been drinking. I was intoxicated, but still, the enticement of the crowd. You know, there's multiple people, you know. Everybody's doing it, and when everyone's doing something, you know, it seems like it's the right thing to do, or it's OK to do. Now, I know that that is not the case, but had there not been a big crowd, and had there not been a lot of people, you know, vandalizing, breaking stuff, and what not, and just going crazy, no, I would not have gone crazy too. You know that's not my, I don't do that stuff normally, you know?

T: So because the crowd was there, did you feel as though no one could single you out from the crowd?

Tr: You know, I was 20 years old. I was still a kid, you know, so peer pressure was still a big thing. You know, I never really had a complete sense of self at the time. I was in a transitional phase in my life at the time, so I didn't really know who I was. You know, the whole crowd influence was a huge factor there.

T: But did you feel that because the crowd was there, that the police wouldn't have been able to single you out?

Tr: Oh yea, that crossed my mind for sure. There were tons of people doing it. I mean, how could they single out this one person, you know? The way I saw it, if one person got in trouble, everybody was getting into trouble. You know, there were so many people doing it, I didn't think they would bother to take everyone down.

T: Did you think about the consequences at all?

Tr: During the time, no. Honestly, I did not think about it. It was just an afterthought. Obviously, I wasn't thinking at all. Obviously, I mean, I was going through a lot of stuff, you know. I was out of my mind, going crazy.

T: So what if it had been a different kind of parade, or celebration? For example, had it been a Christmas parade, or a Thanksgiving parade, where there were a lot of families, do you think you might have done the same things, or would things have been different?

Tr: Completely different. Completely different circumstances. I mean, this was not Thanksgiving parade. It was not a huge family parade, or a family affair. You know, if there were a bunch of little kids around, I wouldn't have been drinking. Everyone wouldn't have been drinking so heavily. You know, we might have tipped a few bags. You know, I'm not completely crazy. I 'm not gonna do that stuff around children. Come on. Forget about it.

T: So let's go back to the crowd for a second. You'd mentioned that the crowd really got you going. Now, were you there with a few friends or were you there by yourself?

Tr: Oh no, I was there with friends for sure. You know, I wasn't going to just be drinking by myself. Me and my buddies had a few, you know, we'd been tipping the bag all morning, so,

T: So were your friends also participating, and what might have happened had they not been participating?

Tr: Well, yea, yea, obviously, my friends were participating too. That's kinda the whole group thing. If they had not been doing it, you know, I probably not have done it myself. I hate to say it, but, you know, I wasn't the leader of the group, but I was completely a follower.

T: Who started vandalizing or throwing bottles? At what point did you start doing it? Or did you start it and did other people jump in and vice versa?

Tr: Well, it was actually a group of people, you know. The vandalism had already begun. We were just passing on through, but then my buddy, Jim, you know, he picked up a bottle and tosses one and, you know, it looks like fun at the time. And, I did it, and one thing lead to another, and mailboxes are getting scraped. Yea, it got pretty out of control. But, no, had my friends not been doing it, honestly, I don't think I would have done it. Product of my environment? I think so.

Nafie

T: What is your name?

N: My name is Nafie.

T: How old are you, Nafie?

N: 26 years old. I'm going to be 27 in about 2 weeks.

T: What is the highest level of education you've had?

N: College. A little bit of junior college. A little bit of university.

T: What kind of work do you do?

N: The work I do right now, I'm a fitness specialist. I help people get into shape and I give them tips on getting healthy.

T: Where do you currently live?

N: I live in New York City.

T: What is your ethnicity?

N: My ethnicity is Guyanese.

T: In regards to the 2007 Caribbean Day Parade in Dorchester Massachusetts, you were arrested for assault and battery. Can you tell me about that incident?

N: It started that me and my girlfriend were attending the parade and a group of guys came up towards me and was disrespectful and was saying rude comments towards my girlfriend, and I felt intimidated. The only way that I can prove to myself that this isn't going to happen right now is that I had to knock someone out. So someone approached me; I gave them the right hand. He fell to the ground. Then, his boys came and jump on my back, and I knocked him out too. Unknowing to these guys, I have a black belt in Jitsu. I've been studying martial arts all of my life. Then, the police came and dragged me away.

T: So when they approached you and your girlfriend, did they know that you guys were together?

N: Yea, they knew that we were together. We were holding hands just like any other normal couple does. But they felt as if they had to say something about that, which broke our peace that day.

T: Why was it important for you to respond to that? Why couldn't you and your girlfriend just walk away?

N: Well you have to understand that this West Indian culture is more than just fun and games. A lot of times, you have to flex your muscles, stand up your chest a little bit when everyone is looking because it's a clash of all the West Indian islands and everyone wants to dig up their own land, and the only way to do it is to hang in your own clicks and group. And, if you're not in a click and you're not in a group, you're just walking with your girlfriend, the guys might say something, and you gotta protect yourself and your woman. It's one of those primal things that happen. And, unfortunately, they messed with the wrong guy. I had to take care of my woman. I knocked them out; clocked them all.

T: Would you have done anything differently, if you could go back?

N: Well, of course, you can always say, 'I'd walk away. I'd walk away'. But, such is life. You just can't go back. I most likely would do the exact same thing, but this time, I would allude the scene before the officials came.

T: Anything else you'd like to tell me about the incident?

N: ...I don't condone violence, but one must protect themselves when they're faced with a situation with hostile men, not so friendly people. Maybe alcohol and any other things are involved, but it doesn't make it OK for anyone to bully anyone else and I will protect myself and my friends and my girlfriend. Anyone else that push me, I don't tolerate being bullied.

T: Thank you for your time. I appreciate your doing the interview.

Maleke

T: What is your name?

M: Maleke

T: How old are you, Maleke?

M: 23 years old

T: What is the highest level of education that you've completed?

M: I graduated from high school, got that diploma.

T: What kind of work do you do?

M: I do freelance construction. My uncle owns the company. He gives me jobs here and there and pays me under the table.

T: Where do you currently live?

M: I live in Harlem.

T: What is your ethnicity?

M: Black. African American, I guess you would say.

T: In regards to the 2007 African American parade and festival in Harlem, you were arrested for assault and battery. Can you tell me about that incident?

M: I mean, you want to start from the beginning of that day or just the incident?

T: Wherever you'd like.

M: I mean, basically, you know. We all decided. I'm from 149. We all decided, me and probably like 3 or 4 of my boys, probably decided just that morning, we were gonna go check it out, you know. We just wanted to go howler at the girls, and basically, you know just do what we do. We wasn't coming there for that. But, sometimes, like people who walking through that crowd be aggressive. You know what I mean? And, I just don't be friend them. I get a little claustrophobic sometimes, you know what I'm saying? I like my space. You gotta treat me and address me as a man, so you know. While we was walking, some dude took it upon himself to bump me. And, I turned around and waitin' for him to say something, you know what I mean? And, he basically just kept walking. I said, 'What the fuck you doing?' And, he turned around and he basically said, 'Fuck you' and he kept walking. So, you know, I took it upon myself to grab him upon the shoulder and when he turned around, he swung on me. So after that, you know, I just did what I had to do. I guess I got the upper hand on him. You know what I mean? And they just try to

make it look like I set it on him first. You know, I guess you could say I started the conflict. To me, he really started the conflict. I just handed over my business. That's how I was taught, you know?

T: So you were with a bunch of friends?

M: I mean it depends on what you mean by 'bunch' but I was with 3 or 4 of my boys.

T: Did they do anything? Were they involved?

M: They might have been. I wasn't, you know what I mean, I wasn't gonna say that, but you know, we always handle business.

T: How did the police become involved?

M: Man, because I guess when we was fleeing from the scene, or allegedly, you know. Somebody pointed out three or four black males in red T-shirts. You know what I mean? 'Fleeing from the scene for assault and battery', that's what they said. You know, they posted us up or whatever. And somebody in the crowd had pointed us out. And, I guess they tried to get the victim to testify and you know, it's pretty much with people pointing the finger. Snitching.

T: Were you drinking at all at the time?

M: Yea, well, I mean on the way. You know what I mean? We stopped at the corner store. I got a Deux Deux, a little Heineken. We weren't really drinking like that but, you know what I mean, I guess I knocked that down. Then, we were drinking like a half pint of Hennessy but nothing crazy. I wouldn't say that I was drunk.

T: So you didn't feel like you were drinking too much. You just had a little bit of alcohol?

M: Nah, I mean, I got a high tolerance. You know, like a Deux Deux in the morning is regular for me. You know what I mean? So, I didn't feel like I was drunk. You know what I mean? But, I was definitely was drinking, cause that's what I do.

T: So going back to the beginning of the incident, when you said they were walking, and giving you a certain look that you didn't like, could you tell me more about that?

M: Yea, well, where I'm from, if you bump somebody, first of all, you better apologize for that off top and say, 'My fault. I ain't know where I was going'. But if you bump me and felt like you did that purposefully, you know what I mean? Like you trying to get the upper hand on me, and I'm not with all that. That's not how my mother raised me, you know what I mean? My mother raised me, you know what I mean, to throw that first punch at the end of the day, so you know. You just bump me in that type of manner, you know what I mean? Basically just trying to, I'm just not with that shit, you know what I mean? That's all I know, respect.

T: So would you have felt less of a man if you didn't react?

M: I mean, I guess you can say that. You know what I mean? Cause I'm not here to take any shorts. I don't care if you took a dollar from me or a thousand dollars. It's all the same to me. I don't care if you pump me, punch me or bump me. You know what I mean? It's all the same to me.

T: So looking back on it, was there anything that you would have done differently or that would have prevented the incident?

M: I mean, maybe I wouldn't have even went there. I don't know how far this case is gonna go. Maybe I wasn't even gonna go there, because it doesn't seem like every time we go out, something like this happens. You know what I mean? Usually, we don't catch no case for this shit. I can't really recall it, man. I guess I shouldn't have gone out that day, you know what I mean? People telling me I'd be drinking too much and I'd be confrontational. They might be right, but that's just how I live. That's just what I know, so I'm not sure.

T: Is there anything else you'd like to add or tell me?

M: Just basically like what I'd told you in the beginning. You know what I mean? When we set out to go, we set out to go look for girls. We didn't set out for that. You know what I mean? It ain't like I just woke up and said let's go beat somebody up at the parade, you know what I mean? We didn't come for that.

T: Well, thank you so much for your time and for the interview. I appreciate it.

Patrick

T: What is your name?

P: My name is Patrick?

T: How old are you, Patrick?

P: I'm 24.

T: What is the highest level of education you've had?

P: I finished high school.

T: What is your occupation?

P: I'm a house painter?

T: Where do you live?

P: In Southie.

T: What is your ethnicity?

P: Irish American

T: In regards to the 2007 St. Patrick's Day parade in Boston, you were arrested for assault and battery and disorderly conduct. Can you tell me about that incident?

P: I was at the parade and I saw some guy, and they were dissing my girlfriend, so I felt like I had to step in, you know, to defend her. So that's what I did.

T: Can you give me more information? How did it get to the point where you got arrested?

P: The guy was saying my girlfriend was a slut and, uh, I wasn't going to stand for that. So I went over and I just decked him.

T: How did the police become involved?

P: They were there. They're usually there and pretty, you know, numerous. But frankly, I didn't give a shit at that point.

T: Had you been drinking at the time?

P: Of course, it's St. Patrick's Day.

T: When the police came, what did they do exactly? Can you walk me through that?

P: Well, uh, first thing they did was they knocked me on the back and they got me down on the ground. Then they cuffed me. One guy had his knee on my head.

T: Sounds pretty intense. Then, did they drag you off to jail?

P: Oh, yea.

T: How long did you have to stay?

P: I couldn't get bail for a couple of days. I think I was there for 2 days.

T: It sounds like there were some issues with the masculinity. Did you feel as if you had to assert that when the other guy came over?

P: Well, yea, I mean, you can't stand there and take that kind of shit. You know?

T: What do you mean?

P: You know, it's my girlfriend. It's her honor, and you know, that's that.

T: If you had to do it differently, would there be anything that you would do differently?

P: No, no. The only thing is I would have hit the guy harder, maybe. That would have been the only difference.

T: Was there anything that could have prevented the incident?

P: Yea, if the guy kept his mouth shut.

T: What about there being more police or a ban in alcohol because I know, in Boston, they were trying to do that?

P: Well, I mean, I saw the cop there. I mean he was right there, you know. What am supposed to do? It's my girlfriend and uh, the guy insulted her. There could have been 20 cops there. That wouldn't have done anything.

T: Is there anything else you'd like to add?

P: No, except I was in the right. I still think that.

T: Thank you for your time. I appreciate your participating.

Anthony

T: What is your name?

A: Tony

T: Tony, how old are you?

A: 30

T: What is the highest level of education you've had?

A: Finished high school.

T: What is your occupation?

A: I'm a welder.

T: Which town or city do you live in?

A: I live in Queens, but I work mostly in downtown Manhattan.

T: What is your ethnicity?

A: I'm half Irish, half Italian.

T: Going back to the St. Patrick's Day parade of 2009, you were arrested for fighting and also for public intoxication. Can you tell me about that incident?

A: Yea, that was completely unfair. I came out of this bar on St. Patrick's Day, and these guys were kinda messing around with this woman. She was just trying to pass along the sidewalk during the parade. You know, with the parade going. And these guys started hassling her and I said, 'Come on, guys. She's just trying to get back to work'. You know, it was just after lunch time, and she was trying to get back to work and they were like, 'Hey, mind your own business'. I said, 'Look guys, it's St. Patrick's Day. Just chill. Come on, have a drink.' I even offered to buy them a drink, but one guy threw a drink at me. It was in a paper bag and it smashed against the wall. I said, 'That was very uncool'; then the other guy shoved me. So I smacked them. Then some cop on some horse came walking by, and he said, 'Hey, hold it right there'. Then, he gets off his horse and asked me my name and everything, and he wanted to see my ID, so I showed him my driver's license and everything. So, I got arrested. I said, 'For what?'. He said, "Cause you were drinking". I said, 'I know I was drinking. It's St. Patrick's Day, but I didn't do anything wrong. I wasn't on the street drinking. I was right here'. I pointed to the café behind me, to the bar where I was in. He said, 'Why did you punch the guy?'. I said, 'What do you mean? He pushed me. Plus these four guys are bothering this lady right here while she's trying to get to work. All I said was, let her be. Let her get to work. So they start hassling me. What are you arresting me for?' So, then he asked the other guys and he asked the lady. And, she said

everything I said was true. He said, 'That means a challenge was issued and that you, you Tony, have met the challenge. I'm still going to arrest you. Although I'm going to arrest these two guys too.' So he arrested two of the other guys - the one that threw the bottle at me and the one that pushed me. He let the other two guys go. Then, I got arrested.

When I went to court, the judge said kinda the same thing, but he made my fine less than theirs. I said, 'Why, your honor?'. He said, 'Because a challenge was issued, and you'd met it'. I said, 'Why was it not self defense?'. He said, 'Because you could have walked back into the bar'. I just shrugged my shoulders and said, 'Well, what about the lady? Was I supposed to just walk away and let them hassle the lady?' He said, 'Well, I'm happy you did that, but I'm sorry, son, you still broke the law'. But what he did do is he lessened my fine. He gave me half the fine he gave them. So that's what happened.

T: Did anybody end up getting hurt?

A: Well, when I smacked the guy, I knocked out one of his teeth.

T: Looking back on it, would you have done anything differently?

A: I might have asked the lady how far her work was, and I would have escorted her away from those guys instead of trying to like intervene on her behalf. I think I would have tried to take her out of the situation. That's what I think I would have done and it might not have escalated the way it did.

T: I know in Boston that they've done a lot in terms of prevention, preventing violence during the St. Patrick's Day parade. They've tried banning alcohol and they've tried increasing the police force. Do you think those things would help with the violence?

A: Absolutely. Honestly, I think that if a cop didn't come by, it would have been a lot, lot, lot worse. Because it was just one bottle thrown, one shove, one punch and it was pretty much over. If the cops didn't come, those four guys were gonna come at me for sure, and by the way, I wasn't going to hold back. If they were gonna try to hurt me, I was gonna try to hurt them right back. The cop just happened to be right there. So do I agree there should be a greater police presence? Yea, I think the violence would come down a lot.

T: What about banning alcohol?

A: I mean, I think the idea of banning it from being on the street. I don't think you're going to be able to ban it from people going inside the bars and drinking. You know, I don't think that will fly. I don't think that would be enforceable. I think that's the word, right? Enforceable? I don't think that it would be enforceable, but I think banning it on the streets would be a good idea. There's probably already laws in place that you're not supposed to drink out in public anyway. By the way, even though I got arrested for that, I wasn't drinking in public. I was actually inside the bar. I came out because the parade was just coming by and I wanted to see it more closely and that's when I saw them hassling that lady. I didn't even have a drink in my hand. I just didn't lie when the officer said, "Had you been drinking?". I pointed from behind me, and said, 'Yea, I

just came out of here'. But, I wasn't in public drinking. That shouldn't have happened. I shouldn't have gotten arrested for that. By the way, maybe that's why the judge didn't fine me as much as the other guys too because that part didn't stick. I got arrested. My arrest stuck for throwing the punch at the guy, but not for drinking in public because even the police officer said, I didn't have any liquor in my hand when I got arrested, so the judge threw that out. Maybe that's why I got half the fine they did.

T: Thank you so much for your time and for the interview.

Gavin

T: What is your name?

G: Gavin

T: What is the highest level of education you've completed?

G: High school.

T: What kind of work do you do?

G: I'm sports agent.

T: Where do you live?

G: I live in Charlestown.

T: What is your ethnicity?

G: Irish American.

T: About the St. Patrick's Day parade in 2007, you were arrested for a fist fight, for assault and battery, can you tell me about the incident and how it came about?

G: It was about midway through the parade and one of these very drunk characters to my right kept calling my daughter a whore. I didn't see any reason for him to keep doing that, so I challenged him on it, and he whacked me, so I whacked him back. It grew into a complete boxing match. Some people tried to break us up. Some people got injured and falling down and stuff like that. And, that's when the police got involved.

T: What happened when the police came?

G: They handcuffed us pretty readily, and hulled us off. I think there were about 7 or 8 people who were hulled off even though they were people that had nothing to do with it.

T: Was anybody hurt?

G: Yea, my eardrum was perforated and I broke his jaw.

T: Was alcohol a factor in this fight?

G: Yes, he was very drunk. And, I gotta admit that I was a little drunk too.

T: When looking back on it, would you have done anything differently?

G: It's a tough call. You know, my daughter is very important to me. I don't like it when people start calling her a whore. She's not that way at all. And, it was probably a case of mistaken identity or something, but the guy, he was not rational.

T: How old was your daughter at the time?

G: She was 17.

T: Looking back on it could anything have prevented what had happened? Whether there would be more police, or I know they tried the alcohol ban. Would that have helped?

G: I don't know about the alcohol ban. I don't think they're going to get anywhere with that. Maybe there should be education before people start parading (chuckle). You know, people get out of hand and start drinking.

T: So more educating the people about the violence that occur during the parade?

G: Yea, that would be good, you know. We have public education program for other things, so that would make sense to me.

T: Anything else you'd like to add?

G: I don't feel good about it, you know. I was too reactive. My temper is high to begin with. I just went with my temper when I should have just walked to the other side of the parade. So, I think I've learned from it, to not to so quickly respond to violence when something like this going to happen.

T: I appreciate your interviewing, and I appreciate your time. If anything else, I'll give you a call.

Johnny

T: What is your name?

J: My name is Johnny.

T: How old are you Johnny?

J: 26

T: What is the highest level of education that you've got?

J: GED

T: Where do you live?

J: I live on Staten Island.

T: What is your ethnicity?

J: Caucasian.

T: Going back to the Giants Victory parade in New York, in 2008, you ... (inaudible).

J: What a day. Where do I begin? It was me and a couple of friends. You know, getting a little rowdy. Had a couple of too many beers. Just hanging out. And then, a few of my friends started to become a little crazy, and I don't know. Just looking at them. It wasn't even like I was doing it purposefully, that it was for a reason. You know? It just kinda happened. I was pushed, you know. Everybody was doing it. I kinda, I felt left out. I felt like I kinda wanted to be in with them.

T: Well, what exactly were they doing?

J: You know, they were throwing bottles at the cars. You know, jumping on top of it. And, I just felt like a loner, you know. It's weird. It's weird to say it that way, you know, but I felt like I needed to do what I needed to do to fit in.

T: And then what happened with the police when they came?

J: They came. They came rushing at us. Three of my 5 friends, they'd left. They got away. I tried running, but I fell and they got me. They threw me onto the car. They arrested me. They bring me in, you know. They asked me a couple of questions. You know, asked me to call my lawyer, if I had anybody to call. They held me in overnight. You know?

T: Was anybody hurt during the incident?

J: We did fight. We did get into a couple of brawls. I'm not gonna lie. You know, it was intense. It was like in the heat of the moment. Things were getting kinda crazy. Our friends were throwing bottles. Kids were just fighting. You know, it was just, you know, when you're so drunk that you do things that you don't even remember?

T: So, looking back now, what could have prevented this?

J: I was, you know, I tried stopping them. The drinking, definitely; not have drank like that, you know. Definitely would try to talk them out of it. If anything, try to walk away next time. Not even mind it. Mind my own business. Do things my way. You know, not tried to fit in with other people. You know, look what happened to me trying to fit in with other people. You know, I got arrested. Now I've got a record. I can't even get a regular job now, you know?

T: Was there anything that could have prevented this situation? More supervision?

J: More police, definitely.

T: How did you feel about the police handling the situation? Did they do OK with it?

J: Well when I was in the moment, when they threw me against the car and everything, I was raged. You know, I had that rage in me, but now that I think about it now, I could, I understand where they're coming from. They're doing their job, you know, and they were 100% right. No matter how mad I was that day, you know, it was off of my stupidity and if I never did reckless things, it never would have escalated to that and we never would have had that problem. They were all doing their job trying to keep everybody safe and I agree with it.

T: Anything else you'd like to add?

J: You know, it started off as a fun day. The kids, the kids I went off with. I went with my friend Joe, you know, he was the only one I was close with, and the other kids were his friends, you know. They all seemed, they all seemed cool, like you know, just a bunch of kids trying to hang out, happy at the parade. And then everybody just got a little too wasted and things just started to go crazy. And, it really got into me. I never thought, you know, I just never thought it would be like that. It really got into me. That's when the riot just started happening. You know, breaking car windows, fighting with kids. It was just a bunch of rage.

T: Well, thank you for your time. I appreciate your doing the interview.

T: Johnny, last time we spoke, we spoke a lot about ‘getting caught up in the moment’ because the crowd was doing it and you just kind of got caught up with it. So, I just wanted to follow-up on some of those questions. Did you think at all that there would be any consequences?

J: (Chuckle) To be honest with you, no. There were so many people over there, you know. I didn’t even. One, I wasn’t even thinking about consequences. Two, I didn’t even know how I would get caught, you know. There were so many people around. It was hard to get around, you know. I didn’t know cops could get you so easily, like that.

T: Were you there with friends or were you there by yourself?

J: Oh no, I was there with friends. I was there with a group of friends.

T: So, your friends, were they also throwing bottles and were they doing vandalism?

J: Unfortunately, yea.

T: Did you remember if you were the one who started it, or did you see someone else, either within your group or within the crowd doing it, and then you kind of jumped in? How did that happen? Do you remember?

J: Actually, it was all around. But, it was my main friend, Joe. You know, he started messing around little by little. You know, he was drunk also. Then, it escalated. Then, it wasn’t just him. It started with more of our friends. And then, it was like the spur of the moment. You know? Where it just happened and then I got involved also.

T: So did you feel as though you were part of the crowd and that you weren’t an individual anymore when that started to happen?

J: Actually, yea. I did. You know, I felt, I did feel like that, as wrong as that sounds. I did feel like that, but that I was, thinking about it now, that was just a huge mistake, and to do something like that, to feel like the crowd, you know? It’s a bit crazy.

T: What if your team had lost and there wasn’t all that craziness? What do you think might have happened?

J: Things would have been the same, you know? But, I would have been on the safer side and never got caught. (Chuckle) We never would have had a trial, you know. We never would have been stupid that day.

T: Suppose that it was a Christmas Day parade instead of the Giants Victory parade. Do you think that things would have been different?

J: Oh, yea. Things would have been much different. I don’t think everybody would have been going crazy, you know. I don’t think things would have been crazy.

T: Why do you think that is though?

J: It's the Giants. It's sports, you know? Everybody gets crazy over football. Everybody, you know. Christmas, that's a family thing, you know? I don't see how anybody startin' that off, or anything like that. Everybody's calm.

T: Well, thank you so much.

Kenley

T: What is your name?

K: Kenley.

T: How old are you, Kenley?

K: 24 years old.

T: What is the highest level of education that you've completed?

K: I graduated from Umass Boston.

T: Where do you live now? Which town do you live in?

K: Bridgeport, CT

T: Your ethnicity?

K: I'm African American

T: Going back to the parade of 2007, you were arrested for assault and battery. This was the Summer Sunset Festival in Bridgeport. Can you tell me about that incident?

K: I had way too much to drink. Drinking definitely influenced my situation. I feel deeply bad about it, but drinking definitely played a heavy, heavy part on it.

T: Do you remember about how much you had to drink?

K: It was a lot. I consumed a lot of liquor and I continued to consume liquor when I got to the parade, so I wasn't really preoccupied with, as far as watching what I was drinking or counting my drinks.

T: Can you tell me about what happened?

K: I saw a girlfriend of mine and she was with a particular individual that I did not like, and I just went off. I went off. I went to speak with her. And her date just wouldn't allow me to speak to her and I just had to get something off my chest, but he just, he was protecting her. And, I kept trying telling him that I knew her and it's OK, that I just wanted to speak with her. But he not knowing what level my tone was at that I was pretty much speaking with everyone around me. And, everyone around us heard what I was saying. And, if you can imagine the volume of my voice; if 10 was the highest, I was at 11.

T: So you were upset that she was with someone else?

K: You only get one chance at love and I messed up. I messed up deeply. I tried to apologize. She would accept any of my apologies. And, I mean, everything was my fault. I cheated on her and I was not mature enough for the relationship and I deserved everything I got that day.

T: Seems like you were really trying to assert your masculinity. Is that what I'm hearing?

K: It really was. At that moment, I wanted to fight him. Someone called the police.

T: What happened when the police came over?

K: When the police came over, I got a lot more upset. I felt like I wasn't in the wrong. I felt like he was in the wrong. So that's when the physicality occurred. I struck him; struck him in the face.

T: What happened after that?

K: The police came and I was just tussling. And, me being under the influence, I just wasn't thinking. I'm wrestling. I'm pushing police officers when I know it was wrong. I got emotional, so I definitely, definitely, definitely regret that moment.

T: Was anybody injured?

K: No. Well, I was injured emotionally.

T: Were you arrested for that incident?

K: I was arrested for that incident.

T: If you could turn back time, what would you have done differently?

K: I would not have consumed that much liquor. When I saw my girlfriend, I would have just said hi, and kept on walking, and just disregarded who she was with whether I liked that individual or not. That's how I would carry myself. I would have carried myself a lot better.

T: Was there anything that the police could have done differently?

K: Honestly, the police was doing their job. The police, they signed up to serve and protect. I was being abrasive. I was being a knucklehead. I was being a jerk. I embarrassed myself. I embarrassed my family, my friends. And, I embarrassed the town of Bridgeport, CT.

T: Is there anything else you'd like to add or tell me about the event?

K: It was not, there was really not too much that I can remember because I was so drunk. There's a lot of dark spots in there, and I definitely regret going in there drunk 'cause I would have enjoyed myself a lot better and I probably would have had a lot more fun, and not have a record right now.

T: That must be hard. Thank you for your time.

Bill

T: What is your name?

B: My name is Bill

T: How old are you, Bill?

B: I'm 25 years old.

T: What is your current occupation?

B: I work for a software company developing software.

T: Where do you live now?

B: I live in Barre, VT.

T: What is your ethnicity?

B: My ethnicity is white, non-Hispanic.

T: Going back to the incident in 2008, during the Fourth of July Parade, I understand that you got into a fist fight and were arrested. Could you tell me about that?

B: Well, sure. It was really silly, actually. I was there with my girlfriend. We were just watching the parade. We were just minding ourselves. We were just cheering everybody on. All of a sudden, my girlfriend got hit with an almost a full can of Pepsi, right in the head. And, so obviously, we turned to find out what had happened. And, there were a bunch of kids about, I would say 15-20 yards away from us, causing a great deal of noise, and throwing all of their belongings around. It looked like they were having some sort of contest to see which person they could hit with their belongings because they were just throwing things all over the place. And the soda got all over me and it hit my girlfriend all over the forehead and it immediately created a bump, so I went over there and tried to talk to them about it.

T: What happened when you went over there?

B: Well, they were very insolent. I said, 'Excuse me. Do you realize you just hit somebody in the head? You could have caused a major accident. As it is, she may have a concussion.' Then the guy said, 'Hey, take it easy there buddy. Just back off, back off. Alright?'. The other guys were laughing, so I, you know, didn't caught for that, so I started pressing the issue and I said, 'I demand an apology. This is completely unacceptable. We're in a public place, and we're having a perfectly nice time, and you guys are out here clearly causing problems.' And, that only made them laugh harder.

T: Then what happened?

B: Well, then one of the guys turned to me and he said, 'Hey, buddy, don't feel so bad. We're trying to throw things at the prettiest people we could find and so the fact that we chose your girlfriend is actually a compliment.' And, so I had to apologize to the officer later, but that just absolutely set me through the roof. Well, I got the guy who'd said that. I got right in his face. I said, 'That is completely unacceptable and that's misogynistic and I won't take that, and I demand that you apologize to me and then to her.' And, he got right up to my face, and then we were chest to chest, and we were staring each other down. And, so I pushed him. His friends jumped in next to him and in about 2 or 3 seconds, I was suddenly throwing punches with 3 or 4 different guys.

T: Looking back on it, why do you think that happened?

B: Well, I don't know. Um, I could have walked away from the whole thing and taken Julie. We could have left. I could have fixed her up and we could have taken the day somewhere else. But, I felt - A, someone had to stand up to these guys, and B, I felt that with her there watching, that my kind of, um, I guess I felt that my manhood was at stake. So, I leapt into the fray and in retrospect, I was kinda defending her physically. At the time, I really just wanted to sock each one of those guys square in the nose, but I now look back on it, I see that it was a bit of an Alpha Alpha exchange, and I felt that I had to take care of them personally. I actually was the first person to aggress. I shoved the person first and I'm not usually a violent person, but I did it, and it was probably because she was watching.

T: What would you have done differently now?

B: Well, you know. It's very difficult to say, when your adrenaline isn't running, what you would do next time, or what you should have done. I'd like to think that next time, I would just turn around and leave. But, obviously, I'm not sure if I would do that. I would probably go over and talk to them, try to coax an apology out of them and if they didn't, the best thing for me to do is to go find a police officer and have them removed. But, instead, I was removed, so you see, I didn't make the best decision.

T: Were you drinking at the time?

B: I wouldn't say that I was drinking. I had a beer or two, but I wasn't intoxicated. I wasn't really that buzzed. I had had, I don't know, maybe 2 drinks in the last hour. I had my wits about me, but of course, they breathalyzed me and told me that I had a blood alcohol level and that just changes the complexity of the whole thing.

T: Anything else you'd like to tell me about the event?

B: No, except that, except the irony. The irony hits you right in the face, doesn't it? When you tried to back away from something where you know that someone is aggressing you. You weren't aggressing them. And that irony is probably the most humiliating thing. That it was me sitting there cuffed at the police station, so I would highly recommend to anyone else in the same

situation to let the police handle the misdemeanor themselves because otherwise, the shoe can be completely on the other foot. And, now I've got a record, so that's what I have to show for it.

T: I appreciate your time.

Nick

T: What is your name?

N: Nick.

T: Nick, how old are you?

N: I'm 23 years old.

T: What is the highest level of education that you've had?

N: High school.

T: What is your occupation?

N: I'm a waiter.

T: Where do you live? Which city?

N: New Orleans.

T: What is your ethnicity?

N: Hispanic.

T: In regards to the New Orleans Mardi Gras parade in 2009, you were arrested for assault and battery, disorderly conduct, and also public drinking. Can you tell me the incidents, particularly the assault?

N: Yea, well, it was crowded. You know, the scene was pretty packed and busy. People pushing up on me. Everything was going kinda crazy. So, I mean I was drinking for a little bit. I was drinking for while, you know, whatever. And, then I had people pushing on me and I was getting irritated, so I started pushing back and then people pushing more. And, I started, I ended up throwing a couple of bottles in to the crowd. Guess I'd cut up some people.

T: Now, when you said that people were pushing you, were they purposefully pushing you, or was it a situation where it just got crowded and they were pushing you because they were just trying to move?

N: Well, now that I think about it, it probably just was crowded. But, I was really just kind of, I was drinking for a while and I was kinda intoxicated so I was just getting kinda irritated with the situation just because there were so many people.

T: Did anybody get hurt either from your throwing bottles or with the assault?

N: I heard that there was. That's why I got into trouble with the assault and battery, so I must have done a lot more damage than I thought I did.

T: How did the police become involved? Do you remember that part?

N: I think it was a local business owner that was on the strip, who probably, I guess he's the one who'd called, and said that some people got hurt and got hit by, I guess, a bottle that I threw.

T: Did it take a long time for the police to come? How long did it take about?

N: Honestly, I don't remember too much about that. I just know that it was, I guess it was within the first couple of minutes. There were cops on the scene already, I guess, just because it was the Mardi Gras. So, they showed up pretty, I guess, pretty fast.

T: If you could go back in time would you do anything differently, and was there anything that could have prevented the incident?

N: I mean, I guess, I should have just stayed under more control with all my drinking. I shouldn't have had so many so fast. I think that was the problem. Maybe I was just irritated with the crowd, but the drinking was what caused me to, um, get irritated in the first place.

T: Anything else you'd like to tell me about the incident?

N: No, I think that was about it.

T: OK, thank you for your time and for the interview.

Jackson

T: What is your name?

J: My name is Jackson.

T: How old are you?

J: 24.

T: What is the highest level of education that you've completed?

J: Some college.

T: What kind of work do you do?

J: Right now, I work at the Men's Warehouse, but I'm also studying.

T: Which city do you live in right now?

J: New Orleans.

T: What is your ethnicity?

J: Caucasian, or white, or I guess you can say I'm Caucasian

T: In regards to the Mardi Gras parade in 2008, you were arrested for assault and battery. Can you tell me about the incident?

J: Well, yea, I mean I really didn't do anything. I was there with some of my friends. And, you know, we were having a good time, and you know, this dude just kinda walked up to me. I guess, I was kinda flirting; I was flirting with this girl. I didn't know that, you know, he knew her and not that it should matter. Anyway, he just kinda end up walking up to me and just starts, you know, yelling at me, being in my face. And, I told him to back off. He kept coming at me, so I had to defend myself. So, you know, I do what I, you know, I just defended myself.

T: So did you throw the first punch or did he?

J: Well, he swung at me, so he didn't hit me. So, I guess technically, I threw the first punch because he swung at me. I ducked and I hit him. So, I mean, again, I was defending myself, you know. If I didn't defend myself, I would have gotten hurt, you know?

T: Did a fight actually break out or was it just a punch?

J: Well, it was a little bit of a fight. I mean, it lasted for a little while, but um, again, it wasn't something that I had started. I wasn't really aware of what was going on. It was kinda a heightened awareness kinda thing. You know, I hit him a couple of times, and someone called the cops.

T: Who called the cops?

J: I don't know. I don't even know. I mean, I'm standing there. I'm defending myself. I hit him a couple of times. Next thing I know, you know, the police were there and I'm being arrested.

T: Did he get arrested too?

J: Yea, but I mean, you know, they charged me with assault. I told them, you know, that this guy was coming at me and that, you know, I was defending myself. But, I guess, the fact that I didn't look like, you know, the victim of the fight, and he did. I guess, that's why they, you know charged me, instead of him.

T: Did either of you get hurt?

J: Um, I got a few scrapes. He was obviously a little more hurt than I was. But, again, I was defending myself, so I had to do what I had to do.

T: Were either of you drinking at the time?

J: (Chuckle) Um, yea, yea. I was a little, a little drunk, but I mean, yea. Yes.

T: Were you a little drunk or a lot drunk?

J: We were at the Mardi Gras, you know. It's Mardi Gras. I mean, what do you do at the Mardi Gras. I was a 21 year old. I went to Mardi Gras. I mean, that's what you do. You have a few drinks and stuff.

T: Looking back on it, was there anything that would have prevented the incident or would there be anything you would have done differently?

J: You know. That's kinda hard to say. I've always been one to defend myself, I guess. If I had to do something differently that would have prevented me from having this charge on my record, um, I guess, you know, maybe I would have, you know, put him in a lock or some kind of hold, and ask my buddies to help restrain him or something. But, either way, I'm not going to just stand there and let someone just kinda wale on my, so I guess the short answer would be, yea, I guess I could have walked away or you know, tell him, or subdue him or something. So, yes, I guess I would have done something different like walk away, or put him in a lock or something.

T: Is there anything else you'd like to tell me about what happened?

J: Um, no, except the fact that I was just defending myself and that I was kinda wrongfully charged with this. Um, there really isn't much I have to say about this incident, to be honest.

T: Alright. I appreciate your time and the interview.

Ramon

T: What is your name?

R: Ramon.

T: How old are you, Ramon?

R: I'm 47.

T: What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

R: I have a BA in business.

T: What is your occupation?

R: I work right now managing a software company.

T: Where do you live?

R: I live just outside of Ashland, CA.

T: What is your ethnicity?

R: I'm White.

T: Ramon, going back to 2006, the homecoming parade incident, can you tell me about that?

R: Well, you know we were watching the homecoming parade, and my little daughter, at that time, she was 3 years old. She was very excited about it. She liked everything about cheerleaders, and was dreaming about becoming a cheerleader. And, she couldn't really see. There were a lot of people in front of us, so I put her up on my shoulders so she could see. And, this jerk, this kinda, well, this person behind me started complaining that they couldn't see. And, you know, I got into an argument with him because, you know, she's 3 years old, and she deserves the right to see it, and she couldn't see over everybody else's, you know, heads. And, we ended up getting into an argument, an altercation. And, then one thing led to another, and then the police came. And, uh, they told me that I was being out of line. And you know, honestly, the person who started the confrontation was the person behind me. And, you know, and just you know. I don't see how I was out of line by my just trying to make sure that my little girl enjoys a parade. I don't get it. I don't get it.

So anyway, the policeman started getting abusive with me and getting all macho and you know, 'You will stop this, sir'. Whatever. My girl started crying. Then, you know, we started having an argument and before you know it, he's got me in handcuffs and he's taking me away. He said that I'd disrespected him. Whatever that means.

T: Why do you think he'd said that?

R: I think that he knows he's out of line and, uh, instead of losing face, you know, he decided to take me away to defuse the situation. I mean disrespect has a pretty wide definition. What exactly is disrespect?

T: Was anybody hurt during the confrontation?

R: No one was hurt. No one was hurt. I wouldn't have, you know, resort to anything like that. You know, tempers got a little bit out of line.

T: But you were arrested for the confrontation with the police?

R: Yes, I was arrested for the confrontation. If I had to do it over, I probably wouldn't have confronted him, but I still think that, you know, I have certain rights and I don't think that, one of my rights is that I should be able to talk back to the police if I feel that they're not being reasonable. After all, I pay for their salary.

T: I'm a little bit confused. Confrontation with the police, doesn't that usually mean that there's shoving and pushing, or was it just an argument?

R: It was just an argument. We got into each other's face. But, I didn't really (grunted). I don't know. Maybe our chests might have been touching, but I had no intention of, you know, hitting a police officer or striking a police officer. You know. I just think that I got the short end of the stick on this one.

T: Were you drinking at the time?

R: No, not at the time. You couldn't drink on the streets. You know, we had a little picnic, a little BBQ at my house a little earlier, you know, making sausages, making hamburgers. I had a couple of beers with my friends, and then we went over there. That's all that happened.

T: So, going back to the police. What could the police have done differently? You seem to be implying that they were really in the wrong with confronting you with the situation instead of the other guy. What could they have done differently?

R: Well, I don't think they need to be as aggressive and rude. I think sometimes they just don't listen to people. And, granted, by that time, I was a little annoyed with this person behind me, but, you know, I think they should be trained to keep calm in these situations, and I'm sorry. I just think that if anything, to keep the peace, isn't necessarily on this person's mind at that moment.

T: Is there anything else you'd like to add or to tell me about the incident?

R: Well, I'm really sad that it turned out this way. I'm really sad that my little girl had to see me, you know, being taken away and being handcuffed. I hope she grows up to be really tall. That

way she doesn't have to deal with this anymore. You know, it's unfortunate. I keep my distance from the police. Even more so than I did before if I can do that.

T: Well, thank you. I appreciate your time.

Zach

T: What is your name?

Z: Zach.

T: How old are you, Zach?

Z: I'm 26.

T: What's the highest level of education that you've had?

Z: College.

T: What is your occupation?

Z: Clerk, at a video store.

T: What town do you live in?

Z: I live in Poughkeepsie, New York.

T: What is your ethnicity?

Z: Caucasian, White.

T: Going back to the parade in 2008, the Giants Victory parade in New York. What happened? What led up to the arrest?

Z: It's pretty ridiculous. I mean, I was at the parade. Everyone had a little to drink and we're just having fun. And, one thing led to another, and the cops just caught me at the wrong moment.

T: What happened exactly?

Z: Everyone was getting really excited. You know, hitting this and that. You know, next thing I know, we were kicking a car, and it was a nice car. We were just having fun. It was all in the spirit of revelry, I guess. I don't know. It was just there.

T: So what do you think caused it, caused you to kick the car? What do you think led to the incident?

Z: It was the alcohol to blame, I guess. Same as 'in the moment', kinda 'everyone is doing it' mentally. You know, it was just what was going on. That car, just got in the way. I don't know why.

T: Were there any weapons? Did anyone get hurt?

Z: Around where we were, there were bruised fists from hitting stuff, but no one had guns or anything like that. Few people had picked up stuff from the streets. Pieces of wood here and there. Stuff like that. I wouldn't call them weapons.

T: So just pieces of wood and stuff that people had picked up?

Z: There were posters and signs, and stuff like that.

T: What were they doing with them?

Z: Well, it started out by carrying poster, 'Go Giants', and stuff like that. As it kinda evolved, people were using them to hit cars. Stuff like that. Hit street signs.

T: What did the police do when they showed up?

Z: They tried to scatter everyone. They came up. They told us to disperse. They singled people out. They tried to stop everyone that they could. I personally think that it was bad luck that they saw me at the wrong second.

T: So they arrested other people during that event?

Z: Yea, there were other people hitting cars, other people getting arrested. I mean, a lot of people were doing it. A lot of people got away just fine. Just a few of us unlucky people got taken in.

T: Do you know how many?

Z: I couldn't be sure. I saw 4 or 5 getting taken in when I was being cuffed.

T: What could have prevented this, do you think? What might have been different if you were able to go back and do things differently?

Z: I don't know. Maybe if I wasn't drinking. And, obviously, if there wasn't as many people watching, it wouldn't have gone that way. More cops just standing around? Video cameras. I don't know, I mean, there were video cameras everywhere. It's not like that helped anyone.

T: So, more supervision, you mean?

Z: Perhaps. I don't know. It's not every year that the Giants win the Super Bowl, you know what I mean?

T: Is there anything else you'd like to add?

Z: That's my general take of what happened. It's a shame I got arrested. It's unfortunate, but I think it's part of what happens when you celebrate an event like that. You're drinking. You're

having a good time, and I don't know. You see people hitting things, the excitement, the frustration over everything.

T: Well, I appreciate your time.

T: Last time we'd spoke, we were talking about the Giants Victory parade and how you were getting caught up in the crowd and getting caught up in the moment, so I wanted to ask more questions about those. First off, were you there with friends or were you there by yourself?

Z: I was there with friends.

T: Were your friends also getting caught up with everything or were they separating themselves from you and from the crowd?

Z: I think we were all getting pretty caught up. I might have taken it a little further than most of my friends, but they were all taken by the excitement.

T: So did you feel that because you were with the crowd that you weren't going to be singled out?

Z: I guess that's part of it. It's more the energy of the crowd. You know, you just get caught up in it. It moves you. It takes you along with it. I mean, there's an energy. I guess there's a sense of anonymity that comes from being in a crowd, but also an energy, and excitement that kind of, that's just expressed, I guess.

(break)

T: We were talking about getting caught up in the energy of the crowd. Can you tell me more about that?

Z: Yea, I mean. Just went to the Super Bowl. Everyone's excited, and there's a lot of energy. And, it's moving through the crowd, and everyone is saying and doing the same stuff. I mean, I had a few drinks and everyone kinda wants to, you know, be part of something and be seen. I guess that's what it is. It's just that you feel bigger when you're a part of something like that.

T: Suppose it was a different kind of parade. Suppose that it was as Christmas Day parade, do you think that there would have been the same kind of energy? Do you think that you still would have gotten involved with what had happened?

Z: I mean, I don't really see why if that would be at a Christmas Day parade, but I think, you know, when there's a celebration, when you're celebrating, that's just how things move. But, at a Christmas parade, it's a different crowd too. You know, a lot of little kids, stuff like that. I mean not that there weren't little kids there, but you know you're celebrating something that hasn't happened in a long time. Christmas comes every year.

T: Going back to the actual incident, do you remember if you were the one who started it and then other people chimed in, or was it the other way where you saw someone else doing something, like throwing a bottle, and then you started doing it?

Z: I mean, I can't say for certain. I'm sure I saw some people doing stuff before I started kicking a car or something, but I don't think that, I mean, I think it just happened, you know?

T: Sounds like you guys just got very excited because the Giants had won, but what if they hadn't won? What do you think would have happened? Would there have been the same amount of excitement?

Z: Well, there wouldn't have been a parade (chuckle).

T: You keep talking about all the excitement. So if the excitement wasn't there, do you feel that this wouldn't have happened?

Z: I mean, I think if you're, you know, with a group of people and you're upset about something, sometimes there's just a sense of energy, like I'd said. When you lose, it's more of a sad moment.

T: So what I'm hearing is that you felt you were at one with the crowd and you didn't feel like you were an individual. Is that correct?

Z: I mean, I think you can say that. I don't pretend that I was just going along with the crowd, but there's a certain sense of freedom that comes when you're moving in a group like that, and everyone is excited about the same thing. Everyone is there for the same reason.

T: Thanks again for taking the time to do the interview.

Christian

T: What is your first name?

C: My first name is Christian.

T: What is the highest level of education that you've had?

C: Right now, I'm in college, but I'm not sure where my future is right now, so it's sorta open ended at this point. Yea, I'm in the midst of my college education, if you will.

T: Where do you live now?

C: I'm living in Boston. Actually in Brookline. About 10 minutes give and take. I'm actually not from Boston, but from California. I came out here for school.

T: What is your ethnicity?

C: I'm actually half Japanese on my Dad's side. I was born in Japan. I actually came over here. I don't know the language very well unfortunately. Recently, I started getting more into my ethnicity. You know, reading more about my culture, where I came from. Where I was born, stuff like that. But, it's a process like my life, you know?

T: In 2004, you were arrested at the Boston Red Sox Victory parade. Can you tell me about that incident?

C: Yea, I was actually, I might have had a couple to drink. I can't really hold my alcohol very well, according to a lot my friends. But, I got kinda loud and obnoxious. From what I can gather, this is what people were telling me. Next thing I knew, the cops were there. I was being cuffed. I was being booked, as they say.

T: What do you think caused the whole incident?

C: A lot of it is kinda foggy. I don't remember a lot of it, but from what I can gather. It was a lot of different factors. I think it was a combination of different, I think I was the instigator because I had a lot of, well, not a lot, a couple of drinks, but for me it was a lot. And I was just getting more and more obnoxious. I think a lot has to do with the fact that I just kinda cut loose and was taking advantage of the situation. And, you know, I was getting kinda wired up and making people feel uncomfortable. And then other people started getting wired up and it was just a snowball effect that occurred, you know. It's just one of those things you can't really kinda control the outcome of the situation. It just kinda happened. It's very organic.

T: If you could turn back time, what would you do different?

C: I probably, I probably should have just gone to my friend's birthday party. Then I wouldn't have gotten loud and everything like that. Actually, they'd all gone bowling. I should have gone bowling instead of drinking. (laugh) You know how it is.

T: Is there anything else you'd like to add?

C: Now that I'm a little older and wise (chuckle), I think I can look back and say I've learned from that experience. I actually haven't drank since that incident. Shockingly enough, I'm like, don't touch that stuff, because you'd never know what could happen after that.

T: Alright, thanks for your time.

Chris

T: What is your name?

C: My name is Chris.

T: And how old are you, Chris?

C: I'm 28.

T: What is the highest level of education that you've had?

C: Well, I just barely made it through high school. Graduated 265 out of 450, so the top 5% of the lower half.

T: What is your occupation?

C: Right now, I'm unemployed. I used to be a steamfitter, pipes and all that.

T: What town do you live in?

C: I live in Boston.

T: What is your ethnicity?

C: I guess you can call me a shampy Irish.

T: Tell me about the St. Patrick's Day parade that you had attended.

C: Well, it was a bad time. I was going through a, uh, I'd lost my job. Wasn't working and uh, I got a little rowdy at St. Patrick's Day parade, drinking a lot of beers with my buddies. So I grabbed some bottles and started heaving them into the crowd and unfortunately, I didn't hit the guy I was aiming at. I hit another person. The cops came at me and that was the end of that. So, down hill.

T: What did the police do when they came at you?

C: They were some big guys, you know. They just, I mean, one grabbed one arm. One grabbed the other arm. Next thing I know, they're hulling me down the street. And, I'm yelling and cursing, and kicking at them. And, they just calmly walked me away, holding me real tight.

T: So were you arrested?

C: Oh yes, I was arrested. They booked me. They finger printed me. The whole nine yards.

T: Anybody injured during the incident?

C: Yea, they said that there were a couple of young kids that were in the crowd by the police tape, caution tape, there were apparently a couple of kids up there, and I hit one of them and it bounced off one kid's head and hit the other one.

T: You said you were throwing bottles, is that right?

C: Yea, beer bottles.

T: Why were you doing that? Do you know?

C: Yea, there were a couple of guys who were busting my chops and my buddy's chops, and we were, we were just standing there, trying to have a good time. And, then they just started insulting us, and talking about us, calling us shampy Irish and why are we wearing the stupid green stuff. Hey, we're Irish. We're wearing green. What do you expect?

T: So you felt insulted?

C: Things got out of hand and they yelled at us, and we threw some beer bottles at them. We missed.

T: Is there anything else you'd like to add?

C: No, I think that's about it. But, huh, the St. Patrick's parade is a dangerous place for a shampy Irish person who's out of work.

T: When was this parade?

C: Two years ago.

T: And it was the Boston one?

C: Yea, it was the Boston St. Patrick's Day parade in March of 2008.

T: Alright, thank you for your time.

Kyle

T: What is your name?

K: My name is Kyle.

T: Kyle, how old are you?

K: 23.

T: What is the highest level of education you've had?

K: I went to high school. Graduated from that. Then, I went to college and did some classes after that, but I didn't graduate.

T: What is your occupation?

K: I'm unemployed right now too.

T: What town do you live in?

K: I'm in Groton, MA

T: What is your ethnicity?

K: Caucasian, white.

T: I understand that you were arrested at the sports victory parade, correct?

K: Yea, I was.

T: Can you tell me about it?

K: It wasn't even a big deal. I don't know what the cops were making out of this. You know, this punk from New York comes over. I'm having a good time with my buddy. We just got out of the bar after the parade. I'd been waiting all my life for the Sox to win this, OK? And this guy is trash talking about them right outside my place. Now, normally, I'm not a very, you know, pull the trigger kinda guy. I just kinda brushed this stuff off. But, uh, I got a couple of drinks in me. Things hadn't been going so well, so I socked him in the mouth. He had a Yankee's hat on. What does he expect? I swear these cops don't even care about that around here anymore. So they hulled me off. Processed me. Here I am.

T: How long were you in jail. Were you charged?

K: I was in for one night. Got my folks to bail me out. They're big Sox fans too. They understand.

T: What would have prevented the incident, do you think?

K: I don't know. If I said, 'No, I don't want to go out. If I'd admitted to them that I shouldn't be drinking. Maybe I ain't got no money to be drinking. Maybe if that guy wasn't wearing that Yankees hat. I don't know. (chuckle)

T: Thank you, so much.

Jay

T: What is your name?

J: My name is Jay.

T: Jay, how old are you?

J: I'm 24 years old.

T: What is the highest level of education you've had?

J: The highest level of education, I'm 3rd year in college.

T: What is your current occupation?

J: I'm mostly a student right now. I do some volunteer work, but you know, I'm just focusing on school at the moment.

T: What town do you live in?

J: I live in New York City.

T: What is your ethnicity?

J: I'm Asian American.

T: In regards to the St. Patrick's Day parade in New York, in 2007, can you tell me about that incident?

J: (sighs) That's a day I would rather not remember. It was a horrible day. You know, I had some classes to study for, and uh, I was distressed, and I was wanting to go out and have a good time. Get my mind away from books. Get my mind away from classes and the hassles. You know, I went out. Was pretty stressed. Just had a couple of drinks. I guess, you could say an altercation happened with me and this other gentleman who was there. And, uh, we got into a little altercation, and the police got involved and it wasn't pretty. But, all in all, I learned my lesson. I guess I should've stayed home and studied instead of going out and having a break. So, it wasn't a good situation at all.

T: When you say altercation, can you explain to me exactly what had happened?

J: Well, um, I guess I was drinking. I was having a good time. This other gentleman was coming towards me. We bumped. We had a few words. (inaudible)... was going everywhere. We had an exchange of words. We had an exchange of physical, how do you say, physicality.

T: And you also mentioned about being stressed out. Were you stressed out about school over all? Could you tell me more about what you were going through then?

J: Yea, well, it was the 3rd year of college, I finished up my prerequisites. I was getting to get ready to go to, you know, med school, or some kind of further education. I was really, you know, trying to hamper down because I wanted to make my parents proud, to make my family proud. I was studying and school over all was getting harder. Classes were getting harder. Study groups were coming up and I just couldn't find the time to balance everything out. I needed to find the time to take a break, and I guess St. Patrick's Day wasn't what I had planned. But, over all, it was just one thing after another, you know. It was just really hard on me.

T: So it sounds like you had a lot of stress with school and a lot of pressure just trying to move to the next level in terms of your education.

J: Yea, definitely. It's really intimidating to go to the next level of higher learning. I'm the first in my family to go to college and then to go even forward. So with that, it's a lot more intimidating than a lot of other people think. It's harder to take all this pressure, but I'm managing. I'm trying my best.

T: Were you at the parade with friends, or did you go alone?

J: I decided to go alone. You know, I'm the type of person that if I were to go with other people, with friends, I don't want to seem like a downer. I'm more of a lone shark. I want to be by myself, more of a loner. Don't wanna, you know, bring people's moods down if I'm having a problem. I was raised with enough responsibility where I can take care of it myself, where I can just, you know, go head on with a problem and take care of it. And, I don't want to bring people down around me. I'm not that kind of person.

T: Was there anything that could have prevented what had happened?

J: Well, I think, I should have stayed home even though I would have loved to go out and get my mind off things. I think, me staying home, having some, maybe some nice meditation session, or nice tea, or maybe a nap even. Then, I would have totally avoided the situation.

T: OK, well, I appreciate your interview.

Gerald

T: What is your name?

G: My name is Gerald.

T: How old are you Gerald?

G: I'm 26 years old.

T: What is the highest level of education that you've completed?

G: Well, I did some college that I did not complete, but I did some college.

T: What is your current occupation?

G: Well, right now, I'm currently working as a truck driver. I work for UPS. I deliver packages over there.

T: What town do you live in?

G: I live in New Orleans, actually. I'm in Louisiana.

T: What is your ethnicity?

G: I'm a Black male.

T: In regards to the incident in 2008 at the Mardi Gras parade where you were arrested, can you tell me about that incident?

G: Well, you know, we were definitely going through some tough situation, and I was out with the guys just trying to drink my problems away, and this guy...

T: I'm sorry, what kind of problems were you having?

G: Well, just some financial problems. It had been pretty difficult, especially being a young man trying to make it, still going to school, still trying to work and go to school full time. It's been pretty difficult. So, I was out with my friends then. We were just having a few drinks, you know, just trying to drink our problems away. And, that's when this young man approached me. See, how the assault and battery happened, you know, had a little too much to drink and you know, words were exchanged, and it was a pretty heated argument, and you know that's how it all basically happened.

T: Had you not been having financial problems. You think that you might not have reacted the same way?

G: Well, basically, with the financial problems, it definitely intensified the situation in being that you're going through so much and you're kinda in a dilemma. You kinda react in a more aggressive manner, so definitely would have been handled a different way had I not been going through the financial problems.

T: Could you tell me what lead to the incident?

G: Well, basically, this guy decided to mess around. We were having a few drinks. He was pretty drunk, I must say. I was out talking to my friends. This young man that was drunk, he approached me and I didn't like what he was saying. I was trying to avoid this situation by being a little calm and rash, you know, but he proceeded to push me and that kinda ticked me. So, my boys, my friends, you know, my boys, they kinda got rowdy. And, you know, when you're with your boys, you have to defend yourself. You know, he was very defenseless, but at the same time, he was being very rude. He proceeded to not only push me, but to throw a drink in my face. So, I, of course, had to defend myself, and being that I was with my friends and that's just the type of person that I am, a character that's very defensive and strong. I just had to defend myself.

T: What do you think might have been different had you not been experiencing that stress?

G: First off, I probably wouldn't have been drinking as much. I definitely wouldn't have had that many drinks. You know, when you're going through certain financial situations, you know, it's pretty tough and you definitely want to take yourself out of the element, your element. And, drinking tends to do that, so I think things would have been very different. Things would have been much different.

T: (inaudible) ... How did [your friends] react, and did they influence how you reacted?

G: Well, being that I'm from a more street environment. You know, being raised in the streets, or coming from the streets, of course they kinda pushing me on. They definitely influenced the way I reacted. They wanted me to definitely defend myself.

T: Is there anything else you'd like to add about the incident?

G: Well, all I would really like to say is this. I would really like to apologize for my actions, you know. Like I'd said being that, you know, you go through so much and life can be so hard. Sometimes you're pushed to do things that sometimes, unfortunately, that you don't want to do but have to do to the effect that you are in these situations, so, um, I just want to apologize. I just want to apologize for my actions. And, hopefully, it doesn't happen again, and I really just wanted to show remorse for the incident.

T: OK, well, I appreciate your interviewing.