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A B S T R A C T

This paper reviews the existing literature on the relationship between social media and violence, including prevalence rates, typologies, and the overlap between cyber and in-person violence. This review explores the individual-level correlates and risk factors associated with cyber violence, the group processes involved in cyber violence, and the macro-level context of online aggression. The paper concludes with a framework for reconciling conflicting levels of explanation and presents an agenda for future research that adopts a selection, facilitation, or enhancement framework for thinking about the causal or contingent role of social media in violent offending. Remaining empirical questions and new directions for future research are discussed.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords:
Violence
Social media
Cyber-bullying
Gangs
Selection
Facilitation

Contents

1. Introduction .............................................................. 194
2. What do we know about cyber violence? ................................................. 194
   2.1. Prevalence of cyber violence ................................................... 194
   2.2. Overlap with traditional violence ................................................. 194
   2.3. In-person perpetrators using social media ............................................. 195
   2.4. New forms of aggression and violence ............................................... 195
3. Individual explanations of cyber violence ................................................. 195
   3.1. Low self-control or impulsivity .................................................. 195
   3.2. Psychopathic and Machiavellian traits ............................................... 196
   3.3. Internalizing traits ........................................................ 196
4. Group and environmental explanations of cyber violence .......................................... 196
   4.1. Social control and social learning theories ............................................. 196
   4.2. Routine activities and "digital drift" ................................................... 196
   4.3. Anonymity and conformity ...................................................... 197
5. Where do we go from here? ....................................................... 197
   5.1. Learning from the gang literature ................................................. 197
      5.1.1. Selection ........................................................ 197
      5.1.2. Facilitation ....................................................... 197
      5.1.3. Enhancement ...................................................... 197
   5.2. Contingencies .......................................................... 197
6. Conclusion ............................................................... 198

References ................................................................. 198

⁎ Corresponding author at: Hamline University, 1536 Hewitt Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55105, USA
E-mail address: jpeterson68@hamline.edu (J. Peterson).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.01.012
1359-1789/© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.
1. Introduction

In a little over a decade, social media has become “a vector for youth violence,” and dramatically changed the landscape for aggressive behavior (Patton et al., 2014). There is a growing body of literature concerned with understanding “electronic aggression,” which has been described as an “emerging public health problem” (David-Ferdon & Hertz, 2007). Perpetrators of in-person aggression have begun using social media in the furtherance of violent activity. Research suggests street gangs and drug cartels, for example, use social media to incite violence (Moule, Pyrooz, & Decker, 2013; Moule, Pyrooz, & Decker, 2014; Pyrooz, Decker, & Moule, 2015; Womer & Bunker, 2010). Terror groups utilize social media to project force (i.e., videos showing assassinations, torture, threats), and recruit into violent extremism (Holt, 2012; Kennedy & Weimann, 2011). Hate groups use online chat-rooms to encourage interracial violence (Glaser, Dixit, & Green, 2002). The customers of prostitutes solicit illicit sexual services online (Holt & Blevins, 2007) and pedophiles and sexual predators access the Internet to gain access to vulnerable potential victims (Goldsmith & Brewer, 2015; Holt, Blevins, & Burkel, 2010; Quayle & Taylor, 2002).

At the same time, social media has introduced new forms of aggression and violence that occur exclusively online. Studies find cyber-bullying and harassment, including threatening or sexual messages delivered via social media, for example, are common among juvenile populations (Hinduja & Patchin, 2008, 2009; Lim, Chan, Vadrevu, & Basnyat, 2012). Despite the above, the scientific fields generally concerned with violent behavior—namely criminology, psychology, and sociology—have produced very little research on the prevalence or etiology of various forms of cyber violence (Brown, 2015). Some argue the study of “virtual criminality” is merely “old wine in new bottles” (Grabosky, 2001) or a “technological variation of ordinary crime” (McQuade, 2006, p. 6), thus is already explained via existing social science theory (e.g., Choi, 2008; Williams, 2008; Yar, 2005). Yardley and Wilson (2014), for example, found when perpetrators of homicide used social networking sites in their crimes, it was in ways largely typical of general homicide offenders. Others suggest current theories of in-person violence may not apply to the rapidly changing world of cyber violence (e.g., Jaishankar, 2008, Clarke, 2004, p. 55) argues, for instance, the Internet has created “completely new” opportunities and environments for “traditional crimes” to “take new forms”.

This paper asks what we know about cyber violence and highlights what we do not know, but need to. It aims to review and organize the extant literature on the relationship between social media and violence. In doing so, we offer one of the first comprehensive reviews of a relatively young but burgeoning literature (c.f., Patton, Eschmann, & Butler, 2013), but also readily identify the gaps in existing knowledge to advance an agenda that might reconcile the “level of explanation problem” (Short, 1985, 1998) currently present in research on cyber violence. To this end, we ask whether the relationship between social media and violence is explained by selection, facilitation, or enhancement, thus evolving a framework of testable hypotheses more commonly associated with the positive correlation between offending and gang membership (Pyrooz, Turanovic, Decker, & Wu, 2016). Our aim is to discuss (1) the individual-level correlates and risks associated with cyber violence, (2) the group processes involved in cyber violence, and (3) the macro-level context of online aggression, so that future research may disentangle them.

2. What do we know about cyber violence?

One of the most cited typologies of cybercrime, developed by Wall (2001), suggests four forms of offending that exist in virtual environments: deception/theft, pornography, violence, and cyber-trespass. This paper is concerned primarily with violence, or what Holt (2011) describes as “cyber violence”. Further, this review focuses attention on violence via social media and social networking sites, broadly defined as “public mediated spaces” such as Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, and Instagram (Boyd, 2014, p. 137). Social media represents a shift toward a more “user-centred” (Van Dijck, 2013) and “user-generated” (Boyd, 2014) Internet, characterized by “spreadable media” (Jenkins, Ford, & Green, 2013) and “participatory” youth culture (Burgess & Green, 2009). Multi-platform or “polymeria” use is common, whereby individuals use different social media platforms for different forms of communication (Madianou & Miller, 2013). Burgess and Green (2009, p. 102) argue that even YouTube has evolved into a social networking site, “one in which videos (rather than friendings) are the primary media of social connection between participants”.

2.1. Prevalence of cyber violence

Cyber violence is difficult to define, let alone systematically track. As a result, prevalence rates are largely unknown. There have been a number of large-scale, national surveys of youth that examine cyber bullying and cyber dating violence. For example, one study used a large national telephone survey (N = 4561) of youth ages 10–17 during 2000, 2005, and 2010 (Jones, Mitchell, & Finkelhor, 2013). The rate of online harassment nearly doubled in a decade, from 6% in 2000 to 11% in 2010. Girls made up 65% of victims, an increase from 2000, and were more likely to report the incident occurred on a social networking site like Facebook. The reported rates of cyber-bullying in another national survey of 1988 youth ages 10–15 in 2008 were much higher (Ybarra, Mitchell, & Korchmaros, 2011). This study used a national, online survey of randomly selected households. In the last wave of this study, nearly 40% of the sample reported being victimized at some point and nearly 25% of the sample reported perpetrating harassment online.

Whether or not there is a gender difference in cyber aggression and violence is also unclear. Lowe and Espelage (2013) posit males typically have higher rates of physical bullying, but females may actually display higher rates of cyber aggression. Ybarra et al. (2011) found no gender difference in rates of cyber-bullying in their national survey. However, a recent cyber-bullying meta-analysis by Barlett and Coyne (2014) examined 122 effect sizes to explore whether or not there is a gender difference in prevalence rates. The results showed that girls were more likely to engage in cyber bullying during younger age (mid-adolescence) and boys were more likely to engage in cyber-bullying during later years (late adolescence).

Girls also are more likely to experience cyber-dating violence. In a survey focused on relationship violence among 5647 youth, over 25% of participants who were in a current or recent relationship experienced a form of cyber dating abuse victimization that year, with higher rates among girls (Zweig, Dank, Vahner, & Lachman, 2013). One out of 10 participants in this study reported perpetrating cyber-dating abuse. Unfortunately, beyond these studies in adolescence, there are virtually no prevalence studies of experiencing or perpetrating cyber aggression and violence in adulthood. Prevalence rates of traditional criminals using social media to facilitate violence (i.e. gang members, terror group members, sex offenders) are few and far between (e.g., Moule et al., 2013).

2.2. Overlap with traditional violence

Cyber violence can lead to similar levels of fear and distress as real-world violence (Bocij, 2004; Finn, 2004; Wall, 2001). One important question is whether or not the same individuals who perpetrate traditional forms of aggression and violence perpetrate cyber violence? Is the Internet simply a new place for antisocial individuals to carry out aggressive acts, or do social media attract a new and distinct group of aggressors, who are violent exclusively online? Research in this area is still in its early stages.

One survey of 1672 middle school students used cluster analysis to examine the overlap between overt, relational, and cyber aggressors (Dempsey, Sulkowski, Dempsey, & Storch, 2011). The data did show...
three distinct subtypes of aggressive behavior, however further analysis demonstrated that aggressive youth clustered more accurately by frequency of aggression, rather than type of aggression. Alternatively, a survey of 400 middle schoolers found only a small amount of overlap between cyber bullying and traditional bullying (Bonanno & Hymel, 2013). Another survey of over 5000 youth found that traditional and cyber-bullying were likely to co-occur with relationship violence—physical, sexual, psychological, and online (Yahner, Dank, Zweig, & Lachman, 2015). Furthermore, a recent study of anti-Muslim hate crime reported to the British government found considerable overlap between being victimized online and in-person, with similar psychological responses (stress, anxiety, and fear; Awan & Zempi, 2015).

In their review of the cyber sexual offender literature, Beech, Elliott, Birgden, and Findlater (2008) posit that there are four types of people who consume child pornography on the internet: impulsive users, those using images to fill sexual desires, people who disseminate images for non-sexual reasons, and those who also sexually offend in real life. Estimates of the percentage of people who use child pornography who also commit sexual offenses against children offline vary widely from 19% (Alexy, Burgess, & Baker, 2005) to 38% (Seto & Eke, 2005). Examining two “pedophile cyberspace rings,” Gambetta (2009, p. 62) observes, “in order to join, a would-be member had to possess at least ten thousand photographs [of children] and be prepared to share them with all other members.” The fact that photographs were screened to confirm they were “not recycled from other sources already available,” suggests online members had to be active offenders offline. Still, this is just one case—the phenomenon as a whole is difficult to study, often relying on arrest records for prior or later incidents (Beech et al., 2008). Overall, we know very little about the extent to which cyber violence and in-person violence overlap or are distinct phenomena.

2.3. In-person perpetrators using social media

Social media provides new means to organize, communicate, and feel connected with peers across the county and world. Gangs have begun using social media for their own self-promotion and more effective communication (Décary-Hétu & Morselli, 2011; Densley, 2013; King, Walpole, & Lamon, 2007; Morselli & Décary-Hétu, 2013; Moule et al., 2013; Moule et al., 2014; Pyrooz et al., 2015; Sela-Shayovitz, 2012; Van Hellemont, 2012; Womer & Bunker, 2010). Gang members often post videos, announce activities, incite dares, and display weapons (Patton et al., 2014). ‘Internet banging’ involves promoting one’s gang affiliation, reporting violence participation, and sharing information via social media (Patton et al., 2013). Most gang members are not committing any form of cyber crime, but rather are using social media to facilitate the violence and aggression of their routine gang lives (Sela-Shayovitz, 2012).

In addition to gang usage, there has been increased attention on the way extremist groups, including hate groups like neo-Nazis and terror groups such as the self-proclaimed Islamic State, have been using social media to incite and in some cases coordinate international acts of violence (Gerstenfeld, Grant, & Chiang, 2003; Schafer, 2002; Winter, 2015). Terrorists use social media for recruitment around the globe—sending messages on Twitter and YouTube to spread misinformation and gather intelligence about potential targets (Holt, 2012). In an extension of what Sageman (2011) called “leaderless jihad,” social media has also brought like-minded or “lone wolf” (see Spaaij, 2010) violent extremists together online using training manuals and video materials (Goldsmith & Brewer, 2015; Kennedy & Weimann, 2011). Homeland security has been actively developing social media campaigns to combat terrorist recruitment via social media, and monitoring social media accounts as a means to track and prevent terrorist activity (Zaffar, 2015).

School shootings also have a relationship with social media, though mostly anecdotally. Case studies of many shooters demonstrate a common interest in violent social media (Rocque, 2012), and many perpetrators express threats online before actually carrying out an attack (Patton et al., 2014). And, as discussed above, sex offenders use social media to stalk victims, disseminate pornographic images, and anonymously network with other pedophiles while remaining undetected (Beech et al., 2008; Boci, 2004; Gambetta, 2009). For individuals who commit crimes offline, therefore, social media is a tool to aid in communication and network with similar offenders on a larger scale.

2.4. New forms of aggression and violence

Social media has also introduced new, often anonymous, forms of aggression and violence that take place exclusively online. Cyber-bullying has generated the most research to date. Although there is some debate on the definition, cyber-bullying generally involves using the Internet to threaten, harm, embarrass, or socially exclude others (Ang, 2015). Some of the most common forms of bullying include the simple act of writing a mean comment on someone’s photo or posts on social media sites (Jones et al., 2013).

Another form of online aggression is “trolling,” which involves destructive and deceptive behavior to disrupt a space on the Internet for no apparent purpose (Buckels, Trapnell, & Paulhus, 2014). Social media also facilitates cyber relationship aggression in many forms—from “revenge porn” (Franklin, 2014) to “cyber-stalking” (Beech et al., 2008). Unfortunately, data on offenders who commit these relatively new forms of cyber violence is limited (Holt & Bossler, 2011). As Holt and Bossler (2011) observe, the “usual suspects of many criminal theories—minority, poorly educated offenders from the lower class—are simply priced and skilled out of computer-related crimes” (p. 28). What exist in the literature right now are anecdotal descriptions, with little attention to causes or consequences (Patton et al., 2014). Beyond debating the empirical status of cyber violence, therefore, research must seek to understand its theoretical and practical implications.

3. Individual explanations of cyber violence

A few psychological studies have begun examining the characteristics of individuals who engage in cyber aggression and violence, which include both traditional criminal risk factors (i.e., externalizing traits) and potentially new risk factors (i.e., internalizing traits).

3.1. Low self-control or impulsivity

Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) self-control theory argues that in-individuals with low self-control will find crime appealing because they are unable to see the consequences of their actions. This theory maps onto the concept of impulsivity in psychology, which is highly correlated with criminal behavior (Krueger, Markon, Patrick, Benning, & Kramer, 2007), and is well established as one of the strongest predictors of both juvenile and adult offending (White et al., 1994).

In the online context, low self-control is often presented as a risk factor either for piracy (i.e., online copyright infringement) offending (Higgins, Wolfe, & Marcum, 2008) or hacking (i.e., illegal access to computer networks) victimization (Bossler & Buruss, 2011; Bossler & Holt, 2010). Indeed, in the context of hacking victimization, Wilsen (2013) concludes, “Low self-control can be expected to go together with risky online behavior” (p. 441). Only a couple of studies have examined whether low self-control has a relationship with cyber aggression and violence. A survey study of nearly 500 undergraduate students found that low self-control predicted online deviance, which included harassing or threatening posts and illegal hacking (Donner, Marcum, Jennings, Higgins, & Banfield, 2014). An additional study of over 25,000 youth in 25 different countries ages 9–16 found associations between online and offline bullying and low self-control, with stronger direct effects on cyberbullying (compared to traditional bullying; Vazsonyi, Machackova, Sevcikova, Smahel, & Cerna, 2012). The small
amount of empirical literature available does suggest the relationship between low self-control/impulsivity and violence applies to the cyber world as well, thus may be an important risk factor for cyber aggression and violence.

3.2. Psychopathic and Machiavellian traits

Psychopathic traits (i.e., charming, manipulative, emotionally salow, callous, deceitful) are highly predictive of criminal and violent activity across a wide range of settings and individuals (Hare, 2003). A handful of studies have begun examining whether these traits are markers for cyber aggressors as well. Although the small collection of empirical evidence is somewhat mixed, the literature supports psychopathic or Machiavellian traits as another potential risk factor for cyber violence.

In one of the first studies of personality characteristics of online trolls, for example, Buckels et al. (2014) examined the relationship between trolling and self-reported sadistic traits, psychopathic traits, and Machiavellian traits (i.e., cynical, emotionally detached, manipulative; Abell & Brewer, 2014). Study one collected online data from 418 U.S. residents, of whom 5.6% reported engaging in trolling behavior online. These individuals scored significantly higher on all measures of sadism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism. A second, larger study collected online data from 188 Canadian college students and an additional 418 U.S. residents. Again, results showed a significant relationship between self-reported enjoyment of trolling and sadism, psychopathy and Machiavellianism. Further analysis demonstrated that psychopathy, specifically, was uniquely related to trolling behavior (as opposed to other, non-aggressive online activities such as chatting or debating).

In one of the only other studies of trolling behavior, Shachaf and Hara (2010) conducted qualitative interviews over email with a small sample of five Wikipedia trolls (who engage in harmful or threatening cyber aggression on Wikipedia). Consistent with Buckels et al.'s (2014) work, these interviews indicated that trolls were motivated by boredom, attention seeking, and revenge—and also found pleasure from causing damage to the Wikipedia community (potentially indicating sadistic or psychopathic traits). Abell and Brewer (2014) examined how Machiavellian traits influence social networking behavior among men and women (N = 243) using a series of self-report questionnaires. In this study, women (but not men) who were high in Machiavellianism were more likely to engage in relational aggression with a friend via social media.

One specific trait of psychopathy is a lack of empathy (Hare, 2003), which is the inability to experience the emotions of another person or to comprehend the emotions of another person (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006). A lack of empathy has been examined in the context of cyberbullying in two European studies. In one study involving online surveys of over 2000 students in Germany, cyberbullies reported significantly less empathy for victims than non-bullies (Steffgen, Konig, Ptetsch, & Melzer, 2011). However, Sticca, Ruggieri, Alsafer, and Perren (2013) surveyed 835 junior high school students in Switzerland, following-up six months later. They found that a lack of empathetic concern did not predict cyberbullying over and above traditional bullying, rule breaking, and frequency of online communication.

3.3. Internalizing traits

Externalizing traits such as low self-control, impulsivity, psychopathy, and lack of empathy also are strong risk factors for individuals who engage in traditional (i.e., in person) forms of aggression and violence. However, online aggression is distinct from traditional forms of aggression in that the aggressors are invisible to their victims, and often anonymous. This unique form of violence and aggression may, therefore, attract individuals with a distinct set of internalizing traits such as depression or shyness.

For example, a study of nearly 400 youth in grades 8–10 in Canada, found symptoms of depression and suicidal ideation were predicted by involvement in cyberbullying (Bonanno & Hymel, 2013). Participating as a cyberbully accounted for a small, but significant amount of the variance in depression and accounted for a larger amount of the variance in suicidality. An additional survey in 2007 of nearly 2000 middle school students found that cyberbullies were more likely to experience suicidal ideation and attempt suicide than students who had not been involved in online aggression (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010).

Beyond depression and suicidality, a study of over 400 University students in Turkey examined the relationship between “problematic internet use” and narcissism, shyness, loneliness, aggression, and self-perception (Odaci & Çelik, 2013). The results of this self-report study demonstrate only aggression and shyness were significantly correlated with problematic Internet use. Although the examination of internalizing traits as predictors of those who engage in cyber-aggression is a relatively new area of study, these preliminary findings highlight these traits as potentially important selection criteria.

4. Group and environmental explanations of cyber violence

In addition to individual-level externalizing and internalizing traits, certain group processes and environmental factors may also facilitate cyber violence. Prior research has generally drawn upon popular criminological theories to account for this, as follows.

4.1. Social control and social learning theories

The role of parents and peers is critical in the development and facilitation of traditional forms of aggression and violence (e.g., Akers, 1998). In a recent review of the literature, Ang (2015) found that poor emotional bonds with parents and a lack of parental monitoring related specifically to cyber aggression as well. Holt et al. (2010) argue social learning theory may apply specifically to cyber aggression through the association with delinquent peers. Exposure to violence in the media is also associated with concurrent reports of serious violent behavior (Ybarra et al., 2008).

Hinduja and Patchin (2007) examined 4400 sixth to twelfth grade students, and also found that cyber bullying was related the perceived likelihood of being punished by adults. Additionally, this study found that perceptions of peer behavior (i.e., whether or not one’s peers were cyberbullying as well) were related to cyber aggression. This finding is consistent with a recent survey of 850 middle school students, which found that weak attachments to peers was associated with both traditional and cyber bullying (Burton, Florell, & Wygant, 2012). Another study of relationship cyber aggression in 600 adolescents found that insecure maternal attachments and insecure partner attachments were related to partner-directed cyber aggression (Wright, 2015), again emphasizing the importance of peer and family relationships as selection criteria.

4.2. Routine activities and “digital drift”

Offending via social networking sites is most commonly associated with routine activity or lifestyle theories of crime (Bossler & Holt, 2009; Holt & Bossler, 2009; Leukfeldt, 2014; Moule et al., 2013; Ngo & Paternoster, 2011; Pratt, Holfreter, & Reisig, 2010; Pyrooz et al., 2015; Reyns, 2013; Reyns, Henson, & Fisher, 2011; Van Wijlen, 2011; Yar, 2005). As first conceptualized by Cohen and Felson (1979), routine activity theory states crime results from the spatial and temporal convergence of motivated offenders and suitable targets in the absence of capable guardianship (i.e., formal or informal social controls). Routine activity theory has intuitive appeal for explaining crime online, not least because connecting to the online world has become so routine, or habitual for society (David-Ferdon & Hertz, 2007; Huesmann, 2007). Still, routine activity theory perhaps has more to say about victimization
than offending (Sampson & Lauritsen, 1990). People explore new technologies because of the freedom these technologies bring, but new technologies make people vulnerable to online violence. Williams and Guerra (2007) observe, “The Internet has become a new arena for social interactions, allowing children and youth to say and do things with a certain degree of anonymity and limited oversight by adult monitors” (p. 15). Limited oversight speaks to the absence of capable guardian-ship online.

Guan and Subrahmanyam (2009) looked into the link of online ad- diction in youth with the likelihood of being harassed, bullied, and sexually exploited and concluded that those who spend more time on the internet are more likely to be approached by online predators. Overall, the more youth are online, the greater chance there is to become a vic- tim of cyberbullying considering the background, type of contact, and relationships formed. As an extension of this line of inquiry, Goldsmith and Brewer (2015) draw on Matza (1964) to advance the theory of “digital drift,” which accounts for the arbitrary and capricious nature of some cyber violence. Goldsmith and Brewer point to lone wolf terrorism and pedophilia as examples of a new “criminal interaction order” “that is encounter based and that can engage with the Internet as a source as well as facilitator of encounters” that result in criminal outcomes (p. 126). Such a perspective speaks to the “great seduction” (Ken, 2008, p.11) of the Internet and what Katz (1998, p. 53) referred to as “sneaky thrills” of offending.

4.3. Anonymity and conformity

Anonymity may contribute to online aggression and violence be- yond a lack of guardianship, due to the “deindividuation” process. People experience reduced inhibition and personal responsibility in situations when they are more anonymous (Zimbardo, 2007). For example, a study of violence in Northern Ireland found a significant relation- ship between wearing a mask to disguise one’s identity and increased aggression (Silke, 2001). The degree of anonymity on social media, with an associated lack of accountability, encourages uncon- strained commenting (Lee, 2006), which in turn may contribute to the aggressive nature of users’ comments (Thelwall & Sud, 2011). New apps, such as ‘Yik Yak’, allow users in the same physical area to post anonymous messages to each other. These anonymous group conversa- tion on Yik Yak have turned so threatening and aggressive on college campuses that many Universities are asking their students to avoid the app altogether (Mahler, 2015).

Another important social process that may take place on social media is conformity, which is changing one’s behavior because of direct or indirect group pressure, either real or imagined (Asch, 1951), as was famously demonstrated by the Stanford prison experiment in the 1970s (Haney, Banks, & Zimbardo, 1978). For example, a study of over 1200 el- ementary school students that examined bullying found that the strongest influence on behavior came from class context and group norms, as opposed to individual attitudes (Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). Social media expands the peer networks of adolescents, exposing them to new group norms in an online context. Although this phenomenon has not yet been empirically studied, social media may contribute to cyber violence by expanding peer networks that normalize aggressive or violent online behaviors.

5. Where do we go from here?

With what we know about cyber violence now established, we can highlight what we do not know and where the research needs to go from here. In his 1997 American Society of Criminology Presidential Ad- dress, Jim Short (1998) revisited the “level of explanation problem” that plagues research into social problems, calling for a concerted effort to address the interaction between micro, meso, and macro levels of expla- nation. As a relatively new field, research on cyber violence is, perhaps predictably, experiencing this same level of explanation problem. This review has examined the macro context of cyber violence, the individu- al-level characteristics, and group-level processes that contribute to its perpetration. But, as can be observed, the literature lacks continuity and coherence. There is a tendency among scholars to revise articulated typologies of cyber violence (e.g., Jacks & Adler, 2015), rather than ad- vance a comprehensive theoretical model that might ground the con- versation about cyber aggression and violence and its overall impact on the criminal justice field. Empirical research thus is needed to disen- tangle the causes and correlates of online aggression and reconcile conflicting levels of explanation. To achieve such a goal, that research needs direction, which is the intent of this section.

5.1. Learning from the gang literature

One way to advance the examination of social media and violence is to think about social media, or anti-social media, as a “gang.” That gang members partake in delinquent activity, especially violent offenses, more than their non-gang counterparts, is one of the most established findings in the field of criminology (Battin, Hill, Abbott, Catalano, & Hawkins, 1998; Gordon et al., 2004; Esbensen & Huizinga, 1993; Thornberry, Krohn, Lizotte, Smith, & Tobin, 2003). The relationship be- tween gang membership and delinquency endures even when control- ling for numerous confounders and mediators (Pyrooz et al., 2016). The question is, why? Thornberry, Krohn, Lizotte, and Chard-Wierschem (1993) proposed three explanations—selection, facilitation, and enhancement—that over the course of two decades have attracted a great deal of attention (over 550 citations according to Google Scholar) and have been tested employing a diverse set of methodologies (see Krohn & Thornberry, 2008). A recent meta-analysis of 179 empirical studies revealed that the relationship between gang membership and offending is best represented not by pure selection or facilitation pers- pectives, but by the enhancement model (Pyrooz et al., 2016). Below we propose adapting this tripartite approach to understanding cyber violence.

5.1.1. Selection

First, the selection model is a “kinds of persons” explanation, suggest- ing that youth with shared individual deficits such as poor self-control select into cyber violence and that any increased delinquency should not be attributed to social media. This is consistent with propensity ex- planations of delinquency, wherein gangs have no causal influence on criminal behavior (e.g., Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). According to the selection model, individuals with certain characteristics are more likely to select into cyber aggression and violence (i.e. the gang). In this view, the Internet is “not a main effect cause of anything” (McKenna & Bargh, 2000, p. 57). Instead, criminal propensity and other individual-level “risk factors” explain the correlation between social media and violence.

5.1.2. Facilitation

Second, the social facilitation model is a “kinds of groups” explana- tion (Akers, 1998; Sutherland, 1947), suggesting that cyber violence is purely attributable to the influence of the social media, particularly group processes associated with its use. In this model, social media have a causal influence on violence—but for anti-social media, an indi- vidual would not engage in certain actions. The causal effect of social media extends beyond mere opportunity or lack of guardianship, arising from features of social media itself, such as anonymity or conformity to group norms.

5.1.3. Enhancement

Finally, the enhancement model is a “kinds of groups and persons” model that combines selection and facilitation effects and is supported when there is evidence of a selection effect—more delinquent youths use anti-social media—and a facilitation effect whereby violent offending is increased during social media use relative to social media nonusers with similar violent propensities. With both mechanisms at
work, anti-social media attract individuals with propensities toward violence and then group processes associated with social media produce greater offending rates.

We have presented three different explanations for the observation that violence is correlated with social media use: (a) violent people use social media (selection hypothesis); (b) social media facilitates violence (facilitation hypothesis); and (c) selection and facilitation work interactively (enhancement hypothesis). Each explanation has different implications for the rates of violence before, during, and after social media use and can be used to organize the existing literature. These are testable hypotheses, which we hope will encourage further study and greater theoretical and methodological coherence in the cyber violence literature.

5.2. Contingencies

Gang research was some 60 years old before the “empirical turn” (Pyrooz & Mitchell, 2015) of which Thornberry et al.’s (1993) tripartite model of gang membership and delinquency is synonymous with changed the trajectory of the field. Since then, there have never been fewer than 150 new contributions to the gang literature on an annual basis (Pyrooz & Mitchell, 2015). This review has exposed a number of unassembled questions in the current literature on cyber aggression and violence and we feel that should efforts going forward examine cyber violence through the lens of selection, facilitation, and enhancement, a similar “turning point” in the field might be achieved.

Existing research on the psychological characteristics of cyber aggressors is almost exclusively concerned with cyber bullying, yet as this paper demonstrates cyber violence takes many forms (terrorism, gangs, sexual predators). Predictably, sociological research is focused more on group processes whereas psychological research is concerned with individual risk and personalities. As a result, there are gaps in the literature where these fields traditionally do not overlap. For instance, there is virtually no research on the psychological profiles or backgrounds of terrorists or gang members who use social media, instead focused only on social processes and how they recruit new colleagues. It is true that the emergence of online social networking sites offers new arenas for social interaction, altering the basic principles of group participation (Turkle, 2012). At the same time, however, online social networks supplement face-to-face sociability, rather than replace it, allowing people to carefully craft their role and participation in community life and control how, when, and with whom they interact (Chayko, 2008). On the “digital street” the real and the virtual overlap with surprising regularity and future research into “networked life” must account for this (Lane, 2016).

It is possible that perpetrators of cyber violence are not a uniform group and are better represented with a typology of behavior. For example, is cyber-bullying perpetuated by teenagers distinctly different than violence perpetrated by adult gang members, terrorists and sex offenders? (i.e., is cyber aggression and violence best represented along a spectrum of behaviors?) Are there habitual versus casual aggressors? Is there a difference between individuals who victimize someone they know (cyber bullying) or someone they don’t (trolling)? Is there a difference between individuals who have in-person contact with their victims versus those who do not? Are there personality differences between those who start aggression online first or in-person first? Does it matter who is the ‘initiator’ versus who is conforming and following group norms?

6. Conclusion

This paper has reviewed the extant literature on cyber violence. Although many questions still need to be explored, we have demonstrated that in many ways the relationship between social media and violence can be understood much like the relationship between gangs and crime and that existing scholarship can be largely organized according to the aforementioned themes of selection and facilitation. Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) general theory of crime, Akers’ (1998) social learning theory, and Cohen and Felson’s (1979) routine activity theory, for example, all have received some empirical support for explaining violence in online contexts. However, none of these explanations alone are sufficient, thus the challenge for future research is to advance a research agenda that includes an enhancement perspective on the role of the social media in violent offending. This likely necessitates longitudinal studies that examine the impact of both individual characteristics and group processes on cyber violence over time, as well as how they interact with each other. If individuals who engage in cyber violence have an elevated violence propensity, for instance, it should be evident across time regardless of social media use. Developing effective prevention and intervention strategies for cyber violence thus requires reconciling how selection, facilitation, and enhancement unfold throughout the life course. To achieve this, future longitudinal studies with young people in general and delinquent youth in particular must include measures of cyber violence and a component addressing social media usage. We must embrace the fact that while violence is constant, technology is ever-changing, thus any understanding of the relationship between the two must be derived from dynamic theory and research.
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