

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Publications and Research

CUNY Graduate Center

2009

Methodology Appendix: On the Craft of Sociology in the Digital Era

Jessie Daniels
Hunter College

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_pubs/196

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).
Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

Cyber Racism

*White Supremacy Online
and the New Attack on Civil Rights*

Jessie Daniels

ROWMAN & LITTLEFIELD PUBLISHERS, INC.
Lanham • Boulder • New York • Toronto • Plymouth, UK

(2009)

~

Contents

	List of Figures and Tables	ix
	Preface	xi
	Acknowledgments	xv
Part I	Introduction	
Chapter 1	White Supremacy in the Digital Era	3
Chapter 2	Theorizing White Supremacy Online	17
Part II	White Supremacy in a Global Context	
Chapter 3	Individual Acts of White Supremacy Online	29
Chapter 4	White Supremacist Social Movements Online and in a Global Context	39
Part III	White Supremacy Online	
Chapter 5	Gender, White Supremacy, and the Internet	61
Chapter 6	White Supremacist Discourse: In Print and Online	91

Chapter 7	Cyber Lies: Cloaked Websites	117
Chapter 8	Searching for Civil Rights, Finding White Supremacy: Adolescents Making Sense of Cloaked Websites	139
Part IV	Fighting White Supremacy in the Digital Era	
Chapter 9	Combating Global White Supremacy in the Digital Era	159
Chapter 10	Conclusion: Racial Justice and Civic Engagement in the Digital Era	187
	Methodology Appendix: On the Craft of Sociology in the Digital Era	195
	References	207
	Index	247
	About the Author	253

omponent."¹⁴ A proliferation of on-
to-netizen.com) are leading the way
gagement. And African American
ivism online, organizing the Million
1999.¹⁵ Today it is black women
nd activism on the Dunbar Village
mainstream media indifference to
vil rights activists.¹⁶
er King Jr.'s vision and reject the
o the starless midnight of racism"
ality, civic engagement online of-
ism to make that vision real. The
ite supremacy online compels us
evaluate knowledge claims within
multiple literacies, how we articu-
or not we become engaged in po-
ion Age will determine whether
victories and the ideals of demo-
elinquish them in the dawn of a

tance Speech, December 10, 1964,
e/MLK-nobel.html.

Center, and the ADL.

Methodology Appendix: On the Craft of Sociology in the Digital Era

Sociologists are still deciding which methods are suitable for the task of investigating society in the digital era. The social world is changing because of the Internet, and sociological methods for studying patterned human behavior must change as well. Yet sociologists have been slow to take up the challenge of Internet research, as DiMaggio and colleagues have observed.¹ There are many possible reasons for this including, perhaps, a distrust and anxiety about the new.² Ben Agger poses the question, "Does the Internet require that we revise sociology's and social theory's categories?"³ That can seem a daunting task to those contemplating a study that includes some Internet component. Sociologists of a certain generation may also view the Internet as something for the young or the not-sufficiently serious. A former colleague of mine assured me the Web was a fad and urged me to abandon my interest in it if I wanted to be taken seriously as a scholar. That was in 1997, and he was wrong, as it turns out. Although some of these concerns may explain part of sociology's failure to take up the challenge of Internet research, I think there is another reason still.

One of the main barriers to the sociological study of the Internet has to do with the fact that there is not, as of yet, a well-developed sociological method for studying patterned human behavior involving the Internet. While there are some empirical studies in the sociology of the Internet, including large-scale, quantitative studies of people's Internet skills,⁴ content analysis of the Web,⁵

ethnographies of online games,⁶ studies of community formation among Filipinos in diaspora,⁷ and neighborhood-based use of new media⁸ as well as some impressive theoretical contributions about understanding the social implications of the Internet by some of the leading figures in sociology,⁹ there is comparatively little about the sociological research methods most appropriate for studying the Internet.¹⁰ The field of Internet studies is also widely (even wildly) interdisciplinary, and some sociologists may be daunted by the prospect of venturing beyond disciplinary boundaries. While in the rest of this book I have drawn on a broad range of literature from diverse disciplines, including library science, psychology, cultural studies, and communications, this appendix is intended for my fellow sociologists and those interested in sociological methods. In this appendix my goal is to contribute some notes toward the emerging craft of sociology in the digital era.

The study at hand draws on a range of sociological methods, including ethnographic observation of a white supremacist online forum; qualitative-discourse analysis of Web text and graphic design, layout, and images; secondary analysis of Web analytics; case studies; and autoethnography. In addition, I developed an innovative combination of experiment, usability study, and in-depth interview in which I asked young people who were participants to try and distinguish between legitimate civil rights websites and cloaked white supremacist sites. This appendix, then, is meant to offer much more detail about precisely what I did in conducting this research. The intended audience here includes the graduate student embarking on a sociological study of the Internet and more experienced sociologists who may be considering how to incorporate some aspect of digital media into an existing research agenda. My framework for this discussion is: (1) what other sociologists have to say about a particular methodological problem or issue of Internet research, (2) what I did in my research for this book and how I dealt with that issue, and (3) a suggestion for a general principle that may guide other researchers interested in conducting a qualitative sociological analysis that involves the Internet beyond the specific case of white supremacists or even social movements more generally. I follow this with a discussion about some of the ethical issues involved in doing such research.

Content Analysis of Social-Movement Discourse before and after the Web

There is a strong sociological tradition of analyzing social-movement discourse and framing of issues.¹¹ And today there is a quickly growing body of

community formation among Fil-
se of new media⁸ as well as some
nderstanding the social implica-
ures in sociology,⁹ there is com-
h methods most appropriate for
udies is also widely (even wildly)
daunted by the prospect of ven-
in the rest of this book I have
erse disciplines, including library
nunications, this appendix is in-
erested in sociological methods.
notes toward the emerging craft

sociological methods, including
icist online forum; qualitative-
esign, layout, and images; sec-
; and autoethnography. In ad-
ition of experiment, usability
d young people who were par-
imate civil rights websites and
, then, is meant to offer much
ducting this research. The in-
udent embarking on a socio-
nced sociologists who may be
digital media into an existing
sion is: (1) what other sociol-
ogical problem or issue of In-
for this book and how I dealt
eral principle that may guide
alitative sociological analysis
case of white supremacists or
v this with a discussion about
ch research.

Movement Discourse

Web

alyzing social-movement dis-
: is a quickly growing body of

literature that examines the use of the Internet by social movements in the form of research on cyberactivism¹² and *Internetworked Social Movements* (ISMs).¹³ However, there is no other research that I know of that is taking advantage of the opportunity to use the Web to study social-movement discourse on either side of the advent of the Internet. This strikes me as a lost opportunity for sociologists interested in social movements, particularly those interested in social-movement discourse.

In this research I followed an earlier qualitative content analysis of movement documents in print by looking at how those same groups had translated themselves (or had failed to make the transition) to the Web. To do this I kept a close watch on the Internet for the emergence of websites by white supremacists I had examined in my earlier research. One of the tools I used to do this (more recently) was Google Reader, which I configured to track relevant research terms, such as *white supremacist*, and the names of specific individuals, such as *Matt Hale*. I also used the Internet Archive (archive.org), a.k.a. the way-back machine, a site that provides the general public free access to old versions of websites. I utilized this rich source of data to retrieve older versions of the sites when they were no longer available as live sites on the Web. This was especially useful in the instances in which the groups no longer have a current Web presence. This became particularly important in the case of Matt Hale, who is now incarcerated and whose WCOTC site is no longer active. The Internet Archive also provided me with the opportunity to track the evolution of particular sites' design and content over a number of years (e.g., Thom Robb's KKK-affiliated sites) and also allowed me to see when a site had *not* changed since its creation (e.g., Ed Fields, *The Truth at Last*).

The principle here is straightforward: sociologists should use the available Internet tools, such as the Internet Archive, to study social-movement discourse on the Web and at different points in time. The Internet Archive is intended for use by researchers and the general public. Sociologists with qualitative interests and skills could use the archive to explore themes in movement websites. And those with more quantitative inclinations could use existing data-mining software to examine statistical patterns in the archive.

(Auto)ethnographic Observation Online and Offline

C. Wright Mills, in his methodological appendix to *The Sociological Imagination*, wrote, "I do not like to do empirical work if I can possibly avoid it. If

one has no staff, it is a great deal of trouble; if one does employ staff, then the staff is often even more trouble."¹⁴ And, indeed, it is a great deal of trouble. Research involving the Internet can seem, in contrast, deceptively easy: turn on the computer, log onto the Internet, do some research. While some sociologists may still be under the misguided impression that studying new media is something one does sitting in front of a computer, there is, as Howard Becker has pointed out, a limit to what this method can accomplish.¹⁵ Sociologists who have engaged in ethnographic observation online have written primarily about online ethnography as participant observation,¹⁶ and as such one of the primary dilemmas for researchers so engaged is building rapport with subjects.

Instead of focusing primarily on white supremacists with websites as subjects, *per se*, I spent time in other online spaces to try to understand white supremacists in comparison to other groups. I was also reflexive about my own encounters with such sites online and, in particular, was interested in the ways that my students encountered white supremacy online both intentionally (by seeking it out) and inadvertently (by stumbling upon it). Thus, the kind of autoethnographic narrative that opens chapter 3, in which I describe my experience of my students' encounters of white supremacy online, is an experience that was part of an ongoing research process in which I formulated and reformulated questions about what I was investigating. I also spent much of the time I was working on this project immersed in Internet technologies (using them for personal connection and knowledge-seeking, teaching with them, reading, writing, and thinking with them, even briefly working in the industry). I systematically spent time and collected data (posts from Web-based discussion forums) at Stormfront. In addition, I kept up with changes in various white supremacist organizations through news reports, their own Web sites, and monitoring organizations such as the ADL, Simon Wiesenthal Center, and the Southern Poverty Law Center. Thus, the form that this (auto)ethnographic investigation took was one that led me down a number of different paths, but all brought me back to my central question about what it means—both for the Internet and for our understandings of race—that white supremacists are online.

There are a number of principles or guidelines to derive from such a methodology, including taking time to pay attention. While some may want to view white supremacy online as a separate, distinct subculture apart from mainstream society, I was interested in understanding how white supremacy online is similar to and part of mainstream American culture. In my methodological approach, online and offline worlds overlap in complex ways. Research that looks only at online worlds suggests a false dichotomy between

the Internet and offline interactions and thus limits our understanding of how the Internet and society work in tandem.

Adapting the Cultural Diamond to the Digital Era

In an influential article Wendy Griswold developed the cultural diamond as a methodological framework for the sociological study of culture. Griswold's schema sets out four points for examining any cultural artifact, and in this research, I have adapted this framework for studying the Web. Examining the text of Web pages, discussion forums, and newsgroups is the most straightforward method, and it is also the most common way of studying white supremacy online.¹⁷ Much less common are studies of the *Web user*. In other media, this type of research is called *audience reception* and explores how the listener, viewer, or reader interprets the text, whether that text is visual (as in films or television shows) or printed (as in novels or newspaper articles). Sonia Livingstone has suggested that the terms *audience* and *reception* do not work well for digital media for a variety of reasons, such as interactivity (rather than one-to-many, with producer and receiver separate as in broadcast media).¹⁸ When it comes to empirical explorations of how people find, read, and interpret extremist rhetoric on racist websites, there is scant research. An important exception to this is the work of Lee and Leets, who examine how adolescents respond to what they call *persuasive storytelling* online by hate groups.¹⁹ More difficult and less prevalent are investigations into the connections between online interaction and face-to-face social networks among extremists.²⁰

Among the questions I wanted to investigate in this study was how young people make sense of white supremacy online. I was much less interested in investigating how avowed white supremacists come to be part of an organized movement or how those in the movement first decided to start using the Internet. My interest in how the young make sense of white supremacy online originated in those classroom lab sessions back in 1997. I struggled for a long time to come up with a way to investigate such an accidental discovery in any sort of systematic way. Then I encountered the work of Dina Borzekowski²¹ in 2004 and had the chance to meet her in 2005 at the foundation where I was scholar-in-residence. It was there that Dina suggested I use the talk-aloud method, and this sparked further ideas about how to construct these interviews in conjunction with viewing cloaked sites. In January and February 2006, I asked adolescents (ages fifteen to nineteen) to use the Internet to search for information and to evaluate two preselected pairs of websites about Dr. King and about the civil rights movement. I utilized a

mixed-method study design, which included search scenarios, paired website evaluations, and the talk-aloud technique (also referred to as *think aloud*). There were two search scenarios: The first asked participants to “find information on Martin Luther King as if you had a report to write for school.” The second scenario asked participants to “find information about the goals of the civil rights movement as if you had a report to write for school.” As they reviewed the results of their query returned by the search engine, I asked them questions about what they saw, what looked interesting to them and why, and which websites they would select to read.

After completing the search scenarios task, I asked the participants to evaluate the differences between pairs of websites. The first pair included the legitimate King Center site (thekingcenter.org) and the *cloaked* Martin Luther King site (martinlutherking.org); the second pair included the *cloaked* American Civil Rights Review site (americancivilrightsreview.com) and the legitimate Voices of Civil Rights site (voicesofcivilrights.org). I preselected these sites based on the similarity of content and traffic. For example, the traffic in 2006 to the websites for the King Center and the cloaked Martin Luther King site are nearly identical, with an overall peak in February, which is African American History Month.

I minimized the windows for all four websites on the computer and introduced pairs of sites to each participant. I made sure to change the sequence, introducing a cloaked site first, followed by a legitimate site, and then reversing the order. Some participants had already found these sites during the initial search scenario, and I asked them to look at the sites again, in relation to the paired website and talk aloud about which site they would choose as a source of information if they were forced to select one for a school report.

During both tasks, the search scenarios and the paired-website evaluations, I asked participants to talk aloud about what they were doing. The talk-aloud technique, which is common in usability studies of graphic user interface (GUI) website design and frequently used by marketing firms, asks Web users to describe what they are doing, seeing, thinking, reading, and clicking on—and why they are making those choices—as they navigate a website.²² Completing both tasks took participants approximately thirty to forty-five minutes. I recorded these sessions using a digital video camera, recording audio of the participants’ voices and accounts of their searching and evaluating the Web, and capturing video images of the computer screens as they searched.

To analyze this data I transcribed the audio portion of the interviews and noted in the transcripts what was on the computer screen at the same time so that I could recall to which websites the participants were referring in

their interviews. I also noted titles, the images on the screen, and I coded the transcripts by theme and then compared the themes across interviews and across participants. This process, although time-consuming, illustrates the Web user in relation to the Web. Reviewing the video recordings and transcripts also provided additional information about what was searched, navigated, read, and interacted with on the regular website.

I used a snowball sampling strategy to recruit participants. Participants for the study were recruited through a youth-focused organization that distributed printed flyers, and online bulletin board postings. The sample includes ten (N=10) participants from the online bulletin board postings for the foundation. Almost all (N=9) participants are from diverse ethnic backgrounds (one African American, two Latina, and three South Asian). All indicated that they were born in the United States, in high school, in the eleventh grade, and that participants under age eighteen would need to get parental consent and were not included in the study. Participants eighteen and over did not need parental consent. Except for the participants who were asked to travel to my faculty office for the interview, all participants complete the interview that lasted 15 to 20 minutes. I was alone to the interview, although I had a research assistant quietly while we completed the interview. The participant who received a \$20 stipend for the interview received a \$20 stipend about Internet searching during the interview. While I wanted to include a larger sample, the money prohibited more interviews. This was a methodological approach in future research.

Given that almost all of the participants were from the online bulletin-board postings (a sample of relatively digitally fluent teens), the sample is not generalizable to all teens or even to all teens in New York City. However, the Pew Intern-

and search scenarios, paired website (also referred to as *think aloud*). I asked participants to "find information to write for school." The information about the goals of the search engine, I asked them what was interesting to them and why, and

task, I asked the participants to visit websites. The first pair included the *er.org*) and the *cloaked* Martin (second pair included the *cloaked* *ancivilrightsreview.com*) and the *esofcivilrights.org*). I preselected content and traffic. For example, the Center and the *cloaked* Martin showed an overall peak in February, which

sites on the computer and introduced me to change the sequence, visit a legitimate site, and then re-visit the sites during the study. I looked at the sites again, in relation to which site they would choose as a select one for a school report.

and the paired-website evaluation. I asked them what they were doing. The usability studies of graphic user interface used by marketing firms, asks about seeing, thinking, reading, and making choices—as they navigate a website. Participants approximately thirty to thirty-five using a digital video camera, and accounts of their searching and images of the computer screens

video portion of the interviews and computer screen at the same time as participants were referring in

their interviews. I also noted the sequence of their navigation through the sites, the images on the screen, and the way they responded to these. I then coded the transcripts by theme and analyzed them for similar and discordant themes across interviews and for consistencies or changes in patterns within interviews. This process, although time-consuming, is useful, because it situates the Web user in relation to the visual images, the text, and hypertext of the Web. Reviewing the video portion of the interviews and noting it in the transcripts also provided additional information about the way participants searched, navigated, read, and made meaning of search results or of a particular website.

I used a snowball sampling strategy to find participants for the interviews. Participants for the study were recruited through a variety of means, including through a youth-focused human-rights foundation, word-of-mouth, printed flyers, and online bulletin-board postings. The resulting convenience sample includes ten (N=10) participants. The majority (N=8) were recruited from the online bulletin board, one through word-of-mouth and one from the foundation. Almost all (N=9) were female and came from a variety of racial/ethnic backgrounds (one African American, one Asian-Chinese, two white, two Latina, and three South Asian); the one male respondent was Latino. All indicated that they were born in the United States, and all were enrolled in high school, in the eleventh or twelfth grade, at the time of the study. Participants under age eighteen who participated in the study were required to get parental consent and were guided through the informed assent process. Participants eighteen and over were guided through the informed consent process. Except for the participant at the foundation, all participants were asked to travel to my faculty office at a college campus in the city to complete the interview that lasted less than an hour. Participants usually arrived alone to the interview, although one participant brought her mother, who sat quietly while we completed the interview. Participants who completed the interview received a \$20 stipend for their time and were given information about Internet searching during the debriefing following the interview. While I wanted to include a larger sample, constraints of both time and money prohibited more interviews. I hope to continue to develop this methodological approach in future research.

Given that almost all of the participants volunteered for the study via the online bulletin-board postings (*newyork.craigslist.org*), it is likely that this is a sample of relatively digitally fluent and Internet-savvy teens. Of course, because of the convenience sampling strategy employed, these results are not generalizable to all teens or even all teens using the Internet in New York City. However, the Pew Internet and American Life Project has conducted

large, national, random-sample survey research into the online practices of adolescents that found that of the majority (87 percent) of adolescents ages twelve to seventeen who were online in 2005 51 percent use the Internet on a daily basis and 76 percent get news or information about current events online. This is in contrast to adults, who are less likely to use the Internet, with 66 percent of adults using the Internet.²³ This research also indicates that among older teens (fifteen to seventeen) girls are power users of the Internet and search for information about a variety of subject areas; they are more likely to use a greater variety of digital technology—including e-mail, instant messaging, and text messaging—than are their male peers.²⁴ It is likely that the sample for this study includes participants who are similar in their Web usage to the national sample. In particular, the fact that I was able to recruit a majority female sample using an online bulletin-board posting suggests that these young women are typical of the power users identified in the Pew research.

There are a number of principles for the sociology of the Internet from this research. The key is that the Internet is a many-to-many medium (rather than a one-to-many medium, such as broadcast or traditional print) and draws an *audience* that is much more interactive than a television audience. For example, *users* are also often *creators* and *producers*. Therefore, our ways of studying Internet audiences need to become more sophisticated as well. Further, one of the key insights I gleaned from talking with the young people in this study is the importance of the Internet as a *visual* as well as text-based medium. Visual cues are important to young people who use the Internet. Our sense of what *reading* means needs to expand to include the *interpretation of the visual*, as long suggested by visual sociologists and cultural-studies scholars. And, finally, a further principle is that sociologists must recognize that text on a website is *contested*, that is read differently by different Web visitors. This is another reason that Internet-only content analysis of websites is a limited methodology at best.

You Never Step in the Same Internet Twice: Doing Sociology on Internet Time

“Sociology is slow journalism,” Dale McLemore was fond of saying. And in many ways Dale—a professor of mine at University of Texas—was absolutely correct. Sociology often tackles subjects that have first been brought to light by journalists. We approach the study of the same subject much more slowly, because we like to think of ourselves (as a discipline) as being methodical and systematic. The relative slowness of sociology is a significant factor in keeping pace with the rapidly changing Internet. Manuel Castells has pointed out, “The speed of transformation has made it difficult for scholarly research to fol-

low the pace of change with an : why and wherefores of the Intern

Even as I write this, the Intern day as websites are created and a let go. Yet sociology is the study (lence is to be able to say someth line behavior before they change

In this study I dealt with this used many different research met it felt like just as I had figured ou pect of white supremacy online s how the Internet worked seemed started writing about white supre how to control Internet content cally changed. But the fact is that point you have to make an argun ten down and out the door (Beck

The principle here for sociol quickly on the Internet and that : rapid pace of change. However, i the study of the Internet, as a nun The key, I think, is to try and be and participate in online commu ing of the medium and the myria data that sociologists systematical reflect this deeper understanding : pace of change.

Some Ethical Issues

Any research with human subject particularly if those subjects are While I would argue that there who were participants in this res find the websites unsettling. Give I took additional steps to ensure critically about these sites, and ot again outside the parameters of th to debrief each participant. I ask anything they saw. I gave each)

low the pace of change with an adequate supply of empirical studies on the why and wherefores of the Internet-based economy and society.”²⁵

Even as I write this, the Internet grows and changes every minute of every day as websites are created and abandoned, domain names are reserved and let go. Yet sociology is the study of patterned human behavior, and the challenge is to be able to say something meaningful about those patterns of on-line behavior before they change again.

In this study I dealt with this problem in a number of ways. Primarily, I used many different research methods over a long period of time. Many times it felt like just as I had figured out what I wanted to say about a particular aspect of white supremacy online something would shift, and my insight into how the Internet worked seemed no longer valid. For example, when I first started writing about white supremacy online, states had not yet figured out how to control Internet content within national borders. That has dramatically changed. But the fact is that it all may change again tomorrow. At some point you have to make an argument and get what you have observed written down and out the door (Becker and Richards 2007).

The principle here for sociologists is to recognize that things change quickly on the Internet and that sociology cannot actually stay ahead of this rapid pace of change. However, it is possible to bring sociology’s insights to the study of the Internet, as a number of scholars have already demonstrated. The key, I think, is to try and be part of the phenomenon, to create content and participate in online communities, in order to gain a deep understanding of the medium and the myriad ways it is changing society. This way the data that sociologists systematically collect and the knowledge we create will reflect this deeper understanding and rather than be undermined by the rapid pace of change.

Some Ethical Issues in Doing Online Research

Any research with human subjects carries with it certain ethical concerns, particularly if those subjects are minors. This research was no exception. While I would argue that there was no risk of harm to the young people who were participants in this research, it is possible that participants might find the websites unsettling. Given that possibility, following each interview, I took additional steps to ensure that participants were equipped to think critically about these sites, and others like them, should they encounter them again outside the parameters of the study. Specifically, I took deliberate steps to debrief each participant. I asked each participant if they were upset by anything they saw. I gave each participant a handout that included a tip

into the online practices of
7 percent) of adolescents ages
percent use the Internet on a
n about current events online.
use the Internet, with 66 per-
ch also indicates that among
ver users of the Internet and
areas; they are more likely to
uding e-mail, instant messag-
ers.²⁴ It is likely that the sam-
similar in their Web usage to
was able to recruit a majority
ting suggests that these young
in the Pew research.

ology of the Internet from this
to-many medium (rather than
ditional print) and draws an au-
vision audience. For example,
ore, our ways of studying Inter-
ed as well. Further, one of the
g people in this study is the im-
based medium. Visual cues are
et. Our sense of what *reading*
tion of the visual, as long sug-
scholars. And, finally, a further
text on a website is *contested*,
This is another reason that In-
ed methodology at best.

Internet Twice:

Internet Time

was fond of saying. And in
city of Texas—was absolutely
ve first been brought to light
ne subject much more slowly,
line) as being methodical and
a significant factor in keeping
uel Castells has pointed out,
lt for scholarly research to fol-

sheet for critically evaluating Internet websites. And, finally, I had participants type the URL of one of the cloaked sites into TouchGraph, a free Web-based software program that graphically and dynamically maps the links to a site. All these efforts were intended to protect the human subjects participating in the study from any potential harm they may have experienced. Overall, study participants did not encounter any risk greater than that which they would have encountered in the course of their usual, everyday lives. And there were some potential benefits for the participants in terms of greater awareness about the presence of cloaked sites.

A portion of this research that involved content analysis of the websites was funded, and because of that, the initial phase of this research had to go through the Institutional Review Board at my institution. In my view, there is no reasonable threat of harm to any human subject in a study that involves a researcher looking at websites. The requirement that such a study undergo IRB review says more about the iron cage of bureaucracy than it does about any legitimate ethical concern regarding protecting human subjects.

Some Ethical Issues in Doing Research about White Supremacy

Given that my research questions about white supremacy have always been about the ideological constructions within movement discourse, interviewing individual white supremacists has never been an appropriate or necessary research method for answering my research questions. In addition, I found it ethically troubling to interview subjects that I disagreed with so fundamentally, lest I inadvertently lend support to their cause (as I wrote in my earlier book). This stance is a difficult one to sustain while doing research into white supremacy online, because, with the advent of discussion-board software that counts the number of users and guests logged on to a particular website, every visit to a white supremacist website becomes a *de facto* vote of support. Or, say, to the people who run and maintain those sites. Given this, I chose to remain an oppositional lurker at Stormfront (and at the other white supremacist sites, but it was somewhat less of an issue at these sites because of the way the sites counted users). That is, I never registered as a user at the site but instead read there as a guest. As an online guest I copied and pasted content from the forums as part of my data collection strategy, but I never had access to any personal information of anyone at the site and did not disclose any confidential information about anyone there. Some may challenge this use of these online forums as ethically questionable; however, I do not think it violates ethical standards of research. Others have also challenged me on the very enterprise of studying white supremacists because, my

detractors argue, it is a scholastic white supremacy and drives in the face of the ethical dilemmas inherent in the study. It unintentionally encourages the traffic there and, thus, unintentionally encourages white supremacy by increasing the hits. I see such collateral benefit to white supremacy with a sincere hope that the benefits will be balanced and that by offering an alternative, I encourage others to look critically at the complex ways about race, racism,

1. DiMaggio et al. 2001.
2. Hine 2005.
3. Agger 2004.
4. Hargittai 2001, 2004a.
5. Weare and Lin 2000.
6. Kendall 2004.
7. Ignacio 2005. *Building dialogues*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
8. Hampton and Wellman 2003. *Supports Community and Social Networks* (4): 277–311.
9. Castells, Calhoun, DiMaggio, and Landolt 2004.
10. Notable exceptions here in the field are Johns, Chen, and Hall (2004). Still, I do not list here well into the third age of the Internet.
11. To name just a few scholars who have written about this: Francesca Polletta, David Snow, and Robert D. Woodberry.
12. McCaughey and Ayers 2003.
13. Langman 2005.
14. Mills 1959, 205.
15. Becker 2002, 342.
16. Kendall 2002. Hine 2000, 2005.
17. For instance, Adams and Solomos (1996), Bostdorff (2004), Weinberg, and Oleson (2003), at 100.
18. Livingstone 2004.
19. Lee and Leets 2002.

And, finally, I had participated in TouchGraph, a free Web-based tool that automatically maps the links to a website. The human subjects participating in the study may have experienced a risk greater than that of their usual, everyday use of the Internet; the participants in terms of risk were the participants in terms of the websites.

The content analysis of the websites was a central element of this research had to go through a peer review process. In my view, there is no substitute for a subject in a study that involves a complex phenomenon that such a study undergoes a more rigorous peer review process than it does about the use of human subjects.

About White Supremacy

White supremacy have always been a central element of the Internet discourse, interviewees have provided an appropriate or necessary perspective on these issues. In addition, I found it interesting that I disagreed with so fundamental assumptions (as I wrote in my earlier work) while doing research into the Internet. The content of discussion-board software is often logged on to a particular website and becomes a *de facto* vote of confidence in those sites. Given this, the Internet is in the forefront (and at the other end) of an issue at these sites because I never registered as a user and as an online guest I copied and pasted the content into my data collection strategy, but I did not contact anyone at the site and did not ask anyone there. Some may find this methodologically questionable; however, I believe it is a reasonable approach. Others have also challenged the Internet because, my

detractors argue, it is a scholarly activity that lends support for the cause of white supremacy and drives interest (and traffic) to their sites. Indeed, one of the ethical dilemmas inherent in writing a book such as this is that I may unintentionally encourage the reader to visit these sites, driving additional traffic there and, thus, unintentionally bolstering the cause of white supremacy by increasing the hits at various sites. I am resigned to the fact that such collateral benefit to white supremacists is beyond my control. It is my sincere hope that the benefits of writing this book will be a sufficient counterbalance and that by offering a critique of white supremacy I will encourage others to look critically at white supremacy online and to think in more complex ways about race, racism, and the Internet.

Notes

1. DiMaggio et al. 2001.
2. Hine 2005.
3. Agger 2004.
4. Hargittai 2001, 2004a.
5. Weare and Lin 2000.
6. Kendall 2004.
7. Ignacio 2005. *Building diaspora: Filipino community formation on the Internet*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
8. Hampton and Wellman 2003. Neighboring in Netville: How the Internet Supports Community and Social Capital in a Wired Suburb. *City and Community* 2 (4): 277–311.
9. Castells, Calhoun, DiMaggio, Healy, Hargittai, Sassen.
10. Notable exceptions here include the work of Hine (2005), Ignacio (2006), and Johns, Chen, and Hall (2004). Still, the fact that there are only a handful of sociologists to list here well into the third age of the Internet makes the point about the relative lack of sociological methods for studying the Internet.
11. To name just a few scholars working in this tradition: Robert Benford, Francesca Polletta, David Snow.
12. McCaughey and Ayers 2003.
13. Langman 2005.
14. Mills 1959, 205.
15. Becker 2002, 342.
16. Kendall 2002. Hine 2000, 2005.
17. For instance, Adams and Roscigno (2005), Atton (2006), Back, Keith, and Solomos (1996), Bostdorff (2004), Gerstenfeld, Grant, and Chiang (2003), Kaplan, Weinberg, and Oleson (2003), and Levin (2002).
18. Livingstone 2004.
19. Lee and Leets 2002.

20. Burris and Strahm 2000. Hara and Estrada 2003. Tateo 2005.
21. Borzekowski 2001a, 2001b, 2006.
22. van Someren, Barnard, and Sandberg 1994.
23. Lenhart, Madden, and Hitlin 2005.
24. Lenhart, Madden, and Hitlin 2005, 6.
25. Castells 2001, 3.

R

- Abbate, Janet. 1999. *Inventing the*
- Abrahamson, Mark. 2004. *Global*
- Adam, Alison E. 1998. *Artificial ka*
Routledge.
- . 2004. Hacking into hacki
SIGCAS Computers and Society
- Adams, Josh, and Vincent J. Rosc
ture and the World Wide Web.
- Adamson, Greg. 2002. Internet fi
Culture 11 (2): 257–75.
- Adorno, Theodor W. 1951/2002.
ganda. In *The essential Frankfurt*
hardt. Oxford: Blackwell Publish
- Agger, Ben. 2004. *The virtual self: A*
- Agre, Philip E. 2002a. Cyberspace
171–89.
- . 2002b. Introduction: The
149–53.
- . 2002c. Real-time politics: T
Society 18 (5): 311–31.
- Aho, James. 1990. *The politics of righ*
versity of Washington Press.