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Abstract

Outrage porn is widely described as material used to evoke anger, disgust or indignation and is widespread on social media. Research discussed here concludes the stimulating nature of outrage porn and the emotions they produce leave our brains in high arousal states encouraging us to react, which on social media translates to likes, shares, retweets and comments. The endless streams of content on social media creates a cycle of information seeking which feeds information overload and addiction. The nature of outrage porn exacerbates this process as it triggers active emotions making it more likely we’ll share and react to the content spreading outrage porn on social media. Black Lives Matter and Covid-19 have dominated headlines and consumed much of 2020 so that will be the focus of this dissertation. This research examines what expressions of outrage content look like for tweets collected about the Black Lives Matter protests and Covid-19 in the form of a discourse analysis. A simple impact assessment (the Outrage Discourse Indicators) was created for the discourse analysis to examine what outrage porn looks like. The findings treat the outrage tweets in the wider context of the current events and examines the themes that can be drawn from them in relation to outrage porn. Outrage expressed in Black Lives Matter tweets presented differently to Covid-19 and this research will discuss these different types of outrage expression. As part of the findings and discussions a short discussion of how outrage porn relates to information addiction is be included to support the conclusions.
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Introduction

Outrage porn as a term, defined by Kreider (2008), is any content used to evoke strong emotions to generate web traffic. In this context outrage porn will be referenced when discussing outrage content online and specifically in reference to social media. The term outrage content will be used in general reference and is not limited to online content as the history of sensationalism in journalism will be discussed further. The term social media interaction will be used to describe likes, retweets, and comments on Twitter as the focus of this research. Outrage porn has grown successfully with the evolution of social media platforms, and the likes of Twitter and Facebook have provided ample opportunity to produce and consume content in an endless stream. This research will discuss the nature of outrage porn; that is what it looks like in real time by tracking viral events. The focus will remain on Twitter as a data source as it serves as a useful archive of content. Twitter is one of the most popular social media platforms and provides a rich data source for use in research. This research will focus on the themes that can be drawn from outrage content and provide context as to why it can be addictive, in information terms, and exacerbate information overload and addiction.

The viral events mentioned here will be looked at in the subjective context of how they are treated online by Twitter users. This treatment is how Twitter users react to it because outrage porn is more successful if people are annoyed and respond to it. The two topics, discussed further in the Research methods, have been selected because there is enough context to support how and why users may be posting outrage porn about them. The topics are emotive and highly politicised which makes the conditions for finding outrage porn advantageous and there has been research to support the findings made. Further to this, they are the defining topics of 2020 and so discussions about outrage porn for these topics are relevant and support the growing body of research about outrage porn and general discussions about social media use. The nature of Twitter data is the personal information experiences of the users and how they come across the outrage content. When studying Twitter data, we are looking into the passive information searching/acquisition behaviours of the users. Liu (2020) defines passive information acquisition as information users come across accidentally by exploring (browsing) or by notification (this includes social media notifications) but the information they come across may have poor credibility with users unable to judge the relevancy of the information they see. Much of the content here has been posted to (in some way) outrage audiences with the emotive content, while Twitter users passively search through their timelines this content stands out from the sea of information. While outrage porn can stand out on Twitter it encourages users to seek out similar information, the constant stream of outrage stimulates our brains and feeds into information overload and addiction. To study this and to explore the nature of outrage and how it is presented online, a quantitative discourse analysis was conducted to identify outrage porn tweets about Black Lives Matter and Covid-19. This research will explore how this impacts the wider issues of information overload and addiction, focus will also be on how social media companies and outrage producers capitalise on information addiction and outrage porn to generate traffic on the sites.
Literature Review

The term ‘outrage porn’ is credited to Tim Krieder (2008), who describes how anger can be addictive and feed the same pleasure systems in our brain as endorphins. Krieder (2008) defines outrage porn as material deliberately disseminated to pander to the public’s ‘impulses to judge and punish’. Outrage porn is frequently used to describe content which deliberately annoys people to garner popularity. What makes outrage porn different to other types of content is it relies on high arousal emotions to catch the reader’s attention in the hope they react and share it. Berger and Milkman’s (2012) study delved into the nature of what makes content go viral. They analysed over 7,000 New York Times articles and examined how the emotions evoked by each article impacted its popularity. Berger and Milkman (2012) concluded the relationship between emotion and dissemination of content is complicated and tended to favour high arousal emotions. Whether positive or negative, content that evokes high arousal states such as joy, happiness or anger are more likely to be shared than the equivalent evoking low arousal or deactivating states. Outrage content will be popular among audiences and is likely to be shared online as it features material pandering to these high arousal states. Whether for personal or professional gain, the impacts of outrage porn online mean the content is treated with action and reaction. We like to share things we find outrageous, annoying, or ridiculous because they trigger these high arousal emotions.

Holiday (2012) offers one definition of the term in his book Trust Me, I'm Lying. He suggests ‘a better term for outrage porn is manufactured controversy’. When we speak about outrage porn the desired impact is to push audiences to engage in profitable online behaviour, any behaviour which benefits the author or organisations. This profitable behaviour comes in the form of shares and likes, because for social media platforms the valued currency is popularity. Going viral or having thousands or millions of followers is the intention of most users. Money can be made from going viral with social media platforms paying for the most popular profiles and rewarding popularity with sponsors, paid advertisements, and money. Holiday (2014) reiterates this and discusses how ‘rage profiteers’ capitalise on the dissemination of outrage content to generate web traffic or influence their audiences. Another definition of outrage content in the political landscape, provided by Berry and Sobieraj (2012), is the ‘hyperbolic reinterpretation of current events’. This definition can encompass outrage content in most sectors, and in the last decade more research into the nature of outrage content and its impacts on information behaviour has been published. Berry and Sobieraj (2012) examine how ‘structural changes in the media landscape, primarily regulatory and technological’ have bolstered the currency of outrage content in the political field but this can apply to most forms of outrage porn. The scope of outrage content impacts is explored in Berry and Sobieraj’s research and they consider that outrage tactics in American politics can wield troubling results. Vilifying and misrepresenting opponents in major U.S. elections had the desired impact of swaying voter opinion in some cases. The language used by some opponents when speaking about their opposition had significant impacts on public opinion. Our information consumption can be dominated by sensationalised or misrepresentative content influencing how we behave in society and can even impact our political ideologies, religious views or shopping habits.
Outrage porn has evolved from the various strands of outrage content such as ‘poverty porn’ which primarily uses media forms like television programmes and documentaries to exploit people from economically deprived backgrounds for entertainment. The U.K. saw a rise in poverty porn content with the growing popularity of reality television programmes and documentaries focusing on working class people. Programming tends to focus on beneficiaries of Universal Credit and other benefits, criminals and drug and alcohol abusers. The trope of Benefits Britain and thug life were extremely popular but networks like the BBC and Channel 4 were criticised for pandering to and exacerbating the negative stereotypes of working class people. The programmes were slammed for presenting situations out of context and orchestrating scenarios to boost negative stereotypes all in the aid of making good TV. The issue with poverty porn is the content creators rely on the outrageousness of the subjects, so the viewing public are tempted to ‘judge and punish' them as Krieder (2008) describes. Bob Jefford, an executive producer for Benefits Britain stressed the importance of ‘casting interesting characters’ when making these shows (Aljazeera, 2019). The implications of these casting choices extend beyond the realm of making good TV and can perpetuate dangerous stereotypes that we, as the viewing public, can turn our indignation and outrage to. Raisborough et al (2019) explores the stigmatisation of marginalised groups with the success of poverty porn shows. In the UK these ‘educational’ programmes tend to focus on class and race issues but Raisborough et al points out there is a distinct lack of representation of disability issues and the same could be said for LGBTQ+ representation. At the time, viewing consumption was focused on stereotyped working class people but ignored representations of employed people, disabled people, and the LGBT+ community. The choice was instead to pander to fashionable stereotypes and employ outrage tactics to boost ratings. The past decade has seen the spotlight focus on these issues, particularly benefits systems, as they mirror the conversations in UK politics. The type of outrage we see on TV and other platforms tends to mirror the conversations in politics and on the news, we see different forms of poverty porn based on what is popular at the time with different groups targeted at different times. The flow of outrage follows what consumers are interested in and panders to the target markets.

Uzuegbunam et all (2013) gives an overview of ‘market driven journalism’ which gives priority to trivial and sensationalised content to attract audiences. The emphasis is less on the information and more on the attractive packaging. We can see how sensationalism is closely linked to outrage porn and its history in the media and journalism sectors. The era of ‘yellow journalism’ which again focuses on the shareability of content rather than the information fuels a world of fake news and outrage porn. This issue far proceeds the current issues of the online world and stems back to the press for profit era of ‘yellow journalism’ in the 1890’s and 1930’s. Thomas Gullason (1959) defines the features of ‘yellow journalism’ as content relying on scandal and the familiar tropes of sensationalism to sell newspapers. Gullason (1959) recounts that (the subject of his article, the American author) Stephen Crane’s failure as a journalist is down to his love of the truth and his rejection of the popular sensationalised style of writing at the time. Scandalisation and sensationalism at this time was driven by a need to sell stories but this competitive truth bending has some serious impacts. Louis Pérez (1989) examined the newspaper coverage of the sinking of the U.S S Maine in 1889. New York newspapers generated increasingly outrageous headlines in the competitiveness of covering the story. Pérez (1989) reflecting...
on the tragedy quotes one argument made that the Spanish-American war was somewhat fuelled by the ongoing battle in New York to grab attention with outrageous headlines. New York newspapers stoked already tense anti-Spanish sentiments in the U.S. and the sinking of the U.S.S Maine provided an opportunity to capitalise on the outrage, feeding negativity to its audiences.

So, we can see how as a Western society we have grappled with the ethics of outrage porn, a direct descendant of ‘yellow journalism’, from the 19th Century. We can also see the real-world implications outrage content can have on human behaviour. We do not have to look hard to find modern day examples, since the Trump campaign and Cambridge Analytica scandal we have plenty examples to choose from. The competitiveness of the 1890’s is echoed in the 21st century, we have more forms of communications, more media outlets and more opportunities to create content. Uzuegbunam (2013) notes the competitiveness noted above is heightened by technology. Mainstream medias increasingly competitive environment can in some cases lead to dangerous outcomes. These issues, with the positive and negative attention they bring, is propelled by the speed and capabilities of our information sharing world. The internet and the advancement of smartphone capability has exploded the amount of content we have access to and ways we publish information. Jones (2019) describes how our ability to fact check and judge content is further complicated by the internet providing overwhelming volumes of information. Micro-bloggers and social media users can self-publish content instantly, sites can be set up in a matter of hours and our sense of ‘news’ can become blurred in the world of keyboard warriors disseminating information without fact-checking. Social media platforms provide additional outlets for information sharing as well as the traditional web-based services. With so many outlets for information and tools for sharing we can find ourselves in a state of information overload and addiction. Outrage content feeds into our information addictions as an endless stream of highly stimulating content. There is no pause button on the internet, and we can find ourselves constantly checking our smartphone and laptops for this stimulating material. Every second something new pops up in our timeline or is shared by our peers so it is no wonder we find it hard to detach from the online world. Research by Kobayashi & Hsu (2019) concludes that human information seeking behaviour is shaped by the value of information which is subjective. Information seeking activities share common neural codes with the body’s neurological reward system. The value of information is highly subjective and outrage content provides great a stimulus for our brain; even negative material provides stimulation which for some may provide implicit rewards for the brain. Information reward is not necessarily reinforced by explicit rewards and even the activity of finding negative information rewards our brains neural system and encourages us to continue searching. The nature of our reward system is highly complex and regardless of the content if our information seeking needs can be resolved they are attracted to similar information which is provided to us by all the information we have access to.

Kobayashi & Hsu (2019) suggests information can be as addictive as food, sex, drugs, or money. The study was designed to measure how information acquisition impacts the brains reward system. The study demonstrated the existence of a common neural code for information and money which helps explain the nature of information addiction. They compared information acquisition to junk food and suggests out brain can crave even useless information as our bodies would empty calories.
Information seeking as a neural activity engages our brains reward systems as food, money or drugs would. They found they could even quantify how much someone wants a specific piece of information; they could translate the brain’s activity into amounts like money. Studies such as this clearly demonstrate how information can engage our brains reward systems and as Kobayashi & Hsu (2019) stresses, this is an integral condition of the addiction cycle regardless of the stimuli. When discussing individual’s engagement with social media content we are talking about their information experience, how they engage with the material. With outrage porn the content is highly emotive, and the information experience is as Hughes et al (2016) discusses steeped in real life contexts. The information is only as valuable as the individuals believe it is. If the stimuli rewards an individual’s information seeking needs the brains reward system will be triggered by it. This stimulus can be negative or outrageous information and as we are almost always in a state of information overload with the vast number of outlets, we are presented with the triggering stimulus can exacerbate information addiction.

We know from research by Bawden et al (1999) and Jacoby (1984) that information overload is broadly defined as the impacts of an individual attempting to process the huge amounts of information available to them. The evolution of technology and our ability to process information and data means our experience of information overload is frequent. Bawden and Robinson (2008) outline issues with information overload in digital formats and the homogenisation of digital information. With so many information sources and homogenisation, distinguishing between reliable and unreliable sources is complicated. Reliable news outlets and misinformation spreaders can have an equal platform on social media sites. There is no efficient way to distinguish between fake news sources and verified publishers in the few seconds you may see the content on your timeline before it is replaced with the latest topic. Anyone can set up a Twitter account and call themselves a news source, if they garner enough popularity they can be verified by the site. The blue tick symbol of a verified account is not based on the content but how many followers, likes and shares they can produce. Individuals can be fooled into thinking the information they produce is valid and truthful, but we are often faced with bots and misinformation spreaders claiming to be reliable information disseminators. Equally anyone with an opinion can set up a news site and disseminate information as they see fit, but we do not have enough reliable fact checkers signposting misinformation and verifying quality. The rate at which we consume content is vast and we have so many outlets to do this. With content going viral on an hourly basis our smartphones are flooded with material. The virality of outrage content online worsens our experience of information overload and feeds our information addictions. Traditional methods of combatting information overload, as outlined in Bawden et al’s (1999) research, are complicated by social media’s unwieldy nature. Twitter has seen an average of over 6,000 tweets published per second in 2020 (Sayce, 2019). It is difficult to manage information overload using just one application and our information experiences of social media are encouraged by the content we are exposed to. We can see how outrage porn can feed information addictions but the impacts this has on our information world is still not entirely clear. Walker (2017) concludes that online outrage does have benefits, it can be used to vilify ‘bad actors’ and unacceptable behaviour in society. Social media is a great platform for reaching a large group of people quickly, and we can see how this would be beneficial when we want to call out bad behaviour. Scrolling through Twitter or Facebook you can be inundated with videos exposing
thieves or abusers, other than news outlets this type of media would be hard to come by and has gained a lot of traction with popular opinion. It has on many occasions made local and national news and even led to criminal charges being brought against suspects. Most recently, a photograph of a protestor urinating on the memorial statue for PC Keith Palmer made the rounds on Facebook and Twitter, sparking a national backlash. Due to the national attention and people identifying the suspect on social media the man was later charged with public indecency. There are plenty of examples like this one, and it is quite possible that without the outrage making these incidences viral they could have escaped the police’s radar. Contrary to this is the self-serving acts of online outrage expression. Rothschild and Keffer’s (2017) study concludes the possibility that third-party expressions of outrage can sometimes be a way to alleviate individual guilt. They found guilty parties often have a desire to punish others targeting what they perceive to be corrupt parties to inflate their own sense and perception of morality. This type of study provides one possible insight into why people share outrage content online and this research will provide context to the nature of outrage porn like the content described in Rothschild and Keffer’s study. Crockett (2017) emphasises some of these sentiments with her research which provides a framework for how technology factors into the impacts of expressing outrage content online. Crockett (2017) suggests technology exacerabtes expressions of online outrage by ‘inflating its triggering stimuli’. Technology allows us to be updated with these incidences in seconds and with social media platforms allowing us to share the content with our peer groups the stimulus (the outrage content) is inflated and triggers more people by it going viral. Much like other research in this field the study concludes that technology, specifically social media, and other opinion sharing platforms, provide bubbles of sympathetic networks. Individuals expressing their anger can be met with like mindedness or sympathy and are rewarded with social media interactions. The social media currency of providing a bubble of acceptance is valued, providing a platform for users to garner appreciation or attention from their opinions. Understanding why people share outrage, what it looks like and how it impacts information addiction will provide a useful insight into how we can identify unhelpful outrage and weed it from our timelines. We can also call out outrage disseminators and share a more balanced view of the world without outrage clouding judgement and skewing perceptions of events in the aid of online profit.

This research attempts to define outrage porn in the specific contexts of two topics identified in the research methods. These topics will be analysed in their highly subjective states to conclude what outrage porn means in their information world. This research does not surmise what all outrage porn looks like but offers two real world examples. It also defines how outrage content can be highly stimulating and feed into information addictions even if the content is negative. The content is not inherently pleasant and stems from emotive topics but the engagement they receive is significant in defining outrage porn information addiction. Outrage porn in media and journalism has been researched extensively but this dissertation aims to explore the realm of personal information experience. Gorichanaz (2019) considers personal information experience to encompass activities which individuals actively choose to do and participate in. Social media can be described as such with individuals more freely expressing their views and outrage. There is much research on outrage porn in clickbait pieces and journalism but research on social media is still gaining traction. Social media has more users and
consumers interacting with material per day than traditional media outlets. It is important we understand their information behaviour and focus on personal information experience. Isolating one social media site is a valuable way to do that as we can analyse archives of content and real time reactions to current events.
Research Methods

Research aims:

- What ‘outrage porn’ looks like in our information world (with a focus on social media);
- Why and how outrage content (and clickbait) can feed into our information addiction; and
- Why we are addicted to seeking information even if it is not pleasurable or satisfying.

Research objectives:

For the purposes of this research a set of five research objectives were identified to support the research aims, data collection and findings. Pickard (2018) suggests objectives are concerned with the ‘how’ of research so I have defined how the research will be conducted and how the conclusions will be formed with these objectives.

- Identify an Outrage Discourse Indicator impact assessment to score tweets
- Collect a dataset of tweets about the two topics identified using the ODI impact assessment
- Analyse the significance of the ODI’s in each dataset (e.g. for Black Lives Matter and Covid-19 which ODI was the most frequently occurring)
- Establish the context of each ODI in relation to the topic and analyse the themes that emerge
- Establish how information overload and addiction relates to outrage porn using the dataset and further research

Social media for data collection

Social media platforms are useful tools for tracking real time events providing a wealth of reactions and opinions from all around the globe. The focus of this research was to outline what outrage porn looks like in response to current events. Twitter provided a data rich archive of reactions, content, and metrics of virality. Oberlo (2019) reported over 330 million active users on Twitter each month, with some 550 million tweets being sent every day. Batrinca & Treleaven (2015) list the advantages and disadvantages of using Twitter in research and notes its usefulness providing a large dataset for analysing human behaviour. This dataset can provide an easy to access store of information about human behaviour and as it becomes entrenched in everyday life social media is hard to ignore. As Twitter’s search functionality allows archive searching for tweets and publishes lists of viral events and topics, to build a large dataset of outrage content, it was the preferred social media platform. With the research aims in mind, it was necessary to only include ‘viral’ events. Virality is important in this context because the research intends to outline what outrage porn means in an information context; understanding how it may impact information behaviour. There are no official guidelines on what constitutes a viral tweet but Nichol (2019) suggested as a guide, a tweet racking up more than a thousand likes can be considered viral.

An outrage tweet with only a few social media interactions would not prove that outrage is popular on social media and may not have many wider impacts on information behaviour. Thus, the Twitter search results were focused to include tweets with a minimum 1,000 likes. Virality and
Discourse & Sentiment Analysis

Discourse Analysis has many forms and Jankowicz (2005) emphasis its usefulness ‘in particular when listening to people’s own narrative’ which is exactly what Twitter is used for, users voice their thoughts and opinions for their social network. A discourse analysis was the appropriate method for this research because the nature and sentiment of each tweet was integral to the analysis. It is important to understand the context in which the tweets were created, and discourse analyses consider the linguistic and social contexts of any piece of discourse. Fairclough (2010) defines critical discourse analysis as a ‘transdisciplinary’ field in which the ‘dialectal relations between discourse and other objects’ are analysed. Discourse analysis works in the realm of the realist approach in academia, as defined by Fairclough (2010) and Hewitt et all (2012), it evaluates and deconstructs an existing world of social media interactions which can be complex in nature. This is important because the content is steeped in context and are so subjective. Sentiment analysis was also considered in this research as extracting meaning from the content was necessary to place it within the social constructs of the topics that were analysed. Batrinca & Treleaven (2015) note the importance of sentiment analysis in social media research as the content is so subjective, it is important to analyse the content of the tweet to understand the sentiment. It was at times difficult to gauge the exact sentiment when you consider irony and jest. What could be seen as outrage content, as defined by the Outrage Discourse Indicators listed below, could actually be irony, sarcasm and/or jest which may not be included in the dataset as the user’s intention may be different to what is considered outrage porn. The highly contextualised content must be analysed by sentiment and intention to not falsely claim outrage and skew the results of the dataset.

Steps taken to collect the data

1. **Identify social media platform**
   - Twitter
2. **Check published lists of viral events**
   - Covid-19 & Black Lives Matter
3. **Identify keywords and search strings**
   - "coronavirus", "covid-19", "Black Lives Matter", "BLM", "black lives matter"
4. **Search Twitter archives with keywords** (in an initial 3 day date range 01-03 June 2020)
   - Identify tweets using Berry & Sobieraj’s (2016) outrage coding method and create a new Outrage Discourse Indicator outrage impact assessment
5. **Collect tweets each week and rate them against the six Outrage Discourse Indicators identified in Step 4**

Fig. 1 shows the steps and rationale taken to collect the quantitative data for this research.
For the initial stage of the data collection published lists of viral events were scanned for reoccurring themes. Twitter published trending topics and hashtags daily and tools such as Trends24.UK and Tweeple provide archives of these trending topics and hashtags. These tools were searched to analyse the types of conversations users were having about the two topics. Due to the Covid-19 crisis at the time of writing, the topic dominated social media and news outlets. Equally it presented an opportunity to track outrage content from a highly politicised and emotive topic dominating news feeds daily. The unfortunate death of George Floyd in late May also dominated headlines and sparked protests around the globe. Twitter top trending hashtags and topics were filled with Black Lives Matter protest material on both sides of the political spectrum. These two topics provided a rich bank of data as millions of conversations were being held online. These topics are so significant in current events and represented an important segment of political and personal conversation between May and August. Establishing viral events to be analysed was a significant step in the data collection. Covid-19 and the Black Lives Matter protests dominated the headlines and social media feeds and rightly so, they were paradigm shifting events of 2020 and are the focus of the study for that very reason. The wealth of content on Twitter made it almost impossible to avoid these topics and it seemed sensible to focus on these two topics in a stand-alone fashion.

Initially various sentiment analysis tools were tested for feasibility in this study. Of the tools available and due to financial and time constraints it became apparent that a manual data collection method was most practical for this research. The manual data collection would allow for an accurate sentiment analysis to contextualise the data into the topics that were chosen based on the research aims. Each of the Twitter accounts were also checked, it was necessary to try and weed out Twitter bots and fake accounts. Although this cannot be verified with total accuracy some of the accounts were checked for authenticity as the number of bots deliberately spreading misinformation is reported to be high and would warrant separate study and research. The manual data collection involved scanning Twitter by time frame and key words and inputting the identified tweets into a spreadsheet to be analysed by the simple impact assessment that was created (the Outrage Discourse Indicators). The next phase of the data collection involved collecting tweets from a sample selection from each of the topics identified. Initially sample search strings, hashtags and keywords were identified to manually search tweets from the Twitter search archive. To retrieve results accurately week-by-week it was necessary to finalise the search strings and then use them each week to collect the tweets. Once the search strings were finalised tweets were identified from a three-day period initially (from 01-03 June) about Covid-19 and Black Lives Matter. The second phase of the data collection was analysing the tweets and noting the themes that emerged from the content; the type of language and sentiments that could be identified from the conversations about the topics. Using Berry & Sobieraj’s (2016) established outrage discourse coding method, tweets were rated against the indicators: mockery, insulting language, and exaggeration. This led to the identification of further outrage indicators from that dataset and are defined below.

**Outrage Discourse Indicator (ODI) Definitions**

- **Mockery** – this defined language used to demean and tease a person, idea or topic
• Misrepresentation – content which intentionally or unintentionally included false or fabricated facts or attempts to exaggerate situations out of context

• Insulting/Obscene Language – abusive, demeaning, and foul language (swear words, racial slurs, and not politically correct language)

• Unfounded Claims – deliberately introducing statements, research or stats taken as fact without sufficient evidence

• Name calling/Slander – abusive language specifically targeting a person/peoples (separate to Insulting/Obscene)

• Embarrassment/Shaming/Exposing – content (specifically videos, and or pictures) that intended to shame or expose people’s behaviour

These indicators were identified from the tweets collected in the smaller data collection task, any tweets from the three-day period mentioned above. Once they were identified the larger manual data collection task was undertaken. The third phase of the data collection, once the outrage discourse indicators had been identified, was manually collecting tweets which scored 1 or above on the Outrage Discourse Indicator week by week by each topic to build a dataset of outrage discourse in a three-month period. The tweets which were collected included the following keywords: ‘Covid-19’, ‘Coronavirus’, ‘BLM’, ‘Black Lives Matter’. Other tweets which may include references to these topics but did not include these keywords were not included due to time constraints. Twitter’s archives contain millions of tweets and only the most pertinent tweets which included the keywords could be captured because of this. Therefore, the dataset does not reflect all tweets about these two topics, only tweets which contained the keywords. In a larger study it would be useful to include all outrage tweets which referenced the topics but may not have necessarily used these keywords. To collect these, the Twitter archive was searched in the following fashion ‘keyword’ ‘min likes:1000’ and date range selected. Tweets were collected week by week, Twitter organised the top 90-100 tweets each week by the criteria selected, each tweet was analysed and if met by the Outrage Discourse Indicators added to the dataset. All tweets collected were either part of the Covid-19 or Black Lives Matter topic set. A tweet would be identified, and a score recorded dichotomously 1=Yes, 0=No. A score would be given for each of the 6 ODI’s that the content matched. For example, the below tweet from President Donald Trump (Fig.2) would score a Total Outrage Discourse Indicator Score of 3 out of a possible 6.

![Fig. 2 Tweet from President Donald Trump – example](image)

| Mockery | 1 |
| Misrepresentation | 1 |
| Insulting/Obscene Language | 1 |
| Unfounded claims | 1 |
| Name Calling/Slander | 1 |
| Embarrassment/Shaming/Exposing | 3 |
| Total | 3 |

Table 1. ODI analysis of Fig.2 tweet

This tweet has only been used as an example to describe the Outrage Discourse Identifier score impact assessment
Rational for the score:

- **Misrepresentation:** Trump’s statement that the U.S. is doing well in comparison to other countries. According to various Covid-19 case trackers (including BBC¹, CNN² and the CDC³) the U.S. had some of the most reported cases and deaths on the globe (at the time of writing over 5,000,000 reported cases and 180,000 deaths).

- **Insulting/Obscene Language:** Trump refers to the disease as the “China Virus” a clearly racially charged and misrepresentative sentiment which would score for Insulting/Obscene language.

- **Unfounded Claims:** This statement does not include any references to research or stats to support it and the claims made do not reflect the research that has been published (see case trackers referenced).

All the tweets collected in the dataset were part of the top 100 tweets by min likes matching the keywords inputted into the Twitter Advanced Search functionality. Unfounded Claims are included and are separate to Misrepresentation because the users are introducing content as fact without including any research or evidence to support it. This goes beyond misrepresentation as the initial intention may not be to overtly mislead audiences, because the content is presented as factual, but they do not include any research/evidence to back it up. For the Misrepresentation ODI users were generally posting their thoughts on the virus rather than suggesting their theories were fact or backed up by any evidence for example. In general, the two ODI’s are closely linked but separate categories in this research to discern the difference between misrepresenting information and posing facts without the research to back it up. Through the data collection the intention was to gather a set of tweets with their ODI scores and analyse the themes which emerged. Once all the tweets were collection the topics could be analysed for how much misrepresentation was included for example. The value of knowing what outrage porn looks like for these topics is significant, identifying outrage porn can help users identify content which may pander to their impulses to argue and judge information which may be there to deliberately annoy them. If we can identify outrage porn, we can better combat it and reduce information overload and addiction by weeding out this type of material. The wider impacts include understanding how these two topics may be used to garner popularity on social media but exaggerating or inflating the sentiments for social media interactions.

---


Ethical Considerations

Ethics is a significant aspect of any research, and ethical guidelines for the use of social media data are still relatively murky. There are conflicting theories and suggestions of what can be considered good ethical practice when using social media content for research. The key ethical consideration when using Twitter data in research is what constitutes the private and public realm. The British Psychology Society (2017) note the line between public and private realms are blurred and social media is a murky space for this argument. It is difficult to gain informed consent with Twitter research as largely the content posted on the site can be deemed public because it is freely accessible in an open forum environment. Furthermore, Twitter’s own privacy policies imply that data from users may be used in research which users have to agree to before setting up an account. However, it is always in the best interest of the public to protect their privacy as much as possible and steps will be taken here to do that. This research will only draw out themes from the Twitter data due to the emotive nature of the content. No publicly identifying data will be published or posted here and to avoid this, I have not recorded any identifiable information (including Twitter handles, names etc.) in the raw dataset. Tweets that are used to support the claims here will be censored i.e. the Twitter handle will be blocked out or cut from the content. The dataset used to support the figures presented does not include any personal information about users and simply treats the content of the tweet. Within the raw dataset no identifiable information has been posted either but the full content of the tweets recorded are available. The raw dataset will not be posted in this report but will be available to the CityLIS team including my supervisor for reference as part of the completion of this dissertation module.
Findings & Discussion

Part I. General Findings

In total 366 outrage tweets were collected out of a total dataset of approximately 15,120 which represents 2.4% of all the tweets about each topic in a three-month period. Although this is a relatively low number, it reflects that within the top 15,120 tweets 2.4% represent outrage content on Twitter (about the two topics). Only tweets with a minimum of 1,000 likes were included in this dataset representing the ‘viral’ content on Twitter. This research explores what this 2.4% looks like, the nature of outrage content in how the sentiment is shaped and the formats they take. The shareability of these tweets will also be explored as although the initial dataset is low (the 2.4%) the shareability of the content is high as they are taken as part of the ‘top shared tweets’ (see Fig. 8 & Fig. 10). The social media interactions for this dataset is in the millions with thousands of different users interacting with the content. Both topics included content scoring any number of the six Outrage Discourse Indicators but varied drastically on which ODI was most commonly occurring. Fig. 4 shows a comparison view of the two topics and the number of incidences per ODI.

Both topics included high levels of Mockery and Misrepresentation but differ with the Unfounded Claims and Embarrassment/Shaming/Exposing ODI’s. Users tended to focus on opinions about Covid-19 in relation to lockdown restrictions, ongoing legislation/mandates and how other individuals were behaving
in response to these issues. Black Lives Matter tweets included more instances of the Embarrassment/Shaming/Exposing compared to Covid-19 were fewer instances were collected. Users tended to post videos and pictures as they documented their experiences of the protests and riots as well as sharing and reposting videos/pictures they came across online. In the Black Lives Matter dataset, the videos and pictures shared focused on the negative aspects of the protests. They tended to show either violence, destruction of property or tense stand offs between individuals and police. For Covid-19 any videos and pictures shared were generally in a mocking fashion and focused on lockdown restrictions. Most of the videos and pictures shared also scored for mockery because of this. Users shared the videos and pictures to tease and berate individuals (discussed further below, see Fig. 7) and draw attention to their failings. The videos and pictures depicted individuals not wearing masks properly or arguing in shops about mask mandates, all this content was used to tease and demean the individuals and will be discussed further.

Both topics included a substantial level of Insulting/Obscene Language which can be expected as each topic is highly emotive and with the conversational nature of Twitter offensive language is common. This language tended to include Name Calling/Slander and was generally aimed at targeted individuals and groups. Racial slurs and racially charged language was recorded in the dataset as individuals’ anti-Chinese sentiments were posted as a direct result of Covid-19, discussed further in Part II of the findings and discussions. In general (particularly U.K. and U.S.) politics was a recurring topic of conversation, users responded to government responses about events and voiced their opinions on the apparent failings or successes of various political parties as events unfolded over the three-month period. Outrage was directed towards users opposing political beliefs and much of the anger sentiments were directed towards specific political figures. The same political figures were mentioned in outrage tweets within both topics and included President Donald Trump, Joe Biden, Elizabeth Warren, Prime Minister Boris Johnson, Kier Starmer, and Jeremy Corbyn. These figures were cited often in outrage tweets in response to the highly politicised events of Black Lives Matter and Covid-19. Outrage from users came from both sides of the political spectrum and equally directed their indignation towards their opposing parties’ political figures. Mentions of these figures will always dominate discussions as they are the faces of their various political parties. Outrage towards political figures change over time as they move in and out of the spotlight, and this was an expected outcome from this dataset as most of the political figures mentioned here were vocal about both topics. What is significant is that regardless of the topic politics was heavily featured and users felt strongly about how opposing parties reacted and behaved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Average total ODI score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Lives Matter</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covid-19</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5 average total ODI score for each topic

Fig. 5 shows the average total ODI score for each topic. From the tweets in each topic, on average tweets about Black lives Matter scored 2.5/6 while tweets about Covid-19 scored 2.6/6. In general, outrage tweets from each topic included at least two out of the six Outrage Discourse Indicators. There
is not one characteristic of outrage porn but from the six identified aspects of outrage depicted here most of the tweets included two or more. Outrage porn is complex in nature and these topics displayed overt and nuanced characteristics of outrage; this average score shows how each topic (within the limit of 140 characters) can encompass complex and multiple characteristics of outrage which will be discussed in length below. It also highlights that outrage porn on Twitter can be multi-faceted, there is no one definition or characteristic of outrage but there are general forms which can be identified in the wider context of the topics.

The results of Part II & III will be categorised by the most significant Outrage Discourse Indicators for that topic. Not all ODI’s will be discussed at length but all will be referenced to provide an overall picture of what outrage porn looks like for both the Covid-19 and Black Lives Matter topics.

Part II. Covid-19

166 outrage tweets were collected for the Covid-19 topic. Each tweet was given a score (1=Yes, 0=No) for each of the Outrage Discourse Indicators as detailed in Fig. 6. One tweet could have a total score of 6 if they included instances of each ODI for example.

Mockery & Embarrassment/Shaming/Exposing

Mockery was the most commonly occurring Outrage Discourse Indicator with over 90 examples in the dataset second to Misrepresentation. 98/166 of outrage tweets about Covid-19 included some form of mockery, while 92/166 included some form of Misrepresentation. Mockery in tweets about Covid-19 was expressed as content demeaning individuals or groups with embarrassment, sarcastic or teasing tactics. Some examples of how mockery was used in these tweets were blaming people for the spread of Covid-19 (or the impacts such as lockdown restrictions or business’ closing), teasing/demeaning individuals who are less educated about the virus, mocking lockdown rules or mask mandates, equating the virus to other diseases or joking about catching/spreading the virus. In some cases, users posted
videos and pictures to mock individuals in relation to Covid-19. The following tweet (Fig. 7) depicts a montage video of individuals arguing in shops for either not observing the mask mandates or disregarding the social distancing guidelines. The video is heavily edited and is intended to shock and humour audiences. This type of ‘Karen’s Gone Wild’ content has made the rounds on social media for the outrageous nature of the material and has caused controversy for its derogatory sentiments.

The use of the popular meme ‘Karens’ depicts (in general) middle aged Caucasian women who act aggressively in retail settings and is deliberately demeaning. The individuals in the video are filmed in highly emotional states and in general provide no useful backstory or rationale for the behaviour depicted. The term has been increasingly criticised for its derogatory nature. The Guardian (2020) defines the Karen meme in their article ‘What does it mean to be a “Karen”? Karen’s explain’ the meme presents women as ignorant, stupid, and aggressive. It has been used heavily in the U.S. but is generally known to depict any woman in the types of scenarios depicted in the video (Fig. 7). This type of demeaning language was commonplace in the Covid-19 dataset with users targeting specific people or groups. The ‘Karen’ meme was noted in several tweets generating well over 134,700 likes and 107,100 retweets and comments. These types of videos support the idea that mockery is a significant aspect of outrage porn about Covid-19. Other videos and pictures which went viral for this topic included pictures of individuals not wearing masks properly, large group gatherings, memes, and GIF’s. Material also included people deliberately ignoring social distancing rules for media attention e.g. performing stunts and pranks. This type of material trivialises serious breaches in Covid-19 restrictions and ridicules the individuals involved. The impacts of this alone may encourage others to replicate the behaviour and put their lives and others in danger for media attention. This material garners millions of social media interactions and floods timelines possibly impacting large groups of people. With social media rewarding this type of content (by it going viral) it is easy to see why people feel compelled to produce and share it.

Other tweets which included mockery targeted China, blaming China for the outbreak, and using derogatory terms for Chinese nationals. On multiple occasions Covid-19 was described as ‘ChinaVirus’ and ‘Kungflu’ in these instances the mockery bordering on racism. The Mockery sentiment in this context was used to generate web traffic by posting provocative content such as the ‘Karen’s’ video and the use of clearly inappropriate language. This is an effective way to gain traction online as we have seen from the research (Berger & Milkman, 2012. Crockett, 2016 & Holiday, 2014) outrage
content tends to go viral quicker than other types of content because of the high arousal emotions they produce in audiences. Posting videos such as this and using insulting or foul language are quick wins online as they point the finger at certain groups allowing for audiences to target, judge and mock them generating social media interactions. The mockery content provides a seemingly light-hearted outlet for individuals to turn their indignation to and although they seem jesting, they rely on stereotypes and causing offense to generate traffic. Of all the tweets which had a score for Mockery 35% included incidences of Insulting/Obscene language which in turn included derogatory words/names, foul language and/or racially charged language. Mockery as an Outrage Discourse Indicator differs from sarcasm and jest as the mocking content is used to deliberately demean a topic, individual, or groups. This is where the sentiment analysis element of the data collection came in most useful, although understanding the intention of the authors can never been achieved with total accuracy. Reading the retweets and comments and understanding the context of the tweet allowed for instances of pure sarcasm or jest to be ruled out and instead identify tweets which were inherently outrageous as defined by the ODI definitions listed in the Research Methods section.

**Misrepresentation**

Misrepresentation took the form of tweets which, whether intentionally or unintentionally, presented misleading information or situations out of context. Of the 166 tweets collected 92 of them included misrepresentative content or sentiments. This content also included information presented as fact without claims or research to back them up. These tweets can also be considered Unfounded Claims and will be discussed further. Many tweets presented misleading information about the nature of the virus, lockdown restrictions or social distancing guidelines. Misleading information took the form of opinions about the virus being a hoax or created in a lab by various political parties to upend upcoming elections. Others claimed there was no need to practice social distancing because the virus was not as bad as presented in media. There were also claims that the virus would not spread in certain temperatures/climates, that extreme temperatures or weather systems could help people avoid the virus entirely. Further claims placed the blame on Communist China and warned people away from buying Chinese made products and foods.

Twitter and other social media platforms have come under intense scrutiny over misinformation about Covid-19 and have taken steps to weed out fake news and false claims on their platforms, but misrepresentative content is still an issue on Twitter. Shahi et al (2020) studied Covid-19 misinformation shared on Twitter and collected 1500 tweets representing false or partly false claims over a seven-month period (January-July 2020). They found false claims spread faster online than partly false claims, and misrepresentative content was primarily about discrediting other information about the virus. This was also the case in the dataset presented here, in some cases users posted about individuals, agencies, companies and or governments opposing the advice given and providing opinions on what they believed instead. Misrepresentation tweets racked up over 4.2 million likes (see Fig. 8), the tweets were generally very divisive, and the conspiracy theory type claims garnered much more social media interactions. However, with conspiracy claims it is useful to note that often people share this content in a mocking or ironic way. Users are not always sharing the content because they believe it is true but
because they are shocked by them. The retweets and comments section of some of the conspiracy claim tweets support this. The threads provide opportunities for people to argue about the statements made and are in general are a stream of outrage and indignation. This falls under outrage porn because users often share conspiracy claims because they know people being shocked by them and will generate social media interactions. This cycle of shock-outrage-share further feeds into information addictions because the cycle of outrage is constantly being fed with users posting increasingly shocking content.

**Unfounded Claims**

Incidences of Unfounded Claims were lower than expected and facts about Covid-19 were more likely to be misrepresented or exaggerated than for users to overtly post misinformation research without the evidence to back it up. The Unfounded Claims ODI, in general, would also score for Misrepresentation in the dataset as it could lead to individuals misusing the information. Themes that emerged from this ODI included claims similar to those mentioned in the Misrepresentation ODI, but users posed the content as fact either with blanket claims, bogus research, stats or without any evidence at all. The stats, research and figures presented in this dataset were not cited by any recognisable research nor were they presented in a format to track the original research. Twitter users tended to quote this research with strong opinions and present their views as fact. Other research was mocked and used to demean scientists who are working on cures and immunity. Examples of this included skewing Covid-19 case and death rates to vilify political figures or scientists. This type of content can be incredibly misleading and with 48 examples collected in this dataset unfounded claims about Covid-19 have gained traction as shown in Fig. 8.

![Covid-19 - total likes per ODI](image)

*Fig. 8 shows the total number of Likes for each Outrage Discourse Indicator in the Covid-19 dataset. This was collected by adding up the likes each of the tweets collected in the Covid-19 dataset by ODI.*

From just the 48 tweets collected in this dataset over 2.4 million likes and hundreds of thousands of other social media interactions were recorded. With this type of content going viral there is a danger that the material could be misused by users who are not informed enough to weed out fact from fake news. Table. 2 details themes that emerged from this dataset and include the unfounded claims that were posted with misrepresented research or without any evidence to confirm them. It does not show what Twitter users have tweeted, but the general themes of the sentiments and statements found.
Unfounded Claims (general themes that emerged)

- Covid-19 was planned by the US Democratic party to thwart Trump’s re-election campaign
- Covid-19 was released by the Bill & Melinda Gates foundation
  - Sub content: Obama conspired with Bill & Melinda Gates to release the virus
- Covid-19 was manufactured in a Chinese lab to bring communism to the Western world
- School children are immune to the virus
- Doctors are lying about the virus and the new cases/death rates
- Covid-19 was created in a lab and accidently released
- Covid-19 and Black Lives Matter protests were part of a larger conspiracy to disrupt political systems globally
- Covid-19 ended some time ago

Table. 2 details the general themes emerging from the Unfounded Claims ODI for Covid-19

Much of the Unfounded Claims content include theories on whether Covid-19 was created as a biological weapon. Another theme which emerged from the data is false accusations. Often users made sweeping accusations without any evidence to support them. These accusations were outright calls to the individuals accusing them of various crimes. Some of the accusations claimed that liberal media outlets were deliberately lying about infection and death rates, that political figures were trying to illegally enforce martial law, and that Covid-19 is a cover up for rings of human trafficking and sexual predators. The ‘Plandemic’ hashtag became increasingly popular as users posted theories and conspiracies on the origin of the virus. It gained more traction with the release of a controversial film of the same name which was removed from Facebook, Twitter, YouTube and other platforms for its presentation of inaccurate facts about the virus. This type of content censoring does illustrate social media companies’ commitment to combat misinformation, but it is still present online and going viral. The Conversation (2020) provides a breakdown of the Plandemic video and the various social media followers it gained. None of the claims were supported by any evidence and mostly consist of users voicing their opinions, quoting research without any sources and arbitrarily misinterpreting stats. We can see from the Twitter reactions (Fig.8) that material went viral despite the lack of research or evidence to support the claims made. Social media interactions can have a direct impact on how viral material can get, with more people sharing the unfounded claims the more likely it is that the material can be misused. Popularity can in some contexts be mistaken for accuracy or relevancy.

Insulting/Obscene Language & Name Calling/Slander

There were 51 instances of Insulting/Obscene Language and 45 instances of Name Calling/Slander which has been discussed generally in the other ODI categories. Further to this, both these ODI’s generally came in the form of demeaning or abusive language towards political figures and individuals found to be flaunting lockdown restrictions, mask mandates etc. This ODI in general saw more profanities and foul language then direct slander at people, and profanities were used in general reference when speaking about a person or topic. As discussed above, Name Calling/Slander was also expressed in insults towards Chinese Nationals with the use of ‘ChinaVirus’, ‘Kungflu’. The provocative
language is triggering and ensures that the tweets are inflammatory in nature and can spur argument and indignation. This often leads to threads of arguments in the retweets and comments section.

Part III. Black Lives Matter

200 outrage tweets were collected for the Black Lives Matter topic; Misrepresentation and Embarrassment/Shaming/Exposing were the most commonly occurring Outrage Discourse Indicators as detailed in Fig. 9. Misrepresentation and Embarrassment/Shaming/Exposing ODI are closely linked as often users shared videos and pictures to mislead the nature of the situations they presented, generally portraying negative sentiments about the nature of the situations they presented.

**Misrepresentation**

Misrepresentation in this context refers to situations taken out of context or exaggerated in some fashion. This included exaggerating or inflating situations from the protests i.e. portraying peaceful protests as riots and using one situation to blame the entire movement. The impact of this are threads of argument and indignation about the content with the meaning of the protests being lost in translation. Much of the Misrepresentation content attempted to undermine or disregard the nature of the protests and the individuals involved. Content would also include sweeping statements about the Black Lives Matter organisation and condemn protesters who associated with the movement whether they are/were associated with the organisation or not. The recent protests around the globe have been in response to the death of George Floyd and the ongoing injustices felt by the Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic community. Black Lives Matter as an organisation has been a separate long-standing organisation with similar and different agendas to the recent protests. There was an unhelpful homogenisation of the individuals involved in the movement and the Black Lives Matter organisation when they are separate entities. Condemnation of the Black Lives Matter organisation spilled onto individuals who may well be
separately campaigning for racial equality, and these sentiments were recurring in the Black Lives Matter dataset. While there have been many peaceful protests around the globe, users tended to take one specific example of rioting, looting, damage to infrastructure or violence and use it to condemn the entire movement.

The Misrepresentation ODI specifically looked at how rioters and protesters were treated and included content in which the two terms were used interchangeably. Violence and criminality from the riots were misrepresented and used to condemn even peaceful protestors. These individuals were held up as an example of what the entire Black Lives Matter movement stands for. We know from psychology research how generalisations and stereotypes of a few individuals can be damaging to a larger majority. This research found that a few individuals were stereotyped and anyone representing Black Lives Matter were tarred with the negativity associated with the minority of violent rioters. The riots are arguably an unfortunate strand of the protests but the two are different in nature and generalisation and exaggeration were featured heavily in this ODI to describe both. Generalisation was a key aspect of this ODI as users chalk up the behaviour of the few to blame the entire Black Lives Matter movement and those who attended protests. The term rioters was used interchangeably with protesters and even clips/pictures of peaceful protests were condemned as aggressive riots. Although the riots became a large portion of the news feed the peaceful protests were often thrown in with the criminality and misrepresented. This type of content is inherently racially charged and highly emotive, emotions run particularly strong in the Misrepresentation ODI. Users posted racially charged and generalised statements about the nature of the Black Lives Matter movement and separately the organisation. This was most apparent in users from the U.K and U.S. where protests and events were very prominent. Some general themes and sentiments from this ODI are listed below, these themes are drawn from the dataset where tweets were given a score for Misrepresentation. They do not show what Twitter's users have tweeted, but the general themes of the sentiments and statements found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misrepresentation (general themes and sentiments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Racial injustices are self-inflicted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leftist governments should take more decisive action against the BLM movement and organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The protests are not about racial injustice but a chance for individuals to loot and cause destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The BLM movement and organisations have caused more racial tensions than police brutality (specific to the U.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The protests around the globe are equivalent to domestic terrorism or are/were used to introduce communism into Western society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There was significant indignation towards the Black Lives Matter organisations Marxist roots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Users felt strongly they’re aiming to destroy capitalism and the ‘nuclear family’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table. 3 the general themes from the Misrepresentation ODI for the Black Lives Matter topic
As expected, the riots and protests have been highly politicised with political figures including the President of the United States and Prime Minister of the United Kingdom speaking out about what has happened. Much of the outrage sentiments were directed at how users felt various governments were failing and provided opinions on how opposing governments were handling the situation whether they were true or not.

**Embarrassment/Shaming/Exposing**

Videos and pictures of the protests have been used to raise awareness of the movement, provide crucial evidence and information, and promote the ideologies of what the movement stands for. Equally videos and pictures of the protests and the riots have been used to spread misinformation about what is happening. There were 78 instances of Embarrassment/Shaming/Exposing in the Black Lives Matter dataset. This ODI dataset includes videos and pictures which were intended in some way to undermine either side of the political spectrum relating to Black Lives Matter. This usually took the form of short videos or pictures showing the violence of rioters (from BLM protests, far-right groups, Trump supporters and so forth). This type of content spread quickly on Twitter and Fig. 10 shows how many likes were recorded from tweets from the Embarrassment/Shaming/Exposing ODI.

![Fig. 10](image)

Fig. 10 shows the total number of Likes for each Outrage Discourse Indicator in the BLM Movement dataset. This was collected by adding up the likes from each of the tweets collected in the Black Lives Matter dataset by ODI.

Fig. 10 details the total number of likes for each ODI, there were over 3.2 million social media interactions from the 78 instances of Embarrassment/Shaming/Exposing in the tweets collected. This ODI included the most viral content with the highest number of social interactions. The nature of the events is highly emotive, and videos and pictures provide much richer material that text tweets. Seconds or minutes of footage provide a much more stimulating experience than text and when users post this content it takes a highly complex, highly subjective event and encourages users to make a snap decision about its contents and what it stands for in the larger context of society. Taking one video of rioting and condemning the whole Black Lives Matter movement encourages negative stereotypes and typecasts the emotional situation as inherently negative. From the tweets collected users at times called for the condemnation of the whole movement despite clear evidence of racial injustices that occurred to spur on the protests since the death of George Floyd which sparked the initial protests in late May.

We know this type of material can spread quickly online and the insulting and/or obscene language may be contributing to its popularity. The videos and pictures can be taken out of context as we have seen in other examples in different areas. With the content going viral quickly, the messages
or intentions can be lost in translation especially without proper fact checking. This type of misrepresentative content can provide an overall picture that may exaggerate the facts and demean the good natured and peaceful people in the protests also. An article by Jackson (2020) provides more detail of how BLM videos and photos have been misused and taken out of context causing outrage online.

An article by Jackson (2020) provides more detail of how BLM videos and photos have been misused and taken out of context causing outrage online.

Fig. 1.1 tweet on the Wisconsin building on fire

Fig. 1.1 is a tweet about the destruction of a building in Kenosha, Wisconsin after the shooting of Jacob Blake in late August. While this type of destruction can never be condoned and is inherently negative the caption for this tweet is inflammatory in nature and relies on the exposing of Black Lives Matter rioters to undermine the entire movement. It is now widely reported that the local business had been shut down for quite some time and the building was vacant. While its destruction is no less severe it does show the authors intention to ramp up indignation towards Black Lives Matter individuals by portraying the destruction of the local community. Sentiments around Black Lives Matter destroying local communities were strong among the outrage tweets and often videos and pictures were portrayed out of context or exaggerated to strengthen this sentiment as Fig.11 demonstrates. Another image of the White House with all the lights out went viral on Twitter and Facebook racking up thousands of social media interactions. Comments and captions portrayed the blackout as a direct result of the protests and riots but was later revealed to be taken in 2015. This photo was used to undermine the Black Lives Matter movement by riling up tensions and portraying the situation as negatively as possible. Research from Gomez (2020) demonstrates that moral elevation is a motivational trigger for people. Watching videos and looking at pictures of positive moral acts uplifts people and encourages them to behave in a similar fashion. The opposite can be said for the examples in this dataset as the videos and pictures, which if taken out of context, may force people to act in anger and indignation. The captions also stoke negativity as users called on their social networks to take direct action and condemn the perceived bad behaviour in the videos and pictures.

Fig. 12 illustrates the total outrage score (out of a possible six, a score for each ODI present) for the tweets collected about Black Lives Matter (specifically in the Embarrassment/Shaming/Exposing ODI). The y axis lists the total possible outrage scores each tweet could score while the x axis shows the number of tweets in this ODI. 30 tweets scored a total possible outrage score of 2 and 31 scored 3, while none of the tweets scored a total of 6.
Most of the tweets for this ODI scored also included instances of the other ODI’s and show the complex nature of the videos and pictures posted, they are about shaming or exposing individuals, but they also included instances of mockery, misrepresentation, unfounded claims, name calling and insulting language. The captions with the videos and pictures provide an interesting frame for the tweet and are used by users to understand the context of the video or picture. As with Fig. 11 and other tweets collected, we can see how the material can be misrepresented by the caption and can skew the context of what is being presented. Samuels (2020) echoes this in her article which explains one of President Donald Trump’s tweets of a video of an apparent assault on a white female by a Black Lives Matter Protestors. It was later revealed that the events happened in 2019 and had nothing to do with Black Lives Matter. Although the violence in the video cannot be condoned what is significant is the vilifying of Black Lives Matter group with a snapshot video taken out of context. This supports the idea that we need to fact check our content and follow the threads of the original content. Most of the videos and pictures we see can be retweeted thousands if not millions of times so understanding the original context is very important. The functionality of social media allows us to take anyone’s video or picture and caption it with our own thoughts and there is a danger that sweeping generalisations can occur because of this. There were several instances of the same video or picture being used with captions which misrepresented the content, and this all contributes to the overall negative perception of Black Lives Matter as discussed here.

**Insulting/Obscene Language & Name Calling/Slander**

From Fig. 12, 61 of the Embarrassment/Shaming/Exposing tweets had a total outrage score of either 2 or 3. 42% of the 61 tweets had instances of Insulting/Obscene Language. A large portion of all the tweets collected for this topic including Insulting/Obscene Language (see Fig. 9) and were shared widely with over 2.9 likes (see Fig.10). Like the Covid-19 dataset, the Name Calling/Slander ODI saw outrage tweets directed at political figures with name calling and slander also directed at individuals involved in the protests of BLM organisation. Insulting/Obscene Language is closely linked to this ODI and demeaning and foul language were used to direct indignation at the protestors on both sides of the political spectrum. Outrage was in general users voicing their opinions on the destructive nature of the movement and the failings of government to either be proactive and create change for Black, Asian and Minority Ethnicity people or their failings to control the protests and riots and stop the movement entirely. Fig. 13 details some of the language used to describe individuals involved with Black Lives Matter including protestors, rioters or anyone involved in the Black Lives Matter organisation. These words
have been lifted directly from the Black Lives Matter dataset and represent a proportion of the demeaning languages used to describe individuals.

This type of language is intended to vilify and abuse the individuals and contributes to the overall negative perception of Black Lives Matter. Insulting/Obscene Language and Name Calling/Slander is one characteristic of outrage porn because it panders to and triggers high emotion states as discussed in this research. Using this type of language aggravates users and triggers emotional responses from them resulting in threads of anger and argument, contributing to the total outrage expressed online. The Black Lives Matter dataset included instances of racially charged and foul language and saw lots of videos and pictures going viral for the outrageous content it depicted. This resulted in anger and indignation towards the movement and portrayed an overall negative picture of the movement despite the intentions of social justice for those involved. With so much content shared on Twitter it may be difficult for individuals to fact check what they are seeing and can contribute to information overload and addiction. Twitter feeds were dominated by Black Lives Matter content, a good portion of it informative and positive but it is the negative inflammatory content which feeds into negative information addiction and produces highly emotional states encouraging users to vent their frustrations at the content and users on their social media feeds.

Part IV. How does outrage porn relate to information addiction?

Robert Shrimsley (2015), writing for the Financial Times about online outrage said, ‘the digital world has created an outrage economy where there is money to made if you can stand the heat’. Shrimsley was speaking of pseudo-celebrities like Katie Hopkins and Josie Cunningham who have built their careers on outrage through television and social media. This sentiment is appropriate when we look at how people garner social media interactions via outrage content on Twitter and other social media platforms. It is no secret that outrage sells and whether intentionally buying into it or not people profit from it. The outrage economy Shrimsley refers to is of high value on social media but the volumes of it can lead to information overload and addiction as the highly stimulating material dominates our timelines and leaves individuals seeking more. The process of information seeking encourages our brains to meet our information needs, find similar information and start the process all over again. The smartphone revolution has made this process easier. Social media platforms capitalise on our ability to constantly scroll through our timelines exacerabating information addiction. Crovitz (2009) suggests that
technological progress continually moves forward and our ability to process information will have to progress with it. The abundance of outrage content on social media and other content platforms may hinder this progress. Archdeacon (2019) summarises that information addiction is relative to environment; the social media environment currently is based on consumption. The more users log in and communicate with the content the more social media platforms thrive. They rely on an information environment in which people are glued to their phones and laptops. Brooks (2017) discusses how social media companies use techniques to play on our compulsions to check our profiles. He suggests they deliberately create irregularly timed rewards and prompts to grab our attention and increase our dopamine to promote positive rewards in our brains when we check our feeds. The prompts come in the form of push notifications, ‘check ins’, new features and updates. Social media companies rely on playing on the brains trigger-rewards systems to keep individuals hooked on the platforms and feed into information addiction. Research by Haynes (2018) echo these findings and suggest that there is a link between social media and dopamine, the brains motivational chemical. Haynes’ (2018) research found that receiving social media notifications releases dopamine into your brain and with the release of dopamine the brain is more likely to encourage reactions to the stimuli. This is turn can exacerbate information addiction with our brains constantly stimulated by social media triggers and craving the pleasure feelings associated with dopamine.

Our assumptions about information addiction are not comparable to say substance or alcohol addiction but information addiction can pose significant impacts on our daily lives. Hemp (2009) looked at the impacts of information overload on different employees, he found that information overload can impact mood, productivity and decision making. One part of the study found employees check over 40 different websites each day, showing they are presented with a huge amount of information daily. This as well as social media and other content presented to us online accumulates to huge volumes of information, not all of it useful. The nature of outrage porn puts individuals in highly emotional states which can often be negative because they trigger our hatred, anger or frustrations. These negative states and the negative emotional confrontations we can find ourselves in on social media impact our mood and mental health. A study by the Hunt et al (2018) found that individuals who significantly reduced their time on social media (specifically Facebook, Instagram, and Snapchat) reported feeling less depressed and lonely. Archdeacon (2019) also considers “non-information” information which is presented as informative but is in essence useless. The consumption of “non-information” can take its form in misleading, misrepresented and often outrageous content. Information itself may not be useful to anyone other than to produce a reaction from the audiences. Being consumed by this “non-information” can have serious impacts on individual’s productivity and their perspective on news and current events. It is suggested here that some of the outrage porn online can be considered “non-information” because of its presentation as useful content but, it is used only for its shock value. This contributes to information overload because we are inundated with non-information on social media and although it can be useless or negative the nature of how our timelines our set up can mean we can be browsing for hours on end.

Panksepp (2005) concludes the reward of finding information, even negative, harmful, or non-information, stimulates our brains to release dopamine and encourages our brain to start the process
again to re-satisfy that seeking need. Ford (2017) describes the information seeking process as complex and encourages individuals to seek reliable information and recognise unreliable or useless information. Stimulating negative content encourages our brains to seek out similar information which social media platforms provides for us every second of the day. However, as Ford (2017) suggests we need to be able to discern between helpful content and this outrage porn which can be damaging and feed into our information addictions. Social media in general resides in the realm of personal information experience and as such it may be harder to judge information and weed out misinformation. Wineburg et al (2016) conducted exercises on students to assess how they cope with evaluating information sources. In one assessment, they asked students to evaluate the trustworthiness of political tweets, they found students struggled to recognize the tweets reliability and judge the sources which were cited in the tweets. Stressing how difficult it can be judging information and information sources on social media even for digitally literate students. However, we are seeing a rise in fact checking and social media companies taking responsibility for flagging misleading content posted by their users. As we get more of our news and information on current events from social media the need to emphasis reliable information is more important than ever. Ofcom (2020) reported that the proportion of people getting news from social media is down on last year from 49% to 45%. However, this 45% is still significant and represents a large portion of people are getting news from social media, rather than reliable news outlets. With so many people getting their news from social media and social media being dominated with outrage porn it is easy to see how people may be fed unreliable or misrepresentative perspectives about current events. Ofcom (2020) separately reported on Covid-19 misinformation. Of the 2,000 respondents, those who came across misinformation came across it frequently during the day and social media was one of the main sources for misinformation. They also found in general the amount of misinformation respondents were seeing was reduced week-by-week and respondents thought misinformation should not be shared on social media. These are still worrying statistics as misinformation and as a strand outrage porn are still being consumed via social media. The efforts from providers to combat misinformation are still a work in progress. The issue remains that the consumption of social media content is still so high it can be difficult for users to interpret and judge the information they are seeing. A panel discussion ‘Outrage fatigue, Democracy and Activism in the Age of Information Overload’ (hosted by Lauren Dubois, 2016) discussed the nature of outrage fatigue and found that seeing the volumes of outrage online that we do has serious impacts. A state of constant outrage information overload can desensitise individuals, this immunity leads us to seek and be exposed to outrage content more easily leading to information overload and addiction.
Conclusions

Outrage content is very much present on Twitter but looks very different depending on the topic of discussion, we can see from the Black Lives Matter and Covid-19 dataset how different outrage can be presented online. Outrage is not always overtly hateful, negative, or annoying and can take nuanced forms such as mockery, misrepresentation, and embarrassment sentiments. The tropes of outrage discussed here varied differently and despite arguments that outrage tactics are primarily used in journalism and politics, outrage has been present in the realm of personal information experience (social media). Generally, outrage porn has been defined and researched in the realm of journalism, but this research detailed the nature of outrage porn in the personal realm, that is outrage content posted by ordinary individuals on their views and opinions about current events. This research has attempted to fill a gap to understand what outrage porn looks like in the everyday, information experiences of Twitter users. What has been observed and analysed is clickbait, outrage porn and misinformation expressed about Covid-19 and Black Lives Matter. The way users express these forms of outrage is not limited to 140 characters and include videos, pictures, memes, GIFs and more. The need to voice opinions on controversial topics has been established and social media provides bubbles of “peer-ships” which either acknowledge an individual’s opinion or directly opposes it. In each situation the individuals can become “twitter famous” their content going viral pushing it to the top of people’s feeds and dominating timelines. Although the user’s true intentions can never be fully established without asking them, we can gain insights into their intentions by the thousands of social media interactions about the tweet. Furthermore, posting clearly provocative content to a public site where any number of people can argue back must mean, at least implicitly, the users have some outrageous intention. Whatever the intention is people will be enraged by content which triggers high arousal emotions as discussed in this research. Outrage porn will continue to thrive regardless of the user’s intentions, if there is content that will produce a reaction from people. With the small dataset of 366 tweets the way users present their outrage varies drastically with each Outrage Discourse Indicator, understanding how users express their outrage can help individuals identify outrage which may be misleading and encourage fact checking.

For Covid-19 misrepresentation and unfounded claims were significant and recurring sentiments. Conspiracy theories gained traction online and provided fodder for users to argue over. The impact of this is information is not properly fact checked and content which may be untrue or misinformed can be shared and spread quickly online. This type of bold claim making gains traction quickly online, especially if the users turn out to be wrong or if they post outrageous claims which can quickly be dismissed. Conspiracy claims spread quickly on social media, the more outrageous it is and the less evidence supporting it the more popular it can become as people direct their indignation towards the author and content. However, without clear fact checking some people may become genuinely misinformed, taking the content as evidence for the claims without the necessary tools to understand whether it is reliable or not. The nature and origin of the virus, political motivations, reactions to the virus, cures and immunity (specifically school children’s immunity) were among the most posted about topics from the tweets collected. Miller (2020) reflects on an investigation by BBC Click and the
UK counter-terrorism think tank, they collected over 150,000 public Facebook posts about Covid-19. They found far right groups were using the pandemic to share outrageous content to vilify certain groups (LGBT+, Islamic, Jewish and elitists groups). The Far-right groups used extreme, outrageous, and misleading content to blame these groups for the ongoing pandemic and lockdown restrictions. This type of targeted outrage is an extreme example but reflects the nature of how outrage porn can be used to rile up audiences and impact the information world. Spring (2020) found the potential for indirect harm caused by misinformation about Covid-19 could be significant. Real world implications of conspiracy theories, rumours and misleading medical information found in this research could have devastating impacts on individual’s health. The traction some of this misinformation gains is worrying and although social media platforms are taking direct action to combat misinformation, we can see how it still makes an impact online.

Politics was a significant topic in both Black Lives Matter and Covid-19 tweets. Each side of the political spectrum aired their views on how governments were doing well or failing in some way or another. Content about the recent Black Lives Matter events tended strongly to expose the perceived bad behaviour of individuals and undermine the movement (or other movements) in some way. The need to shame people through videos and pictures was a strong characteristic of outrage content in this dataset. Research (Martin, 2013. Fan, 2013. & Crockett, 2017) suggests anger is the emotion that spreads quickest online. Further research (Rothschild & Keefer, 2017. Leach et al, 2017) suggests online outrage can be perceived as a desire to restore social justice and is associated with behaviours supporting political actions. With that in mind, we can see how these videos and pictures of the Black Lives Matter protests can gain traction online and how individuals may feel they are contributing to social justice by exposing them. However, with anything posted on social media we need to understand the context of the post and do some fact checking as consumers. What we have seen with this dataset is how easily content can be exaggerated, misrepresented and even falsified. The videos and pictures collected here represent a sample of content which can be considered outrage porn as the content is manipulated in some way for audiences, whether intentional or not. The Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED) (2020) recorded over 7,750 demonstrations relating to Black Lives Matter between May and August 2020 across the U.S. They also found of the 2,400 demonstration locations fewer than 220 locations had violence or destruction, only around 10% of the protests were violent. These figures are in stark contrast to some of (social) media’s reactions to the protests. With over 3.2 million likes recorded in this dataset (Fig. 10) for videos and pictures of the protests we can see how negative perceptions of Black Lives Matter can gain traction online despite evidence to show the contrary. The percentages described in ACLED’s research demonstrates how perceptions of these events can be exaggerated and generally accepted on social media despite evidence which presents a different picture. The research presented here strengthens the claims that social media companies need to actively fact-check content and help stop the spread of misinformation, especially when it comes to medical information and the ongoing issues of social injustice for the Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic communities.
Crockett (2019) shared additional insights into the online outrage problem and discussed the issues with social media companies feeding into outrage porn addictions by employing algorithms which prioritize content which triggers our outrage. Social media companies prioritising outrage content on our feeds provides an endless stream of information which enrages us in some way. Social media can exacerbate outrage information addiction by creating an information environment where this content is so easily accessible. It also rewards outrage producers by catapulting them into virality, the more social media interactions they receive the more popular their profile can become. If outrage pays it is easy to see why users post content which may be intentional outrageous, misleading, or false. Bontcheva (2016) suggests that information overload from social media can be a symptom of people’s individual difficulty prioritising information based on their own values/interests. It is difficult to prioritise information presented to us on social media because it is replaced so quickly with new content and our interests (represented by our timelines and recommendations etc.) are so vast. Judging the value and authenticity of what is presented to us is difficult on social media. Social media has undoubtedly changed the way we consume news and when we are informed about important topics such as Covid-19 and Black Lives Matter by Twitter or Facebook, judging the reliability and authenticity of 140 characters or a 60 second video can be challenging. There are many reliable news sources on social media sites and traditional news producers have capitalised on the quick, direct way they can get news to audiences via social media. However, we still need the tools to weed out misinformation and judge the content we see. If we prioritise outrage porn our views on important subjects can be skewed; we challenge ourselves to find a balanced and informed view of these topics when social media platforms and users reward outrage with the act of going viral. Our information consumption needs to focus more on reliable content and less on how shareable it is, particularly when it comes to important events and topics.

There have been many theories as to why people share outrage content on social media, and we can generally accept that as a strand of clickbait it is incredibly popular. Whether the authors intended the content to be “outrage porn” or not, the impacts can snowball, and users may treat the content as outrageous and respond to it accordingly. Social media for all the positive aspects of social networking it provides has exacerbated the nature of outrage porn. Long gone are the days sensationalism and scandal were only reported in newspapers, every single Twitter user has the potential to be a news outlet for their network of peers and if the content is popular enough it gains a global following becoming viral. Social media is being researched extensively and the data provided here provides examples of outrage from two highly politicised and emotive topics from 2020. They also present the different types of outrage that can emerge from different topics. It is important to understand the impacts outrage porn can have with Covid-19 and Black Lives Matter as they are paradigm shifting events. The types of outrage shared provide different popularity stats and we can see from the research conducted here that different forms of outrage have different levels of popularity. Videos and pictures are still the most popular type of outrage porn on Twitter and even low amounts of content generate millions of social media interactions. The more visual the content the more popular it can become; it satisfies the reward seeking behaviour discussed and provides rich content for consumption by the users.
Tim Krieder (2008) said of outrage:

‘[the] reason we rush so quickly to the vulgar satisfactions of judgment, and love to revel in our righteous outrage, is that it spares us the impotent pain of empathy, and the harder, messier work of understanding’

We should be dealing with the ‘messier’ work of understanding, understanding the context of what we are consuming and judging whether that information is helping or hindering us. By doing that we do not fall into the trap of outrage porn on social media, instead chasing the sources of the content (especially videos and pictures) and thinking about the wider context of the information. Twitter provides millions of hours’ worth of content and it is difficult to process all that content with great accuracy. We make snap decisions based on tweets, videos and pictures we see for a matter of seconds or minutes before we are tempted by another post. Outrage porn thrives on social media because it stands out in the sea of information, and equally because its outrageousness is dulled by the millions of other outrageous things happening on your timeline. Information addiction is a real threat to people when they are presented with unending volumes of content, hours and hours of scrolling through highly stimulating material provides an ecosystem in which information addictions can thrive. Outrage in nature is very attractive to us but we need to stop for a moment and think about how this outrage is impacting our information world.
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Reflections on the dissertation process

My thoughts before undertaking the dissertation: My initial thoughts undertaking this dissertation were excitement at the opportunity to research a topic of my own design. Thinking of a topic, refining it, thinking again about the topic and refining it some more was an excellent opportunity to empathise with all researchers and academics whose work I read as part of the MSc Information Science course. Choosing a topic was initially quite easy, I knew from year one of the MSc degree the type of topic I was interested in but translating this into a fully-fledged research project was no easy feat. However, once my dissertation proposal was approved, I felt a great sense of relief and determination to get on with writing it.

My thoughts (approx..) halfway through the dissertation: Data collection is hard. Once my dissertation proposal was approved, I dove into my data collection which initially was incredibly fun. The thought that every tweet I collected would form part of the larger ideology of my results was exciting, but I hit a wall very hard. I wondered how the data I collected would impact my findings and if I would be able to answer the research aims announced in my proposal. The data collection was equal measures interesting and frustrating. To ease some of this frustration I read through the various dissertation materials on the CityLIS Moodle and was reassured that data collection is a significant and difficult part of any dissertation process. Once I concluded the data collection and moved on to data analysis my faith was restored that I would be able to draw some appropriate conclusions and have some interesting material to discuss.

My thoughts after the first draft: If I could get on with my dissertation without interruption that would be a miracle. I work full time in a busy law firm and trying to adhere to my self-imposed deadlines was incredibly difficult. I understood from day one of my postgraduate degree that timing would always be my issue but the amount of tinkering, rereading and more tinkering of my data collection and findings and conclusions was unimaginable. My wish post-dissertation would be to take even more time to conduct my research but the constraints of my job and homelife meant handing in on 01 October 2020 was a goal I would just have to commit to. Saying that I would do it all over again.

The two things that dominated my thoughts while writing:

1) Am I choosing the right topics to talk about? Within the scope of information overload and outrage porn I choose to write about Covid-19 and Black Lives Matter. The first topic was a no-brainer it had dominated headlines (and rightly so) and my Google alert was pinging off constantly with research about misinformation and Covid-19, fake news and Covid-19, politics and Covid-19 and much more. However, my decision to write about Black Lives Matter was not an easy one and I second guessed myself every day. The topic is highly emotive and highly political but it being such a paradigm shifting event of 2020 I thought I would be doing a disservice by excluding it. Important conversations and research need to be examined in this area and what reassures me is seeing others research about Black Lives Matter, misinformation, and information overload as well.
2) Will I have enough data to draw accurate conclusions? In total I gathered 366 tweets as part of my data collection, and I struggled to determine whether this would be enough. However, as I started writing the findings and conclusions and analysing the data, I realised they would be enough in the context of what I was aiming for. I intended to provide an example of what outrage porn looks like in the context of two subjects and with the 366 tweets I believe I have been able to do that. This research does not try to determine what all outrage looks like but provides an insight into what it looks like on a small scale and with two contextualise topics.

Conclusion: This dissertation was the hardest thing I have done academically but I thoroughly enjoyed it. I loved the topic I choose and would love to continue looking into outrage culture, expanding my topics to include politics, meme culture, celebrities, the workplace and more.
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