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Abstract

Objective: Previous research on bystander behavior has primarily focused on single factors explaining whether bystanders intervene or not. In this thesis, I examine the patterns and processes of active bystanders in the different contexts of public violence. I argue that this approach is necessary to broaden the understanding of bystanders and the characteristics of importance to their patterns of behavior. Methods: The thesis applies a mixed-methods design to examine bystander behaviors in violent conflicts. The sample comprises 75 police recorded cases of public violence in Copenhagen. The data comprises video footage of naturally occurring violence and the matching police case files. I employ a Latent Class Analysis to explore patterns of bystander behaviors and their contextual and situational characteristics. A qualitative case-analysis is used to describe and explain the social and emotional micro-processes of bystander behaviors in the different patterns of violence contexts that the Latent Class Analysis model identifies. Results: The Latent Class Analysis model finds five emergency types of violence with different behavioral, contextual and situational characteristics. The qualitative case-analysis showed the importance of social dynamics of emotions, status and group norms to the way bystanders intervene in violent incidents. Conclusion: The thesis demonstrates how bystander behaviors are performed in different types of violent incidents and how many different micro-sociological processes are involved here. Research on bystander behavior should provide more attention to the contextual dynamics of social group relations and emotions. Moreover, future research should focus more on action patterns and the agency of bystanders.
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Introduction

In conflict situations, bystanders have shown to be a key element in determining how conflicts develop (Black, 1993; Cooney 1998). Bystanders are third party individuals present during an emergency and they have multiple ways of responding to what they witness. In cases of violent conflict, bystanders can help put an end to the conflict by calling the police, by blocking the antagonists or making calming gestures, but they can also cause the conflict to escalate by intervening violently, by cheering for the violence to continue, or simply by doing nothing (Cooney 1998; Levine et al. 2012; Levine, Taylor, and Best 2011; Levine and Manning 2013; Parks et al. 2013). The response to conflict demonstrates important aspects of human life, since it gives us knowledge about humans’ ways of performing social control and it shows the embodiment of morality and the extents to which people abide with morality. Violent conflict itself depicts a type of morality, since the violence can be used and evoked by moral values (Cooney 1998). This makes it vital to examine bystander behaviors in the social dynamics of violence.

Violent conflicts can emerge everywhere, and they are likely to be seen by bystanders, when they occur in public space (Levine et al. 2011). Public place is as a setting of physical traffic among human (Goffman 1966). Here people are moving in, out, and among interactions of strangers and friends, and some of these interactions turn into conflicts. A public space comprises many places and many things. Spatially, the public is the streets; the kiosk; it is the nightclub or the train. Contextually, the public is the night out; the date; it is on the way home; the daily grocery shopping; it is on the job. From all these different places, conflicts sometimes emerge, and here the aggressive interactions are often perceived by the eyes of others who are also occupying the public place. The availability of public places makes it an interesting setting to study bystander behavior. Here both strangers and friends have the possibility of helping when a conflict evolves between antagonists, and moreover, the social norms for accepted behavior in such places are undoubtedly being tested when people start fighting or are being violently assaulted by a perpetrator (Goffman 1966).

A violent assault in the streets of New York City was also what initially prompted the prosperous research field of bystander behavior. In 1964 a young woman, Kitty Genovese, was raped and murdered only a few meters from her own home. Allegedly, 38 people
witnessed the assault, but did not do anything to stop it. The incident gained prominent attention in the news, framed as a story of apathy and a lack of morals among the passive bystanders (Manning, Levine, and Collins 2008). This incident inspired two social psychologists, Darley and Latané (1968), to examine whether the lack of intervention in an emergency is due to deviant morality or due to something more situational. The two authors hypothesized that “the more bystanders to an emergency, the less likely, or more slowly, any one bystander will intervene to provide help.” (Darley and Latané 1968:378). With an experimental design, Darley and Latané found this hypothesized negative effect of intervention, which they named the bystander effect. The two authors argued that bystanders are less likely to intervene when more people are present, because of a diffusion of responsibility in the emergency and confusion about how to act.

Most of the research done on bystander behavior ties its roots to the pioneering article about the “bystander effect” by Darley and Latané. The multiple studies that have replicated the study since the 1960's have moreover also referred to the tragic murder of Kitty Genovese and the 38 passive bystanders. Ironically, the very fact that no one intervened to stop the murderer, has recently been challenged by Manning and colleagues (2008). In their analysis of the police records and media coverage of the murder back in 1964, the three authors find that there might have been fewer than 38 witnesses, and that there was certainly fewer bystanders who saw the sexual assault and murder. Furthermore, more of the bystanders actually did intervene by calling the police.

This critical analysis of the actual events and bystander behaviors is important, because the main narrative within the bystander field of research has been that bystanders remain passive during emergencies when more bystanders are present. When referring to the murder of Kitty Genovese it supports this narrative, and overlooks the potential in studying the contexts and conditions in which bystanders actually do intervene (Levine and Manning 2013; Manning et al. 2008). In this master’s thesis, I examine the patterns and processes of how people respond actively when they witness public violence or aggression. I examine the micro-dynamics between actors and the contextual characteristics of the public incidents. I use video footage of naturally occurring violence in public places in Copenhagen and the matching police case files reporting the video-recorded violence. This sample offers a unique
opportunity to explore the contextual events and dynamics of how people react actively in violent conflicts.

Literature review

A binary approach to bystander behavior

Within social psychology, the research on bystander behavior to a large extent aligns with the approach of Darley and Latané. This seminal focus of the study on the situational factor of numbers of bystanders has been a stepping stone in the research field and numerous studies have replicated it and found support for the bystander effect (Latané and Nida 1981). Most of these studies test the bystander effect with different scenarios of emergencies and explanatory factors (Chekroun and Brauer 2002; Clark and Word 1972, 1974; Darley and Latané 1968; Latane and Darley 1968; Rutkowski, Gruder, and Romer 1983; Slater et al. 2013; Solomon, Solomon, and Stone 1978; Tice and Baumeister 1985). Moreover, they are based on experimental designs, similar to the one of Darley and Latané (1968), where an experimenter simulated having a seizure while bystanders were placed in different rooms connected to the experimenter with microphones and headphones.

The set-up with participants (often students) placed in a room under the pretense of filling out a questionnaire or test is common (Clark and Word 1972, 1974; Rutkowski et al. 1983). While filling out a form, the participants are exposed to a loud crash and the moaning of a person in pain, coming from another room, while either sitting alone or with others. In this set-up, different explanatory factors that influence the bystander effect are tested: Response time of helping and the influence of socially close or unfamiliar bystanders (Clark and Word 1972). The ambiguity of a situation as an emergency or not with different variations of a person falling in a laboratory with electronic equipment (Clark and Word 1974). The impact of cohesiveness in the group, where cohesiveness was prompted by group talks before the experimental emergency (Rutkowski et al. 1983). These studies all focus on explanatory factors of whether or not bystanders help in an emergency under controlled conditions. Other bystander effect studies used a quasi-experimental design (Chekroun and Brauer 2002; Solomon et al. 1978). The set-up here exposes participants in their everyday life to some kind
of emergency. Chekroun and Brauer (2002) exposed participants in an elevator to a person doing graffiti as soon as the elevator door closes, and another study by Solomon and colleagues (1978) exposed residents in their apartment to a person fainting when in the building’s laundry room.

Common for all of these studies is that they look at ways to explain why people do not intervene (or do it more slowly) when there are other bystanders in the room. The studies constructed different test scenarios, but they all had a rather narrow focus on finding further support for the situational conditions for non-intervention.

The criminological take on bystanders is just as focused on a binary understanding of bystander behavior. This tradition is shaped by the routine activity theory, presented by Cohen and Felson (1979), who argue that essentially three elements make criminal violation possible in the convergence of time and space: a motivated offender, a target and the absence of a guardian. Here, it is not the behavior, but the physical presence of the bystander that is of interest, since it makes crime less likely. This line of research on bystanders has been developed by Reynald (2010), who specifies and nuances the role of a ‘capable’ guardian preventing crime. Using in-depth interviews with residential guardians in 13 neighborhoods, Reynald seeks to examine how guardians distinguish offenders from others and what makes them willing to intervene. She finds that guardians may be available, but not capable of responding to crime in the neighborhood (Reynald 2010). Guardians must be willing to react, and when they do intervene, they opt to intervene indirectly, as calling the police.

The danger and aggression of an emergency

Until recently, little concern has been given to the fact that the bystander effect is not as strong or evident when studies take the danger of an emergency into account. Fischer and colleagues (2011) do this in a meta-analysis of the vast numbers of studies on the bystander effect. Here they examine whether the bystander effect is smaller in dangerous emergencies compared to non-dangerous emergencies. Data from multiple studies in 53 articles were used for the meta-analysis, in which the authors found that an increase in the number of bystanders does not inhibit bystanders from intervening in dangerous emergencies, but actually reverses the effect, making intervention more likely (Fischer et al. 2011).
bystander effect was still found in non-dangerous emergencies. Furthermore, they find that experimental studies compared to quasi-experimental studies increase the bystander effect.

The meta-analysis of Fischer and colleagues is of great importance for the research field on bystander behavior, since it emphasizes the need to nuance the understanding of circumstances that are relevant in bystanders’ probability of intervention. Additionally, it substantiates the need to look into bystander behavior in particularly dangerous or violent emergencies. Fischer and colleagues (2006) already did this six years earlier, when hypothesizing that dangerous emergencies make bystanders more likely to intervene, since a dangerous situation is clearly recognized as an emergency and the consequences of not intervening and helping the victim is larger. With an experimental design, where participants were witnessing sexual assault on a screen from the room next door, the authors found that in dangerous situations, bystanders in company with others are similarly likely to intervene compared to dangerous situations where the bystander is alone.

Studying bystander behavior in dangerous emergencies is also done by Parks and colleagues (2013) in an onsite observation study. Following the notion that violence is common in bars, the authors use nonparticipant observation of naturally occurring conflicts in bars to study characteristics of both aggressive and non-aggressive bystander involvement. They find that bystanders are twice as likely to act non-aggressive as aggressively, and that bystanders are more likely to intervene in more severe incidents of aggression where the antagonists are intoxicated, the antagonists are men and where the aggression is mutual. Parks and colleagues (2013) in this study show the relevance of looking at both escalatory and de-escalatory bystander behavior in aggressive conflicts.

Taking social closeness and group behavior into account

Another line of research that has expanded the understanding of possible ways to intervene, has also stressed the need to look at social relations and group dynamics when examining bystander behavior (Black 1993; Cooney 1998; Levine and Manning 2013; Levine et al. 2011; Phillips and Cooney 2005).

In this line of research, we find one of the only sociological studies on bystander behavior. Phillips and Cooney (2005) test the theory of social gravitation developed by Black (1993),
and later further developed by Cooney (1998). The authors here use a bystander typology to examine social ties on an individual and a group level. The typology distinguishes between bystanders who either take side (as a partisan), remain uninvolved in conflict (being passive) or intervene in an impartial manner (as a settlement agent). Phillips and Cooney examine how the structure of social closeness to one antagonist and remoteness to the other affects how bystanders intervene in a conflict and whether the conflict turns violent or not. Using interview data with prisoners’ accounts on self-experienced conflicts, the two authors find that partisanship is much more likely for bystanders who are socially close to one antagonist and unfamiliar with the other, and for bystanders socially close to one of the antagonist group while unfamiliar with the other (Phillips and Cooney 2005). Moreover, bystanders who know both antagonists are most likely to act in an impartial manner. In this line of research, Black, Phillips and Cooney stress the importance of studying different ways of interventions and social relation when looking at bystanders.

Levine has been important in the foundation of a new, more nuanced approach to bystander behavior, as he and colleagues (2011) argue that we need to look at group dynamics in aggressive conflicts. The authors pioneered in using the method of video analysis, when analyzing 42 aggressive incidents caught on surveillance cameras in the UK in night-time economy contexts. They examine how bystanders can stop aggressive situations from turning violent and how sequences of behaviors predict violence. The authors find that bystanders tend to use de-escalatory acts when intervening, and this behavior decreases the risk of severe violence. Moreover, they find that collective group intervention with several bystanders performing de-escalatory intervention is more successful to avoid conflicts from turning violent. Following this, Levine and colleagues (2011) argue that an increase of active bystanders inhibits severe violence. This study has been the corner stone in the usage of real-life recordings of violence to examine bystanders.

**Action patterns and processes**

More recently, the research field has developed further by not only taking social dynamics into account, but also examining what occurs during bystander interventions. Liebst and colleagues (2018) use video analysis when studying the risk of victimization for bystanders who get involved in violent emergencies. Based on video footage obtained from 69 police reported incidents of violence, they find that one in six bystanders get victimized and that
bystanders who know a victim have a higher risk of victimization. Liebst and colleagues suggest that the findings align with the growing body of evidence that social closeness is a key factor in relation to bystander behavior. Within the same new tradition of bystander research, a fourth type of bystander behavior has been incorporated and studied (Lindegaard et al. 2017; Liebst et al. forthcoming). This incorporation is the recognition of consolation behavior in the aftermath of conflicts as a type of bystander action. This inclusion broadens the understanding of ways a bystander can help and respond to a conflict since it includes a perspective of a post-emergency intervention with bystander behaviors to calm down and comfort a distressed victim.

Acknowledging the important progress made in the bystander field of research, it still lacks qualitative insights to open up to a more complex understanding of the dynamics and processes that undertake in an emergency. So far only four studies to my knowledge have approached the bystander research field qualitatively (Cooney 1998; Levine et al. 2012; Lowe et al. 2012; Bloch et al. In press). In his book on the role of third parties in cases of homicides, Cooney (1998) draws on interview data with imprisoned men and women convicted for murder or manslaughter. Here, the interviews focus on the background, history and genesis of the homicides and are used as enriched, illustrative cases of the events. In this sense, Cooney employs a qualitative method, but instead of using the advantages of qualitative research to get accounts from the bystanders, he focuses on the perpetrators’ narratives. Moreover, third parties are not limited to persons present in the emergency, but are defined as “all those who have knowledge of a conflict, actual or potential (Cooney 1998:6).

Both Lowe and colleagues (2012) and Levine and colleagues (2012) also use interviews to examine bystander behavior. Lowe and colleagues (2012) have explored the gendered norms and considerations regarding bystander intervention in female violence. Based on 20 focus groups with 54 participants, the authors examine how men and women respond to female violence in night-time economy contexts. Lowe and colleagues find that the interviewed men show greater moral concerns about intervening in female-to-female violence whereas more of the interviewed women argue that they would intervene despite a larger risk of being victimized as a female bystander (Lowe et al. 2012). The study offers insights into the gender-biased perceptions of female violence and the implications of the willingness to intervene. Levine and colleagues (2012) have studied how social identity processes can regulate public
order in the night-time economy. The authors conducted 20 group interviews with 53 participants who accounted for their experiences of violence in the night-time economy. In the interviews, the authors identify different ways users of the night-time economy police or support group members who get into fights. The violence is discussed by the participants in terms of intragroup violence or intergroup violence. The study also finds that categorization of the opponents and personal recognition were important identity and group processes that should be taken into account when examining bystander behavior in the night-time economy.

Contrary to the three former studies, Bloch and colleagues (In press) take full advantage of the behavioral insights of bystanders, when doing a behavioral micro-analysis of video footage of naturally occurring public violence. The authors examine how bystanders work collectively in cases of public violence and moreover offer a qualitative typology of bystander actions (Bloch et al. In press). Here the authors argue that bystanders can either act with distancing, with ambivalence or with involvement. The qualitative approach offers a behavioral interaction analysis of how bystanders either move away (distancing), are emotionally upset by the situation, but not able or willing to act (ambivalence) or intervene (involvement). The analysis depicts a “caring collective” of coordinating actions between bystanders who act against the social violation of the social order in the public space.
My contribution

In the literature on bystander behavior, I identify an absence of studies that offer a more nuanced and complex examination of the ways a bystander can intervene in violent situations. The research on bystander behavior has gone from being a binary question of whether or not a bystander intervenes (Chekroun and Brauer 2002; Clark and Word 1972, 1974; Darley and Latané 1968; Latane and Darley 1968; Rutkowski et al. 1983; Slater et al. 2013; Solomon et al. 1978; Tice and Baumeister 1985) or is present (Cohen and Felson 1979; Reynald 2010), to a research field including analyses of the active bystander patterns (Levine et al. 2012, 2011; Liebst et al. 2018; Lindegaard et al. 2017). I however still identify a gap in the literature, since no studies have examined the individual and contextual characteristics of violent conflicts with active bystanders deploying a qualitative approach.

With only four qualitative studies within the research field (Cooney 1998; Levine et al. 2012; Lowe et al. 2012; Bloch et al. In press), the statistical approach to bystander behavior often seems to neglect to encompass the meaning of both context and human agency. Instead the quantitative studies mainly focus on highlighting single factors that influence behaviors or violence (Chekroun and Brauer 2002; Clark and Word 1972, 1974; Darley and Latané 1968; Latane and Darley 1968; Rutkowski, Gruder, and Romer 1983; Slater et al. 2013; Solomon, Solomon, and Stone 1978). Knowing why some bystanders act while others remain passive is important, but knowing the dynamics involved when actors escalate or de-escalate a conflict is just as important. In light of this, I argue for a shift from the dominant focus in the bystander literature on the rather narrow question about intervention or not to instead ask what characterizes bystander behaviors and the contextual, violent incidents that the behaviors are performed in.

To my knowledge, no study has attempted to encompass and categorize the varying types of bystander interventions in situational emergencies. However, a typology of actions a bystander can perform is crucial for the very conceptualization and study of bystanders. We need to be able to comprehend the types of behaviors before determining the consequences of them. Following this argument, we avoid simplifying the phenomenon of bystander behavior and instead emphasize the fact that social interaction must be examined in its context and with the complexity of different social factors and dynamics. With my thesis, I
examine the behavioral, contextual and situational characteristics of public violent incidents to gain a better understanding of the diversity of behaviors and contexts that bystanders must be analyzed in accordance with. Thus, my thesis is motivated by the question:

What types of active bystander behaviors are associated with different contextual and situational characteristics in public violent incidents, and what social and emotional dynamics are involved when bystanders intervene?

With this two-folded research question follows a two-folded aim. First, to identify types of violent incidents associated with different bystander behaviors and situational characteristics. This gives the possibility to examine patterns of behaviors related to different contextual circumstances and to emphasize the need not to reduce bystander behavior to a uniform way of human action. Second, to explore the social and emotional dynamics and processes that are associated with how bystanders act in different types of violent incidents. This offers insights about the very different social mechanisms that should be taken into account when studying bystander behavior in public violence.

I examine the patterns and processes of bystander behaviors in public violence with a twofold mixed-methods analysis, deploying video footage of naturally occurring violence and the respective police case files of these incidents. In this thesis, I focus primarily on bystanders and antagonists in immediate face-to-face interactions of the violent situations (Goffman 1966). This does not prevent me from including bystanders watching from a distance or responding to a conflict they do not perceive directly, but it emphasizes the contradiction to the classic bystander field of research, which primarily sets up experiments with bystanders sitting in another room from where the emergency unfolds (Clark and Word 1972, 1974; Darley and Latané 1968; Latane and Darley 1968; Rutkowski, Gruder, and Romer 1983). In addition to this, I define violence as the physical aggressions aimed towards another individual, and public space is defined as any location in- or outside that are more or less open to the public. This includes bars, kiosks, trains and parks (Heinskou and Liebst 2017). With these key definitions in place, I now turn to a description of my theoretical approach.
A micro-sociological theory frame

To gain insights about the patterns and processes of bystander behavior and the contexts they appear in, I employ a micro-sociological theory frame comprising theories on social identity processes, status and power relations and emotional dynamics and structures. The applied theories all belong to the same micro-sociological tradition of deciphering the processes of social behavior and explaining aspects of human behavior (Hochschild 1983; Kemper 2011; Levine et al. 2012; Schmitt and Clark 2006; Swann et al. 2009; de Waal 2007). Since bystander behavior in violent incidents include a variety of social dynamics, I argue that it is necessary to include different theories in order to explain different processes of social interaction. The theoretical perspectives on the micro-processes will be presented continuously as I apply them in my analyses, but I will in the following outline them briefly.

To analyze social identity processes and in-group dynamics in public violence, I draw on the approaches represented by Levine, Swann and Marques and their respective co-authors (Levine et al. 2012, 2011; Marques, Abrams, and Serôdio 2001; Swann et al. 2009). The three researchers have all developed perspectives on how individuals’ behaviors are regulated by both in- and out-group members and social identities. Especially Levine and Swann are important, since both have focused on group dynamics in order to explain how people behave in violent or extreme situations. In order to analyze how status and power are connected to bystander behavior in public violence, I draw on the status-power theory developed by Kemper (2011, 1991). Kemper argues that all social relations are related to the balance of receiving and according status. When status is claimed but not given, power enters in the social relation as a consequence of emotional uproar.

To examine the emotional processes in violent conflicts, I draw on theories on empathy, sympathy and the emotion work related to monitoring these feelings. This use of emotion theories comprises an unconventional combination of the primatologist de Waal’s (Preston and de Waal 2002; de Waal 2007) work on the biology of empathy to the social and cultural structures of feelings as empathy and sympathy represented by both Clark (Schmitt and Clark 2006) and Hochschild (1983). In the combined use of these theories of emotions, I advocate for a need to acknowledge both the biological and cultural construct of emotions. Something that recently has been argued is comprised in Hochschild’s otherwise rather constructionist
theory on emotions (see Bøgkjær & Ejbye-Ernst 2016). Relying on this micro-sociological theory frame, I now turn to my ontological approach, presented through the methodological insights of video analysis.

Behaviors observed through a camera lens

Violence has to a great extent been studied with a main interest in the perpetrator’s (and victim’s) background characteristics and with far less attention to the violent interaction itself (Collins 2008). In general, criminal behavior, such as violence, is rarely studied directly, but is often based on accounts of the behavior and events (Lindegaard and Bernasco 2018). The research field on the bystanders’ role in violent interactions however points towards another ontological perspective on violence: It emphasizes a focus on the violent situation and how bystanders in that situation have the means to change the course of the conflict (Levine et al. 2011). Thus, my ontological gaze is on the behaviors and interactions of public violence.

In his book on violence, Collins (2008) stresses the need to capture the process of violent interaction through direct observation, and calls for attention to the micro-sociological study of video recordings of violence. Studying violent conflicts between individuals or groups from video recordings offers the possibility to examine the micro-processes and dynamics of emotions and social relations involved in tense situations (Collins 2008). It offers the possibility to observe interactions on the very micro-level that they outplay in as they naturally unfold in real life. Video recordings of violence give the opportunity to view the same behaviors and aggressive interactions multiple times; to watch it in slow motion and to have it looked over by others to verify what is perceived (Collins 2008; Lindegaard and Bernasco 2018). This method renders the possibility to use Goffman’s (1966) micro-sociological methodology of human behavior.

Goffman represents an important tradition in micro-sociology that explores and theorizes about the very interactions and behaviors that humans perform in their everyday life. His way of approaching the social, by fetishizing the micro-processes, is vital in the study of bodily behaviors of bystander and antagonists, because this approach emphasizes the importance of behavioral and symbolic cues to understand social life (Goffman 1966). In my
exploration of processes of bystander behaviors and their contextual patterns, I adopt the tradition of Goffman by following Collins’ (2008) argument of studying behaviors recorded as they naturally unfold in real life. This perspective on social life can be argued to be an examination of what Collins (1989; 1994) suggests is the bottom level frame of Goffman’s frame analysis (2014): the physical interaction of human bodies from which all the other social frames arise. The material frame gives insights about the physical and emotional relationships among actors that unfold whenever actors are at the same place (Collins 1994). It is here a direct my sociological gaze.

My epistemological ambition

The encouragement by Collins (2008) to employ video analysis of naturally occurring violence has evoked a new era for analyzing violent interactions. It offers the researcher a potential to examine what actually occurs in violent situations at a micro-level taking the behavioral and emotional processes into account (Collins 2008). With this important method available, it is necessary to ask how micro-sociologists with an interest in emotional and interactional dynamics of violence can take advantage of this new era. How to get most out of this source of data and method when looking at bystander actions and other aspects of violent conflicts? I argue that one possible answer to this question, is to use the qualities of video analysis to approach violent incidents as contextual events consisting of individual and situational dynamics shaping the interaction. Where previous studies on bystander behavior primarily have focused on single factors that affect behavior, my thesis aligns with an approach that advocates the need to look at contexts and individual dynamics in order to understand bystander behavior in violent incidents.

I here draw on an epistemological position articulated through a critique of ‘variable analysis’ made by Blumer (1956). In his critique, Blumer states that social scientists very commonly employ variables to analyze social life in a rather reductionist and schematic manner that assumes a pure, static and uncontested relationship between two variables. He critiques the lack of guidelines and rules about how to use and choose variables for analysis within this established methodology. This absence of rules and guidelines makes the use of variables problematic and not beneficial for the study of human group life, since it does not include
the ‘here and now’ context of social relations. Moreover, Blumer (1956) highlights the problem of employing variables as dependent or independent to determine effect and cause, since this ignores the process of interpretation and definition that undergoes the relation between two variables. He advocates for an approach in variable analysis that remembers and accounts for the processes and dynamics of definitions that human group life comprises.

Much in line with Blumer’s critique, Abbott (1988) has also stressed the importance of not considering the social as consisting of fixed, social entities with variable attributes that have definite, causal meaning. Abbott argues this, when describing how methods of general linear modelling have influenced how social scientists approach and interpret social life and its processes. Both sociologists outline the problem of taking the context, process and meaning out of the studied phenomenon. In this thesis, I take the outlined critique seriously and adopt an approach to bystander behavior that seeks to oppose this reductionist way of using variables. I re-introduce the matter of processes of interpretation and meaning that are attached to bystander behaviors in violent incidents. Instead of pointing out a single explanatory factor of importance to understand bystander behavior, I argue that we need to employ all factors relevant – individual, situational and contextual. In the following sections, I will elaborate exactly how I manage to include the contextual dynamics of bystander behaviors in public violence, when I describe the sample and design of my thesis.

A design of mixed data and methods

To explore the contextual patterns and processes of bystander behaviors, I use a mixed-methods design that allows me to obtain complementary information of bystander behavior and the type of violent incidents they occur in. My understanding and definition of a mixed-methods design refer to 1) a triangulation of data collected from video footage and police case files and 2) a quantitative and qualitative use of the data consisting of both a quantitative pattern analysis and a qualitative case-analysis. In the following, I focus on the triangulation of data sources, when presenting my sample and the procedures of collecting and coding the data for the quantitative analysis. I then present the sampling strategy of my five qualitative cases. Hereafter, I describe the two analytical methods used, and elaborate on how a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods can offer a more nuanced and complete
picture of bystander behaviors in violent incidents. First, I want to inform that I have gained access to the data through my job as a student assistant on a research project about street violence in Copenhagen (Heinskou and Liebst 2017; see Department of Sociology). Thus, my data is a part of a larger research project and some of the articles that I refer to in this thesis are analyses based on (partially) the same data as mine.

A sample of mixed data sources

The sample consists of 75 real-life cases of violent incidents that have been reported to the police and have taken place in a public space in Copenhagen. All cases comprise both video footage and police case files of the incidents. The 75 cases have been selected from a sample of 933 incidents of violence that have been reported in the central police districts of Copenhagen between the years 2010 and 2012 (Liebst et al. 2018). All cases have been charged from the penal code sections as simple violence (§ 244), aggravated assault (§ 245), fatal violence (§ 246) or man slaughter (§ 237) (Heinskou and Liebst 2017). 500 of the 933 cases were obtained for analysis of the police case files. 164 of the 933 cases contained video footage of the violent incidents used as evidence. 79 cases that contained video clips were discarded because the footage was of poor quality (Liebst et al. 2018) or because there was no matching police case file to the video footage. Ten cases were discarded because there were no bystanders performing direct intervention in the situations. This resulted in a sample of 75 cases of violence documented by a police case file and video footage in which at least one bystander conducts direct intervention in the situation.

Coding procedures

The 75 incidents of violence comprise two different coding procedures regarding the video footage and the police case files. A dedicated team of student assistants including myself executed the coding and each of the two data sources contained information about what has happened in the violent incident and who was involved. The coding schemes of the data were developed inductively by qualitatively analyzing cases to find the best way of comprising information from coding the data.

---

1 Except one case where the video was kept in the sample despite no matching police case file.
Police case files
The first coding procedure concerns the police case files. All case files were double coded by a team of 12 student assistants. The procedure was that a pair of two students each coded a case individually and then afterwards compared their coding in a new, joint coding of the case file. Discrepancies of the coding between the two students were discussed until agreement was reached. The process of coding the police case files undertook several months of data collection and throughout the process the students worked in different pairs in order to assure compliance in the interpretation and coding of the case files. A police case file is an informative source of data since police and witnesses offer information about the people involved in a conflict, their motives and social relations. Thus, the coding of the police case files was focused on collecting personal and situational variables that are used to inform the police and court about the violent incident.

The personal information coded on a situational level includes the victim’s and offender’s age, gender, ethnicity, consumption of alcohol or drugs (perceived by the police or stated by the victims and offenders), motives for the conflict and the social relation among the involved parties. Furthermore, information about the victim’s declared injury is coded, and the offender’s criminal record was coded. In cases where a pre-sentence report has been made by The Danish Prison and Probation Service about the offender, this was primarily used to give information of social background about the offender (The Danish Prison and Probation Service).

Video footage
The second coding procedure concerns the video footage and is a procedure that I helped develop. Along with three other student assistants, I coded a variety of bodily behaviors and several situational characteristics. Thus, the video data was coded on two levels: On an individual level, bystanders’ bodily actions and the personal characteristics possible to obtain visually were coded. The bodily actions amongst others include kicks, pushes, calming gestures and hauling antagonists away from each other. The personal bystander characteristics amongst others include gender, if the bystander is at work, social relation and spatial distance to conflict. On a contextual level, the aggregated information about the situation was coded. This involves information about the composition of violence in the
situation, the number of bystanders present when the conflict emerges, characteristics of the antagonists, the place, time and spatial density of the incident.

Data triangulation

The coded data of police case files and video clips were merged into a single data set consisting of 305 individuals. The 305 individuals were all the active bystanders from the 75 cases who were intervening in the conflicts. It is from these two data sources that I gather information about behavioral, situational and contextual characteristics for my quantitative analysis.

The combined usage of the two types of data about the same violent incidents composes a unique combination of behavioral data from real-life recorded violent incidents and personal and situational information from the police case files. This way of combining the advantages from different sources of information is not common in criminological studies (Lindegaard and Bernasco 2018), and have, to my knowledge, only been used once before, where police case files clarified social relation in a video analysis (Liebst et al. 2018). Previous studies have either looked at police case files to examine violence (Heinskou and Liebst 2017; Weenink 2014) or video footage (Levine et al. 2011; Lindegaard et al. 2017). In this data triangulation, I expand the information possible to obtain by using the strengths from each data source to examine bystander behavior.

The ambition with this data triangulation is first and foremost to combine the bystanders’ behavioral actions from the video footage with their personal characteristics from the police case file. In this way, the behaviors and violent interactions are provided with insights about the conflicts and motives for the violent behaviors. Moreover, the triangulation of data is used to verify findings from the different data sources (Lindegaard 2013; Lindegaard and Bernasco 2018). Accounts about who did what in police case files are found to be unreliable, because actors are likely to tell a version of an event that makes them appear innocent so they will not be subject to prosecution (Lindegaard and Bernasco 2018). However, the accounts provide insights into emotional processes and social relations in a conflict, and the video footage can cross-validate the actions accounted for in the files. The use of the two data sources should however not be seen as a primary mean to gain validity of what happens in a specific violent incident, but as a way to get a more nuanced, complementary picture of
bystander behavior in public violence.

Mixed-methods to assess patterns and processes

To gain as complete and elaborated an understanding as possible of bystander behavior in violent incidents, this thesis comprises a quantitative Latent Class Analysis of patterns and a qualitative case-analysis of processes. The former analysis is extensive with the purpose of exploring types of violent incidents associated with different active bystander actions. The latter is an intensive analysis of the social and emotional dynamics of bystander actions and the contexts they unfold in. This twofold analysis makes it possible to explore the systematic patterns of behavioral, contextual and situational characteristics in my sample and examine the emotional and social processes that underlie the actions of bystanders. I here draw on the methodological notion from Scheff (1990) in his book on microsociology. Scheff exemplifies how intensive research on single events of social interaction can inform and complement extensive statistical research, and this is exactly the methodology at hand in this thesis. This aligns with the ontological position emphasized by Delmar (2010). She suggests that in qualitative research the generalizability is a question of what is unique and what is typical in a situation. The typical is what humans have in common; the “typical traits and recognizable patterns” of social life (Delmar 2010:122), and people and their individual life stories are what constitutes the uniqueness of a situation. Thus, I draw on the typical traits in an intensive analysis of single cases to illuminate the patterns found in the extensive analysis.

In this way, the thesis is based on a mixed method approach, where I use the strengths of two methods as an analytical strategy to explore behaviors and their contextual conditions. The triangulation of methods are not seen as a way of guaranteeing complete knowledge of the subject, but as a way to approach the bystander behavior in a more complementary fashion, where different methods provide different knowledge on bystander behavior (Hammersley 2008). I here use a sequential design to obtain the knowledge contributions from the methods. Quantitatively, I am making a typology of active bystander behaviors in different incidents of public violence. Here, I identify the patterns of behaviors and the contextual and situational characteristics. The results of the quantitative analysis are then used to select the qualitative cases (Creswell, Plano Clark, and Garrett 2008). From the qualitative cases I analyze the emotional, social and behavioral processes of the bystanders.
in their intervention. Here, I explore the patterns found in the quantitative analysis by looking at some of the dynamics that can explain why bystanders intervene the way they do. I sample for micro-situations that illuminate processes in order to elaborate and theorize about the patterns (Collins 1983).

The design is for this reason also partly sequential explanatory, because I use the qualitative case-analysis to elaborate and explain the patterns that I find in the quantitative Latent Class Analysis (Creswell et al. 2008). It is however important to stress that the two methods are contributing with two distinct analyses that each serve the purpose of providing insights to bystander behaviors in their contextual events. I perceive the use of different methods together as an analytical approach that offers a more complete understanding of bystander behaviors in violent emergencies, where the difference in practice and analysis of quantitative and qualitative methods can shed light on different aspect of the phenomenon of bystander behaviors (Hammersley 2008). In the following, I describe the sampling of the five qualitative cases that underline the sequential mixed methods design.

**Sampling five qualitative cases**

The five qualitative cases are sampled to represent each of the five Emergency Types that emerge from the quantitative analysis. I refer to the patterns found in the Latent Class Analysis as Emergency Types to indicate that they are statistical ideal types and not actual violent incidents. The sampling of five cases was done in two phases. The first part of the sampling was based on a criterion of random selection. First, I ascribed class membership to each of the 305 individuals based on their item-response patterns and the relative size of the five classes (Collins and Lanza 2010). This means that each individual is classified to belong to one of the five Emergency Types. When all individuals had been ascribed to an Emergency Type, I then randomly selected five different violent cases to represent each of the five Emergency Types.

Second part of the sampling was based on a qualitative criterion to find the five cases that best represents each of the five respective Emergency Types. From the five violent cases representing one Emergency Type, I selected the one case that 1) was most qualitatively detailed, 2) had a good video footage resolution and 3) had the characteristics that makes it a clear illustration of the quantitative Emergency Type that it represents. For this part of the
sampling procedure, I used my thorough knowledge about the cases through my work of coding them. In respect to the qualitative detailed criterion, the cases were all screened for having a police case file that gives insights about the involved parties. One Emergency Type was represented by five police recorded cases that I assessed not to be of good enough quality to either analyze qualitatively or to represent the Emergency Type. I here re-sampled five new cases and then chose one of those to represent the respective Emergency Type. As a result, I have a sample of five incidents of public violence that each represent one of the five Emergency Types from the Latent Class Analysis. In the following, I describe in detail the methods used for the quantitative and qualitative analysis.

A quantitative typology of patterns

To examine the patterns of bystander behaviors in different types of violent incidents, I use the explorative method Latent Class Analysis (hence, LCA). LCA is a method that reduces the complexity of data and identifies patterns and structures in data that cannot necessarily be identified by the researcher (Jæger 2006). It is model-based and organizes data into general classes with certain characteristics, informing about the relative size of the classes in the sample (Jæger 2006). The method does not provide the means to theorize about causalities between variables, but is instead an explorative tool of data-mining that uncovers patterns of associations in data. LCA can be characterized as a measurement model, which presumes a latent factor that causes the structures and patterns in data (Jæger 2006). Since the underlying factor cannot be observed directly, manifest variables, which are measurable, are used as indicators of the latent factor (Collins and Lanza 2010). In this way, the underlying relation of data can be found in the patterns of the item-responses of the manifest, indicator variables. The latent and manifest variables are discrete (Karlson 2017) and the distribution of the latent variable is multinomial (Collins and Lanza 2010)².

² The indicator variables used to characterize the underlying factor are associated with error of measurement, since they do not depict a perfect relation of homogeneity and class separation (Collins and Lanza 2010). The latent factor determines with certainty, but since the individuals representing the item-response probabilities are not perfectly determined to a class, there is error of measurement.
This explorative method substantiates my epistemological ambition of taking the ‘here and now’ context into account when studying bystander behavior. In respect to Blumer (1956) and Abbott’s (1988) critique on variable analysis and general linear reality, LCA oblige this very critique, since the method does not decompose the social, but quite the contrary composes high resolution patterns of social life. By including individual, situational and contextual variables that all have been associated with importance for bystander behavior, the model offers a complex imagery of the patterns of behaviors and contextual matters in public violence. The model allows me to explore how the multiple characteristics of bystander behaviors’ contextual conditions are associated in different types of violent conflicts. The strength of this method is that it does not determine any singular causal relation between social entities, but instead supports my ambition of examining bystander behavior in a contextual manner.

Interpreting a LCA model
When analyzing the output of a LCA model, there are two parameter estimates that are important to know: $\gamma$ (gamma) and $\rho$ (rho) (Collins and Lanza 2010). The $\gamma$-parameters indicate the proportion that each class accounts for in the sample. This could also be referred to as the latent classes’ distribution in the model. The $\rho$-parameters indicate the conditional probabilities of the indicators’ outcome given the class membership, which means that it is the $\rho$-parameters that are used to interpret the characteristics of each class. The method presumes conditional independence among the indicator variables since it is postulated that the variables are only associated given the latent relation. Another important notion of LCA is that the latent classes are mutually exclusive and exhaustive, meaning that each individual can only belong to one class (Collins and Lanza 2010). Working with a statistical model it follows that the class membership is based on probabilities and the individuals are thus classified by their probability of belonging to a specific class given their pattern in item-responses from the indicator variables.

Model search for a final model
When deploying LCA, I need to select a final model with a defined number of latent classes. To select the best final model, I use the two criteria called the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) and the Akaike information criterion (AIC). These two criteria are used to give
information about the parsimony of each model and how well the model fits the data (Collins and Lanza 2010). Parsimony refers to the fact that a goal of LCA is to find the smallest number of classes that best can account for the associations in the variables (Magidson and Vermunt 2004). The lesser the value of the criterion is, the better is the model. Thus, the objective of the model search is to find a model that presents the systematic patterns of the data in both the simplest and most accurate way possible. Additionally, to finding a model with the best parsimony and fit, I also assess my model for homogeneity and class separation.

A model with high homogeneity indicates a satisfying level of high and low item-response probability of the different characteristics within each of the classes (Collins and Lanza 2010; Lanza et al. 2007). In other words, a class with high or low values indicate if the characteristics of the respective class is distinct. To identify characteristics distinct for the five Types that I find in my final model, I use a 0,70 cut-point to determine whether a characteristic is present in the Emergency Type. This does not exclude that I comment on characteristics with lower item-response probabilities, but I do not assess lower probabilities as distinct characteristics of the Emergency Type. The same applies for the lower cut-point of 0,30, which determines a characteristic not to be present or distinct for the Emergency Types.

When assessing the class separation of the final model, this means assessing the differences of the classes in the model. A model with high class separation refers to a model with classes that are clearly distinct in their characteristics compared to the other classes (Collins and Lanza 2010). A weak class separation in a model, indicates that there is no underlying factor distributing the item-response patterns of the data. In other words, the class separation is what gives information about what different types of emergencies there can be found in the 75 cases of public violence. In respect to the defined cut-point to determine a characteristic of an Emergency Type, class separation nuances which item-response probabilities to incorporate in the analysis. When comparing separation of the classes, some item-response probabilities are not likely in any of the model’s five classes with a 0,70 cut-point. In this case it is relevant to pay attention to lower probabilities in classes, disregarding the 0,70 cut-point, since this is just a less likely characteristic of an Emergency Type. In my analysis of the model, I thus also pay attention to characteristics with lower probability than 0,70 if the characteristic is distinctive for one class.
Missing observations and clustering

To model the LCA, I use the LCA STATA plugin\(^3\). This plugin incorporates missing observations, which makes it possible to include all 305 individuals, even if it has not been possible to obtain all information about them. In this model, the missing data is handled under the assumption of missing at random (MAR) (Lanza et al. 2015). MAR is when the probability of missing data from one individual depends on variables in the analysis, but not on other variables (Collins and Lanza 2010). In practice, the model imputes observations where they are missing based on all the information available on the individual from the variables. The LCA STATA plugin also makes it possible to take clustering of observations into account. This is important since the 305 individuals are nested into the 75 cases of violence and more individuals are in that way exposed to the same amount of violence or other situational, context-level factors. The model accounts for clusters in calculation of standard errors (Lanza et al. 2015).

A qualitative case-analysis

To examine the emotional and social dynamics important for bystanders intervening in violent incidents, I employ a qualitative case-analysis of five selected cases of public violence. Here, I both elaborate the understanding of what active bystander behaviors look like in the context in which they are performed in and I explore processes of emotions and social group dynamics that underlie how and why bystanders intervene as they do. For each of the five cases I select a micro-sociological perspective to unfold the social processes. Some of the social processes might be involved in more than one of the five cases, but in order to emphasize what takes place at the very micro-level of interaction, I select one social dynamic to bring under the microscope in each case-analysis. This approach is substantiated by the qualities of an intensive examination of the single case to identify the unique and the typical of violent situations in public space (Delmar 2010; Scheff 1990).

The qualitative case-analysis is based on the combination of five police case files and the respective video clips of these five violent cases. In the following, I want to emphasize the approach that video analysis requires – whether the method is a mean to a quantitative sample or a goal in itself as in this qualitative analysis.

\(^3\) Find plugin at the website: [https://methodology.psu.edu/downloads/lecastata](https://methodology.psu.edu/downloads/lecastata)
Employing videos for a qualitative analysis

Video recordings offer a different methodological approach to the study of social behaviors than sociologists usually apply, since the videos are visual evidence of human action and not accounts of behavior. As mentioned before, I draw on Collins’ (2008) methodology on analyzing behaviors and interactions seen in videos, since he provides an accurate review of the possibilities and difficulties of video analysis. Studying violent behaviors and interactions with visual evidence makes it possible to change the conventional, analytical gaze on human actions since it becomes possible to pause, slow down and repeat the behaviors. This is extremely useful when studying bodily behaviors and dynamics, but also involves a great deal of training and patience. To be able to interpret what actually takes place on a micro level requires what Collins (2008) refers to as sociological sensibility and a way to vocalize what is perceived.

To do a thorough analysis of video footage of human behaviors, it is necessary to become familiar with all the individuals that take part in the conflict observed in the video. One needs to be able to obtain an understanding of the bodily narrative of each actor as well as an overall narrative of what happens in the situation. Following this, I argue that the interactions and behaviors observed in the videos, are only possible to interpret when you ascribe them meaning. As Blumer (1956) argues, social scientists need the interpretative process and meaning of context in order to understand and analyze human life. If you do not understand what is going on in a violent incident, it is difficult to analyze the interactions and behaviors, and if a narrative is not found, then the actions from each individual may not “make sense”. The overall narrative does not have to be exhaustive to be meaningful, but it must be possible to interpret each actor’s position and perception of the situation.

Analytical strategy

To analyze the emotional and relational processes making bystanders respond to a conflict, I select one or two individuals who I follow and analyze in each case. I do this to be able to focus on specific micro-sociological dynamics that account for the bystander behavior. Thus, I am committed to the trajectory and lived experience of chosen bystanders in each of the five cases.
Concerning the video analysis, this takes several, rigorous examinations of the individual’s trajectory in order to capture what is going on and to ensure not to get caught up in the complexity and chaos occurring in violent interactions. I play, pause and rewind as much as needed to intake as detailed and accurate information about the behavior and course of the individual as possible. This strategy means breaking down actions into fragments that may not be meaningful when looking at the situation in its whole, but it is necessary to comprehend the bodily behaviors of the individual in focus. This important epistemological notion of accessing behaviors, is also evident in my presentation of the five cases. In the analysis, I use transcriptions of the violent interactions and bystander actions, based on the video footage. The transcripts consist of all the situational elements that I use to decompose and interpret the actions and interactions. I deploy an interpretative approach to the behaviors that allows the cultural interpretation and ascription of meaning to the behaviors (Mosselman, Weenink, and Lindegaard 2018). Thus, the sociological sensibility and ascription of meaning to behaviors are explicited in the transcripts.

In the case-analysis, the police case file is employed to obtain information about the violent incident and all the actors involved in it. I use this information to support and nuance the understanding of what occurs in the violent conflict. Thus, all information about background factors, accounts and indirect intervention (which cannot be assessed from the video footage) is based on the police case files. When assessing the files, I screen them for facts about place, date and time of day for the violent incident. Facts about age and gender of the involved parties are also obtained. Moreover, I screen the files for information about the social relations among the involved parties and the motives and justifications of actions. If I use information from the police case file in the transcripts, it is clearly stated. I indicate the actor’s age by putting it in brackets when the actor is mentioned. If the age does not appear, it is because it could not be obtained from the police case file. To clarify the social relations in the transcripts, I underline the names of the victims and their group members and make the names of the perpetrators and their group members in bold. If a bystander knows both sides, I both underline and make the name in bold. In the next section I specify my considerations concerning anonymization and ethics.
Anonymization and ethics

Police case files and video footage of violence are sensitive sources of data because of the possible exposure of personal information and visual identification of people. I am aware of this sensitivity in both my conduct and presentation of data. In respect to my use of the quantitative data, the coding procedure involved an elimination of personally sensitive data, and the quantitative data is thus anonymized. In respect to my qualitative analysis, I have anonymized all the mentioned individuals and their personal characteristics. I also keep information about personal background to a minimum. Moreover, I do not expose details about either the exact date or location of the incident or any other information that gives too detailed information about the reported violent incident.

Concerning the ethical use of video footage, I here want to stress the fact that the observer has a natural distance to the observed phenomenon. Compared to other methods, video analysis of surveillance camera recordings has the advantage of not interfering directly with the studied phenomenon. This makes the use of CCTV footage less of an ethical problematic, since the recordings are not made by the researcher, and the researcher is thus not able to influence the course of event (Lindegaard and Bernasco 2018). In respect to the individuals whom I use in my qualitative analysis, it is not possible to obtain informed consent. I here rely on ASA’s proposed code of ethics revision for 2018, which suggests that it is not necessary to obtain informed consent from “… activities [that] involve naturalistic observations in public places where confidentiality is not expected and it is not anticipated that the recording will be used in a manner that could cause personal identification or harm” (ASA).
Variable measures

In the following section I will present the operationalized variables used for the LCA model.

Active bystander behaviors

Bystander behavior has been measured in different ways and with different degrees of intricacy in comprising what actually is responsive, active behavior to an emergency. In this study, bystander behavior is operationalized into four different ways of responding actively to a conflict. Two of the bystander behaviors concern intervention into the ongoing conflict, one behavior concerns actions made in the aftermath of the conflict and the fourth concerns indirect intervention throughout the incident.

De-escalatory intervention

The de-escalating type of bystander behavior covers a variety of behavioral actions that an individual can perform to end the conflict or make antagonists less hostile. De-escalatory behavior is in this thesis a variable comprising the following actions coded from the video footage: a) Calming, conciliatory gestures made with hands open or gentle touch on another person, b) blocking the antagonists from reaching each other with a bystander physically getting in between the antagonist parties, c) holding a person either with or without increasing the distance between the antagonists, and d) pushing an antagonist away from conflict in a non-violent manner (can still be aggressive). These actions are all operationalized as de-escalating bystander behavior, since they were coded from a criterion of not being aggressive or powerful as a perceived intention of the action, even though they might be performed quite intensely or forcefully.

Escalatory intervention

In opposition to the de-escalatory intervention, escalatory intervention covers the violent or aggressive behaviors that a bystander can perform when intervening in a conflict. This includes punching, kicking, shoving, throwing a person and using threatening gestures as pointing at a person or other types of aggressive gestures. These behaviors are operationalized as escalatory bystander behavior and were all coded from the video data.
**Consoling intervention**

Consoling intervention involves behaviors directed at a victimized person in the aftermath of the conflict. Thus, this behavior is based on two limiting criteria: 1) A time-specific criterion since the behavior is limited to only taking place in the aftermath, excluding consoling behavior toward a victim still involved in the conflict, and 2) a criterion of the receiver, since consoling behavior only includes behaviors directed at a victimized person.

Consoling behavior includes the following: a) Calming a victim by staying close and showing unconditional attention to the victim for at least 10 continuous seconds, b) Making physical contact with the victim only for the purpose of calming the victim or in order to provide practical help, and c) Offering practical help, for example by helping the victim stand up or assisting another bystander in helping the victim, for example by fetching a glass of water that another bystander then offers to the victim. These behaviors are operationalized to consoling behavior, since they all encompass “friendly, reassuring contact” with an individual who has been victimized in a previous aggressive incident (de Waal 2007:56), or since they in their practicality of the action serve the purpose of helping a victim feeling less distress. The consoling behaviors were all coded from the video data.

**Indirect intervention**

Indirect intervention comprises the incidents of violence in which one or more individuals call in assistance. Typically, indirect intervention comprises calling the police, a bouncer or another authoritative person who can help end the conflict. In opposition to the three other types of interventions, this behavior was assessed from the police case files and not the video footage. Obtaining this behavior from the video footage would be done with great uncertainty, since the video footage is without audio and does not necessarily capture the bystanders calling for help. However, in a police case file, it is often reported by the police who contacted them, or witnesses are describing how another individual was summoned in the conflict. The type of intervention was thus coded on a contextual level and not on an individual level, and as a consequence of this it is not possible to explore the characteristics of the bystanders doing indirect intervention and the frequency of this behavior.
Bystander characteristics

In the quantitative analysis, three variables are used to characterize the active bystanders: Gender, social closeness and spatial proximity to where the conflict emerges. These variables have all been coded from the video footage. The police are not systematically interrogating all bystanders when an incident of violence takes place, which means that little consistent information about bystanders is reported and appears in the police case files. This circumstance limits the background information about bystanders to the information that is possible to visually obtain from the video footage. In the following, I present the three variables.

*Gender of bystander*

Gender is determined by a visual assessment of the physical and cultural appearance of the bystander. When uncertainty about the bystander’s gender, the police case files were assessed and could often clarify the gender.

*Social closeness*

Social closeness refers to a bystander who knows one or both of the antagonist parties in the conflict. A bystander is also socially close with a rather unfamiliar antagonist if they are both members of the same social group. Social relation was determined for all involved people in a conflict. Here a combination of the video footage and the police case files were used. If social relation of a bystander could not be determined with certainty from the video clips, the police case file was assessed and could often clarify the social relation.

*Spatial proximity*

Spatial closeness indicates if a bystander is spatially close to the antagonists when the conflict emerges. Here, spatial proximity of the bystander is defined as being two meters or closer to the starting point of the conflict. The proximity is based in a visual estimate, and was measured by determining when the conflict emerges and at that moment in time locate how far the bystander is from the antagonist initiating the conflict.
Contextual variables

Night-time economy

Night-time economy (hence, NTE) in this thesis refers to the spatial and social setting of alcohol consumption, such as at bars or in the streets in the night or early morning hours. The operationalization of a NTE is made from the following criteria: The violence is taking place at or in front a public drinking place (Liebst et al. 2018), or is taking place between 10 pm and 8 am in a public street with at least one perpetrator or victim being intoxicated. The variable is constructed from a combination of the data from police case files and the video footage. Time was coded from the video data and the intoxication of a perpetrator or victim and place of incident were coded from the police case file.

Disrespect (and other motives for conflict)

From the police case files, we coded if the incident of violence had character of being: a) partner violence, b) revenge violence, c) about rivalry, d) violence to humiliate, e) hate crime, f) recreational violence, or motivated by either g) jealousy or h) disrespect/insult. Of these different motives or reasons of violence, violence prompted by disrespect or insult were the most frequent in the data (Heinskou and Liebst 2017) and is the one used in this analysis. This variable was coded by identifying whether or not the conflict had been a reaction to a physical or verbal insult. The insult might have been imagined by the disrespected party, but as long as it was argued to be the trigger for the conflict, it was included as a reaction to disrespect and a motive.

Situational variables

Mutual violence

Mutual violence is defined by incidents where both parties are committing violence. The variable was coded from the video footage.

Weapon use

Weapon use indicates incidents where a perpetrator uses a weapon against a person. The weapon can be a knife or gun, but more commonly also a glass, bottle, broom or another everyday object that can be used as a weapon. The variable was coded from the video footage.
Severe violence

All 75 empirical cases contain incidents of violence, but the degree of violence varies. To examine conflicts with severe violence, I construct a severe violence variable from the video coding of the aggregated amount of violence in each incident. This variable is defined as incidents in which there are either several kicks, a person is being kicked in the head or a person is victimized when lying on the ground.

Severe injury

Severity of violence and the severity of injury is not a one to one relation, since one violent action can have fatal consequences and severe actions of violence can leave little physical injury. To encompass the severity of injury the violence causes, I use the medical evaluation from the police case files, concerning the injuries of one or more victims. Severe injury is here defined as bone fractures, severe gashes, dental damages or unconsciousness caused by the violence.

Female perpetrator

Female perpetrator refers to situations where at least one woman performs violence. The variable was coded from the video footage.

Female victim

Female victim refers to situations where at least one woman is victimized. This variable was coded from the video footage.

Number of bystanders

In all 75 violent incidents, the number of individuals present were estimated. The estimate is based on the number of people present when the conflict emerges. At that moment in time the video was paused and the present individuals were counted. If different video cameras covered different angles of the setting, all videos were assessed to make sure to get the best estimate of present individuals. The number also includes active bystanders present when the conflict emerges. The variable is distributed into three categories of either one to four, five to fifteen or sixteen or more bystanders.
**Number of directly intervening bystanders**

The number of bystanders intervening directly is, as indicated, the accumulated numbers of bystanders that throughout the conflict and post-conflict intervene directly. Thus, this number does not include bystanders performing indirect intervention. The variable is distributed into three categories of between one and four, five or six or between seven and fifteen active bystanders. Since I am only looking at cases where bystanders intervene, the lower boundary of active bystanders is one. The maximum number of bystanders intervening directly in this sample is fifteen.

**Interrater reliability**

To test the consistency of how the presented variables deployed in the quantitative analysis were coded by different coders, an interrater reliability measurement was assessed. This measurement indicates whether or not the variables were interpreted in the same way by the different coders (McHugh 2012). I use Krippendorff’s alpha (α) value to measure the agreement of the coders, since this type of measurement can be used for different levels of measurements (Hayes and Krippendorff 2007). Concerning the video coding, 20 cases and 36 bystanders were double coded to test the interrater reliability. All police case files were double coded.

Measures of the three active bystander behaviors, gender, social closeness, severe violence, weapon use and number of bystanders all had an alpha value of 1.0 indicating perfect agreement. Spatial proximity and severe injury had α <0.8 indicating good reliability. Measures of indirect intervention, disrespect and mutual violence had α <0.5. Number of active bystanders, female victim and perpetrator had no variation in the cases double coded, and measurement then cannot be obtained. The measure of NTE was constructed of four variables from the video and police case coding that all had alpha values ranging from 0.68 to 1.0.

---

4 Concerning the police case files, a third, joint coding was made from the two separate ones.
Descriptive results

The following section presents results of the descriptive statistics of the 305 active bystanders and the 75 incidents of public violence in Copenhagen. Since my LCA model includes missing observations for the individuals, I will in the following comment on variable results with a high percentage of missing observations. This makes it transparent which variables have imputed observations in the LCA model. For a full overview of missing observations, see the appendix.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of active bystanders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bystander behaviors</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De-escalatory</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalatory</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consoling</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially close to antagonist group</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to starting point of conflict</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 305 individuals

Table 1 reveals that the most common way of intervening in a conflict is with de-escalating behavior, which 65 percent of the active bystanders do. This result is consistent with other studies (Levine et al. 2011; Parks et al. 2013). Almost a fourth (23 percent) of the bystanders perform escalatory intervention when intervening in a conflict. Thus, this violent behavior is less common than de-escalatory actions, but is still rather frequent in this sample. 31 percent of the active bystanders perform consoling behaviors in the aftermath of a conflict.

83 percent of the 305 intervening bystanders are men, and 58 percent of the bystanders are socially close to one of the antagonists or other members of the antagonist groups. It was not possible to determine the social relation for four percent of the bystanders. Interestingly, more than a third of the active bystanders (38 percent) are strangers to the antagonist parties. This result shows that it is not uncommon for strangers to intervene in conflicts. More than 50 percent of the bystanders are spatially close to the starting point of the conflict.
Table 2: Descriptive statistics of situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Indirect intervention</th>
<th>Severe violence</th>
<th>Severe injury</th>
<th>Weapon use</th>
<th>Mutual violence</th>
<th>Disrespect conflict</th>
<th>Female perpetrator</th>
<th>Female victim</th>
<th>NTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37,3</td>
<td></td>
<td>38,7</td>
<td>41,3</td>
<td>25,3</td>
<td>28,0</td>
<td>73,3</td>
<td>13,3</td>
<td>12,0</td>
<td>84,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of bystanders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of bystanders</th>
<th>Number of active bystanders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4 co-present</td>
<td>60,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-15 co-present</td>
<td>25,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ co-present</td>
<td>14,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 75 violent incidents

Table 2 shows that in 37 percent of the violent cases, a bystander calls for help to an authority or someone else who can help end the conflict. In eight percent of the cases it was not possible to determine whether or not a bystander performed indirect intervention. Note that this behavior was coded on a context level. This result shows that indirect intervention is not uncommon in public violence. However, it is here important to comment on the fact that the sample represents cases of police reported violence, which implies that the police were summoned in many cases.

More than a third (39 percent) of the incidents were cases with severe violence, and in 41 percent of the incidents at least one victim was severely injured. A cross tabulation of severe violence and severe injury shows that in 55,5 percent of the cases with a victim severely injured, the violence was severe (Pearson’s chi-square=2,75, p=0,097). This result shows that
the violence does not have to be severe to have severe consequences for a victim. In seven percent of the incidents it was unclear whether or not a victim was injured severely.

In 25 percent of the 75 cases there was an object used as a weapon in the conflict. This indicates that objects are often used to do violence in public incidents of violence. In 28 percent of the cases both antagonist sides of the conflict commit violence, indicating mutual violence. This reveals that the largest part of conflicts in the sample escalate into one-directed violence where only one of the antagonists perform violence. 73 percent of the conflicts were (amongst other) prompted by disrespect or insults.

In 13 percent of the cases, at least one woman perpetrates a victim and in 12 percent of the cases at least one woman is victimized. When comparing these results to the finding that 83 percent of all bystanders are men, it suggests that men are more involved in public violence than women – whether it is as an antagonist or as an active bystander.

The sample consists of reported incidents of violence from the central police districts of Copenhagen and this comes to show in the percentage of NTE contexts of the violence. 84 percent of the incidents of violence take place in alcohol-contested contexts.

The number of bystanders in the context of violence has been distributed in three categories. In 23 percent of the cases between one and four people were present when the conflict emerged. In 44 percent of the cases between five and 15 people were present, and in 32 percent of the cases more than 16 people were present when the conflict started. This result indicates that there are often quite many bystanders when a conflict emerges. When looking at the number of bystanders who actually intervenes directly into the conflict, it can be seen that in 60 percent of the cases there are up to four bystanders. In 25 percent of the conflicts, five or six bystanders intervene and in 15 percent of the conflicts, between seven and 15 bystanders intervene in the conflict. This result shows that in more than half of the cases, it is less than five bystanders who respond actively to the conflict. With these descriptive results in mind, I now turn to the results of the LCA model.
To select my final LCA model, I run models with one to ten classes, and use BIC and AIC to identify how many classes in a model that gives the best fit of data.

Table 3: BIC and AIC values for model search of ten classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of classes</th>
<th>BIC</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3322.17</td>
<td>3251.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3087.03</td>
<td>2941.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2989.65</td>
<td>2770.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2937.33</td>
<td>2643.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>2919.96</strong></td>
<td>2551.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2963.19</td>
<td>2520.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2980.24</td>
<td>2463.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3008.09</td>
<td>2416.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3058.74</td>
<td><strong>2392.81</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3181.39</td>
<td>2441.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The value in bold is the lowest BIC value used to determine choice of model. The value in bold and italic is the lowest AIC value.

As seen in table 3, I find that a five-class model gives the best fit according to BIC, whereas AIC suggests a nine-class model. BIC is the conventional criterion to rely on (Magidson and Vermunt 2004) and have been found more accurate (Yang 2006), whereas AIC gives a more complex and nuanced result of the data. For this analysis, I value a clear and precise typology over a very complex one, so I select the five-class model to be the final in accordance with BIC. In table 4 below the results of the LCA model is presented and depicts five different violent Emergency Types with different bystander and situational characteristics. As noted in the design section, I refer to the classes as Emergency Types to emphasize that they are statistical ideal types and not actual incidents.
Table 4: Latent Class Analysis of bystanders in violent Emergency Types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Type 3</th>
<th>Type 4</th>
<th>Type 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De-escalatory intervention in one-directed violence</td>
<td>De-escalatory and indirect intervention in male fight</td>
<td>De-escalatory intervention in conflict with women</td>
<td>Consoling intervention in severe injury violence</td>
<td>Consoling intervention in severe violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion in sample</td>
<td>30,63%</td>
<td>28,44%</td>
<td>8,17%</td>
<td>10,23%</td>
<td>22,52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bystander behaviors**
- Consoling: 0,06, 0,18, 0,12, 0,91, 0,59
- De-escalatory: **0,90**, 0,70, **0,80**, 0,10, 0,44
- Escalatory: 0,16, **0,33**, 0,20, 0,03, 0,30
- Indirect: 0,23, **0,71**, **0,52**, 0,21, 0,27

**Bystander characteristics**
- Male bystander: **0,85**, 0,95, **0,56**, 0,88, **0,75**
- Socially close to an antagonist: **0,80**, 0,61, 0,79, 0,34, 0,38
- Close to starting point of conflict: **0,65**, **0,55**, **0,75**, 0,42, 0,33

**Characteristics of violence**
- Severe violence: 0,24, **0,56**, 0,24, 0,03, **1,00**
- Weapon use: 0,28, 0,35, 0,12, **0,48**, 0,00
- Mutual violence: 0,00, **0,81**, 0,28, 0,00, 0,29
- Severe injury: **0,55**, 0,32, 0,00, **0,81**, **0,72**
- Female perpetrator: 0,00, 0,00, **0,99**, 0,03, 0,42
- Female victim: 0,14, 0,00, **0,88**, 0,00, 0,07

**Contextual and situational characteristics**
- Disrespect violence: 0,87, **1,00**, **0,68**, 0,75, 0,19
- NTE: **0,83**, 0,97, **0,64**, **1,00**, **0,93**
- 1-4 bystanders: 0,29, 0,14, 0,12, 0,00, 0,00
- 5-15 bystanders: 0,43, 0,40, 0,12, **0,56**, **0,90**
- 16+ bystanders: 0,28, 0,46, **0,76**, 0,44, 0,10
- 1-4 active bystanders: **0,67**, 0,18, **0,60**, 0,34, 0,01
- 5-6 active bystanders: 0,19, **0,82**, 0,00, 0,22, 0,09
- 7-15 active bystanders: 0,14, 0,00, 0,40, 0,44, **0,90**

Note: n = 305 individuals. Item-response probabilities > 0,70 are in bold to indicate unambiguous relevance for type. Item-response probabilities in italic indicate ambiguous relevance for type based on class separation distinctiveness.
The LCA model results in five Emergency Types based on the naturally occurring interventions performed by 305 bystanders in 75 cases of public violence. The Emergency Types have been labelled in accordance with their distinct bystander behavior and singled out characteristic of violent conflict. The model shows that de-escalatory bystander behaviors are common in different Emergency Types whereas escalatory bystander behaviors are not distinct in any. Indirect intervention and consoling behavior is distinctively common in one Emergency Type each, but both actions are also present in two other Types.

The distribution of the five Emergency Types of the model shows that some of the Types are much more frequent in the sample than others. When assessing the model horizontally, it can be seen that there is a satisfying distinction of characteristics between the five Types. This indicates a good class separation. However, male bystanders and NTE contexts more or less characterize all five Emergency Types and four out of five Emergency Types are characterized by being prompted by disrespect. These three characteristics make the overall class separation weaker, but should be assessed in relation to the descriptive statistics. The descriptive results showed that 82 percent of all active bystanders are men, 84 percent of the incidents occur in a NTE context and 73 percent of the conflicts are prompted by disrespect. These proportions indicate that most bystanders are men and most of the violence occurs in alcohol-contested settings, mostly prompted by disrespect. This makes it less of a surprise and less of a class separation issue that the characteristics are common in different Emergency Types. Moreover, disrespect is not present in all five Types, and male bystanders and NTE contexts are also less common in one Emergency Type each. Before analyzing features of the typology in greater detail, I first present each of the five Types by assessing the vertical findings from the model.

Type 1: De-escalatory intervention in one-directed violence

The most common Emergency Type in the sample is a conflict where only one of the antagonist sides are committing violence. Here, a male bystander typically intervenes de-escalating in the conflict and the active bystander tends to be socially close to one of the antagonists. It is likely that up to four bystanders are helping in the conflict, which takes place in a night-time economy context. The conflict is usually prompted by disrespect and there are no female perpetrators involved. This Emergency Type depicts a common conflict
where a socially close bystander intervenes de-escalatory when one or more people are violently assaulting their rival(s) in a confrontation about disrespect.

Type 2: De-escalatory and indirect intervention in male fight
Another Emergency Type where a bystander typically performs de-escalating behavior, is one where both antagonists are committing violence and where a bystander also is likely to perform indirect intervention. All perpetrators and victims are men, and just as the former Emergency Type, this Type is also usually prompted by a feeling of disrespect. Five or six bystanders are common to get involved in this Emergency Type that takes place in a NTE context. Even though it is not very likely, this is still the Emergency Type most likely to have a bystander performing escalatory intervention (33 percent). This Emergency Type shows a fight between men who are motivated by disrespect and where more bystanders are intervening than for the former Emergency Type.

Type 3: De-escalatory intervention in conflict with women
The third Emergency Type where a bystander performs de-escalating behavior, is in a conflict where the bystander knows one of the antagonists and is nearby when the conflict starts. In this Emergency Type, it is less likely that the bystander is a man compared to the other Types, and is characterized by a woman perpetrating and a woman being victimized. Up to four bystanders are likely to intervene and usually more than sixteen individuals are present when the conflict starts. This (rare) Emergency Type depicts a situation where many bystanders remain passive to a conflict that involves women, and the bystander who does intervene is both socially and spatially close to at least one of the antagonists.

Type 4: Consoling intervention in severe injury violence
The fourth Emergency Type found in the LCA model is, just as the former, not very common in the sample. In contrast to the three Types already presented, this Emergency is not characterized by de-escalating bystander behavior, but instead characterized by a male bystander conducting consoling behavior in the aftermath of the violent conflict. This is a NTE conflict where only one of the antagonist sides are committing violence against a victim, who as a result gets dental damages, bone fracture, unconscious or another severe injury. Despite a victim is severely injured, the violence is not severe in terms of including
more kicks, a kick in the head or the victim falling to the ground. Instead, this Emergency
Type is the one where weapon use is most likely to occur (48 percent) compared to the other
four Types. As the first two Emergency Types, this Type is also usually prompted by a feeling
of disrespect.

Type 5: Consoling intervention in severe violence
The fifth Emergency Type found in the LCA model, is rather frequent (22 percent) and
involves between seven and fifteen active bystanders intervening in a conflict with severe
violence. A victim is usually severely injured, but there is no weapon use in the conflict. The
Emergency takes place in a NTE context in which between five to fifteen people are present
when the conflict emerges. This Emergency Type depicts a situation with many people
involved and a bystander is characterized by not knowing the antagonists and not being
nearby when the conflict emerges. The most common kind of intervention behavior is
consolation in the aftermath of the conflict (59 percent), however the behavior type does
not exceed the cut-point of 0.70.
Quantitative analysis:
A bystander emergency typology

Mutual violence in a conflict
The typology from the LCA model reveals patterns of behaviors and violence that are all relevant to take into account when studying bystanders in violent conflicts on a micro-sociological level. One of the findings of interest is that only one Emergency Type reveals mutual violence between antagonists. Something that otherwise might diverge with the typical picture of barrooms filled with intoxicated and unrestrained people hitting each other in a night-time context. Parks and colleagues (2013) have through participant observations studied aggressions in barrooms and examined if mutual aggression makes bystanders more likely to respond to a conflict compared to an one-sided aggression. They found that one-sided aggression is twice as likely as mutual aggression, but bystanders are more likely to intervene when the aggression is mutual. They also found that a mutual aggression between male antagonists is a predictor for bystanders intervening aggressively (Parks et al. 2013). This aligns with the Emergency Type of a male fight, which has the biggest probability of escalatory intervention (33 percent), depicting an Emergency Type with mutual male aggression.

Violence that does not occur in a NTE context
Of all 75 cases of public violence, the descriptive statistics showed that 16 percent did not occur in a NTE context. These 16 percent of everyday contexts do however not show themselves in a single Emergency Type in the LCA model, suggesting that the day-time violent conflicts may not have certain characteristics that differ from the characteristics of night-time violent conflicts. The Emergency Type of conflicts with women is however less likely to occur in a NTE context (64 percent), indicating that this might be the Emergency Type that contains most of the day-time cases of the sample.

The Emergency Type with less probability of occurring in a NTE setting is characterized by a woman being a victim and a perpetrator and typically has more than fifteen people around when the conflict emerges. It is also characterized by not being severe in neither violence
nor injury and it is most likely that no more than four bystanders intervene (60 percent). These characteristics are all factors that may associate particularly with day-time violent conflicts. Thus, the respective Emergency Type calls for further investigation in violent incidents that do not occur in the NTE in order to compare similarities and differences from this typology. This can illuminate whether violent conflicts in day-time maybe have less responsive bystanders compared to how many people are present, or if day-time conflicts have higher frequency of women involved physically in the violence.

To analyze the active bystander behaviors in relation to the situational contexts they occur in, I will in the next part of the quantitative analysis change my focus from a vertical reading of the model with a focus on the Emergency Types and instead focus more on the horizontal reading of the bystander behaviors in the five Types.

**De-escalatory behavior in different emergencies**

The LCA model illustrates that in three different Emergency Types, de-escalatory intervention is as common bystander behavior. This finding demonstrates that de-escalatory actions are not associated with very specific violent scenarios, but is instead a type of behavior that bystanders use in different Emergency Types. It is used in public violence where one antagonist side violently assaults the other side. It is used in male fights where five or six bystanders are intervening and it is used in public violence where many passive bystanders are present when a woman is victimized and a woman perpetrates. The model also shows that de-escalating behavior in the three different Types of violent situations is associated with a bystander being socially close to one of the antagonists in a NTE context (if including a lower cut-point of 60 percent on social relation in male fight and night-time economy in female-involved violence).

The association between de-escalatory behavior, a socially close bystander and NTE, is something Levine has paid attention to in his studies on violence and group behavior (Levine et al. 2012, 2011). He and colleagues (2012) suggest that the correlation of violence and alcohol-contested socializing in NTE contexts should not overshadow that social groups regulate their members’ behavior in those situations. Levine and colleagues argue that group norms of appropriate behavior in public are used to regulate the processes of violence and aggressive interactions in both inter- and intragroup conflicts. People act in accordance with
the norms and values of their social group, and if they do not, then other group members are likely to intervene to regulate the deviant behavior (Levine et al. 2012). Group members also perform de-escalatory actions to assure that other in-group members do not get into conflicts when drinking too much, or do not damage the reputation of the group (Levine et al. 2012; Marques et al. 2001).

The three Emergency Types characterized by de-escalating behavior in the LCA model all demonstrate that in night-time incidents individuals are not “working on their own”, but are in (spatial) close company with in-group members who are monitoring behaviors and are vital to the development of violence in these incidents. These Types depict pro-social group regulation.

Group members can also act in ways that can have consequences for themselves in order to regulate group norms (Levine et al. 2011). An interesting finding in relation to the prevalence of de-escalating behavior, is that none of the five Emergency Types indicate a conflict where a bystander performs escalatory intervention. From the descriptive statistics, it was however found that almost one third (30 percent) of the active bystanders have intervened with an aggressive or violent behavior. In their video analysis of bystander behavior, Levine and colleagues (2011) find that the escalatory bystander behavior is often aimed towards the perpetrators. They argue that this pattern points towards strategic violence used to punish perpetrators. Here, Levine and colleagues focus on the pro-social dynamics of violent intervention from a bystander, which indicates the use of violence as a performed morality to control the perpetrator.

In the LCA model, escalatory behavior is not associated with a particular Emergency Type, but the behavior is most common (33 percent) in male fights where five or six bystanders intervene. This Type depicts a conflict prompted by disrespect where both antagonists are committing violence. In respect to Levine and colleagues’ (2011) finding of escalatory behavior as a strategy to control a perpetrator, this perception of bystander violence does not seem to be adequate for this Emergency Type. In the male fight Emergency both sides perpetrate, and here the bystanders may very well intervene violently themselves to stand up for their group members. In that case, the violent is not a pro-social strategy, but something else.
Swann and colleagues (2009) has developed a theory about identity fusion process, where members from the same group perform extreme actions when standing up for each other. When groups are defined by a very strong relational tie, and thus fused, they are willing to take personal costs for the sake of standing up for one another. This approach to escalatory bystander behavior is quite different from the one proposed by Levine, since it suggests that fused individuals commit violence to defend their group opposed to Levine’s approach to bystander violence as a pro-social way to regulate conflicts in NTE. This contradiction should however not be seen as problematic, but illustrates how bystanders who intervene violently, can do so based on different strategies and group dynamics. Thus, group processes both promote policing and regulating bystander behavior and partisan behavior to stand up for a group member or to downplay the seriousness of the group member’s wrongdoing (Levine et al. 2011; Marques et al. 2001; Otten and Gordijn 2014; Swann et al. 2009). However, escalatory behavior is not found common in any of the five Emergency Types, which provides a reassuring empirical finding: different types of public violence with certain contextual characteristics to it, does not entail bystanders intervening violently. On the contrary, de-escalating, indirect and consoling behaviors dominate the LCA results.

Consoling behavior in the aftermath of violence

The two Emergency Types that are not associated with a high probability of bystanders conducting de-escalating intervention, are situations where a victim is severely injured. This is the case of type 4, where a victim gets injured even though the violence has not been severe, and type 5, where both the violence and the injuries are severe. Previous studies have argued that the perceived danger of a situation affects the probability of intervention (Fischer et al. 2011), and from the two Types in the model, it can further be argued that when an emergency is dangerous because of the severity of violence or injuries, bystanders perform consolation in the aftermath of a violent conflict.

In the Emergency Type (4) where a victim is severely injured, one antagonist side has assaulted the other in a NTE context. Here, bystanders offer behavioral support in a conflict without being socially close to either of the antagonists. This finding is interesting because it suggests that bystanders are willing to bond emotionally with an unfamiliar victim in distress when performing consoling behaviors. From a perspective of social categorization and social
identity processes, the pattern of a stranger consoling a victim should be interpreted as the collectiveness that arises from an emergency (Drury, Cocking, and Reicher 2009). The emotional consequences of an emergency create a shift from a “me” to a “we” and create social bonds between strangers. Here the common fate of having experienced a violent assault can make an unfamiliar bystander get physically and emotionally close with a victim. In this respect, the visibility of an emergency seems to play a part for the experience of a shared experience. Relying on the argument of Fischer and colleagues (2011), that the severity of the emergency decreases the bystander effect, broken teeth or an unconscious victim are certainly visible cues that indicate emergency to its witnesses. A not yet published study from Liebst and colleagues (forthcoming) shows that the visibility of the victim’s injuries and suffering is a strong predictor of bystanders performing consolation. This is in accordance with the two Emergency Types in the model where severity of injury is associated with consolation.

In contrast to the finding in the LCA model, Liebst and colleagues (forthcoming) find that social relation is a strong predictor for conducting consolation. This finding is interesting since the two analyses are partially based on the same video footage data, but the reason of dissimilarity in results here relates to difference in methods. Whereas Liebst and colleagues’ findings are based on a multi-level regression, in which they compare the consoling bystander with the ones who do not console, I only look at the active bystanders and their patterns in the LCA model.

Both the before-mentioned study and a recent study on consolation in robberies are based on video footage and bring attention to the empathic emotions experienced in humans when consoling (Lindegård et al. 2017; Liebst et al. forthcoming). These studies focus on how social closeness is a predictor for bystanders intervening, arguing that social ties make it either easier to interpret distress for the bystander (Lindegård et al. 2017) or increase feelings of empathy in a group (Liebst et al. forthcoming). If social closeness triggers a greater feeling of empathy when a victim is in distress, then it leaves the question of what brings the bystander who does not know the antagonist groups to perform consolation, as depicted in the LCA model.
Schmitt and Clark (2006) have suggested that the feeling of empathy can both be 1) cognitive, when aware of the other’s suffering, 2) physical, when relating to the physical harness of pain, and 3) emotional, when being sad or distressed because of the other’s suffering. In respect to the empathic emotion in violent incidents where a bystander is consoling a victim, it may very well be the cognitive and physical aspects of empathy that prompts a bystander to help an unfamiliar victim. However, the bystander offering consolation to a distressed victim, could also be argued primarily to be an act of sympathy.

Whereas empathy is an pre-linguistic emotion of taking and envisioning the attitude or perceptions of the other (Schmitt and Clark 2006; de Waal 2007), Clark suggests that sympathy is exterior, and more about following displaying sympathy when needed and expected according to cultural norms (Schmitt and Clark 2006; Turner and Stets 2005). Schmitt and Clark (2006) argue that sympathy should be understood as a currency of micro-interactional processes, which gets one’s own identity verified by offering sympathy and re-generates one’s place in a social hierarchy. They argue that for a person to gain sympathy in Western cultures, the person’s own responsibility in the suffering is of importance.

In reference to Emergency Type 4 where a victimized person is being consoled by an unknown bystander, it seems plausible that the act of consolation is about following the cultural norms of displaying sympathy. Here, the violence is directed from one antagonist side toward the other, which suggests an unequal conflict where one side is in control and where the victimized person cannot be fully responsible for the escalation of the conflict. This justifies the normative right to sympathies with the victim and could lead to consolation from a bystander that does not know the victim.

In Emergency Type 5, consoling behavior is also the most likely behavior (59 percent), though not exceeding the cut-point of 0,70 to be a distinct characteristic. This Type is first and foremost characterized by the severity of violence in the conflict and moreover characterized by between seven and fifteen bystanders conducting intervention\(^5\). In this Emergency Type, all the bystander behaviors have less than 60 percent probability of

\(^5\) In this respect, it is important to take into account that when more people are involved in a violent conflict, it is also more likely to be a severe case violent incident, since more kicks (no matter if from the same or different perpetrators) are operationalized as severe violence.
occurrence. It is however very certain that between five and fifteen people are present when the conflict starts (90 percent) and that seven to fifteen bystanders intervene (90 percent). Moreover, this is the only Emergency Type not likely to be prompted by disrespect. The characteristics might be interpreted as that when many people are involved in a conflict in a night-time economy context, there will also be different types of interventions. Some might stand up for their friend, while strangers are likely to respond in the aftermath of conflict when the violence is over.

The LCA model depicts a typology of five violent ideal type situations with certain behavioral, contextual and situational characteristics. To examine how these characteristics actually unfold in cases of violence, I now turn to the qualitative case-analysis. I thus move from the extensive analysis to the intensive analysis in order to get a better understanding of the emotional and relational dynamics of individuals in the five Types.
Qualitative case-analysis: Micro-processes of bystander behaviors

In the qualitative case-analysis, I examine five cases that each statistically represent one of the five Emergency Types found in the LCA model. Since LCA is a statistical method modelling patterns in data, it is probabilistic and characterized by some degree of uncertainty in measurement (Collins and Lanza 2010). When turning to the cases qualitatively, this is important to keep in mind, since it shows that not all quantitative measures defining the Emergency Type are necessarily present in the case. On the contrary, there are also many behavioral and contextual characteristics that “overlap” in the five selected cases. In each of the five cases, I focus on the distinct characteristics of the respective quantitative Emergency Types.

Case 1:
De-escalatory intervention in one-directed violence

The first case illustrates the Emergency Type where only one of the antagonists are victimized, since the violence is one-directed. The violent incident unfolds in one of the shopping streets of central Copenhagen, with bars and clubs located nearby. Tomas (21) and Kim (20) have been to a private party and are now in the early hours on a Friday morning on their way home. Emir (19), Kendrick (31), Amin, Dusan and Nicholai have been to a Bosnian private party the night before and went out on town afterwards. Both Emir and Kendrick have cocaine in their pockets. It is May 2011 and multiple surveillance cameras are hanging in the street where the antagonists meet.
Illustration 1. Dusan talking to Tomas, while Amin blocks Emir.

Transcript 1.1
From a surveillance camera angled down on the paving stones in front of a shop, Kendrick is seen walking in front of his four companions who are all staggering around in the street, obviously intoxicated. From the opposite direction, Kim and Tomas are approaching, both walking topless with their shirts hanging over their shoulders and Tomas performing “big” gestures while talking to Kim. Emir looks at the two men passing him by and then turns around and kicks Tomas on his bottom. Tomas turns around and says something to Emir while Kim walks on for a few meters. Dusan approaches Tomas while smiling to him and Kim. Tomas prepares to walk away, but Dusan is now standing in his way, talking to him and gently touching him on his stomach and one arm. Amin, another of Emir’s companions, approaches Tomas and stands next to him, while Dusan is talking with Tomas. Emir also walks closer to Tomas with his head leaned forward and his legs and arms spread. He starts moving around Tomas, while Amin tries to block the way so Emir does not get too close to Tomas. Amin is faced away from Emir and tries to use his arm to keep Emir away, while smiling, as if it is a game. When both of them are standing behind Tomas, Emir strikes and hits Tomas on the side of his head with a clenched fist, while Amin is standing in between the two antagonists. Tomas falls to the ground and his friend Kim runs away.
Emir kicks Tomas to the head before walking away. Dusan pulls the hoody over his head and stands over Tomas with his arms crossed for a short while, before walking away with Emir and the others.

This case depicts two group members conducting intervention, when their friend Emir assaults Tomas. In contrast to the Emergency Type that the case represents, this case does not appear to be prompted by disrespect. Instead it seems to be an example of thrill seeking behavior, where the violence is not triggered by a certain motive, but is about the thrill of the violence itself (Jackson-Jacobs 2013; Katz 1988). The thrill of it becomes evident, because no words is exchanged between the two antagonists before Emir kicks Tomas. Moreover, Tomas states in the police record that when he asked Emir why he got kicked in the bottom Emir and his companions responded: “why are you acting stupid”. Emir seems to have categorized Tomas as a “stupid” out-group member (Levine et al. 2012) in his search for trouble.

The thrill seeking violent behavior of Emir, makes the bystander behavior of his friend Dusan puzzling. Is Dusan setting the scene for further violence, when he approaches Tomas, or is he trying to calm him down? In the quantitative data, this behavior is coded as a de-escalating behavior of non-forceful touching, but in the qualitative interpretation of the action, it is not as straight forward. His behavior is not aggressive and he smiles at both Kim and Tomas when moving closer to Tomas. However, Dusan stands in front of Tomas, which makes it difficult for Tomas to walk away from the confrontation. This behavior of Dusan is puzzling because it is not obvious if he is trying to escalate the conflict by blocking Tomas, or if he is actually trying to end it by calming him down.

Intra-group dynamics here serve as an interpretation of the ambiguous behavior performed by Dusan. Emir has shown dominance and willingness to fight and has thus proved himself to be a confident, strong character when he spontaneously kicked a stranger passing by (Jackson-Jacobs 2004). Afterwards he shows both confidence and strength when walking around with a broaden body posture (Tracy and Matsumoto 2008). It appears that this behavior is not violating the group norms of the five men, since none of the four bystanders socially close to Emir respond in a disapproving manner to his assault. Dusan appears to adhere to Emir’s strong character when not challenging the very fact that he has assaulted
an innocent person. Dusan might lose personal recognition and membership in the group if he defies Emir’s behavior and status. This could explain the ambiguous behavior of Dusan.

In contrast to Dusan, Amin is obviously trying to prevent the situation from escalation, because he stands in the way of Emir who circles around Tomas. He did not challenge Emir when he kicked Tomas, but when Emir approaches Tomas again, Amin tries to block the way for Emir. Amin succeeds with this behavior without challenging Emir’s behavior. He does this in an almost playful manner, by taking small jumping steps from side to side when blocking and smiling while doing it. In this way, he does not have to intervene in a way that could make Emir question his partisanship in the situation, but does it in a playful manner that Emir does not feel threatened by. This behavior resembles what Levine and colleagues (2012) argue to be pro-social regulating behavior in NTE. It shows how group members have an important role of self-policing other group members when conflicts emerge. In this case, Amin is however not successful in preventing the conflict from escalation.

Case 2:
De-escalatory and indirect intervention in male fight

The next case illustrates the Emergency Type of a male fight where five or six bystanders intervene. As seen in table 4 presenting the LCA model, this Type is characterized by de-escalatory and indirect intervention, but also has the largest probability of escalatory bystander behavior (33 percent) compared to the other four Types. In the selected qualitative case, both de-escalatory, escalatory and indirect intervention occur and I will here focus on the two latter intervention types. The incident unfolds at the bottom of a staircase at a train station. The surveillance camera recording the incident is placed at the top of the staircase and angled towards the stairs that lead down to the platform. It is past midnight on a Saturday night in September 2012. The three adolescents Hamza (14), Daniel (16) and Fahdi (17) have been hanging out in the neighborhood around the station. Fahdi says in the police record that he thinks all three of them have been drinking. Hamza says he has not. Tom (41) is on his way home from a party, highly intoxicated. He and his girlfriend Jane (48) got into a fight when walking home from the party, and he now tries to find her again at the train station.
Transcript 2.1

Daniel and Hamza walk down the stairs and stop at the bottom of the staircase in front of the door that leads out to the platform. A few seconds after, Tom enters the camera frame and also walks down the stairs. At the bottom of the staircase he starts interacting with the two boys. Then Fahdi appears and walks down the stairs, and now Tom and Fahdi start exchanging words. Hamza has opened the door out to the platform and him and Daniel are standing in the doorway awaiting the interaction of Tom and Fahdi. Tom and Fahdi are moving closer to each other’s faces and it becomes obvious that there is a conflict. The two men’s bodies start moving and they mutually shove each other aggressively away from one another. They then continue arguing, both gesticulating, and Tom takes one step up the stairs, making him taller than Fahdi. The three boys start walking out the door. Now standing outside on the platform, Daniel seems to get more upset and acts out aggressive gestures at Tom, while Fahdi leaves the doorway to get out on the platform. The door closes, but then Hamza opens it again to say something to Tom. Right after, Daniel also re-enters the doorway and then kicks Tom on his leg. Now Hamza attacks Tom as well. The two bystanders hold onto and punch Tom, and Fahdi re-enters and also takes part in the violence. Tom is a victim of several punches and kicks to all parts of his body. After this, the three boys leave Tom lying on the floor and walk out on the platform.
On the whole, this transcript depicts three young perpetrators against a victim, but from a behavioral interaction point of view, this conflict emerges the moment Tom and Fahdi are moving their bodies close to each other and invade each other’s personal space. Fahdi is a tall boy, wearing a big jacket and his body language expresses confidence and dominance with spread legs and a rank body posture (Hall, Coats, and LeBeau 2005; Tracy and Robins 2007). Tom is however not intimidated by Fahdi’s body posture and while discussing, the two antagonists get physically close with their faces only a few inches from each other. This decrease in interpersonal distance has been associated with high status individuals (Hall et al. 2005) and in this case both Tom and Fahdi are bodily illustrating the claim of status (Kemper 2011).

Kemper (2011) theorizes about the dynamics of status and power in social life and argues that people always govern their conduct in relation to ‘the other’ and the status and power that lie in the relation. Every relation is entangled with status and the search for it and if status is not equally claimed and given, then power enters in the relation. Power concerns the realization of one’s own will or own interest against the resistance of others (Kemper 2011). In respect to the conflict between Fahdi and Tom, their bodily behaviors demonstrate how both antagonists are claiming status from one another through their mutual decrease in personal distance and rank and broad body postures. The conflict then emerges, since none of the two antagonists accord the status that the other one is behaviorally claiming in the situation. Kemper (1991) argues that when status is not accorded by another individual, it brings anger, and further, the unfulfilled status-accord brings power into the relation.

When Tom rejects to acknowledge Fahdi’s claim of status in their dispute, Daniel and Hamza respond with the use of power. Fahdi is about to walk away from the conflict and out on the platform, when Daniel followed by Hamza continues the dispute and uses force to gain the status that Tom resisted to offer Fahdi. In this moment, they take over the conflict and put themselves at risk when doing violence on behalf of their group member (Black 1993; Swann et al. 2009). Here the two bystanders demonstrate what Swann and colleagues (2009) would define as extreme group behavior caused by a fused group identity. Swann argues that group identification can depersonalize individuals to align with group norms, but group identity fusion quite the contrary involves strong personal identity. When individuals are fused, they
retain a strong sense of self in the group and when the self is merged with the group then the group members are willing to perform extreme behavior to uphold both personal and group identity, as Daniel and Hamza.

In reference to the LCA model, this Emergency Type is characterized by being prompted by disrespect. This is also the case in this incident where both bystanders say to the police that Tom disrespected them. Daniel says that Tom was provoking them and Hamza says that Tom was offending Daniel by talking about his mother. This reveals how the boys’ personal and social self are used as a motivator for the extreme, violent behavior (Swann et al. 2009). The boys feel challenged as a group when Tom does not comply Fahdi, but they also have their personal selves challenged. They then argue that this is the reason why they escalate the conflict by assaulting Tom.

Keeping in mind that testimonies from police case files can be unreliable, the accounts from the two boys still tell us how they legitimize their own violent behaviors. Jackson-Jacobs has studied the process of creating a fight and notes that: “[c]onstructing a fight is a process of actively invoking justifications for violence, and then feeling authentically motivated by them.” (2013:48). Daniel and Hamza justify their violent behavior because Tom was provoking them. As described before, Tom is challenging the boys since he denies Fahdi the claimed status (Kemper 2011). He keeps his back upright throughout the interaction (Hall et al. 2005), he makes himself taller than Fahdi by taking one step up the staircase, and he claims power by shoving Fahdi. This bodily behavior indicates that Tom does not adhere to the group of youngsters and this makes them attack him.

In the next transcript from this case, I examine a bystander conducting indirect intervention, which from the LCA model is found to be a typical bystander action in this Emergency Type. The transcript is based on the police case file.

Transcript 2.1

Jane, the girlfriend of Tom, testifies to the police. In her statement to the police she says that she was sitting on the platform on the other side of the rails when the incident took place. Jane describes how she noticed trouble on the opposite platform, because she heard people yelling and saw two men [two unknown bystanders who intervene de-escalating and
Jane is Tom’s girlfriend, but quite interestingly, she helps in the situation without knowing that she is socially close to the victim. Thus, it is not the social relation to Tom that makes her call the emergency call center. Instead, she describes how the loud noises and fast movements at the other platform made her react, and how another woman responded to the violent incident. This shows that Jane knew that she was not the only one noticing trouble. The fact that the other woman yelled might have had an influence on Jane’s reaction, because when the other woman signals that something bad is going on, the severity and emergency of the situation becomes clear to Jane (Fischer et al. 2011). The intervention made by Jane here opposes the findings of the bystander effect, because Jane intervenes even though more people are present and other people are already responding to the violence.

Case 3:
De-escalatory intervention in conflicts with women
As the two former analyzed cases, this third one also represents an Emergency Type where a bystander performs de-escalating intervention. However, this case refers to the rather uncommon Emergency Type (8 percent), with a female perpetrator and a female victim. In this Type, the bystander is socially close with one of the antagonists and is also spatially close when the conflict starts. The qualitative case selected is the only one in the analysis that takes place in the afternoon. It is December 2010 and Joanna (32), her son (3) and her big brother Patrick (39) are on their way down the stairs to a platform on a train station. Patrick is carrying Joanna’s son in his arms. Jytte (43) and her daughter Katrine (12) are also on their way to the platform. Multiple surveillance cameras record the incident, but the focal one in this analysis, is the camera hanging in the ceiling at the platform, angled towards the lower part of the staircase.
Transcript 3.1

Joanna is on her way down to the platform, when stopping to look for something. She holds on to the banister with her right hand and Patrick walks beside her with her son in his arms. When Joanna is about to continue down the stairs, Jytte comes very close to her from behind while talking on her phone. Joanna looks up at Jytte, who looks back at her while passing her at the stairs, still on the phone. Then Joanna gives Jytte a push with her right hand. Patrick is standing a few steps further down the staircase in front of the women and turns around to look at them right after the push. Jytte and Joanna are now discussing with Katrine standing close behind them. Joanna once again pushes Jytte, this time up against the wall, and steps closer to Jytte. Jytte demonstratively sticks her left hand out in front of her with a plastic bag that dangles close to Joanna. Patrick now grabs onto Joanna with his right hand while still holding the child with his left arm. He tries to haul her away from Jytte. Joanna puts her face close to Jytte and while Patrick hauls her away, she hits Jytte with her right hand. Jytte now approaches Joanna, and the two women start wrestling, holding onto each other’s arms, both stepping down the staircase on the platform. When they start wrestling, Patrick turns his attention to Jytte. He tries to hold her back from...
Joanna by grabbing Jytte’s arms. Jytte appears upset and stands close to Joanna while talking to her. Patrick keeps focusing on Jytte, and tries to get in between the two women.

This incident is quite distinctive from the other cases analyzed here, but to a large extent also from the rest of the sample. It differs in several ways. Among other factors because it happens in the afternoon, because the antagonists are both more than 30 years old and because family members are present when the two women are discussing. Patrick, who is the older brother of Joanna, is visiting from Uganda and does not speak Danish. When the conflict emerges, he carries his nephew in his arms. The movable restriction because of the nephew and the assumed difficulty in comprehending what happens behind him, however does not prevent him from responding promptly to the escalating conflict. He is the only bystander who directly intervenes and he does so as soon as he realizes that a conflict has emerged.

In the police case file, Jytte describes that Joanna is shouting during the incident. Joanna is aggressive and in an uproar, and Patrick responds to this behavior by trying to hold her back. In his intervention, Patrick responds to his sister’s aggression and regulates her behavior, and the intervention seems to be a way of showing his sister that she is conducting non-acceptable behavior. In line with the social identity approach, Marques and colleagues (2001) have theorized about what they call the black sheep effect. The black sheep effect refers to in-group members who violate the group’s prescriptive norms and characteristics. Each social group follows certain norms that supports a distinctive and positive social identity. If a group member violates the norms, then the retribution might be more severe from the other group members compared to if it was an out-group member who performed the same deviant behavior. In this case, Joanna seems to be violating the group norms by doing aggressive behavior in public space. As a response to that, Patrick tries to get her away from Jytte in an attempt to calm her down and control her public display. This in-group behavior of Patrick contrasts with the in-group behavior in case 1, where the bystander Amin did discrete bystander behavior towards Emir. In this case, Patrick makes an unmistakable attempt to regulate his sister’s behavior.

Throughout the conflict Patrick performs the same type of de-escalating behavior of holding back and hauling, but who he directs the behavior towards, changes during the conflict.
When Joanna hits Jytte, Jytte responds by approaching Joanna. At this point, Patrick changes his focus from his sister, Joanna, and instead intervenes towards Jytte. The change in recipient of the bystander behavior is interesting because Patrick seems to transform his bystander role in the conflict. In the beginning, he tries to regulate his sister’s behavior. However, when Jytte gets hit, she gets physically active for the first time in the conflict and starts wrestling with Joanna. At this point, Patrick changes his focus and grabs onto Jytte’s arm. Even though Joanna has shown herself most aggressive and violent during the conflict, Patrick changes the direction of his behavior, the moment Jytte involves herself physically. At this point, Patrick could be argued to become a ‘settlement’ bystander. He no longer takes sides and focuses on stopping his sister Joanna, but now tries to end the conflict by also getting physically involved with Jytte (Black 1993; Phillips and Cooney 2005).

Patrick is the only bystander intervening directly when Joanna and Jytte start discussing, even though more people can be seen waiting for trains on the platform, and walking up and down the stairs during the conflict. Only one other person, a woman called Sacha (21), stops and shows willingness to help. She asks Jytte whether she should call the police. In relation to the Emergency Type that this case represents, the Type is characterized by many people (16 or more) being present when the conflict emerges, but not characterized by a lot of bystanders intervening during the conflict. The scenario in this qualitative case makes it relevant to ask why more people should not help in this conflict.

Drawing on the theoretical arguments of the bystander effect, the lack of intervention is because of a diffusion about responsibility in the situation (Darley and Latané 1968) or because it is not obvious for bystanders that it is an emergency (Fischer et al. 2011; Latane and Darley 1968). In this case, it is plausible that the passive bystanders do not respond to the conflict, because they are standing with many other people who just as well could respond, making the personal responsibility feel smaller. It is also plausible that it is not obvious for the passive bystanders that there actually is a violent conflict, since most of them are standing further down on the platform and not at the staircase. However, these arguments all account for a lack of responsiveness due to situational factors and not the individual’s assessment of the incident. In contradiction, Swann and Jetten (2017) advocate for a theoretical approach that leaves more potency and agency for individuals. They argue that social psychological studies have wrongly exaggerated the situational forces when
presenting oversimplified findings of humans lacking agency (as the classic bystander effect studies). This exaggeration has simplified the complexity of the relationship between human agency and situations, and has neglected to emphasize the fact that individuals are capable of assessing and controlling their own behavior (Swann and Jetten 2017).

If following the agent-based approach, the explanation to why the other bystanders remain passive during the conflict might be the fact that Patrick has already intervened. This makes other bystanders assess that it is not necessary to intervene. One passive bystander is seen walking down the stairs, just to walk back up when noticing the turmoil. This is an example of a bystander who assesses the risk of the situation and then walks away. Another agent-based explanation for the lack of more bystanders intervening, concerns the fact that the antagonists are women. Lowe and colleagues (2012) have studied bystanders’ accounts about intervention in female-to-female violence, and find that violence between women “is a phenomenon that needs to be understood in its own terms” (Lowe et al. 2012:1803). Here, men and women have different concerns about consequences of intervention in a female fight. Men might be concerned about expected norms of masculinity, and women might be more concerned about the risk of victimization because of the absence of norms prohibiting violence towards women. These, or other gender-biased explanation might play a part in the passiveness when Joanna assaults Jytte at the train station.

Case 4:
Consoling intervention in severe injury violence

Case 4 represents the Emergency Type with consoling intervention in a conflict where at least one victim is severely injured. This incident takes place a Saturday night on a gay bar in April 2012. André (20) is sitting at the bar counter talking with the acquainted bartender, Per (35). Noah (21), who for the past nine months has been harassed online and through text messages, has heard that André is the one behind the harassment and can be found at the respective bar. Kelly (25) who knows both André and Noah is also at the bar with some friends. The surveillance camera hangs in the bar angled towards the counter. In front of the bar counter is a floor where people are sitting at stools or standing at high tables.
Illustration 4. Kelly touching André while paying him full attention.

Transcript 4.1

André and Noah are standing at the counter talking. Noah seems upset, gesticulating fast and talking while André seems calmer, leaning his one arm on the counter and standing still. André grabs Noah’s arm as to calm him, and Noah responds by almost “hitting” it free from André. Then André puts both hands up in front of his body with open palms. Noah now gets very close to André’s face and gives André a full-body shove. André responds by grapping Noah and hauling him towards the end of the bar counter. Per and another bartender, Rasmus, now appear to intervene by saying something to the antagonists, who both look at the bartenders. André lets go of Noah and Noah moves back to where they were standing at the beginning, while André walks in the other direction towards the end of the counter. Then Noah throws a glass at André, which hits his head, and Noah leaves. André takes both hands to his head and starts walking back to his stool at the bar counter. Kelly enters the camera angle when approaching André. She holds onto his one arm so she can see his face. She then follows him to his stool while holding him on his back. André then sits down, still holding his hands to his head, while Kelly stands in front of him. André moves back and forth with his upper body and looks bewildered. Another man now also approaches and touches André on the head and the back. Kelly moves close to André while
touching him gently. The bartender Rasmus hands Kelly a towel and the man also arrives with some fetched paper to André’s head. Another unknown male bystander now also briefly touches André. Shortly after, André almost stumbles down from the stool in slow motion and lies on the floor. From this point, a third unknown male bystander bends forward to check on him and most of the customers in the bar all look towards the floor where André is lying.

The case illustrates an incident where several bystanders are performing consoling behaviors towards André who is badly wounded from a glass thrown at his head. The medical report in the police case file reveals that he both fainted after the assault and got a gash in his ear with a fractured cartilage. From the transcript above, it is also obvious that André is in pain: he holds both hands to his head, and he seems confused and dizzy when walking back to his stool at the counter. As a response to the obvious suffering, several bystanders are touching André, fetching him tissues and are standing next to him after he is hit by the glass. All behavioral ways to comfort a distressed victim, performed by both socially close and unfamiliar bystanders. There is however a difference in how fast and in what ways the bystanders console André.

Kelly who knows André is the first one to respond. When she intervenes, she immediately gets physically close to André and gets him to sit down at the stool while trying to check his injured head. Kelly’s way of responding to André’s distress by offering long lasting consolation, appears to be evoked by the feeling of empathy, where she feels the pain that André is suffering (Schmitt and Clark 2006; de Waal 2007). The primatologist de Waal has found that the socially closer a giver and receiver of empathy is, the greater is the empathic capacity (Preston and de Waal 2002; de Waal 2007). In the case of Kelly’s consoling behavior, this social bond becomes very clear, since she responds much faster than the other bystanders and acts out more persistent consolation. She stands in front of him and touches him – both behaviors that can make him feel more at ease and safe.

More than a feeling of empathy, the behavior of Kelly can also be seen as an act of sympathy. As described in the quantitative analysis, empathy is an interior emotion, whereas sympathy is an exterior, cognitive emotion, relying on cultural norms (Schmitt and Clark 2006; de Waal 2007). Empathy prerequisites sympathy. Clark argues that the display of sympathy is most authentic when the receiver of sympathy is socially close to the sympathizer and when the
problem of the receiver is great (Turner and Stets 2005). When sympathy is shared in a relation, the social bond and the solidarity is strengthened in the relationship. Following the exchange-Understanding of sympathy as a gift or currency, it is especially important for people socially close to give sympathy, because there is a social bond that needs to be maintained and because you then can expect to get something in return. Furthermore, Schmitt and Clark (2006) have argued that especially individuals with social ties have a stronger incitement to offer sympathy, since it verifies their “friend identity”. Following this argument in this case, it may very well be that Kelly is the first to console André since she can gain more from the behavior than the unfamiliar others (Lindegaard et al. 2017).

In respect to the other bystanders who console André in the aftermath of the violent assault, their behaviors could be argued to depict the normative, feeling rules of offering sympathy when a victim is suffering (Hochschild 1983; Schmitt and Clark 2006; Turner and Stets 2005). Compared to Kelly, not all of their consoling behaviors are as persistent and last as long as Kelly’s behavior. The unfamiliar bystanders’ response to the injury of André seems more to be motivated by the cognitive dimension of empathy, defined as the awareness of another’s distress (Schmitt and Clark 2006; Turner and Stets 2005). They are not necessarily feeling the pain or the sadness of André, as Kelly most likely does. In this view, the unfamiliar bystanders are mainly following the cultural norms of impression management in situations where sympathy is needed. Clark here notes that it can be difficult to assess how to display sympathy (Turner and Stets 2005). How much attention should be given and how do you display sympathy? This uncertainty about how to exhibit the right amount of sympathy, is seen in the case of the bystanders who do not know André, who assess that André’s suffering is sincere, but are more restrained in their display of sympathy.

Case 5:
Consoling intervention in severe violence

The last case in this analysis represents the Emergency Type with severe violence defined by either several kicks, a kick to the head or a victim falling to the ground. In this sampled case, the violence is severe because there are committed several kicks. The case takes place in the middle of the night in front of the counter in a McDonalds restaurant a summer night in July 2011. Tania (20), her boyfriend Olaf (26) and Torben (27) have been at a friend’s place
drinking earlier that evening. Afterwards they went out, where Torben and Tania got into a fight with a man, who Tania slapped and Torben punched in the face. All three of them are intoxicated and before going home, they end their night at McDonalds to get some food. Torben has previously been in prison for robbery. Andreas (24) and Jens (23) have both been at Parken [football stadium] watching football all day and have both been drinking alcohol. In the McDonalds, there are three surveillance cameras covering different angles of the restaurant. Two are placed behind the counter and one at the entrance, angled towards the entrance door.

Illustration 5. Lisa holding her hand on the back of Andreas’ neck while standing close to him.

Transcript 5.1
From the camera placed behind the counter furthest inside the restaurant, several people can be seen standing in line, waiting for their food. Tania enters and places her order. Soon after, her boyfriend Olaf and their friend Torben also arrive and order food. A short while after, the two friends Andreas and Jens arrive and get in line. Olaf finds a bag of straws at a service desk in the waiting area and he, Torben and Tania now start playing with it by kicking it. In the end, Tania and Olaf break the bag and straws are lying all over the floor.
Both Andreas and Jens pay attention to the incident and Andreas sarcastically, but quietly claps his hands after the bag breaks. Tania starts to gather the straws, while Olaf stands with Torben at the counter. Louise (20), an employee at McDonalds, enters the camera angle and tells Olaf to clean up the mess. He seems to try to discuss his way out of it, when Andreas approaches him and tries to get Olaf to the straws by pointing and gently pulling him. Olaf starts helping Tania gathering the straws from the floor. When Louise, the employee, leaves the front area, Olaf approaches Andreas and Jens who are still standing in line. Olaf starts patting Andreas on the back of his head with straws and continues to interact with the two men in line, who seemingly do not want to have contact with him. Then Jens and Olaf start to argue and Olaf points straws towards Jens’ head, making Jens push Olaf away. Now Torben approaches from the counter and aims to hit Jens. From this point, the conflict escalates in a series of, often simultaneous, violent behaviors of Torben and Olaf mostly towards Andreas. They kick, punch, wrestle and give head-butts.

Throughout the conflict some people try to stop the assault while others leave or move around trying to avoid being caught up in the violent turmoil. Lisa, an unknown bystander, is standing at the counter talking on her phone when the assault begins. When the antagonists move in her direction while fighting, she moves over in the corner of the counter with other bystanders, not to get hit. She then hangs up her phone and pays full attention to the assault. At one point, Tania manages to separate the antagonists for a short amount of time, when slapped Olaf in the face, but both Olaf and Torben approach Andreas and Jens again afterwards. Andreas now contacts the staff. At this point Lisa starts talking in short sentences and gesticulates to the staff behind the counter. As a final attack, Olaf head-butts Andreas, making him lean forward in pain and the two perpetrators then leave the restaurant. While Andreas is leaned forward in pain, an unknown woman approaches him and touches him on his back while leaning forward, almost in the same manner as him. Another female bystander also approaches and leans forward to talk to and look at Andreas. Meanwhile Lisa has asked the staff for tissues to wipe away the blood and stop the bleeding. Lisa puts the tissues to the forehead of Andreas while she holds her other hand on the back of the neck. Jens stands beside Andreas for a short while, before he moves towards the entrance. Lisa stands with Andreas during the aftermath of the conflict for several minutes.

Lisa has been present throughout the conflict, but has for the most part kept a distance to the conflict. This however changes in the second half of the assault. She physically moves closer to the conflict when making contact to the staff after Andreas once again is victimized and he himself has contacted the staff. At this point Lisa goes from being a passive bystander,
to becoming a partisan of Andreas (Black 1993). From the police case file, it is mentioned by a police officer that there is a pool of blood where Andreas has been standing after the head-butt. Moreover, the medical report reveals bruises and swelling in his face and a displacement of a front tooth. When Lisa involves herself directly in the conflict, she first fetches tissues to stop the bleeding that runs from Andreas’ head. Then she stands in front of Andreas with only a small distance to him while attempting to stop the bleeding. In this way, she takes the role of a consoler who seeks to decrease the distress of the victim (Lindegaard et al. 2017; Liebst et al. forthcoming).

Andreas clearly signals that he is in pain by bending forward and holding his hands to his head. However, this obvious act of distress does not make his friend and ally, Jens, console him when the conflict is over. Jens stands close to Andreas for a short while, before moving to the entrance – most likely to look for the perpetrators or awaiting the police. Jens’ behavior and response to Andreas’ suffering is very different from Lisa, the unfamiliar bystander. This ‘odd’ configuration of Jens not consoling Andreas, when Lisa does, indicate that other mechanisms than social closeness is important to consider when understanding consoling behavior and feelings of empathy and sympathy.

In her important work on emotion management and feeling rules, Hochschild (1983) has remarked the difference in display of feelings between men and women. Hochschild argues that emotion work is used differently by women and men, since women are specialized in emotional display because they need to deploy it in jobs or relations in ways that men do not need. Clark draws on this argument when arguing that women have a bigger burden of displaying sympathy than men (Turner and Stets 2005). Women tend to be more aware of displaying sympathy (Schmitt and Clark 2006), and are also expected to monitor the exchange of sympathy. Men are on the contrary expected to be more cognitive in their distribution of sympathy (Turner and Stets 2005).

These differences in the normative expectations about men and women displaying sympathy seem relevant to account for in this case. Three women who do not know Andreas – but have perceived the amount of violence he has been a victim of – are fast in responding to his obvious suffering. Lisa, who is the most persistent consoling bystander of them all, is watching over Andreas for as long as the surveillance camera is filming the post-conflict
situation. Jens on the other hand stands still and then moves away from his victimized friend. This behavior indicates that he might not know how to respond to his friend’s suffering, and when he sees three women taking over the situation, he might find himself improper or awkward taking part in the consolation. He might not have the same practice in displaying sympathy as the three women obviously have, and this could be why he keeps a distance. Moreover, it is important to note that Jens himself is a victim. He might very well be distressed and shocked because of the assault, and maybe find himself in need of consolation.

Patterns and processes

Before discussing my two analyses in light of the existing literature, I first summarize the findings in the following section.

Quantitative results on patterns

The quantitative analysis identified a pattern of five different Emergency Types of public violence. Only one type is characterized by mutual violence, four types were characterized by occurring in a NTE context, and the one less likely to occur in a NTE context is characterized by a female victim and perpetrator and many bystanders present when the conflict emerges. Three Emergency Types are characterized by de-escalating behaviors, which shows that this intervention type is common in different types of public violence. In two of these Types, the bystander is a socially close man, revealing an association of in-group members policing conflicts in NTE contexts. No Emergency Type was characterized by escalatory bystander behavior, suggesting that this behavior is not associated with a specific type of public violence.

One Emergency Type was characterized by an unfamiliar, male bystander performing consolation in the aftermath of the conflict. Here, a victim is severely injured. The finding suggests that feelings of empathy and sympathy are evoked when a victim is obviously suffering, and the clarity of the injury makes strangers console a victim. The fifth Emergency Type found in the LCA model depicts a more ambiguous emergency with severe violence,
where no bystander behavior is distinct, but where consoling behavior is quite likely (59 percent).

Qualitative results on processes

The qualitative case-analysis revealed different behavioral, emotional and relational micro-processes which are important to take into account to understand active bystander behaviors in public violence. Case 1 and 3 show how group norms influence bystander behavior. In case 1, the in-group norms limit the possibility of doing efficient de-escalating behavior, when a man tries to prevent his friend from committing further violence. It also shows how a bystander’s calm touching of an opponent can be an ambiguous behavior that does not necessarily function as de-escalating. Quite a different group norm is present in case 3, where a bystander regulates an in-group member’s violent behavior, because the behavior is deviant from group norms. In case 2, it is shown how the denial of conceding status – depicted in behavioral cues of invading personal space and expanded body posture – can lead to use of physical power. Here social group processes are also found, since two bystanders fused in a social group stand up for their group members and personal selves and perform violent intervention as a response to disrespect.

Case 3 also depicts the case of many passive bystanders not responding to an incident of violence. Here it is suggested that more than just being a result of diffusion of responsibility, the lack of further interventions can also be a matter of assessment that no further intervention is necessary. In case 5, many bystanders are on the contrary intervening in a case of severe violence. Here, it is identified how severe violence towards a victim can impact how persistently a bystander consoles the victim in distress. The case also shows how a female bystander performs persistent consolation whereas a friend and ally in combat does not console at all. This is argued to be a result of the normative expectations of women being better at displaying emotions as sympathy. Case 4 also depicts a difference in commitment when performing consoling behaviors in the aftermath of violence. A bystander socially close to a victim performs long lasting consolation of touching and spatial closeness, indicating feelings of physical and emotional empathy. Most unfamiliar bystanders console more briefly and not as committed as the socially close bystander. This difference indicates that consolation can also be an act of obliged sympathy as a culture specific exchange currency.
Discussion

Bystanders without a context

The two analyses of patterns and processes of bystander behaviors in violent incidents are important contributions to the shaping and development of a new branch within the well-established research field on bystander behavior. With a focus on contextual patterns, complexity and micro-processes, I argue that we achieve a more thorough and useful knowledge on bystander behavior, since this approach gives us insights about the multiple dynamics and processes that occur during a conflict.

One of the main problems within the research field on bystander behavior has been the lack of interest in the complexity of the phenomenon. Bystanders in very different situational circumstances have all been analyzed in the same way, with the same theoretical assumptions to support the approach. I especially aim this critique at the huge branch classic studies of the bystander effect, which has a rather narrow focus on verifying and testing the bystander effect (Chekroun and Brauer 2002; Clark and Word 1972, 1974; Darley and Latané 1968; Latane and Darley 1968; Rutkowski et al. 1983; Solomon et al. 1978). The question that has framed this research is whether or not more bystanders to an emergency decrease the likelihood of intervention. The problem with this question is that it neglects to focus on the bystanders who actually do intervene and moreover the question does not seem interested in distinguishing between different kinds of emergencies.

Darley and Latané (1968) who initiated the tradition of the bystander effect, conducted their study in acclaimed reference to a deadly assault in the public streets of New York City. When examining the very situational factors that make people stay passive in such an emergency, they however downplayed the set-up of an emergency, by using an experimental design with an experimenter faking a nervous breakdown. I would argue that there should be a clear recognition of how different it is being a bystander to a violent assault compared to being a bystander hearing a person having a seizure in the next room. This argument aligns with the critique presented earlier by Fischer and colleagues (2011), who find support for a weaker and reversed bystander effect in dangerous situations. However, my argument runs deeper than their critique. Fischer and colleagues only argue for a consideration of dangerous aspects
of situations that could make people respond even if there are more bystanders present. I argue that we should consider different patterns of behaviors, in the numerous different situations where bystanders are needed.

Other branches of the research field have focused on more specific types of emergencies and contexts of bystander behavior. This includes situations of bullying (O’Connell, Pepler, and Craig 1999; Thornberg and Jungert 2013), sexual assaults (Banyard 2015; Bennett and Banyard 2016; Bennett, Banyard, and Edwards 2017), robberies (Lindegaard et al. 2017) or as my own contribution adheres to; violence (Levine et al. 2011; Liebst et al. 2018; Parks et al. 2013; Phillips and Cooney 2005; Philpot 2017). These branches all take the contextual circumstances into account when examining bystander behavior, which opposes the classic bystander effect tradition. Levine’s contribution to research on bystanders in violent NTE contexts is an example of an approach that challenges the binary thinking of bystanders. He and colleagues include the social dynamics attached to an alcohol-contested urban setting when studying bystanders (Levine et al. 2012, 2011).

In my thesis, I take the contextual attentiveness one step further, when offering a typology of violent emergency types relating to bystander actions. This typology offers a new way of assessing bystanders, because the typology shows the diversity in individual and situational factors that are associated in public violence. This result suggests that we need more knowledge on different types of situations, since bystander actions are related to different contextual scenarios. If we as researchers want research to have purpose and matter in real-life situations, we should strive to make the knowledge on bystander circumstances as accurate and nuanced as possible – as I argue to do with my typology.

Methods to study bystanders

The knowledge from research on bystander behavior has until recently mainly been obtained from studies carried out using experiments (Chekroun and Brauer 2002; Clark and Word 1972, 1974; Darley and Latané 1968; Latane and Darley 1968; Rutkowski et al. 1983; Slater et al. 2013; Solomon et al. 1978; Tice and Baumeister 1985), but also vignettes and surveys (Bennett and Banyard 2016; Bennett, Banyard, and Garnhart 2014; Brewster and Tucker 2016; Hart and Miethe 2008). Baumeister and colleagues (2007) have argued that the deployment of methods that do not observe behavior directly, has meant that research on
social and personal psychology has paid little attention to the important ways in which people actually behave. The authors’ critique is directed towards the great use of surveys and vignettes where people account for previous or expected behavior – something Baumeister and colleagues mention that Nisbett and Wilson (1977) has already discredited decades earlier. Baumeister and colleagues advocate that researchers should put effort in developing methods to observe behavior directly.

The recent studies on bystander behavior in violent incidents – including my own contribution – is a realization of Baumeister and colleagues’ appeal for methods studying actual behavior (Levine et al. 2011; Liebst et al. 2018; Liebst et al. forthcoming; Bloch et al. In press). When applying video footage of bystander behaviors, it expands the sociological perspective on factors of importance. The method contains the possibility of providing unexpected insights about what is at stake for bystanders who perceive an emergency and capturing new insights about the dynamics and processes of behavior. In my qualitative analysis of case 2, which depicts a scenario of bystanders intervening escalatory and beating up a man, I find that the question of failed status-gain and disrespect, release anger and provokes the violent bystanders. These relational dynamics are behaviorally visible because of recordings of naturally occurring violence, and they give a new perspective on the explanations and processes of bystander intervention.

Bystander studies applying experimental designs lack these sorts of insights that a researcher gains from employing video footage from surveillance cameras. The experiments are used to examine social life under controlled conditions, but I would argue that the very notion of controlled conditions in social studies to a certain extent is effortless. As argued in my theoretical approach of micro-sociology, social life consists of multiple micro-dynamics and –processes that influence human behavior. Trying to remove or control these multiple social dynamics in an experiment may result in excluding a sensitivity to the dynamics of importance. Banyard (2015) points to the fact that group relations are often excluded from experimental designs since these studies use participants who are unknown to each other. This fact emphasizes how the importance of social group ties have been neglected in the controlled experiment of social life. In their critique of studies oversimplifying situational factors, Swann and Jetten (2017) also emphasize how experimental studies’ let the results of personal or group-based agency go unnoticed. The authors argue that the studies only focus
on the situational factors as the systematic variance, whereas inclinations of agency are consigned to the “error term” of the statistics.

Moreover, Swann and Jetten (2017) argue that studies have devoted too much attention to specific psychological mechanisms at the cost of not observing naturally occurring human actions. The authors suggest that experimental studies should be complemented by naturally occurring settings to improve the ecological validity by assuring that the studies approximate real life. Following this, it would be stimulating to investigate the authenticity of the experimental set-ups, perceived by the participants in the studies. In the meta-analysis made by Fischer and colleagues (2011), the authors (moreover than testing the moderator of danger) compared the difference in bystander effect between experimental and quasi-experimental studies. They found that experimental studies produced larger effects than the quasi-experimental ones. This result may incline a difference in the circumstances of an unreal emergency, suggesting that experimental designs are not “real enough”. The authors however suspect the result to be an effect of the difference in being able to control sources of error variance (Fischer et al. 2011).

Admittedly, experimental designs contain strengths in regard of its ability to control measures of interest, which real-life footage of violence at this development stage still have problems with. The experimental set-up is beneficiary to statistical analyses of bystander behavior, since it offers the possibility to hold certain variables constant, to manipulate others and to isolate the effects because of the closed system set-up. In respect to my typology, an experimental design would make it possible to test the conditions for different active bystander actions. Here the association between female violence, the non-severity of injury and the less likely NTE setting (in Type 3) could be relevant factors to study for causality and correlation. On the other hand, the experimental set-up cannot imitate and manipulate the violent dynamics that are gathered from video footage of naturally occurring violence. This makes it difficult to actually study violent incidents with an experimental design.

Concerning the majority of experimental designs used for statistical analyses, I would argue that one of the main problems of the bystander field of research has been the neglect of taking more explorative and qualitative methods into use. Methods often shape what we ask and what we look for as researchers, and thus the bystander research field has primarily been
reduced to binary thinking and causalities because this predominates a quantitative approach. An argument that is emphasized by Swann and Jetten (2017) who argue that qualitative research is needed because it allows “researchers to accurately characterize and understand the phenomena under scrutiny” (Swann and Jetten 2017:393).

With my thesis, I have opposed the tradition by deploying a qualitative method and thus offer a different take on approaching bystander behavior. An approach that respects the complexity and nuances that should be represented in the research field. With my case-analysis I have showed how social relations and group identity affect bystander behavior and intervention. In case 1, I show how a seemingly de-escalating behavior can be ambiguous and perhaps even escalating, even though it is a calming touch performed with a smile. In case 4, I analyze how consoling behaviors in the aftermath of a conflict can be an act of empathy and an act of sympathy with the severely injured victim. This behavioral information has to a large extent not been addressed, because of the quantitative (and experimental) tradition of bystander research.

The implementation of consolation as a bystander behavior is however a result of the newer tradition of bystander research based on quantitative analyses (Lindegaard et al. 2017; Liebst et al. forthcoming). This new tradition offers statistical analyses of the active bystanders in robberies and public violence, based on real-life video footage and have set the scene for a new and more complex approach to bystander behavior. Led by the initial studies by Levine and colleagues (2011), this new approach offers new insights about concepts like behavior types, bystander victimization and strategic use of violence to control a perpetrator (Levine et al. 2011; Liebst et al. 2018). In this approach, the statistical methods find new relevance, because the studies base their analyses on fine-grained behavioral and situational coding of human life.

The theoretical starting point

The theoretical, explanatory ambitions of the classic bystander research field have largely been concerned with different theoretical factors that explain the bystander effect and its importance in different circumstances. One of the most common theoretical explanations for the bystander effect is “diffusion of responsibility”, which argues that the more bystanders present in an emergency, the more bystanders available to share the responsibility.
and the less individual responsibility a bystander feels (Fischer et al. 2011). Even though this cognitive mechanism may very well have a part to play when studying why bystanders do not intervene, it also draws a very simplistic understanding of humans. This focus has resulted in a neglect of the multiple other aspects that need investigation of bystander behavior (Manning et al. 2008).

My twofold analysis illustrates how multiple social processes are present in any given incident of public violence. People intervene in agreement with their social group identity; they intervene in response to the expected and felt emotions of sympathy and empathy; they intervene as a response to relational dynamics of status that challenges their personal or fused selves. These mechanisms all illustrate important aspects of human behavior that have not been incorporated in the classic bystander effect paradigm. Concerning case 3, which depicts two women and their respective family members at the train station, this case is of particular interest when theorizing about the bystander effect. Here, the brother of one of the antagonists is the only bystander who directly intervenes even though many bystanders are present at the train station.

In a classic bystander study, this situation would only focus on the fact that only one person intervenes and why the passive bystanders do not intervene. This case would most likely be another example used to support the same notion that if more bystanders are present people are less likely to intervene. I would argue that this has been the major flaw in the classic bystander studies. The mistake of overlooking the dynamics involved when the brother actually intervenes and tries to stop his sister’s aggression. What does he do? How does he succeed? These questions have been neglected in the investigation in favor of a question of why more people do not help stop the conflict. Moreover, when looking at how and why people actually intervene, we may encounter new explanations for why some people do not.

Social closeness has in recent years been stressed as a main explanatory factor for bystander behavior in public violence. Levine and colleagues (2012) have shown that group members regulate each other’s behavior both in a de-escalating and escalating manner in violent NTE contexts, and Liebst and colleagues (2018) have shown that social relation is associated with the risk of being victimized when intervening, since being socially close with a victim increases the risk of being victimized as a bystander. My results of the LCA model and
qualitative case-analysis also substantiate the importance of social relations in regard to bystander behavior in violent incidents. The findings of Levine and colleagues, Liebst and colleagues and my thesis suggest that social group relations are of great importance of bystander behavior and should be further investigated. The focus on social closeness has to some extent been incorporated in the classic bystander literature. Clark and Word (1972) examined how the ambiguity of the emergency could be perceived differently when bystanders were socially close instead of being strangers to each other. Here they found active helping behavior in all scenarios of bystanders being alone, with strangers or with friends.

The finding of Clark and Word can here be used to support the critique made by Swann and Jetten (2017), which I also touched upon in the case-analysis. The two authors argue that studies on the bystander effect have placed too much emphasis on the passive bystanders and the situational forces that suppress agency. They argue that studies have exaggerated the importance of situational factors – such as the number of people present in an emergency – and at the same time systematically oversimplify their findings in order to conclude that people lack agency. The example of Clark and Word’s (1972) study illustrates how they focus on why bystanders do not intervene when others are present, when they in fact find that bystanders do intervene. Swann and Jetten (2017) argue that this a symptom of a general problem of seeking “…confirmation of a single theoretical or metatheoretical approach while relying almost exclusively on experimental approaches” (2017:395). Further the authors argue that studies could just as well have found support for agency, and not the lack of it.

This lack of attention to human agency speaks to a broader problem in more parts of social sciences. The sociologist Smith (2015) aligns the critique made by Swann and Jetten when arguing that social situationism has been a big cloud overshadowing humanity and human social life. He argues that situationism fails to acknowledge the subjective and personal dimension of social life, including human motivation for action (Smith 2015). We should not neglect the important notions of interaction, collective processes of discourse and cultural norms, but this should not rule out the subjective self and the motivations guiding the self. Kemper (2011) offers the same critical stance in his work on the status-power theory, since he argues that the relations between actors need to be taken into account when examining interactions and social life in general. Both Smith and Kemper argue that Goffman and the
subsequent readings of him have failed to acknowledge that the humans within each situation, each interaction, have agency and motivation.

My thesis should be seen as clear-cut example of support for agency of bystanders. I show how bystanders do respond in situations of violence and emergency and I show what social and emotional mechanisms are important to include in the understanding of bystander behavior. I here adhere to the new tradition in the research field that want to nuance and change the reductive understanding of humans not taking responsibility in emergencies. Far too much attention has been given to the situational count of passive bystanders instead of broadening the scientific gaze and looking for social and behavioral cues of humans in the actual situations where people respond. I argue that future research should explore the different types of emergency contexts and the bystander actions in these contexts. We need more typologies and qualitative studies that describe the complexities of human relations and behaviors in order to gain a more nuanced understanding of social life and the people in it. Bystander behavior is more than helping or not.
Limitations

This thesis has provided a new approach to bystander behavior, but it also has limitations in respect to the methods and data employed and their generalizability. In the following section, I discuss these limitations.

Data sources and the triangulation of them

One of the absolute strengths of this study, is the triangulation of two data sources, which combined provides a complementary and more nuanced understanding of bystander behavior. However, both police case files and video footage also has its limitations as informative data sources.

Police case files have for a long time been a useful source of information for criminological research, but are also known to be a data source with limitations in respect to reliability. The testimonies reported to the police are retrospective accounts of a crime, which are biased in at least two ways. First bias is the cognitive limitation of perceiving and remembering an event and describing it accurately (Vrij, Hope, and Fisher 2014; Vrij, Meissner, and Kassin 2015). Second, a suspect’s or witness’ testimony is made with the awareness that it can affect the outcome of a trial and (parts of) it can therefore be untrue (Lindegaard and Bernasco 2018). In line with this bias, it must also be expected that given the status that the police have in society, the testimonies are affected by the interaction of the police and the ones interrogated, and the interview strategies used by the police (Lindegaard, de Vries, and Bernasco 2018). Furthermore, a police case file only contains the information about the crime that the police find relevant to include in the report. This becomes evident in the aspect of bystander testimonies, since a file rarely comprises testimonies from all bystanders even though they are present when the police arrive (seen from the video footage).

The use of video footage also has its limitations. First, the sample is limited to consist of violent incidents that have taken place in certain streets, bars or shops where a camera has been installed. This limitation is particularly important in a Danish context, where surveillance cameras are not as widespread in urban life as in the UK. The sample’s video footage is further limited to only be from reported assaults, where the police have obtained
the videos. This bias is speculated to have a strong impact on the sample used in the thesis. The cases are likely to be more severe in injury and in people affected than the general occurrence of public violence, since these factors have been found to be important when assessing whether or not to call the police (Tarling and Morris 2010).

The second limitation refers to a broader concern of video analysis. Surveillance cameras do not capture everything that happens in a violent incident. In some cases, violence or aggressive interaction is likely to happen outside the scope of the camera angle, which makes it impossible to gather the full picture of the conflict. Even if the conflict is fully video recorded, the researcher can still not obtain all information about what is happening in the conflict, when observing through a camera lens. More people might be present outside the camera angle affecting how the conflict develops and the lack of audio in this sample limits the insights about what is being said by bystanders and antagonists. Verbal interaction must be expected to be a vital element to stir up a conflict and likewise a vital way for bystanders to intervene in a conflict. However, scholars in this field of research (Lindegaard et al. 2018; Nassauer 2018) have emphasized the fact that most human communication is nonverbal, arguing that this may decrease the importance of audio when studying street violence.

A final limitation of the sample is related to the triangulation of data. The two data sources have originally been collected and coded for different analyses, which challenges the use of the data combined. The video footage was coded with eyes on the bystanders in the conflicts, which has left limited focus on and information about the antagonists who start the conflicts. Moreover, the quantitative coding of the bystander actions is extensive, but cannot be proclaimed exhaustive. The coded actions were based on a thorough inductive examination of several videos to insure a comprehensive index of bystander behaviors, but in the end, the data is still restricted to a certain amount of bystander behaviors. These aspects suggest that the video coding is based on a certain research interest on the individual.

Quite the opposite, the police case files were coded on a situational level and do not offer individual information as the video footage does. This becomes evident with regards to the variable of indirect intervention that has been coded from the police case files. In contrast to the other bystander behaviors that are coded on an individual level, this behavior is coded on a situational level, not providing information about which and how many bystanders
performed indirect intervention. Moreover, information about the victim and offender is provided from the juridical definitions of the files of the involved parties, and does not necessarily correspond with the interpretation of a victimized individual or a perpetrator in the video coding. This leaves a discrepancy in perception and interpretation of the two data sources. These discrepancies structure how the data have been used in especially the quantitative analysis of this thesis.

Employing Latent Class Analysis

LCA is a potent statistical method for sociologists to explore systematic patterns in data and create empirical typologies, but the method also has certain limitations and considerations to keep in mind. Despite the explorative fashion of LCA, it should not be underestimated that the modelling of data is based on the variables that the researcher chooses to include in it. This denotes that it is the perspective of the researcher that shapes the outputted model and hence the results, and this thesis is no exception of this bias. I have tried to overcome this bias by selecting individual and situational characteristics to include in the model based on prior studies that suggest what factors are important for a thorough examination of bystander behaviors and their contexts.

Concerning my selection of variables in the model, I found, in the early stages of the modelling phase, that in- and excluding different variables affected both the numbers of classes and the characteristics of the classes. Excluding the NTE variable in my model made escalatory bystander behavior a characteristic of one class, which it is not in the final model. Further, a change in the distribution of the variable ‘numbers of active bystander’ resulted in a model with six classes, compared to my final model of five classes. These examples indicate the level of fragility attached to this method, where one variable can change the characteristics of a public violence typology. This sensibility of the method underlines the explorative use and further relates to the generalizability of the result. The generalizability of the typology in this thesis is limited by the sample bias and the variable bias.

The LCA model has also included individuals with missing observations on the indicator variables. In case of missing observations, the model has imputed responses based on the other variables in data. Even though this imputation is convenient because it preserves a large sample size, it also creates uncertainty about the output, which is a consideration to
take into account regarding the variables that have higher percentage of missing observations. However, the variable with most imputed observations is indirect intervention with 8 percent missing, which I assess is fairly low.

Finally, despite the contradiction to my epistemological argument to deploy LCA, it is also important to touch upon the limitation of not being able to draw conclusions about correlation and causalities based on my model. The model has given insights about patterns of bystander behavior and its contextual associations, but it has not given insights about the degree of the association within each Emergency Type. Admittedly, it is unfortunate not to be able to examine whether it is the female perpetrator and victim, the lesser probability of a NTE context or the less severe violence that causes many people are present, but only few intervenes, which is one of the associations found in the model.

Conclusion

In this thesis, I have examined the patterns and processes of active bystanders in the different contexts of public violence. This has been neglected in previous research that has a narrow understanding and focus on bystander behavior. With a mixed-methods design using video footage of real-life violence and the matching police case files, I have examined bystander behaviors in violent conflicts quantitatively and qualitatively. A LCA model was used to explore patterns of bystander behaviors and the contextual characteristics they occur in. The analysis showed five Emergency Types of violence with different behavioral, contextual and situational characteristics. The qualitative case-analysis was used to describe and explain the social and emotional micro-processes of bystander behaviors in the different patterns of violent contexts that the LCA model found. The analysis revealed the importance of social dynamics of emotions, status and group norms to the way bystanders intervene in violent incidents. The thesis aligns with an emerging branch of research on bystander behavior that seeks to broaden the notions of context and agency in the study of how and why people respond as they do to violent emergencies.
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## Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-coding and coding definition</th>
<th>Included measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Krippendorff’s alpha Missing observations (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[STATATA code]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video or police case file)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition for pre-coding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bystander behavior measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open hand gestures [open_hand_gestures]</th>
<th>The bystander displays a calming hand movement with open hands. Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-forceful touching [non_forceful_touching]</th>
<th>The bystander touches a person in a non-forceful manner. Coded binary: no (0); yes (1). Note: This action is separate from forceful actions described below (e.g., ‘Holding a person back’ or ‘Hauling a person off’).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blocking contact between conflict parties [blocking]</th>
<th>The bystander blocks a person from reaching a conflict party. Coded binary: no (0); yes (1). Note: This is typically expressed by the bystander moving directly between persons in conflict (i.e., acting as a barrier between them). The arms/hands may be used for blocking, but if force is applied to increase the distance between persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding a person back</td>
<td>The bystander holds a person back from moving further towards the conflict or conflict partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauling a person off</td>
<td>The bystander holds a person and pulls/carries that individual away from the conflict or conflict partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing</td>
<td>The bystander pushes a person away from the conflict or conflict partner in a non-aggressive manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointing and threatening gestures</td>
<td>The bystander is displaying an aggressive hand movement, typically pointing at someone in a threatening manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throw a person</td>
<td>The bystander firmly grips a person and then throws that person in an aggressive manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoving</td>
<td>The bystander shoves a person in a forceful and aggressive manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td>Note: Typically performed in a hit-like manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit</td>
<td>The bystander hits a person with either an open or closed hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several Hits</td>
<td>The bystander hits several times with either an open or closed hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Escalatory behavior**

Krippendorff’s alpha = 1.0
Missing = 0 %
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Event Code</th>
<th>Detailed Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kick [kick] (video data)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The bystander kicks a person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Several Kicks [several_kicks] (video)   |            | The bystander kicks a person.  
Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Kicking to the head [kicking_to_the_head] (video) |            | The bystander kicks a person to the head or stomps on a person's head.  
Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Violence against a person on the ground [violence_against_per_on_ground] (video) |            | The bystander physically attacks a person on the ground.  
Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Consolatory touching [consolatory_touching] (video) |            | The bystander touches a person affectionately (e.g., with a stroke, rub, hug) who has been subject to physical violence.  
Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).  
Note: Touching of the victim must serve a consolatory purpose. For example, touching a victim if raising them to their feet, or inadvertently touching a victim while handing over an item, are not examples of ‘Consolatory touching’. Rather, these acts would be defined as ‘Functional helping’, as they serve an instrumental/tangible purpose as opposed to emotional comfort.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Care proximity and attention [care_proximity_and_attention] (video) |            | The bystander calms a victim of violence by moving close to the victim and showing them their full attention.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Consoling behavior |
|                                         |            | Krippendorff’s alpha = 1.0  
Missing = 0 %                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
```
Note: This non-touching behavior must meet the following two criteria.
(1) The bystander is within an arm’s length of the victim, and stays there for more than approximately 10 seconds. If the victims of violence are lying down, the bystander should lower him of herself to the same ground level (e.g., squat down, sit next to victim).
(2) While being proximate to the victim, the bystander’s main focus of attention is on the victim.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct functional helping</strong></td>
<td>The bystander provides some kind of practical help directed to a physically harmed victim, e.g., handing a handkerchief to a bleeding victim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dir_functional_helping]</td>
<td>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical contact in the provision of functional helping</strong></td>
<td>Only relevant if 1 in ‘Direct functional helping’ above:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[phys_cont_funct_help]</td>
<td>When providing direct functional helping, it is possible that the bystander touches the victim—e.g., raising a fallen victim to his or her feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect functional helping</strong></td>
<td>The bystander assists another bystander in the provision of practical help to a physically harmed victim—e.g., going to get some paper and handing this to a bystander who then gives it to the victim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[indirect_func_help]</td>
<td>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Indirect intervention [indirect_limit_pub] (police case file) | One or more bystander tries to limit the situation’s aggravation and/or physical violence by contacting a third party, typically by calling the police or contacting a teacher. 
Coded binary: no (0); yes (1). | Indirect intervention 
Krippendorff’s alpha = 0.50 
Missing = 8 % |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bystander characteristic measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Gender [gender]** (Based on visual cues in videos and validated with police case files) | Based on the bystander’s visual appearance. 
Coded binary: male (0); female (1). | **Gender** 
Krippendorff’s alpha = 1.0 
Missing = 1,3 % |
| **Social closeness [byst_member_of_perpetrator_or_victim_gr]** (Based on visual social cues in videos and validated with police case files) | The bystander is a member of the group of the primary perpetrators and/or the group of the primary victims. ‘Primary’ perpetrators refer to the individuals who perform the most severe (and most) violence during the situation. knows at least one person who is physically victimizing someone in the conflict. We apply a minimal definition of relationship ties, which include everything from ties established the same day to family ties. 
Coded binary: no (0); yes (1). | **Socially close to antagonist** 
Alpha = 1.00 
Missing = 3,9 % |
| **Spatial proximity [spatial_proximity]** (video) | The bystander is within a 2-meters radius from where the conflict initiates. 
Coded binary: no (0); yes (1). 
Note: It is important that this distance is assessed at the exact point in time when the conflict begins; that is, before the bystander potentially begins moving in the direction to or away from the conflict. | **Close to starting point of conflict** 
Krippendorff’s alpha = 0.81 
Missing = 1,6 % |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual measures</th>
<th>Night-time economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong> [time] (police case file)</td>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What time of day does the conflict take place?</strong></td>
<td>Krippendorff’s alpha = 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note time, e.g., 23:19</td>
<td><strong>Place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Krippendorff’s alpha = 0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong> [place] (police case file)</td>
<td><strong>Intoxication of perpetrator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where does the conflict take place?</strong></td>
<td>Krippendorff’s alpha = 0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded nominally: Inside alcohol premises (e.g., bar, discotheque) (0); In front of alcohol premises (1); Shop/restaurant/kiosk (2); Train station (3); Unspecified public street (4); other (5).</td>
<td>Intoxication of victim: Krippendorff’s alpha = 0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing = 0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intoxication of perpetrator</strong> [alcohol_perpetrator]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(police case file)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicates the perpetrators’ alcohol intoxication.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Principle: Coding is based on the most intoxicated perpetrator. Coding is primarily based on the units of alcohol and, secondarily, on the police and/or the subjects’ subjective assessment of the perpetrator’s level of intoxication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded nominally: no units of alcohol (no intoxication) (0); max 5 units of alcohol (easily intoxicated) (1); 6-15 units of alcohol (visibly intoxicated) (2); 16+ units of alcohol (highly intoxicated) (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intoxication of victim</strong> [alcohol_victim]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(police case file)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicates the victims’ alcohol intoxication.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Principle: Coding is based on the most intoxicated victim. Coding is primarily based on the units of alcohol and, secondarily, on the police and/or the subjects’ subjective assessment of the victim’s level of intoxication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded nominally: no units of alcohol (no intoxication) (0); max 5 units of alcohol (easily intoxicated) (1); 6-15 units of alcohol (visibly intoxicated) (2); 16+ units of alcohol (highly intoxicated) (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect violence [respect_violence] (police case file)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course of violence has, in whole or in part, the character of being a reaction to a physical or verbal violation (ie any form of action showing lack of respect) arising in the situation or immediately preceding the situation. The violation can be imagined or real. This includes examples where the perpetrator feels that the victim has &quot;stared&quot; disrespectful on the perpetrator or his girlfriend, cases where the victim &quot;encounters&quot; the perpetrator or situations where the perpetrator feels disrespectfully treated by being denied access to a club or has been kicked out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disrespect
Krippendorff’s alpha = 0.54
Missing = 4 %

### Situational measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Several Kicks [several_kicks] (video)</th>
<th>The bystander kicks a person.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kicking to the head [kicking_to_the_head] (video)</th>
<th>The bystander kicks a person to the head or stomps on a person’s head.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violence against a person on the ground [violence_against_per_on_ground] (video)</th>
<th>The bystander physically attacks a person on the ground.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Severe violence
Krippendorff’s alpha = 1.0
Missing = 2.7 %
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Krippendorff’s alpha</th>
<th>Missing (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weapon use</strong></td>
<td>The bystander uses a weapon (e.g., a bottle, knife) against a person. Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mutual violent conflict</strong></td>
<td>Does a mutual exchange of violent actions take place during the situation. This contrasts situations where it is only one party who commits violence towards the other part. Violent actions are direct and unambiguous physical aggression, such as punches, kicks etc. Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victim's objective injuries</strong></td>
<td>The degree of injury of the victim, (with the greatest physical injury). The coding is based on a medical report/assessment of the injury to obtain an objective measure of the extent of the injury. Thus, this excludes the police's assessment of the injury as a basis for the objective code. This information is usually found in the hospital's record of injury, but it can also be coded on the basis of, for example, the court documents, if they refer to the medical assessment of the extent of the injury. Coded nominally: (0) No injury (no medical identifiable injury); (1) Minor injuries (scratches, smaller gashes (that do not need sewing or gluing) and/or visible redness/bruising. Minor injuries are generally defined as injuries requiring no treatment other than a</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>6.7 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Gender Compositions</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>standard first aid kit, where victims get painkillers, eye drops or the like; (2) Severe injuries (bone fractures, severe gashes, dental damages or unconsciousness due to violence or other serious injuries).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman assaulting woman [woman_against_woman_violence] (video)</td>
<td>The gender composition of the individuals who commit violence and who are victimized. The gender categories are mutually exclusive with the other gender variables. Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
<td>Female perpetrator and female victim</td>
<td>Krippendorff’s alpha = 0.0 (no variation) Missing = 0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman assaulting man [woman_against_man_violence] (video)</td>
<td>The gender composition of the individuals who commit violence and who are victimized. The gender categories are mutually exclusive with the other gender variables. Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman assaulting man and woman [woman_against_mixed_violence] (video)</td>
<td>The gender composition of the individuals who commit violence and who are victimized. The gender categories are mutually exclusive with the other gender variables. Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man and woman assaulting man and woman [mixed_against_mixed_violence] (video)</td>
<td>The gender composition of the individuals who commit violence and who are victimized. The gender categories are mutually exclusive with the other gender variables. Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man and woman assaulting man [mixed_against_man_violence]</td>
<td>The gender composition of the individuals who commit violence and who are victimized. The gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td>categories are mutually exclusive with the other gender variables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man and woman assaulting woman [mixed_against_woman_violence]</td>
<td>The gender composition of the individuals who commit violence and who are victimized. The gender categories are mutually exclusive with the other gender variables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man assaulting man and woman [man_against_mixed_violence]</td>
<td>The gender composition of the individuals who commit violence and who are victimized. The gender categories are mutually exclusive with the other gender variables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man assaulting woman [man_against_woman_violence]</td>
<td>The gender composition of the individuals who commit violence and who are victimized. The gender categories are mutually exclusive with the other gender variables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td>Coded binary: no (0); yes (1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bystanders [number_of_bystanders]</td>
<td>The number of bystanders present in the situation at the point when the conflict initiates. Count all bystanders visible in the footage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(video)</td>
<td>Coded as a continuous variable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Be pragmatic in this counting process; for example if a bystander steps into the camera angle immediately after the conflict begins, it is more reasonable to include this individual in the count.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of bystanders**

Krippendorff’s alpha = 0.0 (no variation)
Missing = 1.3 %
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(video)</th>
<th>Number of directly intervening bystanders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on an accumulated count of active bystanders from each case. Krippendorff’s alpha = 0.0 Missing = 0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>