[This is the post print of the manuscript accepted for publication]

From a Single Punch to Weapon Use: An Event Typology of Public Place Violence

Camilla Bank Friis, Kim Møller, Peter Ejbye-Ernst, Richard Philpot, Marie Bruvik Heinskou, Marie Rosenkrantz Lindegaard, Lasse Suonperä Liebst

Corresponding author: Lasse Suonperä Liebst, mail: lsl@soc.ku.dk

Introduction

Violence researchers have identified a range of individual-level properties (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990) and life-course trajectories (Sampson and Laub, 1995) associated with interpersonal aggression. By contrast, limited research has studied violent processes as they unfold in here-and-now situations (Katz, 1988; Schinkel, 2004). Across the key exceptions examining violence mid-event, the focus is placed on outlining generalized explanatory principles underpinning most, if not all, interpersonal violence—including, instrumental motivations (Felson and Tedeschi, 1993), emotional dominance dynamics (Collins, 2008), or opportunity structures (Cohen and Felson, 1979). As such, these theorizations tend to abstract away from the distinct features of the violent events and accordingly they offer limited insights into whether violence may be inductively classified into subtypes (Blumer, 1969). Inductive typologies are not only interesting in themselves and potentially informative for the tailoring of crime prevention strategies but are also valuable in assessing whether the explanatory theories generalize across qualitatively diverse violence-types. For example, Collins' (2008) micro-sociological theory of violence suggests that the establishment of emotional dominance is a precondition for violence. While some types of violent behavior may

support this proposition (e.g., mass atrocities, Klusemann, 2012), other types offer counter-evidence (e.g., in robberies, where resistance to dominance promotes violence, see Liebst et al., 2019).

The current study aims to develop an inductive event-typology of public place violence based on police reported incidents, and in turn consider its implications for key micro-interactional theories of violence and crime prevention practice. While there exist numerous attempts to sub-classify other forms of violence (e.g., homicides [(Salfati, 2000)] or sexual burglaries [(Pedneault et al., 2012)]; sexual assaults [(Tutenges et al., 2020)]), the attempts to develop typologies of public place violence are rare. The most extensive treatment of public violence is found within the field of criminology of place. Here, it is reported that public violence tends to be concentrated in a few micro-places (Weisburd, 2015), however, without providing much qualitative insight into the nature, and potential subtypes, of the violence within these hot spots. In contrast, the literature on street culture provides insights into the violence that occurs in typically marginalized and disadvantaged urban neighborhoods (Anderson, 1999; Ilan, 2017; Kalkan, 2021). This research has shown that violence is used as a means to gain respect in everyday life among especially young men engaged in criminal activities.

Overall, across literatures, public place violence is often closely associated with night-time economy violence, and is as such understood as a relatively uniform phenomenon involving disrespect encounters between alcohol-intoxicated male strangers (Wikström, 1995; Homel et al., 1992; Block and Block, 1995). One study that investigates the characteristics of violence in the night-time economy is Graham et al. (2011). This study details four types of violence motives: gaining compliance, restoring justice, attaining a favorable social identity, and pursuing excitement. However, this research works deductively to identify types of motives in observed barroom fights, rather than inductively examine types of violence in different public place settings. While this deductive approach allows the authors to identify motives already detailed in the literature, it also

runs the risk of overlooking new types of violence that remain undescribed in the sparse literature on the subject.

A rare attempt to detail a typology of public place violence is Weenink (2015), who suggests a two-fold distinction between events of "contesting dominance" and "performing badness." In line with Goffman (1967) and Luckenbill's (1977) link between character contests and physical aggression, contesting dominance is described as violence used by conflicting antagonists as a means to settle superiority; this subtype broadly aligns with the aforementioned view of public violence as disrespect encounters. On the other hand, performance of badness involves, as initially described by Katz (1988), cruel violent acts that demonstrate the perpetrator's power over a weaker victim. The exhaustiveness of this two-fold typology may be limited, however, given that Weenink (2015) relied on police-reported events of youth violence, thus excluding unreported cases, the wider adult population and most notably barroom related aggressions (Graham and Wells, 2003; Miller et al., 2016).

Another attempt is Tutenges and Sandberg (2023) who propose a four-legged typology for violence known to people involved in street life and crime. Based on ethnographic data, this typology covers violence related to respect, business, drinking, and family. The authors identify respect-violence as the most common and important type, evolved around either gaining, diminishing, or reclaiming respect in a masculinity-based street culture. Business violence has an instrumental manner to secure money whereas drunken violence is suggested to be the product of mental and physical impairment with conflicts unconsciously escalating to violence. Finally, the authors describe family violence as a tabooed type of domestic violence known in street culture that evolves around punishment and discipline, which can "spill out into the streets" (Tutenges & Sandberg, 2023, p. 9). While this typology offers broader variations in types of violence that are a part of the street culture, its generalizability is constrained to be the experiences of largely young

men with immigrant background in a specific cultural context. These men are, in the terms of Randall Collins (2008), part of the violent few, who are experienced with violence and follow different types of situational routes in violent encounters. While thus informative, it seems important to investigate how these types of violent encounters translate to other groups.

In an open-ended exploration of the number and nature of public violence event-types, there should be given equal attention to the diverse social factors that may constitute each type. Broadly considered, violence may—as other types of human behavior (Bandura, 1978)—be attributed to an interplay between three general factors, the "personal" (e.g., motivations, relationship ties), "environmental" (e.g., people presence, location), and "behavioral" (e.g., violent actions and interactions). Research has identified a wide range of explanations for violence that fall under one of these factors. First, regarding the influence of personal factors, studies have, for example, associated public violence with group relations (Levine et al., 2012), age (Miller et al., 2016), gender (Hochstetler et al., 2014), alcohol intoxication (Pedersen et al., 2016), and disrespect motives (Cohen et al., 1996). Compared to the latter lapse in self-control, premediated revenge motives is arguably more typical in pre-modern societies (Boehm, 1984), and developed societies are further characterized by norms prohibiting the sensation-seeking excitement of violence (Elias and Dunning, 1986). Second, with respect to environmental factors, nighttime-economy settings are as mentioned well-known hot spots of public violence. The emergence of such hot spots has, for example, been linked to alcohol availability (Gmel et al., 2016), and to the high people density of these places, which creates opportunities for social tensions (Graham et al., 2006), raises the stakes of public insults and violent responses (Felson, 1978), and weakens the moral sensibility of those present (Milgram, 1970, but see Reicher et al. 1995).

Finally, behaviorally considered, public violence is typically performed with hits by fists and kicks and this does typically not lead to severe victim injuries (Boström, 1997). This relative

low severity may be due to the widespread occurrence of de-escalatory bystander intervention in public conflict (Philpot et al., 2019a), and to the circumstance that barroom fighters often act in accordance with a cultural honor code that restricts the use of excessive violence (Copes et al., 2013). According to Weenink (2015), severe acts of violence tends to be more common in events where the antagonists are contesting each other's dominance than in cases of performance of performing badness against a weak victim. Further, other factors that have been associated with more severe violence include group fights (Farrington, 1998), victims falling to the ground (Weenink, 2014), and the presence of retaliation motives and aggressive victim actions (Felson and Steadman, 1983). In the current study, we conceptualize motives as a personal factor that may drive the violence while recognizing that motives could also be operationalized as behavioral factors. A central difference between behavioral factors and motives is, however, that motives are more tied to the subjective perception of a situation, while behaviors are observable by outsiders. Two situations can look alike but be motivated by completely different things.

In this article, we study how a combination of personal, environmental, and behavioral factors characterizes a typology based on 500 public violence events reported to the police in Copenhagen, Denmark. We employ a latent class analysis (LCA), which is a statistical method to classify social phenomena into types, based on the "latent" social patterns observed across a set of discrete variables (Hagenaars and McCutcheon, 2002). We identify five types of violent incidents, which we name 'Disrespect in NTE,' 'Severe NTE,' 'Ingroup revenge,' 'Weapon use,' and 'Disrespect in everyday life.' We use single cases to demonstrate the distinct pattern of factors that characterizes each of the five types—thus demonstrating the categorization of events and improving the qualitative understanding of how violent incidents with class-specific characteristics unfold. Taken together, our typology outlines the common features of different personal, environmental, and behavioral factors that characterize five types of public violence in Denmark.

Methods

Data

Data[1] was collected in 2015 and included police reported cases of violence where a charge was raised for either simple violence (Penal Code §244), aggravated violence (§245), attempted murder (§246), or homicide (§237). Specifically, Copenhagen Police Department provided us access to all closed cases from the district of Copenhagen between 2010 and 2012, and study was approved by the Danish Data Protection Agency (ref no: 2015-57-0125-0026). The obtained raw sample comprised 933 cases of which 500 were selected for coding. Given our interest in public space violence, we first excluded cases, which did not take place in a public setting. Public settings included freely accessible outdoor areas (such as public streets, plazas, or parks) as well as semi-public spaces to which members of the public have partial accessibility (e.g., paid entry bars, accessible workspaces, entry corridors and communal spaces in apartments). Further, it should be noted that the data is slightly oversampled on juvenile cases (as to allow for subsample analysis).

Police case files offer a detailed source of information about violence situations, as illustrated by prior work relying on this type of data (Weenink, 2014; Felson and Steadman, 1983). For example, the police case files of the current study typically comprised detailed interviews with perpetrators, victims, and witnesses; police officers' descriptions of what they observed at the scene; pictures of the scene; A&E medical assessments of injuries; all juridical information concerning the case (including the court summary of the case and sentence, descriptions of criminal history, the communication between lawyers, etc.). Further, in incidents of severe violence, the cases often included in-depth social and psychological assessments of the perpetrator.

[1] Data were collected as part of the wider project on street violence, in which several outputs rely on parts of this data (Bloch et al., 2018; Heinskou & Liebst, 2017; Liebst et al., 2018). These outputs apply other methods and/or address other research questions than the current paper.

Prior to data coding, we developed a detailed codebook specifying the situational and individual properties to be coded from the case files. The codebook was informed by previous research on public violence (Weenink, 2014) and extensive qualitative assessments of a subset of cases. The final codebook comprised more than hundred codes, from which 17 variables were constructed for the current study (see Measures below). In developing the codebook, we faced several substantial considerations. First, we had to address the circumstance that the police case file does not record the *absence* of events or properties—e.g., a police case file will note when a weapon is present, but will not note that it is not present. While absence of evidence is typically not evidence of absence, it is also reasonable to take the absence of proof as a positive indication of non-occurrence in cases where it is known that a qualified investigator would have noted the event if present (Stephens, 2011). Following this (Bayesian based) logic, for each variable included in the analysis, we decided whether the non-recording of an event should be coded as absence or missing. Another coding consideration was that the police case files may include conflicting accounts between the participants (e.g., who started the conflict), which makes it difficult to assess what happened. In these cases, we gave precedence to the evidence provided by the individual defined as the victim by the police. Finally, it should be noted that sequences of events where the same perpetrators are involved in several subsequent incidents (sometimes only minutes apart) are defined as separate situations.

A team of 12 student assistants coded the 500 police case files over a period of 8 months. All coders worked together in pairs, to ensure that each individual had a partner with whom they could immediately confide in when handling potentially disturbing content (all students also participated in, and had available, trauma counselling sessions). Coding pairs were rotated frequently in order to minimize the development of local interpretations of the codebook definitions. First, each pair member coded the police case file independently. Next, the pair

members compared their codes, corrected coding errors, and settled areas of disagreement. All cases, except a small subset of data, was double coded following this procedure.

The double coding procedure allowed tests in interrater agreement between members of coding pairs. Cohen's kappa (hereafter κ) was applied as interrater agreement statistics and levels of agreement was assessed with Landis and Koch's (1977) widely applied thresholds (fair ~ 21, moderate ~ 41, substantial ~ 61, almost perfect ~ 81). As a minimum, all included variables had a moderate interrater agreement, with a majority having an almost perfect agreement score—see below Measures section.

Measures

We included the following personal factors in the model. *Perpetrator age* captures whether at least one perpetrator was younger than 18 years or that all perpetrators are at least 18 years (κ = .82). *Perpetrator gender* captures whether there is at least one female perpetrator in the situation (κ = .95). *Perpetrator-victim familiarity* distinguishes between whether or not any of the involved perpetrators and victims know each prior to the event (κ = .83). *Perpetrator alcohol intoxication* distinguishes between whether perpetrators have consumed alcohol or not (κ = .94). *Disrespect motive* indicates whether the violent incident is associated with physical or verbal insults enacted in or immediately prior to the situation (κ = .56). This includes the justifications of real or imagined offenses such as the offender thinking that the victim bumped into the offender, stared at their partner, or the offender being denied access to a bar. *Revenge motive* captures whether the violence is directed at retaliating against a victim (κ = .67). Note that the wrongdoing that is retaliated should have occurred prior to the violent situation; otherwise, the motive is defined as disrespect-related. *Sensation-seeking motive* indicates whether the violence is performed as amusement, as violence for the sake of violence (κ = .52). Please note, that the three motives are not mutually exclusive and one

violent incident can thus be motivated by multiple motives. *Premeditated* captures whether the assault was planned prior to the violent event or not (κ = .58).

Next, we included two environmental items. *Night-time drinking setting* captures whether the event occurred in a night-time economy context or in some other setting. Night-time economy contexts were defined as situations taking place inside or in front of an alcohol premise (e.g., bar or night club), or between 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. on weekends (κ = .91). *People density* distinguishes between events that takes place in a low density setting with 10 or fewer bystanders present and in high density setting with 11 or more persons present (κ = .43).

Finally, we include the following behavioral items. *Escalatory victim participation* distinguishes between whether or not a victim performs verbally or physically escalatory acts as a response to the offender's actions (α = .49). Examples of escalatory victim behavior are a victim saying in a threatening manner that it will have consequences if the offender continues or a victim responding with violence such as hitting the offender. Note that self-defensive victim behaviors or statements trying to de-escalate the situation are excluded from this definition. *Group violence* distinguishes between whether there is a single or multiple perpetrators involved in the incident (κ = .91). *Number of punches/kicks* captures whether there are performed no kicks or punches, one kick or punch, or several kicks or punches during the event (κ = .86). *Violence to fallen victim* captures whether the event involves the enactment of violence towards a victim lying on the ground, typically involving that the victim is kicked to the head (κ = .88). *Weapon use* captures whether any violence is performed with a weapon (κ = .88). Weapons include e.g. knives, bats, and guns, as well as other objects such as billiard balls, bottles, and chairs when these are used to inflict harm. *Severe injuries* captures whether or not a victim in the incident suffers any major physical injuries, such as bone fractures, lacerations requiring medical attention, or is knocked unconscious (κ = .84).

Analytical approach

Data was coded into discrete items in order to perform a LCA, which was estimated in Stata 15 using the user-written "LCA Stata Plugin," with imputation of missing values (Lanza et al., 2015). As a rule of thumb, Finch and Bronk (2011) suggest that a sample size of around 500—as in the current sample—is typically sufficient for an accurate LCA model identification. Further, following the recommendation of Wurpts and Geiser (2014) that the inclusion of larger numbers of items tends to improve LCA model estimations, we were not overly restrictive in limiting the number of items included. Finally, as statistical fit indices to inform the decision on how many classes to include, we initially applied Bayesian information criterion (BIC), and the selected class-solution was then validated against bootstrap likelihood-ratio tests, which is considered the most accurate fit statistics for LCA models (Tein et al., 2013).

Besides the benefits as a statistical tool, Bazeley (2017) suggests that a LCA approach is well-equipped to be combined with qualitative analysis elements. Thus, in addition to deciding on the number of classes using the aforementioned fit indices, we also informed this choice by assessing whether each estimated class resonates with how qualitative single cases describe the violent situation. In analyzing the results, we identify the items most probable in each class relative to the other classes and name the estimated classes based on items that we deem characterize the class. In addition to this, we illustrate how each of the selected classes manifests themselves in single-case descriptions. This triangulation of latent class estimation and single-case evaluations agree with Scheff's (1997) suggestion that validity of social science findings is improved by combining quantitative analysis of greater "wholes" with qualitative interpretations of their smallest "parts." Technically, the single cases were selected by estimating which class is the best match for each case in data. Thus, each case illustrates (some of) the common features of the respective class and provides qualitative insights into how such a violent event may unfold. Notably, the single cases may also include additional features that are not characteristic for the class that they are

selected to illustrate. Taken together, the analytical process involves a statistical model estimation of the coded items and a categorization of how the estimated classes present distinct patterns of personal, environmental, and behavioral factors that characterize violent incidents.

Results

Table 1 shows that the violent events of the current data disproportionally involve a single (72%) alcohol intoxicated (72%) perpetrator, who is male (90%), older than 18 years old (86%), and is a stranger to the victim (67%). Furthermore, the events typically occur in a low-density context (77%), and about half of the incidents takes place in a night-time drinking setting (58%). The disrespect motive (65%) is more prevalent in data than the sensation seeking (10%) and revenge (17%) motives, and violence is rarely premediated (6%).

Table 1.
Descriptive statistics.

	%	Total
Personal factors		
Perpetrator younger than 18	14.0	500
Female perpetrator	10.2	500
Perpetrator familiar with victim	32.7	496
Perpetrator alcohol intoxicated	72.3	451
Disrespect motive	64.7	476
Revenge motive	16.7	485
Sensation-seeking motive	10.1	467
Premeditated	5.8	464
Environmental factors		
Night-time drinking setting	57.8	497
High people density	22.9	477
Behavioral factors		
Escalatory victim	54.8	487
Group violence	28.1	499
Kicks and punches		
One kick or punch	22.0	500
More than one kick or punch	54.8	500
Violence to fallen victim	28.3	498

Weapon use	22.0	499
Severe injuries	36.6	484

In approximately half of the cases, the victim behaves escalatory (55%) and is harmed by several kicks or punches (53%). A minority of cases involves violence towards a fallen victim (28%) or weapon use (22%), and about one-third of incidents result in severe victim injuries (37%). Taken together, the violent events are largely characterized by occurring in a setting of alcohol with adult male strangers who start a conflict revolving around respect. Here, the victim typically contributes to the escalation of conflict and is often exposed to multiple acts of violence. Following this descriptive analysis, we will use a LCA to identify distinct types of violent incidents in this data.

In deciding on the number of classes, the Bayesian information criterion initially indicated that a 4-class model was the best-fitting model. However, the bootstrap likelihood-ratio tests suggested a solution with as much as 9 classes. It is common that LCA fit indices does not converge on one single model (Nylund et al., 2007), and in deciding on a solution, we took the 4-class model as baseline and then considered whether addition of further classes was qualitatively meaningful and improved the overall interpretability of the model. In doing so, we ultimately decided on a 5-class solution (see Table 2), which essentially adds one additional class, without changing the overall pattern of the 4-class solution.

Table 2.
Latent class analysis of public violence

	Class 1 *Disrespect in NTE*	Class2 *Severe NTE*	Class3 *Ingroup revenge*	Class4 *Weapon use*	Class5 *Disrespect in everyday life*
Proportion in sample	46%	25%	8%	8%	12%
Personal factors					
Perpetrator younger than 18	**0.03**	**0.18**	0.47	**0.08**	**0.27**
Female perpetrator	**0.09**	**0.08**	**0.23**	**0.13**	**0.11**

Perpetrator familiar with victim	**0.21**	**0.18**	**0.92**	0.61	0.47
Perpetrator alcohol intoxicated	**0.89**	**0.96**	**0.13**	0.65	**0.01**
Disrespect motive	**0.77**	0.58	**0.10**	0.38	**0.83**
Revenge motive	**0.04**	**0.08**	**0.87**	0.49	**0.16**
Sensation-seeking motive	**0.02**	0.33	**0.08**	**0.02**	**0.04**
Premeditated	**0.00**	**0.02**	0.50	**0.24**	**0.00**
Environmental factors					
Night-time drinking setting	**0.76**	**0.77**	**0.04**	0.34	**0.01**
High people density	**0.21**	0.33	**0.12**	**0.16**	**0.22**
Behavioral factors					
Escalatory victim	0.63	0.52	**0.17**	**0.30**	**0.73**
Group violence	**0.06**	**0.75**	0.57	**0.00**	**0.12**
One kick or punch	0.39	**0.03**	**0.11**	**0.00**	**0.21**
More than one kick or punch	0.36	**0.97**	**0.83**	**0.02**	0.53
Violence to fallen victim	**0.07**	**0.77**	0.48	**0.04**	**0.11**
Weapon use	**0.18**	**0.16**	**0.14**	**0.93**	**0.09**
Severe injuries	0.32	0.58	**0.05**	**0.71**	**0.09**

Note. $N = 500$. Item probabilities ≥ 0.70 and ≤ 0.30 are made bold to indicate a high degree of within-class homogeneity.

Class 1 accounts for approximately half of the sample (46%) and is characterized by its absence of premeditated (0%), and high probability of disrespect motives (77%) and combined with alcohol intoxication (89%). This class is also characterized by one perpetrator (6 % are group violence) and a relatively low probability of severe violence (7%). Compared to the other classes, this class involves a low probability of the perpetrator having social ties to the victim (21%). We name the class 'Disrespect in NTE' given its combined features of violence motivated by disrespect in a night-time economy setting relative to the other classes.

The following case illustrates 'Disrespect in NTE,' using brackets to highlight factors that characterize the class in addition to who is victim and perpetrator:

Claus (adult perpetrator) and Sofie are at a club together in the early hours of a Saturday morning (night-time drinking setting). At one point, Sofie is approached by Tom (victim),

who is there with Simon (victim) and some of their colleagues. Sofie feels that Tom forces his attention on her and she tries to reject him several times (disrespect motive). After a little while, Claus walks over to Tom and announces that Sofie is his girlfriend, and he should move away from her. The two men start having a quarrel, and Claus kicks Tom's leg, as to push him away. Simon, a colleague of Tom, notices the incident and approaches. Claus asks if they want to settle it outside, which Simon declines. Before fleeing the scene, Claus grabs Simon's collar and punches him to the face.

Class 2 accounts for one fourth of the sample and is distinguished from the other classes with high probabilities of multiple kicks or punches (97%), performed by several perpetrators (75%) often towards a victim fallen to the ground (77%). Given the severe violence and the high probability of its occurrence in drinking settings (77%), we name this class 'Severe NTE.' While not a characteristic, we note that this class has the highest probability of a sensation-seeking motive of the model (33%).The following case is an example of 'Severe NTE':

Two colleagues Caspar and Peter (victims) are stopping by a hotdog stand on their way home from a night out (night-time drinking setting). Joachim, his sister and two friends (all perpetrators) are at the stand, complaining loudly about the long wait to get food. Peter exchange words with Joachim, possibly about this misbehavior. After both groups have left the hotdog stand, the victims, Peter and Caspar, once again run into the perpetrator group in front of a nearby ATM. Peter makes contact and asks them if there is a problem and Joachim replies "no, do you have a problem?" Then, Joachim and one of his friends attack Peter with several punches to the face and body (more than one kick or punch). Joachim's sister then pulls Peter to ground and the two men then start kicking him (group violence). In the meanwhile, Caspar has also fallen to the ground where he is being kicked several

times to the head by the fourth perpetrator (violence to fallen victim). Eventually, bystanders are approaching, and the group of perpetrators leave the scene. Peter has swellings on his forehead and cheeks, while Caspar has several severe injuries, including dental damage and a laceration.

Class 3 accounts for 8% of the sample and is characterized by the high probability of perpetrator-victim familiarity (92%) and revenge motivated violence (87%). For this reason, we call this class 'Ingroup revenge.' Further, the class is characterized by several kicks or punches (83%), few severe injuries (5%), and by taking place in other settings than the night-time economy (4%). Despite not being a sufficiently high probability to characterize the class, we note that this class has the highest prevalence of adolescent perpetrators (47%), as it is also the case in the following case example:

Maja (victim) and Christine (perpetrator) are both 14 years old (perpetrator younger than 18) and go to the same school. They are friends (perpetrator familiar with victim) who sometimes fall out, and a while back Maja had spoken ill about Christine's mother. The school had interfered in the conflict and mediated between the two girls to settle the dispute. A Tuesday afternoon at school (not night-time drinking setting), Christine approaches Maja and tries to convince her to go to a nearby park with her and two other friends. In the park, Christine confronts Maja with having lied and spread rumors (revenge motive) and then puts Maja in a headlock, forcing her to the ground. She then kicks her several times (more than one kick or punch). One of the two friends also starts kicking Maja, until the other friend intervenes and pulls her away. Maja gets back on her feet and walks over to a woman passing by, and then asks if she can escort her get back to the school.

Class 4 accounts for 8% of the sample and stands out with its high probability of weapon use (93%) by a perpetrator (0%) and correspondingly severe victim injuries (71%). We name this class 'Weapon use.' Moreover, the class is distinguished by the absence of other acts of violence (0%). The case below illustrates this class:

> *On a summer afternoon, where Marie is outside in the courtyard of the residence where she lives together with her husband Kurt (perpetrator). Sten (victim), who is intoxicated and also lives in the building, appears in the courtyard. Marie is not on good terms with Sten, and a year ago there was an incident where he slapped her husband Kurt in the face. Marie and Sten start having a quarrel, and at one point, Marie calls her husband who soon after shows up with an iron pipe. Kurt hits Sten several times to the head with the pipe (weapon use), resulting in a lesion, several lacerations, and blood pools under the skin (severe injuries). Neighbors start yelling from their apartments and a man runs to the scene and stops Kurt.*

Class 5 accounts for 12% of the sample and is characterized by its absence of premeditated violence (0%), disrespect motives (83%) and typically involve one perpetrator (12% group violence)—similar to the pattern found in class 1. By comparison, however, class 5 is distinguished by not taking place in an alcohol setting (1%) and by a victim that performs escalatory acts (73%). We name this class 'Disrespect in everyday life,' and depicts it with the case:

> *It is a Friday morning and Johannes (victim) is on his way to work (not night-time drinking setting). He is standing at the sidewalk and watches another pedestrian cross the road as a taxi approaches. The taxi driver (perpetrator) stops his car close to pedestrian, who becomes upset and starts shouting and swinging his briefcase at the driver. The confrontation escalates and the taxi driver exits the taxi, and while approaching the*

pedestrian, he yells "do you have a problem?" (disrespect motive). Johannes and another bystander now intervene and the conflict calms down. The driver walks back to his taxi, and Johannes then says, "fuck you, give it a break" (escalatory victim). The driver hears this, turns around, runs towards Johannes and hits him several times in the face. Johannes tries to push and kick the driver away, and eventually the driver stops, walks back to his taxi and drives off.

Taken together, the five classes illustrate distinct types of violent incidents that are characterized by different personal, environmental, and behavioral factors. The single cases illustrate how these factors unfold in real-life events.

Discussion

While it is well-described that public place violence tends to cluster in night-time economy hot spots, little is known about what other types of violent events that take place in public. The current paper explored this by developing an inductive typology of public place violence. Our findings confirmed the common prevalence of a night-time economy related event-type (class 1), characterized by disrespect encounters unfolding between alcohol intoxicated male strangers as documented in previous research (Cohen et al., 1996; Graham & Wells, 2003; Hochstetler et al., 2014; Miller et al., 2016; Pedersen et al., 2016). The finding of this class resonates broadly with what Weenink describes as contesting dominance violence and the type of violence that Graham et al. (2011) relates to the motivation of claiming a social identity. The subtype, to some extent, also resonates with the drunken violence type identified by Sandberg and Tutenges (2023), whose distinction, however, does not include a contestation of respect. Further, we found one subtype, class 2, that resembles performing badness as described by Weenink (2015). Here, violence is

enacted in an excessive manner, and the cruelness of these acts corresponds to the finding that sensation-seeking motives—violence for the sake of violence—are disproportionally more common in this sub-type (though not frequent enough to characterize the class). The link between excessive violence and sensation-seeking contrasts with Graham et al.'s (2011) behavioral indicators of excitement motives in barroom settings, operationalized as low-level types of aggression such as rebelliousness or playful aggression.

In the analysis, we furthermore identified a type of violence (class 3) that is characterized by intra-group violence performed with several hits and kicks, yet without resulting in severe injuries. This somewhat paradoxical pattern may be ascribed to the overrepresentation of adolescent individuals with less physical strength to inflict injuries. It is also possible that the violence is performed in a more regulated, or even symbolic, manner within this class, because it is targeted someone the perpetrator knowns. This interpretation resonates with previous research on how intragroup violence is regulated (Levine et al., 2012). We also found a type of violent encounters (class 4) that is distinguished by weapon use, and high levels of victim injuries. The absence of other violent acts in this class suggests that the use of a weapon supersedes the use of the perpetrator's body as an instrument for violence. Research has shown that violence is motivated by respect in street culture (Kalkan, 2021; Tutenges & Sandberg, 2023). In line with existing research, we found that this also motivates violence in night-time economy settings in class 1. Based on a qualitative evaluation of the LCA result, we identified an event-type (class 5) that—similar to class 1—is linked to disrespect, but does not take place in a night-time drinking setting. This suggests that disrespect motivated violence is not endemic for the night-time drinking setting. Instead, this class is linked to insults and disrespect encounters arising as part of everyday routines (Ejbye-Ernst et al., 2020; Emerson, 2015).

Besides evidencing the multitude of expressions of public place violence, our LCA results indicate that the event-types may hardly be attributed a single source—whether personal, environmental, or behavioral. Rather, the classes and their distinctiveness manifest themselves through the coexistence of multiple factors. This questions the explanatory ambitions of micro-interactional theory of violence, including Collins' (2008) proposition that all violence is propelled by the situational establishment of emotional dominance, without much influence from motivation. This view is insufficient to understand the two disrespect related subtypes (class 1 and 5), in which the violence is instigated by the perpetrator's perception of facing a *challenged* emotional dominance, such as a victim contesting the will of the perpetrator. Indeed, these classes (and in fact the majority of cases) often involve a victim that partakes in some escalatory manner. This result is in line with evidence showing that violence typically unfold through sequences of mutual provocation and aggression (Baumeister, 1997; Block, 1981), and as such with a theoretical view that highlights the importance of instrumental perpetrator motivations in interpersonal violence (Felson, 2009; Felson and Tedeschi, 1993). The findings of this study thus seem to support a multi-pronged approach to understanding violent encounters that draws on information about the situational circumstances, personal characteristics and motives of the involved parties.

Limitations

The current paper has limitations that warrants consideration. It should be acknowledged that the explorative nature of the current study implies an elevated risk of confusing data noise as signal (Cumming, 2014). Stressing this concern is the circumstance some of the presented LCA results hinges of partially arbitrary data and modellings decisions (Steegen et al., 2016), such as the number of items included or whether we apply statistical and/or qualitative criteria to decide the number of classes. Ideally, future research should seek to verify the presented typology using, for example, a confirmatory LCA approach.

Several limitations relate to the use of police case files. Given that the current dataset only include police-reported incidents, data and the corresponding LCA model results are most likely biased towards the more severe cases (i.e., of interest to the police), while the less serious events are underrepresented (Tarling and Morris, 2010). As such, it is plausible that a more representable sample would identify additional types of violent events than those reported in the current study. Another limitation related to the use of police files is that certain kinds of "street" violence might be underrepresented. Previous research has argued that this kind of violence typically is performed in-group between individuals who do not "snitch" to the police (Kalkan, 2021). Adding to this, it remains unknown to what extent our results generalize beyond the Danish context, which is characterized by high social cohesion, equality, and overall low rates of violent crime (Elgar and Aitken, 2010). Specifically, our data is collected from Copenhagen, characteristically distinct by its wealth, multi culture, and population number relative to other cities in Denmark. Here, people come from outside the city at the weekend to go out and enjoy the night-time economy.

As such, the current data contains very few incidents of gang- and gun-related violence, which is a distinct and well-described type of urban public violence in, for example, an American or South African context (Lindegaard, 2017; Fagan and Wilkinson, 1998; Anderson, 1999). Another limitation of the study is the somewhat dated nature of the empirical material. The collected material describes violent cases from up to 2012 and is thus more than a decade old. This means that the typology does not encompass new developments in violent encounters that have happened in the last decade. While we do not think that this invalidates the results of the analysis, further research is necessary to investigate any potential changes that have happened in the meantime.

Adding to these issues, it is questionable how reliably police cases capture the micro-situational details of how the violent events unfolded. To a wide extent, police case files rely on investigative interviews, which are known to elicit unreliable information of the actual events (Vrij

et al., 2014; Jerolmack and Khan, 2014). Although the case files also contain more objective validating information (e.g., pictures of hand injuries to assess who was hit and who was hitting), it is recommended that future research conducts video analysis of violent events, as this method is increasingly recognized as the gold standard for assessing interpersonal behavior (Gilmore and Adolph, 2017), including violence in public settings (Philpot et al., 2019b).

Policy implications

Our findings may inform crime preventive strategies and recommendations. First, in line with the argument that victims may play an escalatory role, it should be appreciated that they may hold, at least some, agency to shape the encounters (Bandura, 1989). As such, victims may be able to adopt conflict management strategies, including attempt to withdraw from the encounter (Black, 1990), or by using submission displays, which (contrary to Collins' view) most probable is a universal behavioral way to minimize victimization risks (Martens et al., 2012). Second, bystanders may be mobilized as a readily available crime preventive resource, especially in crowded night-time settings (Levine et al., 2012). Specifically, evidence suggests that bystander intervention is commonplace, helpful, and rarely dangerous for the intervener in night-time economy settings (Liebst et al., 2018a; Levine et al., 2011; Philpot et al., 2019a)—yet, crime preventive agencies are sometime hesitant in recommending bystander intervention in public violence (Liebst et al., 2018b).

Third, our findings regarding the subtypes located in night-time drinking settings (class 1 and 2) confirms a key assumption in situational crime prevention strategies, namely that violence concentrate in these areas due to the presence of opportunity structures (Clarke, 1995; Cohen and Felson, 1979). These include the availability of alcohol and intoxicated strangers, between whom tensions and in turn violence may arise (Graham, 2009). As such, it seems plausible that violent events related to the night-time based classes may be targeted, for example, by shortening the open-hours of alcohol establishments (Sanchez-Ramirez and Voaklander, 2018), or by adopting hot spot

policing practices (Braga et al., 2014). Such initiatives, it should be added, needs to be balanced against the inherent value of lively urban places that thrive with recreational opportunities and crowdedness (Liebst, 2015; Jacobs, 1961).

References

Anderson E. (1999) *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city,* New York: WW Norton & Company.

Bandura A. (1978) The self system in reciprocal determinism. *American Psychologist* 33: 344.

Bandura A. (1989) Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist* 44: 1175.

Baumeister RF. (1997) *Evil: Inside human violence and cruelty,* New York: W.H. Freeman.

Bazeley P. (2017) *Integrating analyses in mixed methods research*: Sage.

Black D. (1990) The elementary forms of conflict management. *New directions in the study of justice, law, and social control.* Springer, 43-69.

Block R. (1981) Victim-offender dynamics in violent crime. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology (1973-)* 72: 743-761.

Block RL and Block CR. (1995) Space, place and crime: Hot spot areas and hot places of liquor-related crime. *Crime and place* 4: 145-184.

Blumer H. (1969) *Symbolic Interaction: Perspective and Method. Englewood Cliffs,* Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall.

Boehm C. (1984) *Blood revenge: The enactment and management of conflict in Montenegro and other tribal societies*: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Boström L. (1997) Injury panorama and medical consequences for 1158 persons assaulted in the central part of Stockholm, Sweden. *Archives of orthopaedic and trauma surgery* 116: 315-320.

Braga AA, Papachristos AV and Hureau DM. (2014) The effects of hot spots policing on crime: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Justice Quarterly* 31: 633-663.

Clarke RV. (1995) Situational crime prevention. *Crime and justice* 19: 91-150.

Cohen D, Nisbett RE, Bowdle BF, et al. (1996) Insult, aggression, and the southern culture of honor: An "experimental ethnography". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70: 945-959.

Cohen LE and Felson M. (1979) Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*: 588-608.

Collins R. (2008) *Violence: A micro-sociological theory,* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Copes H, Hochstetler A and Forsyth CJ. (2013) Peaceful warriors: Codes for violence among adult male bar fighters. *Criminology* 51: 761-794.

Cumming G. (2014) The new statistics: Why and how. *Psychological Science* 25: 7-29.

Elgar FJ and Aitken N. (2010) Income inequality, trust and homicide in 33 countries. *European Journal of Public Health* 21: 241-246.

Elias N and Dunning E. (1986) Quest for Excitement. Sport and Leisure in the Civilizing Process. Oxford: Blackwell.

Fagan J and Wilkinson DL. (1998) Guns, youth violence, and social identity in inner cities. *Crime and justice* 24: 105-188.

Farrington DP. (1998) Predictors, causes, and correlates of male youth violence. *Crime and justice* 24: 421-475.
Felson RB. (1978) Aggression as impression management. *Social Psychology*: 205-213.
Felson RB. (2009) Is violence natural, unnatural, or rational? *The British journal of sociology* 60: 577-585.
Felson RB and Steadman HJ. (1983) Situational factors in disputes leading to criminal violence. *Criminology* 21: 59-74.
Felson RB and Tedeschi JT. (1993) *Aggression and violence: Social interactionist perspectives*: American Psychological Association.
Finch WH and Bronk KC. (2011) Conducting confirmatory latent class analysis using M plus. *Structural Equation Modeling* 18: 132-151.
Gilmore RO and Adolph KE. (2017) Video can make behavioural science more reproducible. *Nature Human Behavior* 1.
Gmel G, Holmes J and Studer J. (2016) Are alcohol outlet densities strongly associated with alcohol‐related outcomes? A critical review of recent evidence. *Drug and alcohol review* 35: 40-54.
Goffman E. (1967) *Interaction ritual: essays on face-to-face interaction,* Oxford: Aldine.
Gottfredson MR and Hirschi T. (1990) *A general theory of crime,* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Graham K. (2009) They fight because we let them! Applying a situational crime prevention model to barroom violence. *Drug and alcohol review* 28: 103-109.
Graham K, Bernards S, Osgood DW, et al. (2006) Bad nights or bad bars? Multi‐level analysis of environmental predictors of aggression in late‐night large‐capacity bars and clubs. *Addiction* 101: 1569-1580.
Graham K and Wells S. (2003) 'Somebody's gonna get their head kicked in tonight!'Aggression among young males in bars—a question of values? *British Journal of Criminology* 43: 546-566.
Hagenaars JA and McCutcheon AL. (2002) *Applied latent class analysis*: Cambridge University Press.
Hochstetler A, Copes H and Forsyth CJ. (2014) The fight: Symbolic expression and validation of masculinity in working class tavern culture. *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 39: 493-510.
Homel R, Tomsen S and Thommeny J. (1992) Public drinking and violence: Not just an alcohol problem. *Journal of Drug Issues* 22: 679-697.
Jacobs J. (1961) *The death and life of great American cities,* New York: Random House.
Jerolmack C and Khan S. (2014) Talk is cheap: Ethnography and the attitudinal fallacy. *Sociological methods & research* 43: 178-209.
Katz J. (1988) Seductions of crime: Moral and sensual attractions in doing evil.
Klusemann S. (2012) Massacres as process: A micro-sociological theory of internal patterns of mass atrocities. *European Journal of Criminology* 9: 468-480.
Landis JR and Koch GG. (1977) The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *biometrics*: 159-174.
Lanza ST, Dziak JJ, Huang L, et al. (2015) LCA Stata plugin users' guide (Version 1.2). *University Park: The Methodology Center, Penn State*.
Levine M, Lowe R, Best R, et al. (2012) 'We police it ourselves': Group processes in the escalation and regulation of violence in the night‐time economy. *European journal of social psychology* 42: 924-932.

Levine M, Taylor PJ and Best R. (2011) Third parties, violence, and conflict resolution: The role of group size and collective action in the microregulation of violence. *Psychological Science* 22: 406-412.
Liebst LS. (2015) Phenomenology of the movement economy: A multilevel analysis. *The Journal of Space Syntax* 6: 49-60.
Liebst LS, Heinskou MB and Ejbye-Ernst P. (2018a) On the actual risk of bystander intervention: A statistical study based on naturally occurring violent emergencies. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 55: 27-50.
Liebst LS, Lindegaard MR and bernasco W. (2019) Dissecting the Role of Dominance in Robberies : An Analysis and Implications for Micro-Sociology of Violence. *Journal of interpersonal violence*.
Liebst LS, Philpot R, Heinskou MB, et al. (2018b) Bystander Intervention in Street Violence: Current Evidence and Implications for Practice *Samfundsøkonomen* 4: 11-15.
Lindegaard MR. (2017) *Surviving gangs, violence and racism in cape town: ghetto chameleons*: Routledge.
Luckenbill DF. (1977) Criminal homicide as a situated transaction. *Social problems* 25: 176-186.
Martens JP, Tracy JL and Shariff AF. (2012) Status signals: Adaptive benefits of displaying and observing the nonverbal expressions of pride and shame. *Cognition & emotion* 26: 390-406.
Milgram S. (1970) The experience of living in cities. *Science* 167: 1461-1468.
Miller P, Fund NDLER, Bruno R, et al. (2016) *Drug and alcohol intoxication and subsequent harm in night-time entertainment districts (DASHED)*: National Drug Law Enforcement Research Fund.
Nylund KL, Asparouhov T and Muthén BO. (2007) Deciding on the number of classes in latent class analysis and growth mixture modeling: A Monte Carlo simulation study. *Structural Equation Modeling* 14: 535-569.
Pedersen W, Copes H and Sandberg S. (2016) Alcohol and violence in nightlife and party settings: A qualitative study. *Drug and alcohol review* 35: 557-563.
Philpot R, Liebst LS, Levine M, et al. (2019a) *American Psychologist*.
Philpot R, Liebst LS, Møller KK, et al. (2019b) Capturing violence in the night-time economy: A review of established and emerging methodologies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*.
Reicher SD, Spears R and Postmes T. (1995) A social identity model of deindividuation phenomena. *European Review of Social Psychology* 6: 161-198.
Sampson RJ and Laub JH. (1995) *Crime in the making: Pathways and turning points through life*: Harvard University Press.
Sanchez-Ramirez DC and Voaklander D. (2018) The impact of policies regulating alcohol trading hours and days on specific alcohol-related harms: a systematic review. *Injury prevention* 24: 94-100.
Scheff T. (1997) Part/whole morphology: Unifying single case and comparative methods. *Sociological Research Online* 2: 1-15.
Schinkel W. (2004) The will to violence. *Theoretical Criminology* 8: 5-31.
Steegen S, Tuerlinckx F, Gelman A, et al. (2016) Increasing transparency through a multiverse analysis. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 11: 702-712.
Stephens CL. (2011) A Bayesian approach to absent evidence reasoning. *Informal Logic* 31.
Tarling R and Morris K. (2010) Reporting crime to the police. *The British Journal of Criminology* 50: 474-490.
Tein J-Y, Coxe S and Cham H. (2013) Statistical power to detect the correct number of classes in latent profile analysis. *Structural equation modeling: a multidisciplinary journal* 20: 640-657.

Tutenges, S., Sandberg, S., & Pedersen, W. (2020) Sexually violent effervescence: Understanding sexual assault among youth. *Sexualities*, 23(3), 406–421.
Vrij A, Hope L and Fisher RP. (2014) Eliciting reliable information in investigative interviews. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 1: 129-136.
Weenink D. (2014) Frenzied attacks. A micro‐sociological analysis of the emotional dynamics of extreme youth violence. *The British journal of sociology* 65: 411-433.
Weenink D. (2015) Contesting Dominance and Performing Badness: A Micro‐Sociological Analysis of the Forms, Situational Asymmetry, and Severity of Street Violence. *Sociological Forum.* Wiley Online Library, 83-102.
Weisburd D. (2015) The law of crime concentration and the criminology of place. *Criminology* 53: 133-157.
Wikström P-OH. (1995) Preventing city-center street crimes. *Crime and justice* 19: 429-468.
Wurpts IC and Geiser C. (2014) Is adding more indicators to a latent class analysis beneficial or detrimental? Results of a Monte-Carlo study. *Frontiers in Psychology* 5: 920.