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ABSTRACT

The popularity and usage of social media over the years has increased. Due to this increase there has now been an influx of information shared on a global platform. This information that has been shared can be as superficial as daily activities, food eaten or as sensitive as graphic crimes committed. The Perceived Social Media Anonymity Effect is a concept that I am introducing and seek to explore. It is based on the premise that allows one to relinquish the fear of being in large crowds and speaking up when crimes have been committed while also being able to seek solitude among numbers on a social media platform where it appears easier to report and inform. This concept stems from the Bystander Effect. Darley & Latane (1968) states that the Bystander Effect refers to the phenomenon surrounding the passivity of onlookers’ willingness to help or intervene when faced with critical situations where others are being harmed.

This study reviewed literature and high-profile social media exposure cases and analyzed the following questions: To what extent is there a nexus between non-reporting of crimes and reporting on social media? Furthermore, what are the perceived factors an individual reports that they take into account when determining whether to post or share videos of crimes on social media platforms and/or not reporting to police?

To explore these issues, the public cases of Eric Garner, Laquan McDonald and Kenneka Jenkins were used to determine the impact of social media and its usage in a way of spreading information to the general public and at times used as a catalyst for social change. Information from a range of sources including local and national newspaper articles, media interviews, Chicago Police Department and the New York Police Department are synthesized and analyzed.
This study concludes by reviewing implications and findings and recommendations for future study.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In June 2016, I was leaving my church located in the Roseland community. I heard the loud screeching sound of tires against the pavement as a vehicle collided with another vehicle. Adrenaline kicked in, and I ran to the vehicle to assist. I yelled at a young man approaching the scene to go on a porch and get chairs as I assisted the driver out of the car, who was crying and kneeling over as she exited the vehicle. I could hear the sound of two babies screaming as they felt the pain of the impact and fear from the events that had just taken place. I assisted the woman sitting in the passenger’s side get out of the vehicle to check on her babies. I then looked around and instructed another woman to grab towels from a neighbor nearby who I had known for years and knew would be willing to assist. Upon approaching the other vehicle, which caused the accident, I quickly assessed the scene and, upon identifying the male driver, saw that there was a great amount of blood in the vehicle. I yelled to have more towels brought over to prop the gentleman’s head up. Around this time, he began to lose consciousness. More people approached the scene and began assisting; others stood by the side and waited or had their phones out recording for all to see.

I yelled for someone to call the police, and, within five to seven minutes, officers arrived. Though many onlookers were still there, several who had previously helped me at the onset began to leave the scene as the police vehicles approached. The detective asked the crowd, “Who here would like to make a statement?” Someone pointed to me and replied, “She was the first on the scene, she can do it.” I looked around at those surrounding me. There were about 15 other people assisting, calling the police, or just looking, and yet, when it came to making an official statement to the police, there I was, standing alone. You could hear the sound of a pin drop in a
deeply crowded area in the middle of a densely populated urban community. There was nothing but silence.

In areas where crime rates have skyrocketed and violence is at an all-time high, there is still an unwillingness from citizens within the community to make an official statement and provide assistance to the authorities while on the scene or as a witness to a crime (Unicef, 2011). The use of social media to share crimes has become more prevalent. Numerous reasons may exist to explain why bystanders may be unwilling to provide statements while willing to post crimes on social media platforms. It is important to understand the circumstances of when a bystander does react and what the causes related to this reaction are.

The popularity of social media platforms, such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Snapchat, have, in recent years, transformed the way that we view and experience crime, victimization, violence, communication, investigations, and voicing both political and social concerns. Between the years of 2008 and 2012, there was an increase of 780% of alleged crimes linked to the usage of Facebook and Twitter (Hirsen, 2017). We have seen crimes broadcasted live, “how to” videos on committing crimes, and investigation inquiries that have caused the police departments, in many cases, to change their tactics and procedures related to surveillance, inquiry, and witness questioning (Written Directives, n.d. p.12). Social media has become our preferred news source and has begun to change the way that we view crime and react to it.¹

The Perceived Social Media Anonymity Effect is a concept that I am introducing and seek to explore. It is the premise that allows one to relinquish the fear of being in large crowds and speaking up when crimes have been committed while also being able to seek solitude among numbers on a social media platform. It allows the individual to speak about their experiences
while casting off the social responsibility of officially reporting it. They make information available to those who choose to use it as they see fit.

Similarly, the Bystander Effect refers to the phenomenon surrounding the passivity of onlookers’ willingness to help when faced with critical situations (Darley & Latane, 1968; Latane & Nida, 1981).

Friday, March 13, 1964, in a middle-class neighborhood of Kew Gardens Queens, Kitty Genovese, a 28-year-old manager of a local bar, was stabbed to death outside of her apartment in an event that took approximately 33 minutes and 3 separate attacks to complete. It was reported that there were 38 onlookers at the scene, and only 1 phone call was made to the police at 3:50 am, after the attack had taken place (Cook, 2014). August 21, 2007, a woman was raped and beaten in the hallway of an apartment, while she was ignored by 10 witnesses who heard her cries in St. Paul, Minnesota (“Police: 10 Witness Rape,” 2007, para. 1). In October 2009, a teenage girl was gang raped by a minimum of 7 participants in a courtyard during a high school dance while 20 people looked at the attack for nearly 2 hours. No one responded; no one reacted (Wethal, 2010). In February 2016, Marcus Gaines, 32, was in a physical altercation outside of a 7 Eleven. Gaines was then approached by two men with a rifle and knocked unconscious and fell to the ground. Upon falling, bystanders were looking at the altercation and the attack; some bystanders remained on the scene and others left. After a few moments, Gaines, still unconscious on the ground was accidentally run over by a taxicab. In the article “A Chicago Assault Victim Might Still be Alive if Bystanders Had Cared Enough to Help” (2016) suggest that if the bystanders intervened, even after the altercation, there is a possibility that Gaines would be alive today (para. 3). In January 2017, there were live videos posted on social media of an 18-year-old male with mental disabilities being abused on the Westside of Chicago, but no call was made to the police regarding this (“Is ‘bystander effect’ why, 2017, para. 2).
The Bystander Effect and variants of it have expanded in the wake of social media. In April 2017, Robert Goodwin Sr. of Cleveland, Ohio, who was chosen at random by his alleged assailant Steve Stephens, who uploaded a video of himself killing Goodwin. Stephens’ alleged crime drew attention from both media and social media, including drawing large audiences to view and comment on the uploaded video. In 2015, Vester Lee Flanagan, the alias of Bryce Williams, recorded a video of himself shooting two co-workers and then uploaded the video to Twitter.ii

These scenarios are situations that took place where there were multiple people not only aware of the crimes being committed but who actually witnessed them, and there was little to no official reaction or intervention from the onlookers. In many cases, there was minimal verbal assistance provided by the bystanders even though some of these crimes are considered heinous. Bystanders, in many cases, may be on the scene of the crime recording accidents, robberies, beatings, and deaths. These bystanders may go “Live” on Facebook or share on other social media platforms but may be reluctant to share information with authorities while on the scene of the crimes. They choose to be silent while allowing social media to speak for them.iii

In July 2012, a survey of 1,200 federal, state, and local law enforcement professionals found that 4 out of 5 respondents use various forms of social media to assist in investigations and have found that agencies serving smaller residential communities, who have a smaller amount of personnel (<50) will use social media more, while larger state agencies may use it less (71%) than local (82%) and federal (81%) agencies.iv Research found that, by individuals posting, they have been able to identify people and locations, discover criminal activities with those locations, and gather evidence to assist in investigations. The survey revealed the following:

- 67% believe social media helps solve crimes more quickly
• 87% of the time, search warrants utilizing social media to establish probable cause hold up in court when challenged, according to respondents

• Close to 50% of respondents use social media at least weekly

• Only 10% of respondents learned how to use social media for investigations through formal training given at the agency

• Lack of access and familiarity are primary reasons for non-use—70% are either unable to access social media during work hours or do not have enough background to use social media.

On July 17, 2014, Eric Garner died after a New York City Police Officer put him in a chokehold while arresting him. Garner was suspected of selling loose, untaxed cigarettes on one of New York’s Staten Island corners. The confrontation was caught on video with Garner muttering the words “I can’t breathe,” while the officer continued to place him in a chokehold in order to restrain him. This video was then shared on several social media platforms and news media outlets. This video and the utterance of his last words became a rallying cry among protesters.

On October 20, 2014, Laquan McDonald was fatally shot by a Chicago Police Officer 16 times. Per the initial filed reports he displayed erratic behavior and the officer stated that he felt that this was the right decision since McDonald had a knife in his hand and lunged at him. Known as one of the most secretive cases, it took 13 months before the dashboard camera video was released and from there the city of Chicago and police enforcement would never be the same.

Kenneka Jenkins, a 19-year-old woman, was in a hotel in the Chicago suburbs partying with her friends. Those friends went live on Facebook, and there is speculation that a crime such as rape was taking place in the background. The young lady was found 24 hours later, frozen to death, locked in the freezer of
the hotel. Once the story was released, there were many people who began their own online investigation. The friends’ names from the live video were released, and those individuals were verbally attacked online due to their carelessness. Facebook subscribers began to view the hotel surveillance videos, segment-by-segment, and posted them online. Many would comment on the pictures and there were protests due to vagueness of the investigation. Comments on the posts were made regarding police intervention and the overall perception of the case but many feel that there was more that can be done.

**Statement of the Problem**

Considering that an individual can record and post an event but be unwilling to provide statements at the scene of a crime have, at times, placed our communities in turmoil. There is an emptiness and void growing in communities that fester as this behavior continues. Heinous events may take place, but, possibly due to the Bystander Effect and other factors, an individual may not be willing to do more to assist others that are in need of assistance while they are on the scene. This is the problem; individuals have committed crimes and no one has spoken up. Bystanders speaking about the crimes that they may have witnessed have the possibility of reducing crime and recidivism.

Social media has provided an outlet to those who may be afraid to speak to police due to widespread distrust resulting from multiple officer-related shootings, racially motivated searches, as well as other injustices that may have been endured by certain minorities or a general population of our cities. This outlet does have some loopholes. Though someone may be posting their opinions and comments and making many statements, they are not reporting them to the police. In a way of not providing this untapped resource is limiting the use of the shared information as an investigative tool.
A question is raised: Is it the case that some people are unwilling to provide a statement at the scene of a crime but will then post relevant information regarding the crime on social media and, if so, why? This dissertation will add to the research on the Bystander Effect and explore the concept of the Perceived Social Media Anonymity Effect.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

The purpose of this qualitative case study is to review and understand the concept of the Bystander and Perceived Social Media Anonymity Effects, which may explain why an individual may not be as apt to assist in critical situations when larger groups of people are present but may post information online on social media platforms. This study deeply reviewed the effect of violence-related crimes that are viewed and shared on social media and the possible connection between posting and social responsibility.

Furthermore, the proposed research study examined the Bystander Effect and explored what would cause an individual and even a community to react and respond to crimes that had taken place and was shared repeatedly on social media.

The following research questions helped to drive the research study with the hopes of extending conversations between the police, community leaders and other concerned citizens:

1) **Central research question**: To what extent is there a nexus between non-reporting of crimes and reporting on social media?

2) **The thematic critical sub-question**: What are the perceived factors an individual reports that they take into account when determining whether to post or share videos of crimes on social media platforms and/or not reporting to police?
Rationale and Significance

The researcher was interested in exploring the role of the bystander and their intricate part in crime prevention, crime intention, and also unsolved crimes. Research studies on the bystander involvement and intervention show that when individuals are faced in both violent and non-violent situations, there is a high likelihood that one will not react to help but may turn their head or assist only with minimal effort. (Fischer et al., 2011)

Robert Thornberg (2010) discusses seven stages of moral deliberations before deciding whether to help in circumstances of non-emergency and critical situations and applied his method to classrooms of students from Grades 2 and 5. The researcher felt that it could be applied to situations outside of the classroom due to the nature of its findings and also the idea of the bystander. The personal accounts helped to support the need for more research in the field and its relation and usage in social media.

1) Notice something is wrong – Bystanders are typically able to understand when there is danger or unfavorable circumstances. This is the time when one may, in the present day, decide to watch and take out their phone and record. If one were to react, the police/first responders would be called at this time

2) Interpret individual need for help – By taking a look at the situation, the bystander is able to determine if the circumstances are severe enough to warrant whether or not to assist the individual who is in need of assistance

3) Feel empathy – The bystander must feel some sense of empathy, connection, or understanding for the individual who may be in need of assistance. If the bystander does not feel empathetic toward the victim, there is a high likelihood that the bystander will not react
4) Process society’s model frames – There are many societal frames that the bystander may consider when determining whether to assist. For example, a bystander may be more willing to assist a pregnant woman and child than someone who may have a gang relation. This due to the notion of whether the individual “deserved” what was coming to them or whether society may accept the individual and characteristics. This is seen in the LGBT community regarding hate crimes in which one may not intervene due to the acceptance of the individual and their lifestyle by the society.

5) Scan for social status and relations – The bystander may determine the impact assisting would have on their life or family. Fear is one reason why some bystanders may not assist for not wanting retaliation or wanting to “mind their own business”.

6) Determine motives for action – The bystander must gage and determine what their motivation for acting and assisting in a critical situation is. If the bystander does not feel empathy or have no connection to the individual, no matter how critical the situation, the bystander will not react.

7) Act – In this phase, the bystander has taken the responsibility to act. This is due to concern, empathy, connection, and the ability of wanting to help the situation.

In consideration of the emergent norm theory and also Thornberg’s seven stages of moral deliberation, this study was designed to investigate the motives of individuals that can lead to action/social action and begin to understand how to appeal to both the individual and communities on ways to begin active bystandership.

**Conceptual Framework**
As the research study unfolded, the researcher utilized a conceptual framework to help conceptualize the bystander’s experience. The researcher drew upon three types of responses to crime which helped to explore and generously contribute to the experience of the bystander. In addition to providing a detailed analysis of the three cases reviewed, the study was also set up in a way to place emphasis on the meaning behind a bystander’s reaction to crime and information shared on social media. The purpose behind including a structured framework in this study was to not only explain a bystander’s experience related to social media, but to also set the stage for future researchers who also want to apply a qualitative lens to a framework that has limited research conducted.

As a developed framework, there are several stages of moral deliberation that a bystander may experience when faced with an event that involves crime. The individual will first take notice of the incident; they will determine the severity of the crime and evaluate all options. Following this, the individual will choose to act or react in a way that may be socially motivated depending on the situation. When dealing with action, an individual may choose to intervene or give a statement on the scene of the crime. If an individual chooses not to act on the scene of the crime, they may ignore the situation or, as a way of socially acting, choose to “go live” on Facebook or other social media platforms. This particular option does not necessarily help police officials but gives visibility to it on the social media platform, although the bystander still does not cooperate with police officials nor make a statement at the scene of the crime.

Thornberg (2012) suggests that there are determining factors that an individual will consider which would help them decide whether to intervene or not; these factors include how the bystanders define and evaluate the situation, which can be socially or internally motivated. Bystander motives includes: interpretation of harm, emotional reactions, social evaluating, moral
evaluating, and intervention self-efficacy. *Figure 1* below provides an illustration of how the conceptual framework was put to use in this study:

*Figure 1. Conceptual Framework (Washington, 2020)*

**Overview of Methodology**

This study sought to explain the experiences bystanders and knowledge shared on social media through a phenomenological lens. By including this method, the researcher was able to legitimize the qualitative frame of the study (Scheumann, 2014). Considering the nature of Phenomenology, this study was in place to explore the contextual meaning of an experience, underscored within phenomenological inquiry (Creswell, 2007). Creswell (2009) underlines the importance that phenomenological inquiry may help to fill the void in which previous literature was unable to fill. Throughout this study, a phenomenological lens was used in order to allow the viewpoints in the study to have a “voice” while also seeking to learn about additional factors.
regarding crime on social media in order to further illustrate an understanding of the impact of crime in areas and its effect on the community.

Because the study did not involve the interaction of human subjects, the researcher did not need approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and was deemed a non-reviewable collection of social media data. The researcher spent approximately 3 months collecting data from social media specifically regarding Eric Garner, Laquan McDonald, and Kenneka Jenkins. The collected data was retrieved from publicly available postings on Facebook, Instagram and Twitter. Additional data was collected from news media outlets, print media outlets and court proceedings.

The researcher observed personal posts that enhanced the rigor of the study as evidenced by the response posted and shared publicly on social media. The researcher looked for emergent themes in the findings as they related to the Bystander Effect (Darley & Latane, 1969). Larkin, Watts, & Clifton (2006) states that coding data phenomenologically is more extensive that providing a description, it is more about moving to understand the individual’s viewpoint. The study attempted to understand the meaning individuals, posted and shared information related to crime, and by analyzing the data in such a way, that helped to generate meaning (Smith, 1996). The themes emerged from the bystander reports contributed to knowledge involving the Bystander Effect. More specifically, the data collected from the bystanders supported the study’s goal of utilizing the bystander perceptions as a way to make sense of the Perceived Social Media Anonymity Effect in relation to this emerging phenomenon. More detail about the data analysis can be found in Chapter Three.

**Limitation of Methodology**
The goals and setting of the study considered, there were circumstances which were beyond the researchers control. For example, since the researched events took place in 2014 and 2017, the information shared on the social media websites could have been altered due to the time frame. Social media accounts, which could have had relevant information, may have been deleted or deactivated over the years or after judicial rulings. Throughout the research process, the researcher continuously reminded herself to detach personal experiences and biases from the study to avoid issues of trustworthiness with the data. As another means by which to increase trustworthiness, an external auditor and peer reviewer was included in order to review the research process and product. The peer reviewer and auditor were committed reviewing the perspective reviews of the publicly posted reviews (Zaharie & Osoian, 2016). The central limitations of the study – time, and researcher positionality – contributed to the structure and process of the research study.

**Researcher Positionality**

This research study parallels the researcher’s own experience as an active participating bystander. Much like the narrative of other bystanders, the researcher’s own experience has supported personal and professional growth. These moments of leadership have generated an authentic interest in the response of bystanders and the Perceived Social Media Anonymity Effect. As to avoid the interference of the researcher’s bias, the researcher participated in peer debriefing with the peer reviewer. Lincoln & Guba (1985) suggest that while debriefing is underway, there should be questions posed to the researcher surrounding the projects central aim, as well as confirm that the project contributes to filling gaps in the literature. The peer reviewer
confirmed the clarity of the study’s findings, while taking into account what was discussed between the researcher and reviewer during the debrief.

**Definition of Terms**

The *Perceived Social Media Anonymity Effect* is the premise that allows one to relinquish the fear of being in large crowds and speaking up when crimes have been committed but be able to seek solitude among numbers on a social media platform. It allows the individual to speak their opinions while also casting off the social responsibility of reporting. The information is made available to those who choose to use it as they see fit.

The *Bystander Effect*, as defined by the Psychology Dictionary, as a tendency for people not to intervene or offer to help in a social situation. This is often misunderstood as apathy and selfishness and is more of an interpretation of the lack of response in others. The individual is typically thinking that help is not either needed or that understanding or lack of obligation of responsibility to react to circumstances.

*Social media* is the collection of websites and web-based systems that allow for mass interaction, conversation, and sharing among members of a network. In this definition, social media has four defining characteristics: user-generated content, community, rapid distribution, and open, two-way dialogue (Health Research Institute, 2012).

*Violent crimes*, as defined by the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program, is composed of four offenses: forcible rape, murder and non-negligent manslaughter, aggravated assault, and robbery—offenses which include force or the threat of force.\(^vi\)
Property crimes, as defined by the FBI’s UCR program includes offenses such as larceny-theft, burglary, arson, and motor vehicle theft. The objective of these theft-type offenses are to acquire money or property; there is no presence force or threat of force against the victims.vii

Quality-of-life crimes are defined as minor, nonviolent, illegal behaviors that undermine an individual’s sense of well-being and public safety in a given area.viii

Community policing, as defined by the US Department of Justice, is the philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues, such as social disorder, fear of crime, and crime itself. It uses three components—community partnerships, organizational transformation, and problem solving—to assist with dealing with issues of crime, increase trust in policing, and supporting community partnerships.ix

Policing, as defined by Egon Bittner (1973), is the capacity of the police to use nonnegotiable coercive force in any suitable situation that appears to require a prompt and decisive response.

Emergent-Norm Theory suggests connective behavior uniformed and seen as collectives such as crowds and cults.x Crowd behavior is guided by unique social norms which are established by members of the crowd and, in most cases, determines the response of individuals formed within the crowd as a whole regarding the crisis that is faced. (Curtis, Turner, & Killian, 1957)

Human capital, as defined by the Encyclopedia Britannica, is the intangible collective resources as possessed by individuals in groups within a given population. These resources include, but are not limited to, knowledge, skills, trades, talents, abilities, experience, training, wisdom, and judgement viewed both individually and collectively.xi
Socioeconomic status, as defined by the American Psychological Association, states that it is the social standing or the class of an individual or group. It is typically measured by income, education, and occupation.

**Organization of Dissertation**

The Chapter Two is a review of literature. In this chapter, I examine literature that discusses the external and internal factors that may cause an individual to practice active bystandership or not. In addition, I will discuss how social media, the sharing of crimes, and police/community leader relations effects a community overall. Chapter Three presents the methodological approach used in the study and in the data collection process. Chapter Four will give an overview of the cases, the use of Social Media and community responses connected to Eric Garner, Laquan McDonald and Kenneka Jenkins and the emerged themes found in the responses and analysis of those themes as they related to the study’s research questions. Chapter Five will conclude the dissertation by explaining and summarizing the findings and review the study’s thematic elements as they relate to the proposed literature and the stated gaps. The dissertation concludes by discussing the limitations of the study and the implications of the findings, and providing recommendations for future research.

**Conclusion**

Throughout Chapter One, the researcher provided a framework through which to understand the Bystander Effect and the Perceived Social Media Anonymity Effect. Background information and relevant concepts was shared in order to set the tone for the proposed phenomenon, which gave an understanding of the need to further research the topic. Furthermore, the study’s questions are essential components of the project and help capacity
development and understanding of the topic. The central aim of the study is to provide different avenues for an enhancement of social media presence and community policing. The research questions left room for additional unearthing and meaning-making. Phenomenological inquiry was discussed to give attention to how the proposed methodology supported the need for new discovery. Challenges and limitations were also examined in order for the study to be executed ethically and with intention. The organization of the chapter is in such a way that the researcher was mindful of presenting the Bystander Effect in an approach relevant to social media, its usage, and benefits so that ultimately, future research on the topic can continue to bring attention to the possibilities and the untapped potential that this type of collaboration can bring to many communities.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents a review of the literature that is relevant to the study. This chapter will analyze and review studies and cases that will reveal key characteristics of the Bystander Effect and its interaction with social media. The component of witness statements, the acquisition of those statements, the research regarding the obtaining, maintaining, and validity of those statements, and provide areas where research should be completed further and, in some cases, re-evaluated. The literature review will also provide research and necessary steps regarding the impact that educators and community leaders can have on bystanders in order to create a culture of active bystandership.

Bystander Effect

Research on the Bystander Effect (Latane & Darley, 1969) suggests that, while being in the presence of others, the impulse to help others is stifled. This then leads to suggesting that, while others are watching and crimes are committed, there is a lower likelihood that an individual may assist (Daley & Latane, 1968; Latane & Rodin, 1969). Latane and Darley have proposed the following: a) social influence, b) evaluation apprehension, and c) diffusion of responsibility (Fischer, Greitemeyer, Pollozek, & Frey, 2005). Social influence is a concept that is slightly ambiguous. It is made up from what society sees, at the time, as being acceptable. It is forever changing with the evolvement of society and can be politically and emotionally driven. Therefore, it is a notion that is fluid; it’s constantly changing and never stagnant. An example can be seen when others choose not to react to a crime that is taking place due to their interpretation of it being non-critical (Prentice & Miller, 1999).
Evaluation apprehension is the belief that upon a census of the event, those who are surrounding the scene would view negatively the individual who would assist. This would cause a fear in the individual and inhibit a reaction. This particular view is one that is socially driven and can have both emotional and physical consequences for the individual who is acting to assist the individual in need or making the choice to walk away (Darley & Latane, 1968).

The diffusion of responsibility is the psychological view that others will assist. It is the knowledge that, since more individuals are on the scene, it is their responsibility to report or respond (Garcia, Weaver, Moskowitz, & Darley, 2002). This particular view is similar to deflection. It is deflecting the responsibility on others as a way of satisfying oneself or justifying a reason to not assist in a time needed.

The Bystander Effect has been replicated in the following experimental cases (Latane & Nida, 1981). The scene takes place in a room with people waiting to be interviewed. The room became full of smoke. Individuals had to help themselves and/or help others to leave the premises (Latane & Darley, 1968). This even occurs in a room where a fire alarm started (Ross & Braband, 1973) while someone was suffering from a seizure (Schwartz & Clausen, 1970) or while someone was suffering from an asthma attack (Harris & Robinson, 1973). Each case suggests that bystanders were less likely to respond and diffuse the situation. Though all of these cases show significance, little of this research reviews emergency situations and the reactions of bystanders in more violent and dangerous scenarios. The above cases did not review the apathy that one had for the individual, the community that one lives in, and the sense of the community that the crime took place in or the crime element in them. Though not fully investigated, I believe that the theories regarding the Bystander Effect may still hold true in situations outside of non-emergency-related incidents but due to different reasons.
Latane and Darley (1968, 1970), while regarding situational factors where others were present, raised doubts regarding the social norms and personal characteristics as direct inhibitors or intervention. This is due to the fact that social norms are not static; they are dynamic and can change over time. They shift, and, therefore, personality characteristics cannot be a direct implication of action (Laner, Benin, & Ventrone, 2001). Other studies have delved into other situational factors, such as characteristics of the victims, physical attractiveness, the victim’s distress, the style of pleading for help, the type of threat, and the responsibility of action (Formby & Smykla, 1981; Hartmann, Gelfand, Page, & Walder, 1972).

On Friday, February 12, 1993, James Bulger, a 2.5-year-old boy, as well as two other boys was abducted by his mother. The three boys were allowed to wonder and walked in Liverpool, England, for more than two hours, after which James was murdered beside a railway line. Thirty-eight witnesses were called to testify regarding their interaction with James Bulger. None of the bystanders intervened, which could have led to saving his life (Levine, 1999).

Fischer et al. (2005) suggests that when individuals are faced with real emergencies, the bystanders become more empathetic, thus, leading to helping the victims. This is seen in the arousal: “cost-reward model” (Dovidio, Piliavin, Gaertnert, Schroeder, & Clark, 1991; Piliavin, 1981; Schroeder, 1995). The arousal: cost-reward model proposes that, as empathy rises while witnessing a crime, it is probable, more so in the context of emergencies than non-emergencies, that it can be predicted whether an individual will assist to diffuse the emergency. Simply put, the way to reduce the arousal is to relieve the victim’s distress. The following scenarios challenges this theory.

On February 11, 2011, there was a sexual assault committed against CBS foreign news correspondent Lara Logan in Egypt while covering the Egyptian President Mubarak’s decision to
step down from his position. Logan was swept up by a mob of about 200 men and endured a “brutal and sustained sexual assault and beating”, lasting approximately 30 minutes. She was later rescued by some Egyptian women and 20 Egyptian soldiers and then returned to the US to recuperate in the hospital (CBS News, 2011a). Logan gave several descriptive interviews following the attack, which include stating that the crowd chanted anti-Semitic and anti-Israeli slurs and that she realized that it was not until she fell into the lap of a woman, who embraced her, that she felt that she may have a chance at survival (Replogle, 2011). There were statements made about Logan’s looks, the risk associated with being a correspondent, her gender, the culture, the country that she was in, and their lack of respect for women, but this does not take away from the fact that there were many onlookers who saw this attack had taken place, yet there was minimal intervention. In these instances, there was minimal interaction, and a prolonged act that took place prior to bystander intervention.

Sergeant Schultz was a fictional character from a 1960s television comedy series called *Hogan’s Heroes*. Schultz was a prison guard who was sympathetic and would often look in the other direction when prisoners would break the rules. His approach to this scenario is what one would call “I see nothing, and I hear nothing”. This type of approach is now widely used. (Gandossy & Sonnenfeld, 2004).

A few studies have investigated the Bystander Effect while exposing participants to scenarios that are more violent in nature (Harari, Harari, & White, 2010; Schwartz & Gottlieb, 1980), which implies that, in situations where there is a risk of danger to the bystander, there is also the implication of a high risk of danger for the victim. Schwartz and Gottlieb (1980) conducted a night study on a campus. An altercation was broadcasted via an intercom, and participants heard a conversation between a victim and another male, which escalated into a
fight. A tape recorder was stolen from the victim, who tried to retrieve it back. There was loud arguing, and the sound of an individual falling. The victim’s recorder was taken, and the victim was left crying on the floor. This scenario took place in a group setting. Results determined that participants were more aware of their reactions, and there seemed to be a slightly elevated likelihood of participant intervention.

**Bystander Intervention.** Bystander Intervention in crime is one often associated, at the community level, as the strength of social control, one in which higher levels of crime can dictate the social constructs of those living in the community (Pattavina, Byrne, & Garcia, 2006; Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997; Silver & Miller, 2004). A study examined the fears of those in the community who were aware of the crimes and the community that one lives in and determined which may play a role in determining the bystander interaction (Zhong, 2010).

Can active bystandership be taught? Ervin Staub states that active bystandership can be both created and also implemented by officers as well as other bystanders (2015). By individuals becoming active bystanders, there is a possibility of preventing crime, stopping bullying, and also creating an environment of care, healing, and reconciliation. I propose, by using a similar theory, this can be applied to educators, as well. Staub determined through research that witnesses have substantial power to influence events (2015). The research provided by Latane and Darley (1970) showed that bystander intervention was situational, meaning the presence of other bystanders made it less likely that someone would intervene. In the study provided by Staub (1970), in a classroom of first graders, when directed by an authority figure that “one” was in charge, that individual was most likely to help in any rising situation of harm or concern. It was in these students that there were three primary focuses: human nature, concern for others, and the belief of responsibility. Staub (2005) defined bystanders as those individuals who are in a
position to know what is happening and also in a position to assist. This then takes into consideration human nature, concern, and the belief of responsibility. Human nature as defined by Merriam-Webster as the way of thinking, feeling, and acting that are common to most human beings. In studies completed by Staub (2005) and others, this particular “feeling”, is one that has caused an action to assist others in times of crises.

Social responsibility is a theory built on a system of ethics which determines whether one feels validated prior to proceeding to help. If the lack of assistance can cause harm to an individual or the environment, it would be considered to be socially irresponsible not to act.

Bystander intervention can take place on many levels and for many reasons. It could be speaking to someone to assist with de-escalating a situation, It could be taking a picture, shooting a video, “going live” on a social media platform, giving a statement, or just being readily available to help, but it starts and ends with an action.

The research of Latane and Darley (1970) on the Bystander Effect emphasizes a situational influence. When others were present, bystanders were often less likely to react. It is my belief that, on a social level, a community, its sense of community, and also those who are active and have a prevalent presence within a community have a possibility of changing the dynamic of the community.

**Emergent Norm Theory**

Emergent norm theory (ENT) is collective behavior where people are driven to react based on the act itself. ENT is not always indicative of the race, cultures, backgrounds of the individuals, or individual capabilities but analyzes the crisis, what is going on, and who should respond to it. ENT is considered a more social than normative type of behavior (Tierney, 1980) and is not defined as static. It is dynamic in meaning due to the face that the definition can be
revised depending on the situation. Social relationships as well as norms characterizes the “pure” form of collective behavior (Aguirre, Wenger, & Vigo, 1998). In considering social interactions which may impact group interactions and responses to crises, research has found that the longer than an individual is determining what actions to take, the longer it takes to decide whether or not they will react. ENT argues that the appearance of unanimity among the participants in incidents of collective behavior, a dominant norm emerges (Aguirre, Wenger, & Vigo, 1998).

**Community Policing**

Community policing, as defined by Trojanowicz (1994), is a philosophy of personalized policing where the same officer patrols and works in the same area on a permanent basis, from a decentralized place, developing a proactive partnership with citizens to identify and solve problems. This, in turn, would improve the fundamental relationship between the community and their police to one of mutual respect and trust.\(^{xiv}\)

Community policing takes a different approach to crime, drugs, and disorder. Community policing involves average citizens in daily policing efforts. Citizens are no longer looked upon as individuals who are unable to contribute; rather, it empowers citizens by enlisting them as partners in order to create a better and safer community to both live and work.\(^{xv}\)

Providing community officers in crime-ridden communities would be a permanent staple and would enable to presence community-based problem-solvers directly in the community. These individuals would interact with some of the same faces, businesses, children, and elderly in both formal and informal approaches while also working with the community to come up with creative ideas and solutions to help solve community problems.\(^{xvi}\) This type of community policing should increase active bystandership within the communities, one block at a time.
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Community policing is also another way of providing both the police and those active citizens in the community the ability to work with the young prior to any problems escalating to the point of arrest or incarceration.\textsuperscript{xvii} It gives those in the community the chance to offer work opportunities, the ability of locating counseling, if necessary, and also sending messages of “strength” in the community and that we are one and have to improve the condition of the community starting from the bottom and upward.

At the community level, the strength of informal social control is negatively associated with the level of crime and violence committed within the community (Pattavina, Byrne, & Garcia, 2006; Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls 1997). This theory is one that can be validated by deaths in the community, the lack of respect of life, and the conditions the community is in. In communities that are more socially and economically stable, crime is less prevalent, property values are higher, businesses are often flourishing, and, therefore, the “community” itself is in a better condition. The presence of disorder in neighborhoods, however, is most associated with the fear of crime (Scarborough, Like-Haslip, Novak, Lucas, & Alarid, 2010). Community disorder is attributed to weak social networks, which include the following factors: poverty, residential mobility, and ethnic heterogeneity (Sampson & Graif, 2009). Neighborhood disorder is often categorized with physical and social disorder (Sampson & Raudenbush, 2004). With physical disorder, you would see graffiti, abandoned buildings, vandalized properties, and vacant lots (Chadee, Ali, Burke, & Young, 2016). Social disorder is the perception of threatening situations in public spaces (Garcia, Lopez-Quillez, March, Lladosa, & Lila, 2014). Examples of this type of behavior would be loitering, public intoxication/drunkenness, prostitution, drug dealing, robbery, and violent crimes. Xu (2005) stated that the distinction between physical and social disorders provide an overall view of the social condition in the neighborhood.
In the city of Chicago, you are able to see while just casually driving through the different communities if there are signs of community policing involving the residents. There are block party signs which will state whether they will call police and actions that will and will not be tolerated on the block. There are “We Call Police” signs posted throughout different communities, as well. On some blocks, you are able to see the elderly out walking daily as a way of “patrolling” or checking on their neighbors. This type of presence on certain blocks and within certain communities has proven itself to be at times, a deterrent of crime.

At this time, there have been certain systems that have been implemented as a way to improve community relations and assist with crime. Chicago Police Superintendent Eddie Johnson agreed that improving community relations by the use of technology is important when reducing violent crimes in communities. The Chicago Police Department has implemented “strategic decision support centers” that will analyze data quickly and then determine if officers need to be deployed. The department has also added video cameras and sensors as a way of deterring crime and identifying the location of gun shots. At this time, limited research has been found regarding the impact of these deterrent systems in the different communities.

**Trust and Authority**

Erick Erickson (1957) states that there is a widespread distrust of juveniles and authority figures. He states that juveniles are made and not born and that many adolescents begin to find their identity through their parent’s expectations of them and the environment they are in. Those who are in authority typically have an effect on adolescents as they continue to progress through life and continuously grow. Erickson states that in areas where youth are leaderless and unguided, the youth would try to find a form of acceptance or community, which is unfortunately seen with finding their identity within the association of gangs. As children, youth mimic roles
that they see, such as both cops and robbers. As they continue to grow and experience life, however, these roles go from no longer being imaginary but begin to play out in reality.

In many cases, these types of associations can lead to the lack of trust with authority figures. Typically, but not in all cases, those who are found to be in gangs are seen as dressing differently and acting differently and hanging in certain areas where there may be high crime and criminal activity and, therefore, leads to profiling. Weitzer and Tuch (2002) demonstrates that when people believe that they have been profiled, be it true or not, their support for the police begins to fade. As more and more cases arise, the lack of trust begins to become widespread amongst those who may be of similar background and stature, even if they are not involved in criminal activity.

**Crime Reporting**

Determining blame is a very important determinant when looking at crime. This is also very important legally since the wrong judgment can either cause unjustly punishment for an individual or can be the reason an assailant is set free (Critcher & Pizzaro, 2008). A study completed by Kruger (2008) suggests that a neighborhood consists of a radius of one-quarter mile and is also based on social contact with neighbors, its social perceptions, the fear of crime, the built environment surrounding it, and the satisfaction of the quality of life regarded within it. This particular study on crime reporting suggests that the above criteria can help determine the rationale for crime reporting within a given area.

Crime reporting can be seen as a method of “snitching”. The “stop snitching” campaign is typically targeted at the criminals who are attempting to make deals with police officers and prosecutors as a way of lessoning time for an offense committed (Rosenfeld, Jacobs, & Wright, 2003). This same premise is also permeated in larger communities where crime is prevalent. The
understanding is that if one were to report a crime, this would be considered “snitching” and there could be retaliation resulting from such an action (Slocum, Taylor, Brick, & Esbensen, 2010). Regardless of the notion of snitching, 80% of crime is brought to the attention of police (Black, 1970). This is significant with the understanding that crime is reported on some scale but may not be the magnitude needed in certain areas in order to be a crime deterrent. James Fyfe, a former New York police officer, stated that “crime is underreported in the places where people have given up, where they know that the police can’t do anything”.

In Chicago, there are multiple agencies, such as Ceasefire and the Chicago Center for Youth Violence Prevention, that work together in the field of violence prevention by way of recruitment, training, and strategically placing individuals within the neighborhoods as a way to promote crime reporting and also a deterrent of crime by exhibiting a sense of concern and persistence to the improvement of the neighborhood perception and rejuvenation (Wisnieski, Bologeorges, Johnson, & Henry, 2013). The two agencies formed a working research group set within the Southside community of Englewood. Based on the 2010 consensus, the community housed a population of 37,403 people spanning 3.1 square miles and 11 census tracts. This particular community was chosen due to the amount of crime that had taken place. In 2011, 526 robberies, 704 assaults, and 80 shootings were reported in Englewood alone. This area, at the time, possessed the highest shooting and homicide rate in Chicago (City of Chicago, 2011). The study concluded that crime reporting varied greatly depending on the type of incident in relation to the radii from where the crime had taken place. Residents were more likely to report stabbings and shooting that occurred at greater distances from their home location than minor violent crime, which then suggested that there was an interaction between event severity and physical proximity. This study also advised that there were no effects of age, gender, or length of
residency within the community (Wisnieski et al., 2013). Though this study gives insight on the amount of crime that had been reported within a proposed geographic area, in order to receive data, a “gift” had to be offered for participation. It is unclear at this time if the participants may have willingly participated in the study or willingly reported the crime without the offering of an incentive, which can be seen as a limitation of the study.

Sampson et al (1997) asserted that neighbors’ willingness to intervene on behalf of the common good, or connections, is linked to reduced violence at the neighborhood level. In this study, characteristics of the individual participants, the neighborhood, and prior violence within the neighborhood had been taken into consideration.

**Social Media**

Social media and the usage of its platforms has become more popular since it was first introduced in the 1990s (Hill, Dean, & Murphy, 2014). The increased popularity of the internet has led to the steady infiltration of social media into daily life (Leberknight, Inaltekin, Chiang, & Poor, 2012). Between 1993 and 1995, internet service providers began offering internet services such as America Online to the major US cities (Scott & Jacka, 2011). Social media itself did not become popular until the introduction of Myspace in 2003. On this platform, users could share media, control personal pages and content, and make comments on the pages of others (Scott & Jacka, 2011). Between 2005 and 2009, the adaptation of connecting and building relationships and the sharing of information began to integrate into daily life. By 2006, YouTube and Twitter had launched, and Facebook propelled beyond 10 million subscribers. The term “social media” was born, which refers to the sharing of communication using web-based technologies (Smith, 2009). Boyd and Ellison (2007) state, “Web-based services that allow individuals to (1) construct a public or semi-public profile with a bounded system, (2) articulate a list of other users with
whom they may share a connection, and (3) view and list their connections and those made by
others within the system.” Van Dijk (2013) states that social media sites have evolved into four
categories: “social-networking” sites, such as Facebook, which promotes interpersonal contact;
“user-generated content” sites, such as YouTube or Wikipedia, which promote cultural
collaboration and exchange; “trading marketing” sites, which have the aim of selling or
exchanging sites; and “play and game” sites, which enable users to play online games.

Social networking sites host online communities of people who share similar interests
and provide ways for users to interact, including e-mail and instant messaging services (Shin,
2010). Users are able to create profiles, broadcast messages and interests, make political stances,
date, share personal information and pictures, establish “friends and followers”, and
communicate with others (Boyd & Ellison, 2007). During early adaptation, social media was
used mostly by the younger population; now, social media is used by all ages (Sheldon, 2008).
Introverts and extroverts alike are using social media more often and as platforms to voice their
opinions and concerns (Sheldon, 2008).

In the US, 81% of adults go online, 67% of which visit social networking sites, and those
who have cell phones use social networking sites on their phones (Pew Internet & American Life
Project, 2013). See Appendix A. Among teens aged 12 to 17, 93% are online and 74% of teens
have a profile on a social media networking site (Pew Internet & American Life Project, 2011).
To determine the scope of the usage of a particular social media platform, consider Facebook. In
October 2012, more than 1 billion individuals worldwide were active Facebook users monthly.
According to Facebook’s second-quarter filings in June 2012, nearly 57% of these individuals
used Facebook on a mobile device (Facebook, 2012a, 2012b). As of October 2012, in the US and
Canada, 186 million people were Facebook users, and over 65% of US internet subscribers used
Facebook. These 1 billion Facebook users contribute to 300 million photos uploaded to the site per day, 3.2 billion “likes” and comments per day, and 125 billion friendships (connections) among people. Users also express opinions and moods via status updates, share a wealth of internet content (e.g., videos, news, stories, blogs, and URLs) in groups, and express interest in any entity with a label, such as movies, music, pop culture, political figures, and ideologies (Nielson, 2011).

Each generation is brought up with a preferable mode of communication. For millennials, social media platforms have become one of the more ideal methods of communicating. With an unprecedented amount of information at their fingertips, much of this information comes in the form of new behaviors, often in the form of social sharing, which may be used in many ways. From political views, newspapers articles, face-to-face communication, video chats, instant messaging, phone calls, or even email exchanges, information is able to be viewed, shared, and commented on (Hill, Dean, & Murphy, 2014).

**Public vs Private Data**

On most social media sites, user-generated data remains accessible to permitted users until the data owner changes the privacy setting (Mondal, Messias, Ghosh, Gummadi, & Kate, 2017). Social networking sites make public many pieces of personal information, such as the user’s name, age, gender, interests, hobbies, geographic location, attitudes, and opinions (Wilkinson & Thelwall, 2011). Most social networking sites have privacy settings that allow users to control who can access their information, but many users leave their profiles public, either by choice or because they do not take the time to understand the distinction to determine what information is accessible or not (Wilkinson & Thelwall, 2011). Social networking sites and platforms allows mass-scale sharing of thoughts, behaviors, and opinions of people worldwide.
A study completed by Mondal et al., found that inaccessible tweets that are either selectively deleted by users or withdrawn by users have a significant problem with control mechanisms; even when a user deletes the tweets on the account, the current mechanisms leave traces of residual activity, i.e., replies from other users, deleted tweets, and old accounts may still remain accessible. This, in a sense, leaves the ability for most, if not all, information shared on social networking sites to re-surface and be recirculated.

Sociality

Sociality, in regard to social media, can be broken down into three different hierarchies: 1) broadcast, 2) conversational, and 3) community (Hill, Dean, & Murphy, 2014). Situational factors may also play a part in regard to intervention. The sense of belonging socially is, at times, powerful enough in controlling the behavior leading up to whether or not a person would intervene or not (Zoccola, Green, Karoutsos, Katoni, & Sabini, 2011).

Social psychologists have examined the role of bystanders for nearly 50 years, i.e., Latane & Darley (1950), but, more recently, the act of bystandership has poured over into not only community and school settings but also social media/networking sites. Active, prosocial bystanders, or defenders, are individuals who are able and willing to stand up for peers, while passive bystanders are individuals who ignore or pretend not to notice (Jenkins & Fredrick, 2017). Theory and research suggests that individuals with greater social capital (i.e., resources and benefits gained from relationships, experiences, and social interactions) will have a higher likelihood of being active, prosocial bystanders in emergent situations (Jenkins & Frederick, 2017). As we take a look at society, we recognize that the lower the social capital in neighborhoods, the higher the amount of crime in those neighborhoods. This correlation is one that we may see in urban areas where there is a higher rate of illiteracy, poverty, single parent
homes, schools with lower test scores, abandoned and vacant properties, and a lack of larger, more prosperous businesses located within the communities.

Evans and Smokowski (2015) argue that possessing social capital may encourage the youth to defend because they are likely to have social relationships that model prosocial behaviors and reduce the fear of becoming a victim. This type of prosocial behavior would begin as a child and then, as those relationships mature, would then manifest in adulthood. Like physical capital (i.e., homes, cars, personal devices) or human capital (i.e., employment, college education), social capital is comprised of tools, training, and resources “that enhance individual productivity” (Putnam 2000, p.18), where productivity is engaging in prosocial bystander behavior. Evans and Smokowski (2015) also found that, in youth, social support from friends and teachers, ethnicity and religious orientation, and future outlook outcomes were associated with an increased likelihood of engaging in prosocial bystander behaviors.

Lin (2001) states that social ties between an individual and their network will provide several benefits, including access to information, social influence, social credentials, and reinforcement of social identity. In regard to these benefits, it is logical to assume that individual with greater social capital would be more likely to have better social and emotional outcomes, including the ability and higher likelihood of engaging in prosocial behaviors.

There are two models that explain the benefits of social support (Cohen & Wills, 1985) and its impact on bystander behaviors. The main effect model suggests that perceptions of support are important at all times for all people. This particular notion states that it is important to have different types of support, even if that resource is never utilized. The second model, the stress-buffering model, suggests that social support has its greatest benefits when an individual has significant stress in their lives. In this model, social support is being utilized instead of being
a source of comfort. In both cases, social support is an indicator of social capital. If individuals feel that they have supportive people to whom they rely on, especially in times of need or duress, they may be more inclined to engage in prosocial bystander behavior.

**Broadcast**

Social media in regard to the conversational aspect is different from face-to-face interactions. Taylor, Sherman, and Kim (2004) claim that there are social values that internet users contain as a community. Social support is received amongst the interactions that individuals have on the social media platforms. Certain online activities, such as clicking the “like” button, has shown to positively impact social capital. In this case, social capital refers to the social ties that one may feel informed or even inspired by each other (Williams, 2006). Social media platforms such as Facebook or Twitter give the ability of producing and consuming content in online communication and creating a channel for social commentary among those watching the event (Mukherjee & Jansen, 2017).

**The Idea of Anonymity**

Ellison (2007) speaks in reference to the concern of “anonymity” or “pseudo anonymity” of online interaction, where the “gender, race, age, location, and physical appearances of others are not immediately evident” and neither are the reactions of those who they have interacted with. Many social media websites require users to register and provide their legal names. Of course, one is unable to force someone to truly identify themselves and guarantee that the identifying information is not falsified. In some cases in which crime is committed while online, the offender may choose to use their correct identification in an effort to seek and publicize their conduct to a larger social media audience (Salter, 2017). This same publicity that is turned
against the victim whose privacy is invaded and personal information shared, the perpetrator is given maximum exposure to display their public and interactive acts (Salter, 2017).

In many cases, crimes that happen both onsite and also on social media will have bystanders who choose to want to remain anonymous, or at least feel anonymous, because they can hide in the crowd (Prentice-Dunn & Rogers, 1982). When one remains anonymous, it is less likely for the individual to be judged and evaluated at an individual level. This, when others are present, leads to a decrease of accountability (Diener, Lusk, Defour, & Flax, 1980), which may keep others from reacting and assisting others.

**Crime and Social Media**

The rise of social media and its technologically savvy citizens has undermined the business model of newspapers and televisions, in particular (Salter, 2017). Our lives have become so saturated with social media and its usage that the distinction between “online” and “offline” abuse has become synonymous and requires understanding the role of new media technologies in abuse, crime, and justice responses (Salter, 2017).

Social media has also began to play a major role in public self-awareness as well as the emerging “perceived social media anonymity” effect. The usage of camera recordings to view crimes triggers an “accountability cue” that, within the social context, eliminates the feelings of anonymity, which then makes others become more aware of their actions, but they still do not report information to the proper authorities (Van Bommel, Van Prooijen, Elffers, & Van Lange, 2012).

As the popularity of social media continues to rise, the emergence of cyberbullying—an “aggressive, intentional act carried out by a group or individual, using electronic forms of contact, repeatedly, against a victim who cannot easily defend themselves” (Smith, Mahdavi,
Carvalho, Fisher, Russell, & Tippett, 2008) and an unintended consequence of increasing access to and the use of technology—also becomes a notion that is affected by the perceived social media anonymity effect. Studies have shown that the increase of cyberbullying on social networking sites has a negative impact on the mental and physical health of adolescents in the US and around the world (Patchin & Hinduja, 2012). In this case, cyberbullying takes place in both anonymous accounts and, in cases of those who are bolder, personal accounts with no regard to the effect that they may have on the individual in which they are discussing. Many victims of cyberbullying may suffer from numerous negative outcomes, such as anxiety, fear, depression, and low self-esteem, which could lead to other detrimental side effects, such as suicide (Schneider, O’Donnell, Stueve, & Coulter, 2011). The Bystander Effect can be seen in many positions taken. Lenhart et al. (2011) created a large scale study reviewing adolescent online behavior. It was discovered that, while 88% witnessed cyberbullying, about 90% reported that they ignored the bullying, 67% reported that they saw others begin to participate in the bullying, 21% joined in themselves, and about 25% defended the victim. In an online environment, cyberbullying and the Bystander Effect differs from those in a physical setting. In a physical setting where danger may be involved, studies have shown that bystanders can play a significant role in reducing the bullying (Salmivalli, 2010). When considering cyberbullying, the visibility that may take place propels the impact of the cyberbullying event. Those involved may increase the negative viewpoints by posting videos, pictures, creating memes, or asking others to like and share while all of these actions can be stored, copied, and shared multiple times over (Kowalski, Giumetti, Schroeder, & Lattanner, 2014).

Bystanders of online cyber bullying and crime can only estimate how many others may be watching and, in most cases, are unable to see those who are reacting. Conditions such as
these can lead to a diffusion of responsibility, which result in a lack of support for the individual harmed or an inability to act (Latane & Darley, 1970; Thornberg, 2007). Online bystanders may not reinforce the behavior of those who are committing the crimes or bullying but, by forwarding, “liking”, commenting on humiliating posts for fun, anger, or admiration, and not reacting within a manner that could help the individual harmed, can cause a snowballing effect (Machackova, Dedkova, Mezulanikova, 2015; Runions, Shapka, Dooley, & Modecki, 2013). In an integrative model predicting the Bystander Effect, DeSmet (2016) found that, among a wide range of predictors, contextual factors, such as class norms and media exposure, had an influence on the willingness of cyber-bystanders to intervene; however, his type of exposure did not account for the bystanders’ behaviors toward the cyberbullying. Cyberbullying on social networking sites has an echo chamber effect, which may change an individual’s perceived control and normative beliefs regarding either assisting in the cyberbullying or helping the victims (Leung, Wong, & Farver (2018) For example, individuals who are likely to assist victims of cyberbullying are typically those who have been exposed to groups or posts that are of a similar nature. They view this, a link to human response, as a way of assisting and coming to the aid of those who are in need, which will then create a normative belief that it is acceptable to assist victims (Leung, Wong, Farver, 2016).

The results from a meta-analysis study of Kowalski et al. (2014) show that cyberbullying victimization is one of the strongest predictors of cyberbullying perpetration. There was a strong correlation between cyberbullying victimization and also perpetration in studies from both Western and Eastern cultures (Wong et al., 2014). These findings imply that there may be a correlation between retaliation and reactive bullying in cyberspace. Jenkins, Ford, and Green (2013) noted,
“People make a series of socially embedded decisions when they choose to spread any media text: Is the content worth engaging with? Is it worth sharing with others? Might it be of interest to specific people? Does it communicate something about me or my relationship with those people?” (pp. 13)

These particular questions are asked daily while they consider the content of what they are viewing on social networking sites. Information that is released through social media/networking sites, both on the individual level as well as corporate, is shared for one particular reason—exposure. The ways in which community sanctions are made meaningful are shaped by the social, political, and media cultures which are embedded in individuals (Happer, McGuinness, McNeill, & Tiripelli, 2018).

In addition to cyberbullying, as social media continues to grow as another media platform, individuals are using this “access” as ways to information of crimes committed. Recent analyses demonstrate that, on a broad level, reporting about crime and the actual act of the reporting has influenced public punitiveness over time (Enns, 2016). The experiences that others may have experienced on social networking sites has become a way that people gain real world information regarding crime, and they use this information to weigh against both objective conditions and the broader mediated reality (Habecker & Kort-Bulter, 2018). Both traditional and social media can act as an emotional contagion, spreading thoughts of fear, anger, and other negative effects in addition to pure information. Social media has been shown to directly impact the emotions of those consuming it (Bejan, Hickman, Parkin, & Pozo, 2018). Yardley (2017) developed a methodological framework she terms “Ethnographic Media Practice Analysis for Criminology”, which focuses on four media practices associated with social media sites: archiving, showing, “presencing”, and searching. This framework is reviewed in three social
media homicide confessions: the murder of Jennifer Alfonso, the murders of Emily, Laurel, and Shelly Janzen, and the murder of Charles Taylor. In each of these murders, the confessions were highly publicized on social media. For each confession given in these gruesome murders, each individual had their own reason for sharing the information given. Essentially, social media was a way to guarantee “criminal celebrity”, even if short lived (Yardley, 2017).

In these particular cases, the widespread views became massive. Hundreds of thousands viewed and shared these confessions, but, in this case, it was after the murders had been committed. Studies have shown that personal experiences as well as the experiences that others have endured on a social networking platform can essentially make crime issues more salient as well as provide firsthand and secondhand accounts of the how the justice system functions (Habecker & Kort-Butler, 2018). Few studies have been completed examining media consumption and social network variables. Rosenberger and Callanan (2011) found a relationship between having a household member arrested and both having lost confidence in the police and fair treatment. According to the substitution thesis, the effects of media should be more robust for people who have little direct experience with crime of the justice system in which social media becomes a window to the crime. The resonance thesis suggests that media portrayals of crime may resonate more with people who have experience with the criminal justice system and for those that crime is already a salient issue (Eschholz, Chiricos, & Gertz, 2003). In other studies completed, research has demonstrated that tweets with a negative or positive connotation will often be retweeted more often and faster than those of a neutral message (Stieglitz & Dang-Xuan, 2013).
The Authentic Self

Can information shared on social media be seen as valid? Online representation is seen and treated as a level of distrust regarding the individual’s authenticity; no individual’s identity is taken to “be what it seems”, and all internet sources are deemed in need of verification (Degroot, 2011). In recent years, many studies have stated that individuals “do not give up” their notions of authenticity when they interact with others online (Rak, 2005). Leppanan, Moller, Norreby, Staehr, and Kytola (2015), find that the need to authenticate (or dis-authenticate) oneself and others continues to be crucial for identification, socio-cultural participation, and membership. Due to this idea, our daily “need to know” has grown tremendously due to the ability and accessibility of information provided by social media platforms, including Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, discussion forums, and blogs. This need-to-know mentality drives the search in more ways of needing to investigate and determine the authenticity of the information that is being conveyed through the many media channels and social networking sites. The need to know draws an individual’s attention to find out how information is achieved, crafted, argued for or against, questioned, debated, or rejected by others (Leppanen et al., 2015)

As internet usage continues to grow and the need-to-know mentality drudges forward, managing reputation on social media becomes increasingly important for public relations. The latest figures show that internet users spend most of their time on social networks, and at least half of those users have expressed complaints or concerns about brands, services, or the flow of “sensitive” information on social media (Nielsen, 2012). The need for authenticity in regard to crimes has been a significant debate in recent years. Anderson (2015) states that social media posts and photographs are increasingly denied admission as evidence in criminal trials due to courts deeming information that can easily be searched for and retrieved from social networking
sites as inauthentic. There have been two approaches in case law regarding the review of evidence: the Maryland approach and the Texas approach. The Maryland approach is one that is seen as overly skeptical and often sets the bar too high regarding social media evidence so that it is often difficult to argue admissibility. The Texas approach is seen to be more lenient and declares that if it is reasonable evidence, the jury should be able to determine that admissibility (Anderson, 2015).

In the case of US v. Drew, there were two friends, Sarah and Megan, who had a “falling out”. Sarah’s mother decided to create a fictitious account of a 16-year-old boy named Josh on Myspace and befriended Megan. She used this account to communicate with Megan (as Josh) on multiple occasions. One day, Sarah’s mother (as Josh) told Megan that she (Josh) no longer liked her and that the world would be a better place without her in it. That night, a distraught Megan hung herself in her closet.xx

This case and many similar to it demonstrate that anyone can create a fictional persona online that may sometimes end with horrific consequences. Social media is built particularly easy for users to create fake accounts, access individuals’ information online, spread fake news, build up notoriety, bully others, confess their dying loves, and cause harm to others, all while onlookers gape at the material and determine the authenticity of what has been shared or viewed.

After the determination of the information’s authenticity, the next step is to determine what happens to the information that is shared.

**The Importance of Witness Statements**

Witness statements in cases of murder, burglary, vehicular homicide, and other acts of crime are very important when determining the timeline of events and what has actually taken place. It is, therefore, necessary to obtain and maintain an accurate account of the event that has
taken place and crucial that witnesses are able to provide a reflection as soon as the event has taken place. This is also important when considering the steps of what takes place after leaving the scene of a crime, which, in most cases, may be litigation. Wolchover and Heaton-Armstrong (1996) state that the most crucial part of the litigation process is not necessarily the confession of the accused but the evidence of witnesses for the prosecution. Witness statements, from a legal perspective, can be pivotal point in the determination of determining whether someone is found guilty or innocent. Wikoff (1994) states that there are three separate steps in obtaining a good witness statement: 1) identifying, locating, and obtaining the cooperation of a witness; 2) taking the witness statement; 3) completing the paperwork associated with taking the statement. Having the ability of completing this process, either on the scene of a crime or shortly thereafter, is why (1) it is so pivotal with helping to decrease the crime rates in some of the highest crime areas in Chicago and (2) witness statements are so important.

**Overcoming the Bystander Effect**

There are many benefits to overcome the Bystander Effect; one, in particular, is the genuine interest in helping others. The circumstances surrounding helping others often leads to obtaining a good reputation. This can also lead to increasing one’s social status due to the possibility of being able to receive resources for the sole purpose of helping others (Hardy & Van Vugt, 2006). This type of display of being virtuous is one that may take place when there are many bystanders present rather than when there are only a few. Therefore, the presence of multiple bystanders amplifies one’s ability to help and promotes one’s good reputation. This is what is considered as public self-awareness (Prentice-Dunn & Rogers, 1982). This is a state where the focus is on the impression that they may make on others. Chiu and Chang (2015) state that social networking site developers as well as internet service providers must consider the
perception of self-exposure and the awareness of others. If users are unaware of others, they may feel less fear and more responsible to help those that may have been afflicted when crimes have been broadcasted on social media.

Although each bystander is a potential judge of behavior, the presence of self-awareness does not always determine action, or an act of helping in high stress situations does not always create public self-awareness (Froming, Walker, & Lopyan, 1982).

Theory of planned behavior is a theoretical framework for predicting and possibly changing human social behavior. According to Azjen (1991) human behavior is based on three belief-based concepts: (1) the attitude toward the behavior; (2) the perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform particular behaviors; (3) the perceived behavioral control over performing the behavior. Azjen believed that “the more favorable the attitude and subjective norm with respect to a behavior, and the greater the perceived behavioral control, the stronger should be an individual’s intention to perform the behavior” (pp. 21).

Williams and Guerra (2007) found that in most cases regarding online participation in events, particularly cyberbullying, the behavior was related to the perception of peer approval and is subjective at best. Studies, though limited, have shown that individuals that have positive outcome expectancies are more confident in their ability to help and are, therefore, more likely to intervene (DeSmet et al., 2016). DeSmet et al. (2016) also found that there are several predictors predicting bystander behavior but factors, such as class norms or media exposure, seems to influence cyber-bystanders’ willingness to intervene.

An Educators Approach

Educators have the unique ability of remaining a constant in an individual’s life from childhood to adulthood. Vaughn (2005) notes that there are two specific social norms as a basis
for prosocial behavior: the *norm of reciprocity* in which we should help those who help us, and the *social responsibility norm* in which we would help or assist others who depend on us or need our assistance. These two particular norms are acquired through socialization. As educators, it is our duty to provide knowledge to young and adult students alike. Through this process, educators are sought to give information to those who are seeking it. Furthermore, educators are able to impact many of those who they come in contact with and teach them how to react and, in some cases, override other behaviors which could possibly inhibit actions regarding bystandership.

Thornberg (2007) raises the notion of prosocial morality, which regards acting in the best interests of others via actions such as caring, helping, and protecting (Arsenio & Lover, 1995). Moral education has to deal with cognition, feelings, motives, and behaviors with the aim to educate a moral person (Berkowitz, 1998). Values education has to incorporate theories and research due to group processes, social influences, and a variation of student’s interpretations of the social situations which, in turn can, develop, promote, and even inhibit prosocial morality in individuals (Thornberg, 2007). Caplan and Hay (1989) focused on student Bystander Effects among preschool children. In the study, the low rate of helping or prosocial responses was observed when the young bystanders witnessed a peer in distress. The teachers did little to encourage children to help or intervene in actual situations in which a peer was in distress. In interviews, the students stated that they didn’t respond since teachers were present and should have responded. Those students exhibited an understanding that an individual (teacher) with authority chose not to react; therefore, they did not react, as well. In this particular study, it shows the impact of an educator’s influence on individuals. As educators ourselves, we have the innate ability to impart understanding, wisdom, and knowledge to those we are placed authority over.
Lantieri (2007) proposes that the focus of the school system should be on community, collaboration, and partnerships with an emphasis on the appreciation of diversity. School leaders would change the educational approach from a more individualistic way of learning to a more group-centered way of learning. Two key concepts that would be taught include social responsibility and interconnectedness. There would be value placed in personal change, which would then be used as a foundation for systemic change and social justice. More attention would be given to students so that they understood their purposes in life and how they are able to contribute to the community.

As educators, it would be up to us to make sure that schools are functioning as a live organism. The students should have a high value of self-knowledge, healthy relationships, and building community. Lantieri (2007) states that there should be an emphasis on academia, but, due to the direction of where society is headed, more emphasis should be given to teaching social responsibility both in and out of the classroom. Educators would be able to simultaneously teach, care, respect, and show kindness and purpose alongside academic achievements and requirements.

Teaching social responsibility is necessary due to what children are seeing daily on social media and also inside of their communities. Lantieri (2007) states that the choices we make today regarding how we nurture our children’s development has a great impact on our future. As a society with advancements in technology, we must understand that the younger generation needs—and will continue to need—support, structure, and understanding, and will need to participate in the community in order to feel interconnectedness to the community.

James Gabarino (1999), the author of *Lost Boys,* discusses what he calls “juvenile vigilantism,” which is the notion that young boys have lost faith in the ability of adult care and
adult protection. Due to this, they will join a gang in order to feel slightly safe rather having no safety at all.

From my review, prior work fails to investigate the possibility of using the different theories provided in ways to help improve the communities that are affected by crime and lack of community involvement and communication. By applying these said theories, a culture of prosocial capital leading to active bystandership is created. This will allow the community to have better police relations, involvement of citizens in the improvement of their communities, and use technology in ways to be more beneficial to law enforcement and the judicial system. Educators and community leaders would be sounding boards and catalysts to assist in establishing prosocial relations, thus, leading to assisting with deterring crime.

As educators we have the ability to create a sense of care, safety, and community within the classroom. This would begin in the classes, stretch to the masses, and then spread globally. Given this, this study plans to (1) seek and understand why individuals may be more inclined to speak up on social media than make a statement at the scene of a crime, (2) determine if there is a lack of trust in the police department, leading to an individual not providing information relative to crimes committed, and analyzing how this relationship can be mended, and (3) look at the possibility of an alternative way of using technology to streamline the process of making a witness statement. It is necessary that, we, as educators and community leaders, understand what type of impact that we are able to cultivate in order to begin to create a system of active bystandership in communities where this type of behavior is needed.

Conclusion

Given what we know about the Bystander Effect, there is value in researching further the steps that an individual take in relation to the sharing and viewing of crime, how information is
perceived and how bystanders react to information shared on social media. The seven moral stages of deliberations’ framework incorporated in this qualitative study will explore the discourse elements, while discovering the meaning and experience of the bystander’s motivation to act. During this shift, the researcher will pay particular attention to the bystander’s reaction to the publicly shared information, while noting what bystanders share in regard to their expectations of their roles and social responsibility. For example, the bystander motivation could be linked to the empathy or connection that the bystander had with the victim. What is the true motivation, the bystander choosing to engage in advocacy for social justice, or another reason entirely? As the researcher begin to gather more evidence of the perception of the Perceived Social Media Anonymity Effect, we can perhaps better adhere to the needs of community/police relations, allowing for continued discussion in how the literature ought to expand. Once scholars make a more intentional shift to explore qualitative reports regarding social media and bystander responses on social media, this can perhaps help to better understand how and why bystanders choose to engage, go “live” on Facebook or share crimes on other social media platforms. The following chapter will examine each qualitative report gathered on social media websites, print media and news outlets.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology followed when exploring the sharing of the three significant events on a social media platform, the impact to the community, the response of the community leaders and the aftermath of those events. My choice for this research was a case study. A case study explores an issue or the problems associated with the issue through one or more cases in a bounded system (Creswell, 2007, p.73). My research was bounded by the experiences and the impact on the community at the time of the occurrences and also in present day. These events have made significant impressions on how we see crime and social media today. A case study provides a unique perspective of the complexities of social media and the sharing of crimes on the multiple platforms. Schram (2006), “The value of a case study lies in facilitating appreciation of the uniqueness, complexity, and contextual embeddedness of individual events and phenomena” (p.107).

There are three types of case studies: the intrinsic, collective, and the instrumental case study (Creswell, 2007). The intrinsic case study focuses on the uniqueness of the case. The collective case study focuses on an issue that is prevalent in multiple cases. The instrumental case study focuses on the issues and then selects a case relevant to the issues and the concerns. I conducted a collective case study approach which allowed me to study multiple cases in order to receive a more in-depth exploration of the complex issues associated with the Bystander Effect and the sharing/viewing of crimes on social media.

Research Content

This study was conducted in the context of bystanders/individuals viewing and/or sharing crimes on social media, their posts and opinions surrounding the highly publicized events. The
study included any individual, regardless of race, income, background, political status or any unique identifiers. Considering the data gathered in this study, the researcher dived into the information that was shared and took into the consideration the perceived effect on the individual posting the data and the information shared. Chapter Four will investigate further into the accounts of the information shared and those sharing the information.

Research Sample & Sources of Data

The role of the bystander is one that is so important in our society today. Many crimes are being committed, and, in some cases, there has been a bystander there to record those events. These recorded events are then being shared on a grand scale as the popularity of social media continues to rise. Due to this, it is very significant that the bystander uses the authority that is given, due to the circumstances, and use it in a way that can become a crime deterrent.

In consideration of Thornberg’s (2010) seven stages of moral deliberation—notice, interpret, feel empathy, process, scan, determine motives, and act—as well as the Emergent Norm Theory, this study aimed to investigate the steps that an individual can and does take which could lead to action and social action. This study sought to understand the driving appeal of the individual and the communities in different ways to implement active bystandership. With these in mind, the researcher was selective and purposeful in the selection of the posts retrieved from different media outlets.

The study used data/posts from social media websites, news outlets and court documents. All information was reviewed for its relevancy in regards to its relation to the three cases involving Garner, McDonald and Jenkins. The researcher retrieved information which appropriately aligned with the central research questions (1. To what extent is there a nexus between non-reporting of crimes and reporting on social media? (2. What are the perceived
factors an individual reports that they take into account when determining whether to post or share videos of crimes on social media platforms and/or not reporting to police?) in order to enhance the rigor of the proposed phenomenon (Sargeant, 2012). The researcher assumed that with each question asked, that the witnesses, judges and all parties involved answered interview questions in an honest and candid manner. The researcher also assumed that the information provided in this study by those parties involved will have enough knowledge regarding the topic of interest in order to provide rich evaluative feedback. Because the sample is considered small in qualitative research, it was imperative to seek out individuals who provided their perspectives on the publicized events. Upon receiving IRB non-viewable status approval, the researcher began to scour the internet looking for any information related to the relevant cases in order to find background on the topic. Demographic information was not used as a factor when capturing posts, comments, and remarks made by individuals or bystanders involved in each case.

**Data Analysis Methods**

The first step of analysis would include the researcher bracketing assumptions, which is a fundamental step in conducting a phenomenological data analysis (Kaufer & Chemero, 2015). The researcher suspended all judgement and assumptions and focused on the information as reported by those posting on social media sites. The following assumptions were bracketed by the researcher:

- Crimes were race related
- Individual sharing the crimes did so for “likes” or exposure on social media
- The individuals that were involved in the crimes deserved what happened to them
- All police officers are corrupt and will cover for each other
Bracketing assumptions led the researcher to continue the phenomenological data analysis process. The researcher took note of emergent patterns. The researcher created codes that were hand-written and used a color legend to determine how and what the individual was posting.

- Blue: Police Mistrust – How those posting may have viewed the interactions with the police
- Orange: Empathy/Connection – If a person felt any connection to the individual(s) involved
- Yellow: Social Change – The need to want to make a change or feel that a change would need to be made

As the researcher implemented this system, the content was categorized and coded. Once all codes and themes were identified, they were then organized into groups based on individual’s posts and response. Taylor and Bogdan (1998) suggest that the researcher refine the codes in a manner so that the organization of the codes are seamless and little room for misinterpretation. The researcher conducted this strategy by inputted the codes into a spreadsheet. This gave the researcher the chance to see all codes, themes and sub-themes together, supporting the phenomenological method of interpreting participant experiences. Central themes began to emerge based on the repetition of ideas and responses by those viewing the events on social media (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016). The three main themes (see Chapter Four for full description) were analyzed by the researcher.

**Trustworthiness**

In qualitative research, trustworthiness is imperative and allows the academic community to assess to what degree a specific phenomenon has been adequately captured and examined (Denzin & Lincoln, 2015). Considering prior literature, trustworthiness places an emphasis on
the claims by the researcher, whether they are warranted and also the ultimate finding of the study (Levitt, Morrow, Motulsky & Wetz, 2016). The researchers focus should be based on lived experiences or reactions, instead of trying to obtain a large number of participants and waiting for the experience to emerge from there (Levitt et al. 2015). In qualitative studies, using a smaller population allows the researcher to obtain rich data (Creswell, 1998).

During the study, the researcher was watchful of her biases from her own prior experiences, therefore the researcher suspended her own personal views and beliefs about the phenomenon as to not influence the study’s findings (Lin, 2013). This allowed a more organic process while the themes began to emerge. Once the data was collected and at a point of saturation, essentially a repetition of themes continuously emerged as well as other additional properties of the phenomenon were not emerging as a result of the collected data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967); the researcher began to review the findings in order to provide a thick description (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The researcher was able to spend sufficient time with the study's population in order to maintain familiarity with the phenomenon yet remain mindful to not allow personal preconceived notions to interfere with the data collection and the analytic process (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006).

An external auditor was brought in to review the research plan, process and findings. The researcher provided the auditor with a detailed audit trail which consisted of each step of data collection and analysis and the final spreadsheet which contained the three emerged themes as well as the sub themes. It was through the audit trail that the researcher was able to verify the findings (Cutcliffe & McKenna, 2004). By using an external auditor, the data can be confirmed as credible to the degree that it aligns with the goals of the proposed research. In addition to the auditor, the peer researcher included a peer reviewer to review the study’s findings. The peer
reviewer provided insight on the emerged themes and how they relate to the study’s research questions. Once completed, it was deemed that the study is duplicatable, should a similar study be conducted (Simon, 2011). The future researcher should be able to gain enough knowledge from this study in order to conduct their own research with similar findings.

Limitations of the Study

While the researcher implemented steps to enhance trustworthiness, there are limitations found within the study. Principal to this method of this qualitative inquiry is the process of researcher interpretation (Giorgi, 2012). As posts related to the cases were shared and gathered, it was up to the researcher to outline the conclusions of the data while detaching personal biases. Due to this, data analysis was subjective to how the researcher determined the meaning of the data. A major portion of the study was conducted using information found in an online setting using a purposive selective sample. The study used individuals who were active on social media but may not be truly indicative of the overall community since there are individuals who do not actively use social media. Due to this subjectivity, this weakened the findings, which can be seen as a limit to the validity of the phenomenology (Hycner, 1985).

The sample size of this study, in comparison to other similar studies, may not be as favorable as other qualitative studies. The participants are from different communities. Based on the targeted criteria and exploratory nature of the study, the priority was to obtain a sample of individuals who were actively engaged on social media and were aware of what took place in their communities or online in order to provide feedback. While taking all things into account regarding the central limitations of the Phenomenology, the researcher took the appropriate steps in this study to establish trust with all parties involved which made for more valid and reliable data sets.
Future qualitative research would be needed in order to test and validate the Emergent Norm Theory to understand the motives of why bystanders may (not) engage with law enforcement, provide statements, or “go live” on social media platforms. Quantitative research is also needed to test the conceptual framework and examine the possible relationship between the perceived framework and the emergent theory.

**Conclusion**

The phenomenological approach to the research sought to understand the bystanders and those sharing, going “live” and posting events on social media platforms. By exploring the phenomenon surrounded the Bystander Effect and the possibility of the Perceived Social Media Anonymity Effect, the researcher gained insight on how individuals perceived their roles in giving visibility to an issue as well as their part in social change which partially answered the two main research questions:

1) To what extent is there a nexus between non-reporting of crimes and reporting on social media?

2) What are the perceived factors an individual reports that they take into account determining whether to post or share videos of crimes on social media platforms and/or not reporting to police?

The discussion on reporting of crimes and the sharing of crimes

Despite the limitations of phenomenological inquiry, the researcher gathered findings which would perchance contribute to a deeper conversation about the usage of information viewed and shared on social media outlets. This would in turn allow both individuals who have seen and shared crimes that have taken place, as well as those in authority, to view the information and use it in a manner to solve/deter crime. This would, in time, allow the focus to be on the
information shared and not the person who shared the information. The following chapter will outline the study’s findings and conceptualize how the researcher determined the study’s central themes.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

This chapter is devoted to a brief review of the three cases involving Eric Garner, Laquan McDonald and Kenneka Jenkins. In each case the researcher reviewed social media presence, community response, a review of the details of each case and the case outcome. The existing literature on the Bystander Effect does not necessarily take into consideration the experience of others, the connection/empathy that one may have toward the individual/victim, or the perceived reasons why an individual may choose to act/behave at the scene of a crime or after viewing shared information. As such, this project sought to fill a void in the literature, in the context of the bystander and social media responses. The methodology of the Phenomenology was used to fill the gap in the scholarship, allowing the researcher to obtain how information is shared and the perceived motives behind the actions of those bystanders (Kaufer & Chemero, 2015). The findings of this study include the personal perspectives of the individuals sharing the content on social media which ultimately helped to answer the central research questions proposed for this study:

1) To what extent is there a nexus between non-reporting of crimes and reporting on social media?

2) What are the perceived factors an individual reports that they take into account when determining whether to post or share videos of crimes on social media platforms and/or not reporting to police?

The findings shared in Chapter Four are presented as a result of the data collected from social media posts, videos, and news media interviews regarding Garner, McDonald and Jenkins. The researcher engaged with the data in a indirect manner as to revisit the data several times (DeCuir-
Gunby & Marshall, 2011). Approaching the data in this manner allowed the researcher to thoughtfully code and categorize the data in order to conceptualize the content from the posts shared and newspaper articles reviewed. The researcher engaged in coding that consisted of open and axial coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Open coding when analyzing data consist of gathering meaning and ideas from raw data. Axial coding began once the ideas were located, allowing for coding connections to be made. Once codes were developed in a meaningful and clear way, the research adopted a codebook structure (DeCuir-Gunby & Marshall, 2011). This structure included the code, along with an example retrieved from the raw data and then appropriately matched. The researcher was able to strategically analyze the data in a way so that the data could be conceptualized in a simplified way in order to produce central findings of the study. This chapter is organized in a way that the first section and the subtopics underneath will discuss the facts, issues and practices relevant to the cases and it’s reporting of crime/incidents on social media.

“I Can’t Breathe” Chokehold Death of Eric Garner: To Protect and Serve

Eric Garner, a 43 year old African American male was on a sidewalk in Staten Island, NY when he was approached by police officers who had been driving an unmarked police vehicle. He was stopped under the ‘suspicion’ of selling untaxed loose cigarettes. It is alleged that at least one of the officers was aware of who Eric Garner was due to previous arrests. It was understood that he was known for selling untaxed cigarettes near the Staten Island Ferry Terminal. Garner, who was 6 Feet 2 and 350 pounds was standing on the sidewalk in front of a convenience store. Two police officers, Justine Damico and Daniel Pantaleo began to approach Garner who advised them to back off. He stated several times that he was not doing anything. He was minding his own business. He threw his arms up in the air and advised them that he was not
selling any cigarettes. A bystander standing on the side then pulled out a cellphone as the entire confrontation continued and began to be record. There was a swarm of police officers who then attempted to subdue Garner. The recorded video shows Pantaleo placing Garner into a chokehold which ultimately lead to the other officers being able to push Garner to the ground. You are then able to see that as Garner was being taken down by force, he was still being held in the chokehold. As Garner is lying on the ground his hand is open and he states several times, “I can’t breathe.” As Garner continued to utter those words the police officers did not react. The video shows Garner then became still. The paramedics arrived attempting to get Garner to respond, his body remained still. Upon being transported to the hospital he was pronounced dead 1 hour later. The medical examiner, Dr. Floriana Persechino ruled his death a homicide. She conducted a traditional autopsy as well as used the cellphone video to determine that a “chokehold” triggered an asthma attack which led to Garner’s death. The video went viral.

Who is to blame?

The ‘chokehold’ death of Eric Garner raised questions regarding the use of excessive force while subduing an alleged criminal. Garner who unfortunately died, is one of many cases where police officers have used a chokehold or similar restraining method in order to subdue an arrestee. Immediately after the video went viral protests began to take place across the country. This was another catalyst into the Black Lives Matter movement. This movement was significant due to the use of social media outlets to voice concerns regarding police brutality and a call for a reform in the entire police department countrywide.

In early September 2014 the grand jury heard from a total of 22 civilian witnesses and the officers involved. It took several months before a verdict was reached. In December 2014, outrage sparked another set of protests following the grand jury decision not to indict New York
City Officer Pantaleo over the death of Eric Garner. Protesters staged ‘die-ins’ on the street as peaceful demonstrations. The NYPD argued that they could not pursue disciplinary action against the officer until a federal investigation into Garners death was completed. Thousands aligned themselves in the streets of New York, also near the Brooklyn Bridge and the Staten Island Ferry Terminal. Many protestors chanted “I Can’t’ Breathe” while walking through streets across the country. The White House announced President Obama and the New York mayor, Bill de Blasio, would be joining forces and work on relations between police and minority communities and also an additional look in to the case to determine if Garners civil rights were violated. De Blasio understood that the grand jury decision would cause widespread discontent in the city. He stated, ‘It’s a very painful day for so many people of this city.’” The Mayor said that the country was now at a crossroad regarding discrimination and inequality not just a problem for New York but a problem for the country. He stated, “Anyone who believes in the values of this country should feel a call to action right now,” he said, “It is a moment that change must happen.” Many people were speaking out at this time, both young and old concerning the injustice that minorities were having to face at the hand of the police department. Sharon Gordon, 52, of New Jersey told the Associated Press, “There’s been a confluence of social media and outrage,” she said, “I do believe for the first time we’re about to make a change.”

The NYPD outlawed chokeholds more than two decades prior to the Garner case due to the fact that it could be deadly and if administered incorrectly, a careless act. Between January 2009 and June 2014, the New York City Civilians Complaint Review Board, an independent agency that investigates police misconduct received 1,128 civilian complaints involving chokehold allegations. Of these claims only 10 were substantiated.
In August 2019, 5 years after the death of Eric Garner and nearing the statute of limitations, Daniel Pantaleo had a disciplinary trial that was preceded over by a NYPD Judge Rosemarie Maldonado. Though these trial records are sealed, it was released that Judge Maldonado recommended that Pantaleo, who had been on modified administrative duty since the death of Eric Garner, was guilty of “reckless assault” when he used the chokehold to subdue Garner and due to this, recommended that the officer be fired. Pantaleo was found not guilty of “intentional strangulation.” After being given the recommendation from the Judge, Police Commissioner James O’Neill made the decision to fire Pantaleo. In the announcement made to the public O’Neill cited Judge Maldonado verbiage “was reckless and constituted a gross decision from the standard of conduct established for a New York City police officer” when referencing Pantaleo’s behavior. xxiii

Eric Garner’s daughter Emerald Snipes Garner said while at a news conference after the announcement of the decision to fire Pantaleo. “You finally made a decision that should have been made five years ago,” she said “I don’t want another Eric Garner. I will do everything in my power to never see another Eric Garner. I don’t want to see another video of a person being choked out because it was not supposed to happen to him, and it’s not supposed to happen.” xxiv

In 2014 following this event Mayor De Blasio announced the start of a pilot program to equip officers with body cameras to record encounters on patrol. In March 2019, the NYPD began Phase 3 rolling out cameras to be work by specialized units such as emergency services, Critical Response Commands and Strategic Response Groups. xxv In 2015, the city of New York agreed to pay $5.9 million to settle the lawsuit brought forth by Garners family.

Social Media Outcry
The release of the Eric Garner video which went viral within a short amount of time set the tone for black men and women to use their cell phones when dealing with police interactions. At that time #BlackLivesMatter was being formed. As cases similar to Eric Garner continued to become visible to the public, the cry of disparity and social justice became a cry for social change. Social media also helped to fuel protests after the New York Police Officer was not indicted over the death of Eric Garner. ¹ #Eric Garner began to trend immediately after the grand jury decision. Protestors began to organize across the country to voice their disgust at the judicial system.

No longer were individuals silent. They began to use social media to voice their concerns regarding law enforcement agencies and the justice system. Topsy, a site that offers Twitter analytics logged between November 23 – December 5, 2014 #ericgarner was tweeted 1,221,434 per day.

![Figure 2 – Social Media Awareness Post](https://example.com/image2)
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The ‘Pantaleo Effect’

The Pantaleo Effect is a term that was coined by the founder of Blue Lives Matter, Joseph Imperatrice, in terms of police officers who were no longer being aggressive or assertive, they were more passive in order to avoid criticism. This was shown in the wake of the firing of Officer Daniel Pantaleo. There was a decline in the number of arrests and criminal summons in handled by the NYPD in 2019 when compared to the same time period in 2018. In August 2019, the firing of Officer of Daniel Pantaleo caused a general upset with the NYPD and the union. The union leaders argued that Pantaleo was doing his sworn duty within a reasonable manner in order to subdue Garner. Police Benevolent Association Chief Patrick Lynch advised his members to “proceed with caution.” Arrests dropped 27% between August 19, 2019, which was the same day that Pantaleo was fired and August 25, 2019. Police made a total of 3,508 arrests in comparison to 4,827 the year prior. The number of criminal summons decreased nearly 29% over the same period from 1,655 to 1,181.

July 2019 protesters gathered outside of Daniel Pantaleo’s home which was guarded by several police officers doused the officers with water while shouting, “He needs to feel fear wherever he goes!” as well as “We will find you, Pantaleo! No justice, no peace.” Multiple arrests were made but this event was seen as officers were now more passive and thinking whether they should put themselves in harm’s way. Patrick Lynch, President of the Police Benevolent Association stated that officers would continue to uphold their oath to protect and serve the public, but not be “by needlessly jeopardizing our careers or personal safety.”

The Shooting Death of Laquan McDonald: A State of Unrest

On October 20, 2014 at the Chicago Lawn District headquarters in Chicago, Illinois a 911 call came in at about 9:45 pm advising that a person was breaking into trucks at 41st Street and
Kildare Avenue. A witness stated that they confronted McDonald who was 6 feet 180 pounds, who allegedly pulled out a knife and swung it at one of the witnesses. A dashboard camera video shows Laquan McDonald in the middle of a two way street with a knife that had a 3 inch blade in his hand. The video shows as soon as Police Officer Jason Van Dyke’s car pulled up, Van Dyke opened fire, McDonald fell to the ground and then several other shots were fired after McDonald was already on the ground and the knife had been kicked away. Laquan McDonald was shot a total of 16 times. Though the dashboard cameras are equipped with audio, the video had no audio attached.

The original report stated that McDonald was behaving erratically walking down the street, refused to put down the knife in which he was carrying and had lunged toward Van Dyke which due to preliminary reports the incident was ruled as a justified shooting death. Journalists continued to seek information regarding the shooting but was to no avail. Jamie Kalven and Brandon Smith, both independent journalists were able to assist with the release of information regarding the shooting and death of McDonald. Kalven was able to obtain McDonald’s autopsy report through a request filed under the Illinois Freedom of Information Ave. The document revealed information that was contradictory to the shooting report filed by the officers. After Kalven reported those findings, Smith filed a lawsuit that forced the city to release the police body camera footage of the shooting. On November 24, 2015, 13 months after the shooting death of Laquan McDonald uncovered findings which contradicted the report initially filed by officers of the Chicago Police Department led to both internal and external investigations regarding this case. Though the video was grainy, and had no audio, it shows McDonald walking away from the officers when he was shot. Upon the release of the video Officer Van Dyke was charged with first degree murder and taken into custody. An investigation then began regarding
the officers involved in the shooting. Officer Thomas Gaffney, Officer Joseph Walsh and Detective David March each faced charges of conspiracy, official misconduct and obstruction of justice after they allegedly falsified reports from the scene of the shooting as a means to conceal the true facts of the events which lead to the death of Laquan McDonald.

**The Truth Uncovered**

States prosecutor gave a breakdown of the events, the first two officers on the scene to arrive was Officers Thomas Gaffney and Joseph McElligot. They initially questioned two witnesses who advised which direction McDonald was heading. They then pursued and spotted McDonald. McElligot exited vehicle and commands McDonald to stop. He then turned around, took his hands out of his pocket and held a knife in his hands. He then began walking away from the officers. An officer with a Taser was requested to come to the scene but no one arrived. The officers then pursue McDonald. Officer Gaffney turns his car toward McDonald to try and direct him down Karlov. McDonald punctures the tire of the officer’s car and then hits the windshield on the rights side with his knife. McDonald then continues to walk away. The Officers reported that McDonald “popped” the tire on the squad car and were two blocks away. Officer McElligot began to pursue on foot. Officer Van Dyke, a 13 year veteran of the Chicago Police Department, then pulled up to the scene. McDonald did not speak when the officers demanded that he dropped the weapon. Upon exiting car Officer Van Dyke began shooting McDonald. Officer Van Dyke arrived at the scene with his partner Officer Joseph Walsh and was there for less than 30 seconds prior to opening fire. According to the police dashcam it was exactly 9:57:36 on October 20, 2014 when the officer began shooting. There were a total of eight officers on the scene but only one officer opened fire. Officer Van Dyke pistol had a nine-millimeter caliber semi-automatic pistol which held a capacity of 16 rounds. Officer Van Dyke emptied the clip and shot
McDonald 16 times. All 16 casings were retrieved from the scene and all confirmed were fired from Van Dykes weapon. There were a total of 14-15 seconds between the first and the last shot. Officer Van Dyke was preparing to load his weapon when his partner notice McDonald struggling to breathe advised him to hold his fire. McDonald still had a pulse when paramedics arrived but was declared dead at Mount Sinai Hospital.\textsuperscript{xxii} The Cook County Medical Examiners officer stated McDonald was shot 16 times and a toxicology report concluded that McDonald had phencyclidine (PCP) in his system. The manner of death was homicide. Twenty-six entry and exit gunshot wounds were identified as:

- Chest: Four
- Right arm: Six
- Left arm: Five
- Right-side torso: One
- Back: Two
- Right hip: One
- Left leg: Four
- Right thigh: Three

Alma Benitez a witness to the incident stated, “It was super exaggerated,” she said “You didn’t need that many cops to begin with. They didn’t need to shoot him. They didn’t. They basically had him face to face. There was no purpose why they had to shoot him.” \textsuperscript{xxxiii}

The Alleged Cover Up

Officer Joseph Walsh resigned in 2016 after nearly 20 years with the Chicago Police Department following a report conducted by the Inspector General which recommended that his employment be terminated. Walsh was partnered with Van Dyke for a second time on the night of the McDonald shooting. He was the driver of their marked squad vehicle. He was seen on the dashboard camera approaching McDonald with his gun drawn after Van Dyke fired his weapon. In the CPD report Walsh claimed that McDonald swung his knife “in an aggressive manner”
when he got between the 12-15 feet of the officers and stated that Van Dyke only continued firing his weapon when McDonald was on the ground due to the fact that McDonald was still armed and trying to get back up. The dashboard camera doesn’t show McDonald attempting to stand or swinging his weapon. Walsh allegedly lied during several interviews with the Police Review Authority regarding the sequence of events. During the Van Dyke trial, Walsh testified under immunity as a state’s witness for Van Dyke that Van Dyke took ‘necessary action’ in the shooting of McDonald. Walsh also told the jury that if Van Dyke had not have fired his weapon then he would have fired his.  

David March, a detective with the Chicago Police Department of 30 years also resigned after the city’s inspector general report recommended his termination. March was not at the scene of the shooting but was assigned as the lead investigator of the incident. March filed a supplemental report months after the shooting claiming that the dashcam footage was “consistent with the accounts of all witnesses.” March also listed Van Dyke, Gaffney, Walsh and another officer as “victims” and that McDonald “swung the knife toward officers in aggressive manner.” March allegedly advised the Cook County Medical Examiners Investigator that McDonald “lunged at the officers with the knife.”

Thomas Gaffney, a Chicago police officer for more than 20 years was suspended without pay from the department. Gaffney remained inside his squad vehicle while his partner pursued McDonald on foot. McDonald stabbed a tire of his squad car popping a tire and hit the windshield. In his filed report, Gaffney stated that three officers had been injured by McDonald – himself, Walsh and Van Dyke. This was one of the reasons used for the shooting of McDonald. It was confirmed that neither Gaffney nor his partner were injured or present on South Pulaski Road to witness the Van Dyke shooting of McDonald. Dashboard camera footage showed that
McDonald was shot and did not make any physical contact with the officers. During the grand jury testimony, Gaffney stated regarding McDonald contact that ‘he never came at us at any time,’’ and also stated that he never felt personally threatened since he was inside his vehicle during the incident.xxxvi

Patricia Brown Holmes of the Chicago Office of Riley Safer Holmes & Cancila LLP, was appointed as special prosecutor in July 2016 by Judge LeRoy Martin to investigate the McDonald shooting and determine if the other officers involved should face criminal charges.xxxvii There were a total of 16 officers singled out in the report. June 2017 Prosecutor Patricia Brown announced that Detective David March, Officer Thomas Gaffney and Officer Joseph Walsh would be indicted for what she described as “conspiracy in an attempt to prevent or shape an independent criminal investigation of the police involved shooting death of McDonald.” And she further states that “The indictment makes clear that these defendants did more than merely obey an unofficial ‘doe of silence,’ rather it alleges that they lied about what occurred to prevent independent criminal investigators from learning the truth.” The indictment then continues on to state that the three officers protected Van Dyke “by furnishing false information, making false reports, failing to report or correct false information, ignoring contrary information or evidence, obstructing justice, failing to perform a mandatory duty, and performing acts each knew he was forbidden to perform.”xxxviii

Officer Gaffney, Office Walsh and Detective March waived their right to a jury trial and chose to have Cook County Judge Domenica Stephenson decide. The trial closed on December 6, 2018 with none of the men taking the stand and their lawyers only calling 1 witness. March was represented by James McKay of Tomasik, Kotin and Kasserman. Walsh was represented by Todd Pugh of Breen and Pugh and Gaffney was represented by Will Fahy of William N. Fahy
law offices. Prosecutors called seven witnesses in four days in order to discredit that reporting filed by the three officers.

Cook County Judge Domenica Stephenson found former officer Joseph Walsh, Officer Thomas Gaffney and Former Detective David March not guilty of felony counts of conspiracy, obstruction of justice and official misconduct. Judge Stephenson stated the following, “The state did not prove beyond reasonable doubt that there was an agreement between any of these defendants or others, or any act in furtherance of their agreement.” She also stated “This court finds that the state has failed to meet its burden on all charges.” The three men were acquitted of all charges. She stated that in this case you could not just look at the reports and the video and determine from that regarding the officer’s statements that they were in deed falsifying the reporting. She stated that the video does not show the viewpoint of Gaffney or Walsh since they were at the scene of the incident. She stated that in the reports that she viewed Former Detective March who was not at the scene did not state that McDonald lunged at Janson Van Dyke. She stated that a key witness in the prosecutor’s case, Officer Dora Fontaine, “tried to minimize” McDonald’s behavior prior to the shooting and this was conflicting to all reports filed. After the announcement of the verdict, the public was outraged. Rev. Jesse Jackson Sr posted on twitter, “They were guilty of lying and obstructing justice. They reduce the credibility and moral authority of the police. They do not deserve to be on the force. Justice delayed is justice denied.” Chicago Alderman Roderick Sawyer, 6th ward, stated, “There is no circumstance under which the actions of these officers was justifiable and appropriate.” He also stated, “The decision by the judge is a blow to the cause of police accountability, and will serve to further undermine trust between the CPD and the Black community. We have so much work still to do.”
ACLU of Illinois posted on twitter, “Today’s acquittals are a painful reminder of the complete lack of structural accountability for CPD. We are committed to working with our clients and partners to ensure the ‘code of silence’ stops shielding officers from accountability.” Black Lives Matter Chicago also displayed their disappointment with the judges’ verdict by posting the following on twitter, “This system has proven that it is unwilling & incapable of delivering true justice. Throw the entire system out. We are to believe the entire collusion, false statements, and lies were happenstance & not systemically criminal. This says a lot about how the system operates.” The Chicago Urban League made the following statement, “Accountability for police conduct is not just the responsibility of any one officer. It must be rooted into our systems and processes to be truly transformative for our city. This trial presented an opportunity to impose some accountability for police officers who maintain the code of silence that has enabled inequitable policing in Chicago. It is disappointing and disheartening to know that, even with an apparent conflict between officer statements and video proof, that opportunity was missed with this verdict. The Chicago Urban League will continue to support efforts at real police reform and equitable and fair treatment of African Americans and other underserved communities.”

Other officers affected were Sgt. Stephen Franko and Officers Janet Mondragon and Ricardo Viramontes were unanimously voted for termination by the Chicago Police Board. Other officers listed in the report resigned prior to any disciplinary action. Sgt. Franko was accused of approving false police reports that McDonald attempted to stab Van Dyke and another officer. Also approved report that stated that Van Dyke was injured during the confrontation. Mondragon was accused of falsely reporting that she did not see the shooting and was shifting the gear of her car while it was taking place. She was also accused of incompetence due to not checking her
dashboard equipment in her car to make sure that it was operating correctly. Viramontes was accused of reporting that McDonald moved and tried to get up with the knife in his hand. His story never changed even when he was shown the video. Then Mayor Rahm Emmanuel fired Police Superintendent Gerry McCarty and then Cook County State’s Attorney Anita Alvarez lost her bid for re-election. xlii

**Proceed With Caution**

Cook County Judge Vincent Gaughan required that all documents regarding the Jason Van Dyke case be filed in his courtroom. This essentially was making those documents sealed. The Reporters Committee as well as several news media outlets such as: Chicago Public Media, WGN Continental Broadcasting Company, WFLD Fox 32 Chicago, the Associated Press, WLS Television, the Chicago Tribune and Sun Times Media filed motions opposing the sealing of documents. Judge Gaughan held closed meetings during pre-trial proceedings with attorneys representing both parties. The courtroom was also closed to the public for several hearings. At one point Judge Gaughan ordered a court stenographer not to transcribe part of a hearing. The Van Dyke trial became known as one of the most secretive trials which raised flags amongst the media outlets regarding the accessibility of what should be considered as public records. Andy Grimm, a reporter for the Chicago Sun Times stated, “I don’t know that I have ever seen a criminal case in which so many records have been placed under seal and where sealing all records in the case was the default.”xliii The coalition challenged many sealed court records which led to the release of 70 of the 110 documents that had been filed in the Van Dyke case as of spring 2018. See **Exhibit B**. One released document by Van Dykes stated that Van Dyke was “sacrificed to appease the angry horde” and that Chicago Mayor Rahm Emmanuel and State’s
Attorney Anita Alvarez were in a “bitter re-election campaigns.” On March 20, 2019 Judge Gaughan agreed to release 89 of the 110 documents in the case.\textsuperscript{xliv}

On October 5, 2018 Jason Van Dyke was found guilty of second-degree murder and 16 counts of aggravated battery. Van Dyke was found not guilty of official misconduct. Van Dyke was the first Chicago policer to be found guilty for an on duty shooting in more than 50 years. Van Dyke was sentenced for 81 months in prison for the shooting death of Laquan McDonald.

**The Community Responds**

April 2015, Federal and county prosecutors announce that they are investigating the fatal shooting of Laquan McDonald. Also in April the Chicago City Council approved a $5 million dollar settlement with Laquan McDonalds Family. In November 2015, the settlement with the family included an agreement that the video of the shooting would not be released. Journalist, Brandon Smith filed a lawsuit which was able to overturn that agreement and have the video released. In November 2015 due to the nature of the video, community leaders began to meet in order to assist with the apparent uproar that would be caused due to its content. Also in November 2015, Then Mayor Rahm Emanuel also met with community leaders prior to the release of the video as a way of being proactive instead of reactive. On November 24, 2015 the video is released to the general public and immediately went viral. Protests began immediately and through Social media and its’ reach, individuals began to plan on several locations in the community to halt sales of goods and protest. Organized protests took place for 16 days throughout the city of Chicago to signify how many shots that Laquan McDonald received. Then Mayor-Rahm Emmanuel created a police accountability task force in December 2015. This later replaced the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA). This task force is known as the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) led by Chief Administrator Sharon Fairley.
During protests community leaders, politicians and civilians called out for the resignation of Rahm Emmanuel and Anita Alvarez. In June 2016 the IPRA released over 300 video clips, audio and information regarding 101 police involved incidents. Shortly thereafter IPRA was dissolved. In December 2016 Chicago police officers were ordered to wear body cameras as an initial phase roll out that would be completed by December 2017 for the entire department. Due to the review and the upheaval caused by this case the Chicago Police Department created a ‘use of force’ policy.xlv

The ‘use of force’ policy states that force should only be used as a last resort and should be limited when a suspect is fleeing. There should be de-escalation tactics as well as immediate medical assistance when a person is injured. The new policy also called for additional training for each member of the Chicago Police Department. Alderman Ariel Reboyras (30\textsuperscript{th} Ward) stated that “the process used to develop this policy is an example of the police departments commitment to reform and building the community trust.”xlvi

On the day of the Jason Van Dyke verdict many local businesses and areas of the city were closed as a proactive security measure. It seemed as if all of Chicago was tense. Defense attorney Dan Herbert call Van Dyke “a sacrificial lamb” since this case was highly publicized with both political and community implications. He said it was “a sad day for law enforcement” after the reading of a guilty verdict.xlvii

**The Mysterious Death of Kenneka Jenkins: Accountability**

Kenneka Jenkins, 19, was found dead in a freezer in the Crown Plaza Chicago O’Hare Hotel and Conference Center in Rosemont, Illinois on September 17, 2017. October 2017 autopsy results released determined that Jenkins died from hypothermia due to exposure in the hotels walk-in freezer. The freezer had the capability of getting to a temperature of 8 degrees
which was noted by the medical examiner’s office. In addition to hypothermia, alcohol
intoxication of .112 and topiramate, a drug used for treating epilepsy and migraines were also
noted as “contributing factors.” Also noted was mucosal erosions or lesions which indicated she
suffered from hypothermia and an abrasion on her right ankle. The autopsy also showed that her
brain was swollen but this finding did not indicate a specific cause of death. xlviii

On October 20, 2017 the Rosemont Police Department closed Jenkins case and stated that
there is “no evidence that indicates any other conclusion.” Graphic photos of Jenkins post-
mortem body released to the public which began to raise more suspicion. Sam Adams Jr., lawyer
for Tereasa Martin, Jenkins’ mother, stated that the photos released were ‘graphic and disturbing
images that inexplicably show portions of Kenneka’s body exposed.” l According to the
Rosemont police reports Jenkins was found on her side, face down, with her left arm underneath
her, her right shoe off and a small cut on her right foot. The photographs also revealed that she
was wearing the same clothing as detailed in the released videos of jeans and a jean jacket but
the shirt beneath her jacket “was pulled up exposing her breasts,” noted in the police report. A
phenomenon studied by scientist’s state that this could be due to “paradoxical undressing,”
where people who are freezing to death begin to remove their clothes and this theory was used in
order to address the indecency of the pictures. li There was never a video uncovered of Jenkins
entering the freezer. The video clips released show Jenkins staggering through the hotel for more
than an hour. This led to the Rosemont Police Department announcing that there was “no sign of
foul play exists” in relation to Jenkins case. lii

The police conducted 44 interviews, 36 people of which were located in the hotel room
connected to a party in which Jenkins was in attendance. Two attendees had “active” arrest
warrants. Martin, Jenkins mother contested the validity of the police report stating that if her
daughter was drunk then it would have been difficult to open the freezer door on her own. Martin originally called the hotel looking for her daughter and asking for help from the staff. The staff directed her to the police.

Kenneka Jenkins funeral was held at the House of Hope located in Chicago in September 2017. There were thousands of attendees present during the service. Rev. James Meeks had staff monitor social media as a way to make sure that no one attending the service live-streamed the event.

Step by Step

On September 8, 2017 at 11:30pm Jenkins left her home on the west side of Chicago in her mother’s car with some of her friends. They attended another friend’s birthday party at the Crown Plaza Chicago O’Hare Hotel & Conference center in Rosemont, Illinois. Friends advised police that they stopped to pick up a Bluetooth speaker, a bottle of cognac, energy drinks and marijuana. They arrived at the hotel at 1:13 am on September 9, 2017. At 1:30 am Jenkins sent her sister a text message and that was the last contact that the family had with Jenkins. At 1:36 am September 9th a Facebook live video shows a party taking place on the 9th floor of the hotel with a woman with mirrored sunglasses on talking to the camera. There is a reflection in the glasses revealing where Jenkins appears to be sitting. At 2:17 am Jenkins posts a Snapchat video that show her in what looks to be the hotel bathroom. Those attending the party stated that there were approximately 30 attendees who were drinking and dancing. At 3 am while preparing to leave, Jenkins realizes she is missing some belongings including her phone. She stood in the hallway while her friends when back to the room to locate her belongings. It was reported that the friends took 10-15 minutes before they returned. Between 3:25 – 3:32 am surveillance videos shown Jenkins staggering around the hotel by herself in halls, bumping against the walls and
going into an empty kitchen. This kitchen contained the freezer with the walk in cooler which automatically shuts from the inside but the door latch can be activated by pushing a white circular handle. This was the last time that Jenkins was seen alive. At 4 am Jenkins’ friends’ calls her mom to let her know that they are unable to locate her and ask if she had made it home. At around 5 am Jenkins’ friends then returned her mother’s car and advise her that Jenkins is lost and they left after searching for her. At 7:15 am Martin calls Rosemont police from the parking lot of the Hotel. She and other relatives have been at the hotel for about an hour looking around for Jenkins. A dispatcher advised Martin to wait a couple hours and to return home and if she does not show up to call back. At 1:16 pm Police enter Jenkins into Law Enforcement Agencies Data System, LEADS as a missing person and begin to search for her at the hotel. At that time they were unable to locate Jenkins. At 8:29 pm Officers were alerted that a family member of Jenkins was knocking on doors looking for Jenkins. Once arriving, Police request to review surveillance videos. They spot Jenkins on videos, notice no suspicious activity and left the hotel. September 10, 2017 at 12:23am a hotel worker goes into the empty kitchen where the freezer is located, outside of the camera’s view and then calls a police officer. Jenkins is then found inside the freezer frozen.

An Investigative Social Media

Surveillance videos were released on social media and immediately went viral. Each day online activity would produce more and more theories surrounding Jenkins death. Some were more credible than others such as Crown Plaza Hotel personnel who demonstrated how Jenkins could have never closed the door. One theory claimed that Jenkins had been drugged in which authorities considered since surveillance footage shoes Jenkins staggering in the hallway into the kitchen where the freezer was located. Bradley Stephens, Mayor to the Village of Rosemont
stated, “It’s unfortunate that some of the stuff is convoluting the investigation because all those leads have got to be followed up on.” He also stated “As I’m sure you’ve seen, there’s a lot of different speculation out there, so [police] are doing their best to come to a quick resolution, obviously. I think everybody wants to know what happened.”

Jenkins’ mysterious death has proven itself to be considered one of the extreme cases of Social Media CSI. Her death was so significant due to the lack of complete footage which shows how Jenkins navigated through the hotel and ultimately to her death. The lack of urgency from the personnel at the Crown Plaza and the police department was used as basis for an even more profound racial issue.

The video filmed by Jenkin’s friend, Irene Roberts, is one that was used as a catalyst for the Social Media frenzy. In this video many people were stating that you could hear Jenkins in the background saying “help me.” After this input, people began to ridicule Irene for her participation in the mysterious death. Many social media users slowed down the videos, clip by clip and began to explain their theories of what was taking place. Some even stating that the videos were edited. Theories ranged from motion detectors picking up others that were not in camera view. Edited videos not showing that Jenkins was actually being carried. Others claiming that the individual in the video is not Jenkins at all. There were Facebook groups boasting thousands of individuals reviewing their “case discussions.” Others stating that this was the work of an organ harvesting ring. Ultimately the general consensus is that Jenkins was murdered.

This case was so high profiled due to its Social Media presence that it has been on MTV’s True Life Crime since it raises more questions than answers revealed.

Gary Hughes, A YouTuber from Oregon who specializes in true crime also looked further into the Jenkins death. He pieced together several videos both looking into the police
version and the conspiracy theorists versions. He stated, “I think it all built up,” in regards to the opposing views of the death. “I think social media, and the availability of content, created an avalanche of insanity.”

Through social media, protests were broadcast and organized. A year after the death of Jenkins, protestors again met at the Crown Plaza where previous protests had taken place in remembrance of Jenkins but also advising of an unsatisfactory review into Jenkins’ mysterious death. Each protest prompted for individuals to request a further probe into the death of Jenkins and also boycott Crown Plaza Hotel for their lack of urgency in their response. Rosemont Mayor Brad Stephens stated “People see shadow images and all kinds of other things, and I don’t know how and where they see that stuff,” he said. “But that’s the internet age we live in. People become experts and post it on social media channels.”

Jedidiah Brown, a Chicago activist who assisted with the organization of several protests after the death of Jenkins stated, “I think the dialogue or opinions concerning the case is what kept it alive,” he said. “It kept people interested and focused on getting that justice. To this day, it keeps that fight alive.”

The amount of reviews and responses, truly showed the large amount of distrust that the general public has for the police department. Time after time, protest after protest, the theme that continuously reared itself was lack of police intervention, police distrust, underlying racial issues and the validity of information given to the general public. Many uses of social media stated that the narrative given by the police department just did not add up. Latyra Goodman, a protestor in Chicago stated, “They had (time) to edit, and remove and add anything they wanted to that video,” she stated, “There’s been a video (online that shows) how you can edit videos and
remove a person from them. We’ve seen this with our own eyes. Why trust the Rosemont police?“

Coding Process

In qualitative research, assigning labels or codes to data gives the researcher a chance to review the raw data that was collected and comprehend the findings. DeCuir-Gunby and Marshall (2011) states that codes be assigned in a manner that is meaningful to the researcher based on the raw data. By implementing a coding process based on the uncovered details, experiences and other factors uncovered by the researcher is developed by an in-depth review of the data (Van Manen, 1990). Open and axial coding procedures were implemented in the study as a way to deeply analyze the meaning behind the posts on social media platforms as a way of possibly adding to the discussion of the Bystander Effect and recognizing the possibility of the Perceived Social Media Anonymity Effect phenomenon.

During the coding process, the researcher found 300 significant posts (100 per case) related to Garner, Mcdonald and Jenkins. The researcher condensed the posts into codes. The codes were created based on repetition of words, actions, thoughts or beliefs (Creswell, 2013). The researcher then color coded the words based on its perceived meaning. The codes were then significantly broken down based on the initial perception of the code. The researcher then simplified the codes into clear themes. TABLE 2 outlines the codes and corresponding colors. The following colors were used to identify the codes:

- Blue: Police Mistrust – How those posting may have viewed the interactions with the police
- Orange: Empathy/Connection – If a person felt any connection to the individual(s) involved
Yellow: Social Change – The need to want to make a change or feel that a change would need to be made

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eric Garner</th>
<th>Laquan Mcdonald</th>
<th>Kenneka Jenkins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police brutality</td>
<td>Cover up</td>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent</td>
<td>Corrupt system</td>
<td>Capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicious</td>
<td>Doubt</td>
<td>Compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wariness</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Sympathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protest</td>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>Impartiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cry for help</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pity</td>
<td>Resolve</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Restore</td>
<td>Condolence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Policing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Insight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commiseration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Initial Codes and Color Identifiers

After reviewing the codes, the researcher organized the themes and subthemes as a way to give meaning and ultimately address the study’s central research questions (Creswell, 2011). The researcher noted which codes appeared repeatedly throughout the data and used that as a strength identifier, which determined the relevance of the theme and subtheme and confirming that the theme relates to the study’s central questions (Vaismoradi, Jones, Turunen, & Snelgrove, 2016). The researcher determined that the emergent themes and subthemes were relevant to the study’s findings based on the perceptions of those posting on social media platforms. TABLE 3 outlines the frequency of the reactions/responses highlighting which emerged subtheme is in correlation to the response(s).

The summation of themes and subthemes are shared underneath TABLE 3, using a method shared by Hill, Thompson, and Williams (1997). Frequency reported themes are recorded as general, typical or variant (Hill, et al. 1997). The frequency report will begin with
general themes, then typical themes and followed by variant themes, which is the final
designation and are not identified in the study due to high frequency of the emergent themes and
subthemes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Mistrust</td>
<td>1 Effectiveness</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Fairness</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Community Engagement</td>
<td>Typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy/Connection</td>
<td>4 Perceptions of Empathy</td>
<td>Typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Community Responsiveness</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Self-Reflection</td>
<td>Typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Change</td>
<td>7 Judicial Reform</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Police Reform</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3. Nominal Report Frequency*

**Themes**

Qualitative research themes are the main products of data analysis as suggested by Vaismoradi,
Jones, Turunen and Snelgrove (2016). The further suggest that qualitative analysis and theme
development often requires the researcher to fully immerse themselves in the content. The
themes, the responses, the study’s phenomenon work together to answer the central questions of
the study. For the purposes of this phenomenological study, themes and subthemes were
identified, based on the multiple perspectives of the individuals posting information related to the
three cases of Garner, Mcdonald and Jenkins. By including subthemes in the data analysis, the
research uncovered insight and patterns among the shared information from the social media
posts (Vaismoradi et al., 2016). In the end, the researcher was able to make clear connections as
to the perceived feelings surrounded by the posts shared on social media and news outlets and
the perceived responses following the highly publicized events.
As the researcher engaged in the data analysis process, there were three central themes which emerged from the data (police mistrust, empathy/connection, and social change), each one including at least two subthemes. These themes and subthemes, helped to give meaning to the study’s central aim, to determine what are the perceived factors that an individual reports that they take into account when determining whether to post or share videos of crimes on social media platforms?

**Police Mistrust**

The first theme *police mistrust* explains why a bystander may be reluctant to speak with police officers while on the scene of a crime as a witness. The subthemes of this central theme are important to take into consideration as evidenced by the reports collected during the study. For example, the bystander or any individual viewing crimes on social media must feel that the police will be *effective* and investigate or more so solve crimes if provided evidence of the alleged crimes. In each of the cases the community and those individuals directly impacted by the cases had considerable reasons of why there was and still is police mistrust. Garner, though having underlying health issues was held in a chokehold which ultimately lead to his death. As previously presented in literature, this was not the first time that an incident including a chokehold was used by an officer to subdue an alleged criminal. This was the time when it led to the death of an individual. In McDonald’s case, he was shot 16 times while walking away and the department was under investigation for a cover up. The 16 shots received by McDonald had 26 entry and exit wounds. This type of behavior can be seen as over kill when the individual did not pose a “last resort” threat. In the Jenkins case, her death is still a mystery today. There are more questions posed than understood. There seemed to be a lack of communication between the department and the people and no full understanding of what happened to Jenkins. To this point,
fairness is another subtheme which emerged from the data. Many individuals posted that they felt that the mystery of Jenkins remained a mystery due to the race of Jenkins. Posts were made stating that if Jenkins was white, justice would be served. Then leading to the final subtheme of community engagement which was an important piece to the overall review of the cases. In each case, protests began to take place concerning the “handling” of each situation and how changes should be made due to the outcome. The community and its leaders took centerstage speaking on the importance of police/community relations and the steps that are needed in order to heal the community.

Empathy/Connection

The second theme, empathy/connection provides more insight into the possibility of the Perceived Social Media Anonymity Effect and the Bystander Effect in its relation to social media. Posts falling into this theme showed a constant reflection of the situation, the hurt/harm caused from the actions and many feeling hopeless/helpless and unable to understand the meaning behind the events. There were posts of people pleading, asking others for help. There were posts where individuals were so angry at the outcome of the cases. There were posts where individuals who may have gone through similar situations that had different outcomes rallied together to protest what had happened and what could happen. As such, perceptions of empathy are a key piece to the theme. This subtheme captures the idea of why all three cases had such virality. Images, videos and any information related to Garner, Mcdonald and Jenkins was widely circulated from one internet user to another. This in turn caused an incitement of community responsiveness. In each of the three cases the community rallied together in order to receive answers and demand a systematic change. We see this taking place across the country with the many protests regarding Law Enforcement Agencies and the judicial system. Many notable
protests such as those involving Trayvon Martin, Michael Brown, Eric Garner, Laquan McDonald, Kenneka Jenkins, Sandra Bland, Oscar Grant, Vonderrit Myers Jr., Antonio Martin, Alton Sterling, Keith Lamont Scott, Anthony Lamar Smith and so many others. All listed displayed actions of a united community working together to achieve one common goal: Justice. Similarly, upon reviewing the posts and the actions of others, there was a noticeable undertaking of those who were in a mode of self-reflection. Youtube videos, interviews from both community leaders, celebrities and others, displayed self-reflection attributes based on what they may have done, how they acted and the decisions they have made which could have led to one of the three cases.

Social Change

The third theme, social change, explores the posts from those individuals who felt that there should be changes in regards to rules of behavior leading to both judicial reform and police reform. The two subthemes suggested for this central theme are important in exposing how individuals posting their responses to social media felt that there would need to be a stronger collaboration between the community, the judicial system and also law enforcement in a way of improving community relations and also increasing accountability. In cases such as Eric Garner, the data retrieved revealed that the judicial system did not hold Officer Daniel Pantaleo accountable for his actions which led the death of Eric Garner. On the other hand, in the case of Laquan McDonald, Officer Jason Van Dyke was charged a count of second degree murder due to the death of Laquan McDonald. In one case (Garner), the posts suggest that those individuals involved were not held accountable and in another case (Mcdonald), the posts suggest that the officer was held accountable. In the case of Mcdonald, based on the findings and the amount of
time that it took to uncover the circumstances surrounded by the death of Laquan Mcdonald, the posts suggest that the judicial system failed again.

Summarized further in TABLE 4 below are the total frequencies of each emergent theme, and the responses noted above. Next, in TABLE 5, the frequency of each subtheme is reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Mistrust</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy/Connection</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Change</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>358</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4. Frequency of Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Eric Garner</th>
<th>Laquan Mcdonald</th>
<th>Kenneka Jenkins</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Empathy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Responsiveness</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reflection</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Reform</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Reform</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>358</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5. Frequency of Subthemes*

**Examples of Themes**

**Theme One: Police Mistrust.** The first theme of the study helps the reader better understand the perceived feelings regarding the experiences of those individuals sharing posts of
crimes committed on social media. As such, it is important to note that the theme of police mistrust is based on individual experiences. Coming together, these varying dispositions are what created the first emerging theme of police mistrust. For example, below are some of the shared posts and responses related to the three cases in relation to the emerged subthemes.

**Effectiveness.**

*Jacqueline D Ray* Where is the FBI?? Damn Shame. Can someone please help this family? I don't understand how this can be allowed to happen. What are the attorneys doing? Hire new ones if they are not making moves. You have over 4k followers. Start a petition and have everyone sign it. We all need to come together. My heart breaks. 🖤 prays.

*Tyler Boyd* Not to blacks - unhealthy, drug addicted resisting arrest.

*Justin V St John* He'd be alive! There's no? Re that unless your drinking that whitecool old.

*Austin Centola* I can not say every police is bad. I am always for supporting law. I do say, too many today do not care to know what it is to be a standard bearer. And they are beneath us for that. 🎌

"Even if we could prove that Officer Pantaleo's hold of Mr. Garner constituted unreasonable force, we would still have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Officer Pantaleo acted wilfully in violation of the law."

**Fairness.**

*Oldy Jupri* The policeman should be promoted and receive a medal.

*dolly63* 4 Dec 2014 5:36
Like the 60's all over again.

*Allen Hartopp* Was he on PCP in this picture like he was when he ignored law enforcement instructions while wielding a weapon ultimately causing his own demise?

R.I.P. Eric garner and fuck NYPD
The issue of race loomed over the case, although it was rarely raised at trial. One of the only instances was during opening statements, when the special prosecutor told jurors that Van Dyke saw “a black boy walking down the street” who had “the audacity to ignore the police”.

“They are intentionally sabotaging this audio equipment because in their mind, they’re going to do something wrong or reckless when they’re outside on the beat,” Calloway said.
The Civilian Complaint Review Board, which investigates complaints against New York police officers, announced that it will study chokehold complaints it has received since 2009. “We’re going to make this chokehold study an agency priority,” Tracy Catapano-Fox, executive director of the agency, said in a statement.

**Theme Two: Empathy/Connection.** The second theme of the study is a perceived reflection of an individual’s empathy/connection to the information that was shared online. While the aims of this study did not consider how the individual identities with the cases involved, it is however worth noting that not all posts came from the same demographic. For added context, two of three cases represented were related to police conduct while the case regarding Jenkins was centered on police investigative measures. Considering the diversity of the individuals posting the information on social media, a more dynamic perspective was portrayed in the data. For example, below are some of the shared posts and responses related to the three cases in relation to the emerged subthemes.

*Empathy.*
I'm still wondering what happened to that young lady that is some mystery and I just think about it because it was so weird how everything played out. I don't understand but the good Lord is not sleep. Justice for kenneka jenkins. I wish somebody say something about it.

July 8, 2018

Community responsiveness.

I want to thank all the people who prayed for the angel kenneka from t ies hearts and wished her peace in the paradise into the great heaven... I want to thank all the people and everybody that sending us messages... Thank you for the people who are showing how much love they got and how much faith and support they give... kenneka the innocent soul of a beautiful child will never be forgotten... she lives in my heart your heart and the hearts of us all... I want to thank everybody for their condolences and support and their respective cooperation and being by our side all time... kenneka rest in peace rest in heaven... I love you... We love you.

Roger Starnell: Prayers for kenneka family, I want to see the officers charged!

I believe that our baby kenneka is happy in paradise but I believe either that someone locked that innocent angel inside the freezer... Rest in heaven baby girl.

Black lives matter!!

Community responsiveness.

Girlsend -> pretzelattack 4 Dec 2014 6:03

It's very much like the 60's, it just hasn't reached that scale.

No that's exactly how it is nothing like the 60's, in that the masses do NOT condone this type of behavior, but if there are riots, then that sentiment, will begin to change, for the worse.

Wonsidy Fornixtul Justice for you kenneka! All the way from Baltimore. Justice will be serve.

I'm always down by my side. I'm down by my side.

Farah Pam: Support prayers and love from France.

Nicolle Phillips: From Jamaica justice no peace. Rip baby girl.

Sa Gardner: I just want to leave a comment to say this need to take place all over the world what you doing right now is a great thing some kind of way we need to all work together all over the world and this type of thing needs to take place everywhere not just in Chicago but all over the world my heart go out to the family and everyone such as myself or hurting I'm from Birmingham Alabama. God be with you all peace love you all in Jesus name.
Theme Three: Social Change. A central theme in this study explored posts shared within the context of social change in relation to judicial and police reform. Many of the posts communicated their concern with the judicial proceedings as well as concerns regarding police officers and the use of excessive force. Because this theme could be defined in many ways, the researcher decided to focus on the majority of posts related to the cases of Garner, McDonald and Jenkins. For example, below are posts and responses shared related to the reviewed cases in relation to the emerged subthemes.

Judicial Reform.
William Calloway, who was instrumental in the legal battle that led to the release of the dashcam video in 2015, described the penalty as “a slap in the face to us and a slap on the wrist” for Van Dyke.

The lead defense attorney, Dan Herbert, said Van Dyke “truly felt great” after learning his sentence. “He was happy about the prospect of life ahead of him” and someday being reunited with his wife and two daughters. The prosecutor who oversaw the case said he can live with the sentence.

The rare decision to bring a murder charge against a member of Chicago law enforcement perhaps contributed to the peaceful and relatively small nature of the demonstration that stretched into the early hours of Wednesday, as agitated crowds gathered in streets, stopped traffic in downtown Chicago and chanted.
The case has also had repercussions for the Chicago police department – the force’s top officer, Superintendent Garry F McCarthy, was fired. A taskforce was created to look at accountability, oversight and training and a US justice department review found police regularly used excessive force.

**Themes Summary**

The three themes that emerged from the review of posts and responses related to the cases of Garner, McDonald and Jenkins allow us to make sense of the perceived reasons that individuals were posting information online. The first theme, *police mistrust*, described how individuals were posting online either in favor or against the actions of law enforcement. This was either driven by their possible feelings surrounding law enforcement of uncovered feelings related to the cases reviewed. Furthermore, this theme explained how many may not feel
comfortable with speaking with members of law enforcement and therefore would rather post their opinions online amongst numbers. Through thinking about the numerous postings shared online, the second emerged theme of *empathy/connections* surfaced. The second theme exhibited the care and connection that individuals who were posting information online offered and gave them the chance to reflect upon their prior and current experiences, so that ultimately they could formulate a deeper meaning behind their actions of posting/sharing crimes on social media. As individuals continued to posts and observe the outcome of the investigations connected to each incident, the third emerged, *social change* surfaced. Much of what was shared centered on police and judicial reform. In each case, individuals shared their concerns regarding the investigations, lack of information, and lack of clarity regarding judicial proceedings surrounding each case and law enforcement accountability. These three themes, along with the corresponding subthemes, allowed the researcher to make connections to the central research questions of this study. The connections supported the main goals of this study, which were to examine the perceptions of those posting crimes on social media and to determine to what extent is there a nexus between the reporting and non-reporting of crimes and reporting on social media platforms.

**Connections to the Research Questions**

The aim of this study was to take a look at the possible nexus between non-reporting of crimes and reporting on social media which would ultimately lead to the conversation regarding the possibility of developing a method for individual’s to share information online and it be used in a meaningful way by members of law enforcement. Because the central aim is connected to bridging the gap between civilian and law enforcement relations (Borrero, 2010), this study sought to examine the phenomenology behind the motivation to post and share crimes online. By
conducting the study in such a way, the researcher was able to gather first-hand accounts from those posting information and viewpoints related to the cases studied, explaining their opinions and connection to the information shared.

*To what extent is there a nexus between non-reporting of crimes and reporting on social media?* Much of the literature on the Bystander Effect has yet to explore the psychological and behavioral factors that influence individuals to post and share crimes on social media (Latane & Darley, 1969; Thornberg, 2010). Furthermore, the field knows little about the motives behind individuals posting on social media and their overall experiences in the context of the frequency of posting, connection to victims and their role in the sharing of information. As such, this study’s focus was to conduct a micro-level analysis of determining if there is a nexus between noon-reporting of crimes and reporting on social media. This research question allowed an open review of posts that could determine if there was a possible connection between posting and non-reporting of crimes. Additionally, individuals posted the perceived challenges that they feel when reviewing information on social media, and their perceptions around leadership and authority. Due to this, the researcher was able to further understand their roles in posting/sharing crimes on social media. The researcher was then able to create a dialogue around the motives of those sharing information online, closing the loop on the study’s goal; using the conceptual framework to understand the perceived reasons an individual may post and share information related to crimes online.

*What are the perceived factors an individual reports that they take into account when determine whether to post or share videos of crimes on social platforms and/or not reporting to police?* The second research questions aimed to identify the perceived factors that an individual reports that they take into account to determine whether to post or share videos or crimes on
social media. As was shared by Thornberg (2010), while there are seven moral deliberations identified as a precursor to bystander response, we have yet to truly understand motivation as it relates to posting and sharing of events on social media and the lack of interaction with law enforcement on the scene of a crime. As such, those individuals who did post and share information explained how they wanted to ignite social change, asked for answers, demanded justice, cried for the victims and were willing to rally and show support. Together with the information shared and the perceived reasons the individuals were posting, the researcher was able to identify some underlying reasons regarding the sharing and posting of crimes that was taking place based on the emerged themes. The study’s conceptual framework concerning taking notice, action and socially driven action will be used in the follow chapter to explain the bystander/individuals motivation as it related to their reported perceptions.

Conclusion

Chapter Four presented the findings from this phenomenological study on the Bystander Effect and crimes shared and reported on social media. First, the researcher outlined the posts and their relevancy to the study. Included in this outline was the perceived views of the individuals posting the information on social media. The researcher summarized the varying responses in order to give attention to the multi-dimensional bystander experience. Following, the researcher shared the emergent themes which validated the reported experiences of those individuals viewing and sharing the crimes on social media. Finally, the researcher paired the study’s findings with the central research questions so that connections be made in hopes of filling the relevant gaps in the literature. The themes which grew out of the participant posts are shared below in Table 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1: Police Mistrust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme: Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme: Fairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme: Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 2: Empathy/Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme: Perceptions of Empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme: Community Responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme: Self-Reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 3: Social Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme: Judicial Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme: Police Reform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Emergent Themes and Subthemes
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

The central aim of this phenomenological study was to deeply examine the Bystander Effect from a social media perspective. Interest in this topic emerged as a result of experiencing an incident where there were several individuals on the scene, recording, and I was the only one to provide a witness statement. As a result of this, literature was reviewed on the topic making note of the subsequent gaps in the literature and its relation to social media. Together with the researcher’s prior experiences and knowledge on the topic, this study continued the conversation on social media and the need for a more efficient system that bystanders are able to anonymously post crimes in a way that would be beneficial for Law Enforcement use, in a manner that would, hopefully bring justice to those who may have been harmed while filming. The study was executed in such a way that allowed for the retrieving of rich, unaltered data from individuals posting relevant information in transparent ways. Through a deep review of the posts shared, the researcher discovered three central themes (police mistrust, empathy/connections, and social change), paving the way for a more detailed and rich description of why there is a need for understanding the perceived factors an individual reports that they take into account when determining whether to post or share videos of crimes on social media platforms and/or not reporting to police.

Connection to Literature

While scholars and psychologists have completed a substantial amount of work outlining the key aspects of the Bystander Effect phenomenon, little has been researched about social media and the implications of those who post and share information on social media platforms, as well as the impact that this has on Law Enforcement and community relations. If those
individuals who are involved in Law Enforcement want to gain a better sense of why bystanders may post and share events on social media while not making statements at the scene of a crime, this arising phenomenon would need to be thoroughly researched. Despite the lack of scholarship on the phenomenology of the Perceived Social Media Anonymity Effect, the literature on the Bystander Effects contribute meaningful, thought provoking concepts in order to bring awareness to this growing phenomenon. These concepts are incorporated below as the researcher outlines the connections made from the qualitative study to the literature on the topic.

This study aimed to answer and/or provide insight on the following: To what extent is there a relationship between non-reporting of crimes and reporting on social media? What are the perceived factors an individual takes into account when determining whether to post or share videos of crimes on social media platforms and/or not reporting to police? The three cases studied, Garner, McDonald and Jenkins have three common themes: social media, social change, and empathy/connections.

Robert Thornberg (2010) discusses seven stages of moral deliberations before deciding whether to help in circumstances of non-emergency and critical situations. These seven stages should be taken note of when dealing with bystanders witnessing crimes while on the scene. These same stages have relevance when individuals are sharing the crimes on social media as well.

1) Notice something is wrong – When incidents that have a possible criminal undertone are shared online it is viewed and the individual must determine whether “they feel” that this event is significant enough for them to either take action, share, or delete. This particular step is important because if an individual does not feel that anything is wrong, the information will be bypassed.
2) Interpret individual need for help – By taking a look at the situation, the bystander is able to determine if the circumstances are severe enough to warrant whether or not to assist the individual who is in need of assistance.

3) Feel empathy – The bystander must feel some sense of empathy, connection, or understanding for the individual who may be in need of assistance. If the bystander does not feel empathetic toward the victim, there is a high likelihood that the bystander will not react.

4) Process society’s model frames – There are many societal frames that the bystander may consider when determining whether to assist. For example, a bystander may be more willing to assist if the incident involves elderly, children, or those who may not be able to care for themselves on their own volition.

5) Scan for social status and relations – The bystander may determine the impact assisting would have on their life or family. Many individuals may create “fake” pages in order to share information that would not be easily traced back to them.

6) Determine motives for action – The bystander must gauge and determine what their motivation for acting and assisting in a critical situation is. If the bystander does not feel empathy or have no connection to the individual, no matter how critical the situation, the bystander will not react.

7) Act – In this phase, the bystander has taken the responsibility to act. This is due to concern, empathy, connection, and the ability of wanting to help the situation.

Thornberg’s seven stages of moral deliberation is one that is relevant both on the scene of a crime/incident, when uploading the crime/incident to social media and in particular for those who view the crimes/incidents and continue to share them.
Emergent Norm Theory (ENT) is collective behavior where people are driven to react based on the act itself. ENT doesn’t necessarily focus on the race, gender, socio-economic status of the one involved but on the act. In the cases of Garner, McDonald and Jenkins, all three had racial undertones attached which caused for the people to assimilate themselves and protest against these acts of injustice. Though neither case was proven to be racially motivated, concerns were raised regarding the procedures that followed and if they were escalated due to the individual’s racial status. Eric Garner, an African American male, 350 pounds with a prior criminal history and upon view of the footage there are no weapons in his hands, no cigarettes in his hands based on the suspicion of why he was confronted and he was subdued by several police officers in order to arrest him. Laquan McDonald, an African American male, though he had a knife in his hand, he was shot 16 times while walking away from the officer and posed no physical threat. Kenneka Jenkins, an African American woman was missing for several hours and based on reports offered minimal assistance by the Crown Plaza Hotel and the Rosemont Police Department. Though this statement is unfounded, the question that was raised several times over by protestors is if this would have happened if they were Caucasian.

The findings suggest the following conclusions and next steps:

1) There is a thirst for information in society. Due to political climate change, crime, the education system, prison systems, economic system, internet notoriety and other factors; one thing that is certain is that people want information as soon as it has happened.

2) Social media can be used to organize protests, share theories, share information and crimes that have been committed, but not organized in such a manner to determine credibility
3) There is a need for improvement regarding police and community relations

**Connection to Theme One.** Similar to the work of Latane and Darley (1969), this study paralleled much of what scholars such as Robert Thornberg (2010) have mentioned may be the key elements of bystander engagement or lack thereof. The authors shared that the engagement of bystanders may have several different causes and can be indicative of the crime committed, race, empathetic connection, social awareness, gender, age and other factors. It is important to note that while each experience is different and may be reported differently, each are multidimensional, shedding light on the phenomenology behind the bystander experience. To this point, the first emergent theme of **police mistrust** opened up dialogue referencing how both current and past events relating to police interaction with citizens is constructed based on an individual’s experience. **Yukl (2013)** discussed how we respond to others and how we make sense of our own identities is linked through traits, which, also in a way challenges how much power an individual is perceived to have. Several individuals referenced this in posts where they felt that police officers may often misuse their power as a way of making those individuals that they come in contact with feel powerless as a way of regaining social order (Neocleous, 2000). In general, police misconduct and excessive force receive a significant amount of attention, both on social media and also on news outlets as we have seen in the cases of Eric Garner and Laquan McDonald (Borrero, 2001).

**Connection to Theme Two.** Many of the individuals who posted and shared information regarding the cases reviewed felt a sense of **empathy** or felt a sort of **connection** to the victim involved in the incidents. Studies completed by Clements, Brannen, Kirkley, Gordon & Church (2006) showed that there are different levels and factors concerning empathy and concern for victims of violent crimes. The authors shared that victim concern and emotional empathy
influenced advocacy responses to victimization. Based on their studies, victim concerns was unrelated to traits such as authority, politics, or punishment, but more of the type of crime committed and the offenders. In the case of Eric Garner and Laquan McDonald, the actions of a law enforcement officer played a major role in the death of both men. In each case, there was video footage outlining the steps taken by the officers involved and ultimately the death of the men involved. Though bystanders were on the scene of both crimes, there was no civilian engagement. In the case of Eric Garner, the bystander who recorded the incident, posted the video on social media and it immediately went viral. In the case of Laquan McDonald, the dashboard cam video was first released on news media outlets and then that video went viral. In the case of Kenneka Jenkins and the mystery surrounding that particular incident, its’ significance was based on the overwhelming amount of sadness exhibited in the posts that were shared on social media. In the posts regarding Garner and McDonald, many individuals were very empathetic and angry in many instances surrounding the circumstances of those deaths. The death of Kenneka Jenkins sparked an outcry and questions on the effectiveness of law enforcement investigations and the uncertainty of how such an accident could have happened. In this study, the researcher found that the circumstances surrounding the death of these three individuals played a major role in the sharing, commenting and posting of the videos and information relevant to the incidents. Individuals, according to the findings of this study, were very mindful in the information they shared, and in turn, many were hoping to have justice prevail, some in which felt that it had, or for a hope for a stronger sense of community to join together to elicit change.

**Connection to Theme Three.** Because this study sought to expand more deeply on the experience of bystanders and individuals posting and sharing crimes and/or information on social
media, it was worth reviewing the responses related to social change. The researcher found that much of what the individuals shared about their feelings/opinions related to the cases of Garner, McDonald and Jenkins aligned with how many people feel about the judicial system and law enforcement. Prior literature suggests that elected officials promote punitive and racially disparate criminal justice policies due to partisanship and racial fears (Donnelly, 2016). In the cases of Garner and McDonald, both instances, both black males were involved in white male officer related confrontations. Officer Daniel Pantaleo, was found not guilty for the “chokehold” death of Eric Garner. After being placed on administrative duty for five years, his employment was then terminated. Officer Jason Van Dyke was convicted of second degree murder in the shooting death of Laquan McDonald which held a sentencing of 81 months. Second degree murder sentencing carries a lighter sentence than first-degree murder (original charge). Second degree murder does not carry mandatory prison time but offenders can sentenced four to twenty years in prison or probation. In both cases, there were many posts that suggested that there was political undertones in the ruling of Officer Jason Van Dyke and the dismissal of charges for Officer Daniel Pantaleo. As evidenced in the study, there were several communications regarding judicial concerns and a call to action for police reform.

Considering the central themes of this study and their relevance to the scholarship on the Bystander Effect, it is also worth noting how the study’s conceptual framework connects both to this study and what prior scholarship has shared (Latane & Darley, 1969; Thornberg, 2010). Not only did this study explore the perceptions of those posting and sharing crimes on social media, but the study also explored an individuals perceived motivations on their actions. The literature is lacking a deeper understanding of motivation as it relates to the phenomenology surrounding posting/sharing crimes on social media. Even though authors such as Thornberg (2010) suggests
that there are seven moral deliberations in regards to bystander actions or lack thereof but there was nothing mentioned on how these actions can be translated or transcribed to social media usage. For the purposes of this study, the researcher used prior experience in hopes of more explicitly defining the possible perceived steps that are taken within this phenomenological context. As with the conceptual framework, one would view and choose not to share or choose to share in a manner that they feel is able to assist “society” or the “authorities” without having to deal with the social responsibility of personally reporting the incident.

Implications for Practice

By researching the context surrounding posts shared on social media platforms, the researcher had the opportunity to take notice at the possible bridge needed for law enforcement and civilian relations. The use of social media has both positive and negative attributes attached to its usage. Due to the vastness of its platform, there is the ability of reaching hundreds of thousands of people within a short amount of time in order to “get the word out” so to speak and spread information. One of the issues with social media as we can see from the cases involving Eric Garner, Laquan McDonald and also Kenneka Jenkins is that many times people will share, view, like or comment on the information shared but little is done to actually assist the police with the investigation. A positive in the usage of social media is the ability for those who are wanting to be active and have the ability of rallying up support in order to protest, which in turn would lead to exposure for a systematic social change. The negative of social media and its amateur sleuths is that over the years, the police departments around the world have begun to monitor social media and therefore when there are so many tips and leads, this becomes a daunting task for the police department and fellow law enforcement to follow up on the validity
of the claims. This then raises the question of whether social media and its usage is beneficial at all.

The researcher introduced the *Perceived Social Media Anonymity Effect* which is the premise that allows one to relinquish the fear of being in large crowds and speaking up when crimes have been committed but be able to seek solitude among numbers on a social media platform. It allows the individual to speak their opinions while also casting off the social responsibility of reporting. The information is made available to those who choose to use it as they see fit. This particular concept is one that we may have seen and literature has proven to take place. In the case of Kenneka Jenkins, information was consistently dissected, reviewed, edited and shared but for as much as it was viewed on social media, this was not indicative of those speaking to authorities or participating in protests. There were hundreds that showed up to participate in the protests but not nearly as many as the thousands upon thousands that were daily researching her information and viewing the “case discussions” on Facebook, YouTube and Instagram.

Prior studies of the *Bystander Effect*, as defined by Darley & Latane (1969), is a tendency for people not to intervene or offer to help in a social situation. This is often misunderstood as apathy and selfishness and is more of an interpretation of the lack of response in others. The individual is typically thinking that help is not either needed or that understanding or lack of obligation of responsibility to react to circumstances. The Bystander Effect has its limitations. In the case where the police is involved, the only authority that the bystander may feel at that time is the ability to film and share. This is not stating that they do not want to intervene, it is the understanding that in some cases they will be placing themselves in more harm by providing a statement. In the case of Eric Garner, a bystander filmed the entire event. There were several
Police officers on the scene. If that particular bystander had intervened, there would have been a high likelihood that the individual may have been arrested. In this case, the bystander recorded the incident and posted it on a website. The bystander believed that this incident needed to be shared. Once individuals began to view the video this was a catalyst used to assist with a reformed New York Police Department.

In the study, the conversation was primarily centered on the response, thoughts and perceptions of individuals posting or sharing crimes on social media platforms. The dialogue considered, this qualitative study presented a perspective that when considering the Bystander Effect in relation to social media, there are several similarities that can be drawn from the interactions of those posting information. The implications for practice is possibly shared across different communities (leaders), different populations, law enforcement and educators.

**Educators.** As previously noted, Vaughn (2005) suggest that there are two specific social norms as a basis for prosocial behavior: the *norm of reciprocity* in which we should help those who help us, and the *social responsibility norm* in which we would help or assist others who depend on us or need our assistance. As educators, there is a unique opportunity to work with individuals, more so children, to teach them ways in creating a society focusing on social responsibility. In an interview with Robert Coles (1997), the premise of schools stands for exclusiveness, privilege, authority, power and social achievement. Considering schools within this context, educators are seen as authoritative figures. Schultz and Oyler (2006) reviewed a social action curriculum project where students were able to participate in mainstream political life, but to also challenge that mainstream. The concept of this study was built on the foundation of John Dewey who recognized that the essential role that schools can play is teaching the democratic process in a manner of stressing that “democratic ideal must pervade the public
schools” (Patterson, 1995). This idea was chosen because currently in society, as seen evident in the posts shared on social media, there is a due process. Due process as defined in both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution is the fair treatment through the judicial system, especially as a citizen’s entitlement. In consideration of the Bystander Effect, those individuals who see a crime committed, has the authority to record, post, analyze and assist with the capture of an alleged criminal. As Educators, the foundation of “see something, say something” a termed coined by the Department of Homeland Security, is a concept that can and should be reiterated in schools across America. This type of response can be a fundamental step in the direction of teaching others to report what they have seen both online, for visibility but also to law enforcement agencies for additional assistance.

**Law Enforcement.** Fundamentally, this study will have particular bearing on how law enforcement may view information found on social media websites which in turn would hopefully assist in finding a secure system where bystanders/individuals with information are able to share on social media anonymously if needed. Social media can be used as a resourceful tool and has proven itself to be such over the years. Melvin Colon, a suspected New York gang member posted public photos on Facebook while making incriminating posts, past criminal activity and threats against others. By using Facebook, the local law enforcement agency was able to arrest and charge him. One of Colon’s Facebook friends gave police access to Colon’s “private” information and since it was shared publicly it could be used against him. This is just one of many examples of how social media is able to assist in a manner of a favorable outcome for both the community and also the law enforcement agency. A bystander was able to review the information and share this with local authorities. This bystander took the approach of action instead of a socially driven response such as repeatedly sharing of the information. This type of
collaboration should be one that is continually taught on all levels. In the classroom, in the churches, the local community boards and the local police department. This approach displays active bystandership by using information readily available to the public and using it in a manner to possibly prevent future crimes.

In order to reduce crime one must first change the mindset of the community. This starts from the beginning. As educators there is an opportunity to teach methods while collaborating with local law enforcement agencies that will allow individuals to be safe while also participating in active bystandership.

**Community Leaders.** Community Leaders will find this study to be relevant due to the issues that are taking place in society present day. More and more we are seeing crimes shared openly on social media platforms. Also with these crimes, we are seeing public outrage also expressed. In the case of Eric Garner, as previously shared, protests were publicized and organized on social media. We have seen this type of behavior demonstrated also with Sandra Bland, Eric Brown, Trayvon Martin and others. Although each bystander is a potential judge of behavior, each individual and their experience is different, the presence of self-awareness does not always determine action, or an act of helping in high stress situations does not always create public self-awareness (Froming, Walker, & Lopyan, 1982). Community leaders can be very visible in the community. Many times there are churches offering pray, organizations distributing food and clothes, organizations and Pastors organizing marches against social injustice so therefore community leaders are seen as major contributing factors to our neighborhoods. As such, community leaders should continuously be seen working with local law enforcement and promoting active bystandership in their communities. In addition to the impact this study has on educators and law enforcement professionals, community leaders are impacted as well. As such,
this study will help inform the future of how we engage with law enforcement and share information online.

**Active Bystandership/Social Responsibility.** As a final implication for practice, this study will inform the future of how individuals are able to view information that is shared online and determine its true use and meaning derived from the sharing of the content. Teaching social responsibility is necessary due to what children are seeing daily on social media and also inside of their communities. Lantieri (2007) states that the choices we make today regarding how we nurture our children’s development has a great impact on our future. As a society with advancements in technology, we must understand that the younger generation needs—and will continue to need—support, structure, and understanding, and will need to participate in the community in order to feel interconnectedness to the community. Due to this, we must start teaching active bystandership and social responsibility at a young age. In a study completed by Thornberg (2010), when students began to understand the position of the teacher and the expectations of how to react in emergent situations from the actions of the teacher, they began to mimic similar behavior when faced with similar situations. Essentially, when teaching individuals another way of reacting and sharing information, this can become a learned behavior. As a result of this study, individuals will be able to take note of what steps are needed in order to implement a plan of action so that bystanders are able to not only share content online, but in a manner of usefulness for law enforcement. With the high level of support from educators, law enforcement, community leaders and others, bystanders are more likely to be motivated to continue posting information online but based on the conceptual framework, within the mindset they are acting in a socially driven way so that those individuals who can, are able to use the information in a more meaningful way. Nonetheless, by enhancing the voice of the bystander, it
is possible that law enforcement, educators and community leaders are able to clearly outline and execute a process to review, process, inform and react to crimes/information shared on social media posts.

**Limitations of the Research**

In order to fully understand the extent of social media and the non-reporting of crimes, further studies would have to be used to determine the full extent of this particular question. Quantitative methods should also be considered in order to possibly form a numerical hypothesis to further increase the credibility of the findings. This in itself may be difficult task but if one was able to partner with a police precinct with high crime and social media presence, this may be a possibility. Though there are many cases that could have been used, this research study focused on three major cases. Although these cases provide information regarding this usage of social media and community engagement, it would be beneficial to review more cases and a further review into community and law enforcement relations.

Two cases, McDonald and Jenkins are centralized in the Chicagoland area. Though both cases had a national impact, other cities that may have had similar issues would broaden the scope of experiences documented. Majority of the qualitative data used was from New Outlet, interviews with individuals directly involved may have given more credibility to the information shared.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Future research should focus on further documenting what this dissertation calls the *Perceived Social Media Anonymity Effect*. Additional research should look into the experiences of others, monitor social media posts and responses and identify the effects and the continuing concern of the Bystander Effect. Qualitative data should be used and collected over time to assist
researchers with identifying possible methods of productively sharing information on social media which would report to law enforcement agencies in order to “weed” out the more credible sources. This in turn would satisfy the community with receiving more, transparent, information with a speedier response while also assisting local law enforcement agencies with solving more crimes.

Conclusion

As I reviewed the data in these cases and many other similar cases, I was able to come to a general understanding that as information is made readily available to the public it can either hurt a case or help a case. Though this is one that is not recognizably so information is necessary. Eric Garner was a case that was significant due to the fact that if a bystander would not have recorded the video, Garner would have been filed away with little to no exposure. If journalists would not have continued to press the courts and the police department to be more transparent providing information to the public in the Laquan McDonald case, though it took, in my opinion, too long for the video to be released, justice would have never been served since his case had been filed away and closed. In regards to Jenkins, though her death is still seen as a mystery, the use of social media, exposure, murder theories, etc. shows the impact of what incomplete information and video footage can do to a community that demands answers. Overall, the underlying theme is change. Change is needed and necessary in order to begin to work with the community to reduce crime and use resources such as social media as a tool. Though the sharing of information on social media can seem insensitive to the families involved, in the cases discussed in this dissertation, this type of exposure was needed to bring light to a system that essentially has areas where reform is needed.
END NOTES
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PEW RESEARCH CENTER
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, CRIMINAL DIVISION

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,

Plaintiff

V.

JASON VAN DYKE,

Defendant.

17CR4286

Proposed Order

Hon. Vincent M. Gaughan,
Judge Presiding

ORDER

This matter coming to be heard on Intervenors' Post-Trial Motion To Unseal Court
Records, and by agreement of the People of the State of Illinois, Defendant, Jason Van Dyke (the
"Parties") and Intervenors¹, and the Court being fully advised in the premises, IT IS HEREBY
ORDERED:

1. The Clerk of the Court on the fifth floor of the administrative building, 2650 S.

California (the "Clerk"), shall make available to the public via the Clerk's Office's

Public Access Terminal the 87 documents listed on Exhibit A within 10 days of the

execution of this Order.

2. The Clerk shall also provide a single copy of each of the 87 documents listed on

Exhibit A to counsel for Intervenors within 10 days of the execution of this Order.

¹Intervenors are the Chicago Tribune Company, LLC; Sun-Times Media, LLC; the Associated

Press; WLS Television, Inc.; WON Continental Broadcasting Company, LLC; WFLD Fox 32

Chicago; Chicago Public Media, Inc.; and the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press.
3. In the event the Clerk does not have a copy of any of the documents listed on Exhibit A, the Clerk shall immediately notify the Court, the Parties, and Intervenors identifying the title and filing date of the missing document. The Parties shall provide a copy of the missing document to the Clerk and Intervenors within 7 days of receiving notice of the missing document. The Clerk shall thereafter make the document available to the public via the Clerk's Office's Public Access Terminals.

4. The Office of Official Court Reporters, Criminal Division, of the administrative building, 2650 S. California (the "Court Reporters' Office"), shall immediately make available to the public for order the following transcripts for the above captioned case:
   a. The May 10, 2018 hearing before the Honorable Vincent M. Gaughan regarding the People's Motion in Limine ("the May 10 Hearing"); and
   b. all trial proceedings before the Honorable Vincent M. Gaughan including sidebar deliberations.

5. The Court Reporters' Office shall also provide a single copy transcription of the May 10 Hearing and all sidebar deliberations to counsel for Intervenors within 2 days of the execution of this order subject to the Court Reporters' Office transcription fees.

[Signature]

ENTERED:
Judge Vincent M. Gaughan
Circuit Court of Cook County
Criminal Division

Date: ______________________
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### APPENDIX C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Filing 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/05/16</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>15CR2062201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RESPONSE TO THE PETITIONS TO APPOINT A SPECIAL PROSECUTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>08/18/16</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PEOPLE'S OMNIBUS DISCOVERY MOTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>08/18/16</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR DISCOVERY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>09/29/16</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PEOPLE'S INITIAL GARRITY TEAM DISCLOSURE TO THE DEFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11/02/16</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PEOPLE'S FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL GARRITY TEAM DISCLOSURE TO THE DEFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11/02/16</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PEOPLE'S SUPP DISCOVERY MOTION 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>01/10/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PEOPLE'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL GARRITY TEAM DISCLOSURE TO THE DEFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>01/10/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PEOPLE'S SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY ANSWER 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>01/18/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO SUPPRESS EVID TAINTED BY EXPOSURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>02/01/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOTICE OF MOTION/MOTION TO QUESH SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>03/23/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PEOPLE'S SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY ANSWER 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Filing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF THE PEOPLE'S GARRITY KASTIGAR HEARING POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>09/27/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>PEOPLE'S PROFERRED TIMLINESNESS FOR PREL. GARRITY/KASTIGAR HEARING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10/04/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>DEFT'S OFFER OF PROOF/KASTEGER WITNESSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10/16/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>SPEC PROS PATRICIA BROWN HOLMES' MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10/25/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>PEOPLE'S SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY MOTION 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11/06/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>ANSWER TO DISCOVERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11/06/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>MOTION TO DISMISS THE IND BASED ON PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12/06/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>DEFT'S REPLY TP PEOPLE'S RESPONSE TO DEFT'S MTN IN LIMINE TO PERMIT INTRO OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12/06/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>DEFT'S REPLY TO THE PEOPLE'S RESPONSE TO DEFT'S MTN TO DISMISS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12/06/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>PEOPLE'S SUPP DISCOVERY RESPONSE 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>12/06/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>ST'S RESPONSE TO DEFT'S MTN TO DISMISS THE IND BASED ON PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>12/06/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>DEFENDANT'S LIST OF EXPERTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12/20/17</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>PEOPLE'S SUPP DISC RESPONSE 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>01/05/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE DEFT'S INITIAL EXPERT WITNESS DISCLOSURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>01/05/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE DEFT'S SUPPLEMENTAL LIST OF EXPERT WITNESSES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>02/01/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE REPORT OF DEFENSE EXPERT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>02/01/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE REPORT OF SECOND DEFENSE EXPERT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>03/08/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE PEOPLE'S MOTION IN LIMINE DR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>03/08/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE PEOPLE'S SUPP DISCOVERY RESPONSE 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>03/26/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE PEOPLE'S MOTION TO RETAIN EXPERT ASSISTANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>03/26/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE PEOPLE'S SECOND MOTION TO RETAIN EXPERT ASSISTANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>03/28/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE PEOPLE'S SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY RESPONSE 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>03/28/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO MEDIA INTERVENORS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>04/06/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE DEFT JASON VAN DYKE'S RESP IN OPP TO MEDIA INTERVENORS MTN FOR ACCESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>04/26/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE PEOPLE'S MTN TO BAR BATSON OBJ IN FRONT OF JURY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>04/26/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE PEOPLE'S MOTION IN LIMINE-GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>05/03/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE DEFT'S RESP IN OPP TO PEOPLE'S MTN IN LIMINE (DR.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Filing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>05/10/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>DR. REPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>05/11/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>DEFT'S COMBINED RESPONSE TO STATE'S MOTION IN LIMINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>05/17/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>DEFT'S MEMO ON ILL RULE OF EVIDENCE 704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>05/31/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>STATES RESPONSE TO DEFT'S OPPOSITION TO THE PEOPLE'S MOTION IN LIMINE (DR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>06/07/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>PEOPLE'S REQUEST TO SEAL DRFT'S MTION TO RECONSIDER LYNCH WITNESS TESTIMONY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>06/14/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>PEOPLE'S SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY RESPONSE 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>06/28/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>ORDER 5/10/18 HEARING ON PEOPLE'S MOTION IN LIMINE (DR) PRELIMINARY RULING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>06/28/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>PEOPLE'S SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY RESPONSE 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>07/27/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>PEOPLE'S SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY RESPONSE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>08/07/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>DEFENDANT'S ANSWER TO DISCOVERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>08/17/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>PEOPLE'S SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY RESPONSE 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>08/20/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>DEFTS REQUEST TO FILE UNDER SEAL HIS PROPOSED JUROR QUESTIONNAIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>08/21/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION OF WITNESS TO EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Filing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>08/22/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>PEOPLE'S SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY RESPONSE 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>08/27/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWER TO DISCOVERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>08/27/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION OF WITNESS FILED REQUEST FOR EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>08/27/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION TO WITNESS FILED REQUEST FOR EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>08/27/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION TO WITNESS FILED REQUEST FOR EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>08/27/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION OF WITNESS FILED REQUEST FOR EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>08/27/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION OF WITNESS FILED REQUEST FOR EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>08/28/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>PEOPLE'S SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY RESPONSE 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>08/29/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION OF WITNESS FILED REQUEST FOR EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>08/31/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION OF WITNESS FILED REQUEST FOR EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>08/31/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION OF WITNESS FILED REQUEST FOR EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>08/31/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION OF WITNESS FILED REQUEST FOR EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Filing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>08/31/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION OF WITNESS FILED REQUEST FOR EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>08/31/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION OF WITNESS FILED REQUEST FOR EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>09/04/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>PEOPLE'S SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY RESPONSE 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>09/05/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJ OF WITNESS TO EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE FILED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>09/05/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJ OF WITNESS REQUEST FOR MEDIA COVERAGE FILED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>09/06/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION IN LIMINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>09/06/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE ORDERS ENTERED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>09/12/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION OF WITNESS REQUEST FOR MEDIA COVERAGE FILED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>09/12/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>ORDER/EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE OBJECTION GRANTED IN PART/DENIED IN PART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>09/14/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>PEOPLE'S RESPONSE TO DEFT'S SUPPLEMENTAL MOTIONS IN LIMINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>09/14/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>DEFENDANTS SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION IN LIMINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>09/18/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION OF WITNESS TO EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE OF TESTIMONY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Filing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>08/31/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION OF WITNESS FILED REQUEST FOR EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>08/31/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION OF WITNESS FILED REQUEST FOR EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>09/04/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>PEOPLE'S SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY RESPONSE 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>09/05/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJ OF WITNESS TO EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE FILED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>09/05/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJ OF WITNESS REQUEST FOR MEDIA COVERAGE FILED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>09/06/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION IN LIMINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>09/06/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE ORDERS ENTERED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>09/12/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION OF WITNESS REQUEST FOR MEDIA COVERAGE FILED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>09/12/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>ORDER/EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE OBJECTION GRANTED IN PART/DENIED IN PART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>09/14/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>PEOPLE'S RESPONSE TO DEFT'S SUPPLEMENTAL MOTIONS IN LIMINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>09/14/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>DEFENDANTS SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION IN LIMINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>09/18/18</td>
<td>RESTRICTED IMAGE</td>
<td>OBJECTION OF WITNESS TO EXTENDED MEDIA COVERAGE OF TESTIMONY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>