

Review of: "Exploring the link between Smartphone Use, Violence, and Social Sharing in 50 case studies"

Daniela Šincek¹

¹ University of Osijek

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors chose an important topic and showed enthusiasm to remove the previous methodological difficulties. However, their paper also has certain, even considerable limitations, which should be eliminated.

Introduction - an overview of the different forms of violence that were recorded in video form is given, but no theoretical basis is given that would explain or be a starting point for understanding the results of this research. This should be added to the introductory part. The ambition of the paper itself is unclear - does it want to be a scientific paper or an educational - entertaining material to sensitize the masses? The introduction is written more like the latter, and not as an introduction to the presentation of scientific research. It seems to me that the focus of the work is the ways in which the smartphone is used to record violence or violent behavior and what is the motivation for such recording/behavior. However, in the introductory part of the paper, there is not a sufficiently elaborated theoretical basis for the motivational part, and in this context the introduction should be expanded.

Problems, method, and results

The authors clearly explain their motivation for the data collection method in the introduction. The method is too vaguely described, that is, it is not clear to me how the motivation for someone to record such a video was determined - was it written in a newspaper article or did the authors categorize it themselves? If it was written in the article, I assume that one of the criteria was that the motivation was clearly stated in the article. If the authors assessed motivation, it would be necessary to clearly describe how this assessment was made. In the results themselves, only the event is described and what role the smartphone played in it.

The results are of very questionable value. They are not collected so that they are representative, but rather they are cases that have attracted the attention of the media. The explanations themselves are very basic - it is visible how many different cases of violence have been shown in the media (it would not be appropriate to say how many different cases occurred, because, I repeat, the sampling is not representative, that is, it is possible that there are dozens of different violent behaviors that are not attracted the attention of the media, and thus not even the authors of this paper). Only the role of the smartphone is observed, and then, the authors explain that they came to three basic motivations through a qualitative analysis. It would be important to clearly describe in the Method part which qualitative method of analysis they used and who analyzed the data and how matching among those who assessed the data was achieved, as well as what happened in cases of different assessments (there are two authors, I assume they both analyzed all cases and followed

each other's matching). How did they initially arrive at the three motivations - was the framework method used, for example?

Discussion

In the discussion, the authors present some parts that would be more appropriate to mention in the introduction, they look too little at the results they obtained themselves and there is a lack of contextualization of these results within the framework of other empirical knowledge, and some alternative explanations such as empathy are introduced, which until then had not been touched upon at all in the paper (and to which a lot of space is devoted in the discussion, although the connection with the specific research presented by the authors is unclear).

Although in the limitations they point out that it is a pilot study, the authors did not clearly present the arguments that indicate that the paradigm they chose is appropriate for the goal they want to achieve (it would be useful to present it in the method).