# Running Head: COMPARISON OF LONE AND GROUP RAPE

An interpersonal comparison of lone and group rape offences

Sarah Hauffe<sup>1</sup>

&

Louise E. Porter<sup>2 3</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> School of Psychology, University of Liverpool, UK
<sup>2</sup> Centre of Excellence in Policing and Security, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia
<sup>3</sup> Author for correspondence

COMPARISON OF LONE AND GROUP RAPE 2

**ABSTRACT** 

This study explores differences between group and lone sexual assaults, using

a framework of interpersonal dimensions of dominance-submission and co-operation-

hostility (Alison & Stein, 2001). From archival sources, 120 cases (60 group and 60

lone offender assaults) were content analysed for offender, victim and context

variables. A number of behavioural characteristics were found to differ between group

and lone rape. Specifically, more hostile interactions were involved in group rape,

including increased violence. Additionally, (pseudo-) submissive offender behaviour

was more frequent in lone assaults, including the offender's use of a confidence

approach and associated greater victim dominance. The psychological implications

are discussed, with particular reference to the circumplex dimensions and principles

and how these can inform the treatment of both offenders and their victims.

Keywords: Group rape, Sexual assault, Circumplex, Interpersonal

Previous literature focusing upon patterns and behaviours of rape offenders and victims has identified that rape can be committed by a single offender or groups of offenders. Prevalence rates suggest that 20% of women in America will be victims of rape at some point in their life (Ullman, 1998). Similarly, the 2004/5 British Crime Survey reported that 23% of women since the age of 16 in Britain had experienced a sexual assault (Finney, 2006). While many official statistics do not differentiate between group and lone offender crimes, researchers have suggested that group rape is more frequent than was once thought (West, Roy & Nichols, 1978; Wiehe & Richards, 1995). However, there is relatively little research comparing group and lone rape, with much of the previous work comparing rape in terms of individual features. The present study aims to clarify differences between group and lone sexual assaults by adopting an interpersonal framework that allows features to be explored in terms of themes of interaction between offenders and victims. In this way, both the psychology of offenders and psychological impact for victims can be considered, in order to develop theories and inform tailored offender treatment and victim support programs.

Researchers have suggested that inter-group dynamics play an important role in group rape, suggesting group rape is a product of group processes. In this respect, psychological factors come into play, which determine the nature and interaction of that group. Recently Krahe (2001) suggested that group sexual assaults can be accounted to psychological processes including social identity, de-individuation and diffusion of responsibility. De-individuation theorises that, in groups, individuals lose a sense of individuality (Goldstein, 2002) and personal identity and, as a result, become submerged within that group, whereby collective behaviour and identity becomes salient (Decker, 1996). Group dynamics including peer pressure, groupthink, cohesiveness and modelling, (Porter & Alison, 2005; Woodhams, Gillet & Grant, 2007) have all been suggested to contribute to the nature of group interaction in sexual assault. Researchers have also outlined group rape to be primarily motivated by comradeship and male camaraderie (Groth & Birnbaum, 1980: Holmstrom and Burgess, 1980), an element of excitement, 'kick', or adventure (Scully & Marolla 1985). Further, there is a view that group rape occurs in the context of violence rather than passion (Hilberman, 1976). From previous research, the issue that emerges as an important theoretical aspect to consider is the view that group rape differs to single offender rape, with regard to social-psychological theories.

In contrast, single offender rape "may reflect personal pathology" (Wright & West, 1981, p.30) whereby individuals are driven by personal sexual urges rather than social pressures. This theoretical perspective of groups and individual rape offenders therefore provides the basis for differing behavioural characteristics that have been previously suggested by researchers.

Previous studies have directly compared group rape and lone assaults, noting (sometimes conflicting) differences in the behaviours and characteristics. Amir (1971) provided an influential study that is still drawn upon today, likewise Wright and West (1981) directly compared group rape with lone assaults noting differences in line with Amir (1971). More recent studies have also compared lone offender and group rape (Ullman 1990; Gidycz and Koss, 1999; Bijleveld & Hendriks, 2003), while some have focused solely upon the characteristics of group rape (Bijleveld, Weerman, Looije and Hendriks, 2007, Porter & Alison, 2006a). However, such previous studies have focused upon specific features in isolation, such as the age of offenders and victims, previous convictions, location, violence and victim resistance.

Recent research has begun to investigate rape with a more socialpsychological view, focusing upon rape from an interpersonal perspective and the importance of themes of behaviour. Alison and Stein (2001) explored themes of offender behaviour, dichotomously coded from victim statements of single offender sexual assault, in relation to a specific model of interpersonal relating, termed the circumplex or interpersonal circle (Leary, 1957). The interpersonal circle predicts that behaviour can be described in terms of two intersecting, orthogonal dimensions; Dominance- Submission and Hostility- Cooperation. The positions of behaviours around this circle depict the extent to which the dimensions describe them and are relative to one another. Each behaviour has an equal relationship to adjacent items, for example, Dominance is as similar to cooperation as it is to hostility. However, behaviours at opposite ends of dimensions are not only geometrically opposed but also conceptual opposites. For example, a person behaving submissively is behaving in a way that is opposite (in meaning, motivation etc.) to someone behaving dominantly.

A strength of the interpersonal circumplex is the wealth of research that confirms its reliable and valid application in a variety of different settings, since it facilitates understanding of all interpersonal interactions as a combination of control and affiliation (Plutchik & Conte, 1997). Examples of its application can be found for reactions to family members' need for support (Wiggins and Trobst, 1997); parent-child and husband-wife relationships (Schaefer, 1997); clinical phenomena including group therapy interactions as well as behaviour associated with personality disorders (Soldz, 1997), and; offender-victim behavioural transactions in group robbery (Porter & Alison, 2006b) and child sexual abuse (Bennell, Alison, Stein, Alison & Canter, 2001).

Alison and Stein (2001) applied this circular framework to single offender rape, highlighting that three of the four themes accounted for offender behaviour (the submission theme was absent from the model). Following this, Porter and Alison (2004) applied the circumplex to cases of group rape, finding all four themes of interpersonal offender behaviour.

A further advantage of the circumplex is that, rather than being purely descriptive, it also allows predictions to be made as to the likely reactions to behaviour, through the principle of *complementary* (Kiesler, 1983). This principle argues that interpersonal behaviour is designed to invite or generate particular reactions. Porter & Alison (2004) had some success for determining that the interaction of offender and victim behaviour conformed to the circumplex's principle of complementarity. Complementarity suggests that on the co-operation – hostility axis, behaviour is likely to elicit a similar reaction. In other words, hostile offender behaviour is likely to create hostile victim behaviour (and vice versa) while co-operative offender behaviour is more likely to gain compliance from victims. On the dominance-submission axis, complementarity suggests an opposing action-reaction sequence, whereby dominant offender behaviour is likely to gain victim submission while submissive offender behaviour allows the victim some control or dominance in the situation. Research comparing group and single rape offences has identified various differences in features and behavioural characteristics that, we argue, can be interpreted and understood in terms of these circumplex themes and principles.

The dominance theme relates to gaining control of the victim, where the "victim feels the offender has complete control and forces the victim into a position of complete supplication and non-resistance" (Alison & Stein 2001, p.519), for example gagging, blindfolding and binding the victim. Alison and Stein (2001) also identified

the offender having forensic awareness as belonging to this theme, which adds to this picture of an experienced offender. Wright & West (1981) reported that lone offenders were more likely to have a previous conviction for a sex offense than group offenders. Previous criminal involvement may be indicative of forensic awareness, whereby criminals learn about methods of detection and are careful not to leave evidence at the scene. Previous experience may also encourage an offender to bring certain tools (such as items for binding and gagging a victim) to the scene in order to control for victim reactions experienced in previous offences.

In the circumplex model, offender submission opposes offender dominance, since some "control is given to the victim" (Porter & Alison 2004, p.519). Alison and Stein (2001) outlined offender submission to be unexpected in rape. However, some offenders may be considered to seemingly allow their victims to be more dominant, thus creating a pseudo-submissive stance. For example, use of a confidence trick when approaching the victim may give the victim the choice to place trust in the offender (Porter & Alison, 2004), sometimes involving the victim allowing the offender access to her/his own home, a place where the victim may feel more secure and in control. Thus, while offender submissiveness could involve a loss of offender control and, therefore, greater victim dominance to resist or end the attack, this is not necessarily the case. Pseudo-submissive offender strategies can be used to manipulate victims into believing that they have control when in fact they are being maneuvered into vulnerable situations or falsely secure states of mind.

The location of sexual assault has been found to vary between group and lone offender assaults, with lone rape reported as more likely to be inside the home of either the victim or the offender, whereas an outdoor location is common in group assaults (Wright & West, 1981; Porter & Alison, 2006). Further, Amir (1971) outlined that confidence approach behaviour was also found to be significantly higher in lone rape than group rape. On the basis of complementarity, research has outlined victim resistance (indicating dominance) to be linked to offender submissiveness (Porter & Alison, 2004). Victim resistance has also been noted as more common in lone than group offences (Amir, 1971; Wright & West, 1981) in both verbal and physical forms. Given these differences, it would appear that lone offender assaults may be likely to exhibit offender (pseudo-) submissive behaviour in the present study sample.

The interpersonal theme of hostility is characterised by aggressive and violent interactions between an offender and victim, beyond that necessary to commit rape. Alison and Stein (2001) suggest that, within this theme, offender behaviours involve violation of a victim through aggressive behaviour, such as verbal and physical violence, use of a weapon and tearing the victim's clothing.

Previous studies comparing group and lone offender rape have suggested that physical violence, both manually or with a weapon, is more common of group assailants, with a knife being the most frequent weapon used (Wright & West, 1981). Offender acts of violence including kicking, biting, hitting and strangulation have also been found to be prominent in group offences. However, when looking at the level of injury sustained by victims, no differences between the two types of offence were found (West & Wright, 1981).

When looking at the behaviours of groups in general, violence and aggression are common in group interaction, in particular the view that group norms promote aggressive behaviour, leading to more hostile interaction (Smith & Mackie, 2007). This directly relates to the theme of hostility and, therefore, may predict differences between lone and group offences from a theoretical perspective, both in terms of offender hostility and ("complementary") victim hostility.

The final theme of Co-operation, also termed compliance-gaining, involves the offender seeking active participation by the victim. Alison & Stein (2001) showed that this theme also often entails pseudo-relationship behaviour, such as the offender kissing and complementing the victim as well as apologising and reassuring the victim. Previous comparison studies have suggested that group and lone sexual assaults may differ in respect to the theme of co-operation. Sexual behaviour has been widely researched, and in terms of co-operation, offenders fondling and kissing the victim were found to be more common in group assaults (Holmstrom & Burgess, 1980; Amir, 1971). Likewise, multiple rape by the same offender has been suggested to be common in group assaults (Porter & Alison, 2006). However, no difference between group and lone assaults has been reported for the offender apologising or returning the victim to safety.

Previous studies have also identified general characteristics of lone and group assaults, such as age, relationship, marital and employment status. Studies have identified that group rape offenders and victims are younger than lone offenders and victims, (Wright & West, 1981) with offenders in groups ranging from ages 10-19, which is the prime age range for gang delinquency.

To summarise, we argue that previous literature investigating rape can be viewed from a dynamic theoretical perspective of the underlying interpersonal interactions between offenders and victims in sexual assault. The current study, therefore, applies this perspective to compare the themes of behaviour in lone and group rape. The interpersonal perspective not only provides a theoretical model for understanding the wider themes of differences between lone and group offences but, further, the principles of complementarity provide some insight into the interaction and likely reactions to particular forms of behaviour. This allows a more

comprehensive model of behavioural differences than would be gained from consideration of individual factors independently.

The work of Alison & Stein (2001) and Porter & Alison (2004) discussed earlier has shown the relationship between dichotomous sexual assault variables and the circumplex dimensions. Thus, the present study is able to employ these findings to now explore and understand the patterns of differences between group and lone sexual assault, in relation to those variables and their associated circumplex dimensions, or themes.

Specifically, from the review of previous studies, we predict that group rape will involve more hostile interactions between offenders and victims than lone offences (offender hostility and victim hostility will be more likely in group rape), while lone offenders will be more (pseudo-) submissive, with greater victim resistance (offender submission and victim dominance will be more likely in lone offences).

### **METHOD**

#### Sample

The sample of the study included 120 cases obtained from law reports. The majority (82.5%) of cases occurred in the UK, 17% occurred in the US and 1 case in Israel. Of the 120 cases, 60 involved sexual assault incidents by a single offender while 60 involved multiple offender (group) sexual assaults. We identified group assaults as any sexual assault involving more than one offender. All sample offences occurred between 1964 and 2006. The median year was 1995, with 52% of cases occurring between 1995 and 2006, inclusive and 71% of cases occurring from 1990 onwards.

The 120 cases consisted of a total of 263 offenders and 140 victims. For those offences in the *group* sample (n = 60), offender group size ranged from 2-14

offenders, with a mean group size of 3 offenders (SD 2 offenders). The most frequent group size was 2 (38%), followed by 4 (25%), 3 (22%) and 5 (10%) with the remaining 5 % of the sample (3 cases) encompassing one incidence each of 6, 8 and 14 offenders. The majority of cases (102) involved a single victim, with 4 lone assailants attacking two victims simultaneously, 16 groups attacking two victims simultaneously and 2 groups assaulting 3 victims simultaneously.

All offenders were male, with the exception of two group cases that each involved two female offenders (4 female offenders in total sample). In contrast, the majority of the victims were female, with only two male victims.

# Design

The Independent Variable of 'type of case' is used to form the two independent samples of *lone* assaults and *group* assaults. These were compared across a number of Dependant Variables that encompass behavioural, situational and background features of the offences, offenders and victims, which were organised, where possible, around the circumplex themes (discussed further below). Where variables were recorded as frequencies, chi-square was employed to compare the samples. However, where expected frequencies were less than 5, Fisher's exact test was employed to test for significance. Those variables that were measured on a continuum (for example age), were tested against the parametric test assumptions before selecting either t-tests (parametric) or Mann-Whitney U (non-parametric), as appropriate.

### **Data Collection**

The majority of sample cases were obtained from databases of law transcripts, including Westlaw and BAILII. However, 2 of the cases were taken from a published book. When conducting the search for law reports, key search terms were used, which included 'rape', 'sexual assault', 'multiple offenders', 'co-offenders' and 'co-accused'. The sample cases were selected on the basis that they reported some form of sexual component, including attempted rape. However, for a minority of cases, sexual assault was not necessarily the main offence; some cases also involved the murder of the victim (4 cases).

Cases were also selected on the basis that the offenders had been convicted of the offence, meaning that the facts presented had been accepted as a true account of the crime. While this is important in terms of the validity of the information it does provide a select sample, ignoring those cases where offences have not been reported or offenders have not been caught and/or found guilty. This may pose a problem as there could be behavioural differences between offenders who are caught and those who are not. However, given that the nature of this study is to compare two samples from this same source, we would expect any bias to be consistent across both samples of group and single offender rape, therefore not directly affecting the study aims or results. Further, law reports may be favourable over other sources of information on criminal cases. First, they are accessible to researchers. Second, they are based on numerous sources including offender, victim and witness accounts as well as forensic evidence and this evidence has already been scrutinised by the legal system in terms of its reliability.

Since the information in the law reports was not collected and organised for research purposes, the current data could be limited by interpretation bias on the part of the researcher when content analysing. However, the reports offer a free narrative

description of offences and data coding in the present study was subjected to interrater reliability assessment (see below) to counter this. For further discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of law reports as a data source and archival sources in general see Porter & Alison (2004) and Alison, Snook & Stein (2001), respectively.

## **Data Coding**

The data collected was content analysed for features of the offences (dependent variables). A sample of cases were analysed initially on the basis of features explored in previous research (Amir, 1971; Wright and West, 1981). From these cases, further coding variables were developed. In total, 95 variables were extracted, of which 17 focused on offender details, including age, sex, previous convictions, employment details and marital status and 3 on victim details (age, sex and number of victims).

The cases were further analysed for features of the offence and offender and victim behaviour. Variables were coded dichotomously (whether a feature did or did not occur in a given case) in line with the previous research of Alison & Stein (2001), Bennell, et.al (2001) and Porter & Alison (2004). With reference to the attack, 11 variables were coded in relation to the approach type. The attack location, (7 variables), sexual behaviours (7 variables), offender attack behaviour (28 variables) and victim behaviour (10 variables) were also coded. Nine variables were coded in relation to the outcome of the attack for the victim and for the offender and a further 3 variables described the impact of the offence on the victim.

Variables were then grouped in terms of the four themes within the interpersonal circumplex and their predicted reactions, as offered by the principle of complementarity, as outlined in previous literature (Alison and Stein, 2001; Porter

and Alison, 2004). Thus, these four themes are Offender Dominance/ Victim Submission; Offender Submission/ Victim Dominance; Offender Co-operation/ Victim Co-operation, and; Offender Hostility/ Victim Hostility.

It should, however, be noted that the circumplex is not a tool for creating typologies, rather behaviour takes on dimensional properties to a greater or lesser extent. The labels of dominant, submissive, co-operative and hostile have, therefore, been used in this study to identify which theme each behaviour is most indicative of, they are not meant to represent discrete categories that individuals can be assigned to and that exclude the influence of the other dimensions. For this reason, each behaviour was analysed separately, rather than attempting to measure and differentiate between over-all levels of dominance, submission, co-operation and hostility in the cases.

Sixty-five of the 95 variables coded had previously been ascertained statistically, by previous research, as representing a particular theme in the circumplex structure. These 65 variables were, therefore, organised in terms of these themes and used to test the hypothesised differences between group and lone assaults. The remaining 30 variables (comprising offender and victim characteristics, sexual behaviours and impact on the victim) resulted from the content analysis of the present sample cases but had not been previously tested with regards to their relationships to the circumplex. The tests for differences between lone and group assaults for these 30 variables were, therefore, exploratory and independent of the circumplex model. The full coding dictionary outlining variables and their definitions, as well as which (if any) circumplex theme they relate to, can be found in the appendix.

Each case was coded using the developed coding dictionary. With regards to the behavioural variables, while some cases involve multiple offenders and multiple victims, the case, rather than the individuals were coded. Thus, if any one offender in a group exhibited a behaviour (variable), that variable was scored as present for that case. This is because we were interested in themes of behaviour in the cases, rather than individual interactions. Likewise, inter-offender behaviour and inter-victim behaviour were not the subject of this analysis.

As previously outlined, data interpretation is an issue for this form of research. In order to test the reliability of the coding dictionary, an independent rater coded 10 randomly selected cases for the presence/absence of the variables in the coding dictionary. Results of inter-rater reliability scores found agreement in 97% of judgements (n= 1080, Cohen's Kappa = 0.919, p<.001).

### **RESULTS**

### Victims

Within the whole sample, 85% (102 cases) of cases involved one victim, 13% (16 cases) involved 2 victims and 0.01% (2 cases) involved 3 victims. Mann-Whitney U tests showed a significant difference between lone and group offences for the number of victims (U=1496, p<.01) with group offences involving significantly more victims than did lone assaults.

The mean age of victims of lone assaults was 26 years (SD 22 yrs; range 4 – 87 yrs), whereas the mean victim age for group assaults was 18 years (SD 6 yrs; range 2-41 yrs), this difference was significant (t=2.34, df=47.76, p<.05).

# Offenders

The mean age of group offenders was 21 years old (SD 7 yrs; range 13 - 39 yrs), compared to the mean age of 29 years (SD 11 yrs; range 15 - 52 yrs) for lone

offenders. A Mann-Whitney U test showed that group offenders were significantly younger than lone offenders (U=397.5, p<.001).

Table 1 shows the offender background details. Lone offenders were significantly more likely to be married or have a partner than group offenders ( $\chi^2$  = 12.57, df=1, p<.001) and also have children ( $\chi^2$  = 5.07, df=1, p<.05). Group rape offenders were significantly more likely to have a history of drug or alcohol abuse ( $\chi^2$  = 4.09, df=1, p<.05).

# [Insert table 1 about here]

# Circumplex Offence Variables

Sixty-five of the 95 variables were analysed using Chi square and significant differences explored in terms of the themes of dominance-submission and cooperation- hostility and are shown in tables 2 to 6.

# **Approach**

Table 2 shows comparisons of group and lone offences in relation to the offenders' method of approach to the victim. Lone offences were significantly more likely than group offences to exhibit a number of characteristics in the offender submission/victim dominance theme; deceiving the victim ( $\chi^2 = 7.21$ , df=1, p<.05) the approach being made inside ( $\chi^2 = 4.8$ , df=1, p<.05), including in the victims home ( $\chi^2 = 9.08$ , df=1, p<.01). Thus, it seems lone offenders are more likely to use manipulative approaches where the victim may believe, at least at first, that they hold some sort of control over the situation. However the offender(s) drinking, a variable that has been associated with actual loss of offender control, was significantly more

likely in group rape than lone ( $\chi^2 = 3.97$ , df=1, p<.05) as was the offender(s) using drugs ( $\chi^2 = 4.47$ , df=1, p<.05).

## [Insert table 2 about here]

Group rapes were also significantly more likely than lone assaults to involve the offender dominance/victim submission themed characteristics of the victim drinking ( $\chi^2 = 8.54$ , df=1, p<.01), and therefore more likely to be incapacitated and submissive, and also the offenders kidnapping the victim ( $\chi^2 = 6.11$ , df=1, p<.05), where the victim was taken to a new location and held there for a period of time. Similarly, the use of a vehicle in the approach of the victim was also significantly more likely in group assault than lone assault ( $\chi^2 = 4.68$ , df=1, p<.05). While this use of vehicle is themed as an offender co-operation/victim co-operation variable, its relationship with kidnapping the victim is noted and begins to build a picture of group rapes as being more mobile and dominant than lone rapes.

### **Attack location**

The location that the actual sexual attack took place was also analysed. Table 3 shows that, similar to the approach location above, lone offenders were more likely than group offenders to rape the victim inside ( $\chi^2 = 8.78$ , df=1, p<.01), inside the victims home ( $\chi^2 = 14.56$ , df=1, p<.001) and more specifically in the victims bedroom ( $\chi^2 = 13.14$ , df=1, p<.001).

### [Insert table 3 about here]

Further, similar to the results for approach, group offenders were more likely than lone offenders to move the victim from the approach location to a different rape location ( $\chi^2 = 16.15$ , df=1, p<.001) and use a vehicle for this purpose ( $\chi^2 = 8.08$ , df=1,

p<.01). These variables have been associated with a co-operative, or compliance gaining, theme of offender/victim behaviour in previous studies.

# Offender attack behaviours

Table 4 summarises the comparisons of group and lone rapes for variables of attack behaviour. With the exception of single violence, where lone offenders were more likely than group offenders to use a single act of violence ( $\chi^2 = 5.55$ , df=1, p < .05), group assaults were more likely than lone assaults to exhibit a hostile offender style, including acts of multiple violence ( $\chi^2 = 4.73 \ df = 1$ , p < .05), violence to restrain the victim ( $\chi^2 = 8.62$ , df=1, p<.01), holding the victim down ( $\chi^2 = 15.42$ , df=1, p < .001), the use of multiple weapons ( $\chi^2 = 4.68$ , df = 1, p < .05) as well as pushing ( $\chi^2 =$ 4.17, df=1, p<.05) and dragging the victim ( $\chi^2 = 5.78$ , df=1, p<.05). Group rapes were also significantly more likely than lone assaults to involve multiple rape by the same offender ( $\chi^2 = 7.07$ , df=1, p<.01). This variable has been associated with offender/victim co-operative behaviour and is likely to be associated with the previously discussed findings that group rapes can involve the kidnap of the victim. Holding the victim for extended time at the offenders' location of choice is likely to facilitate multiple rape, as is the number of offenders. Notably there were no offender attack behaviours found to relate to the offender submission/ victim dominance theme.

#### [Insert table 4 about here]

### Victim behaviours

Table 5 shows the range of victim behaviours found within the offences.

Victim behaviour was consistently found to be more frequent in lone than group assaults, regardless of theme. Significantly, victims of lone offences were more likely

to offer resistance ( $\chi^2 = 10.61$ , df=1, p<.001), including verbal resistance ( $\chi^2 = 4.13$ , df=1, p<.05), struggling against the offender ( $\chi^2 = 8.78$ , df=1, p<.01) and physically fighting the offenders ( $\chi^2 = 9.7$ , df=1, p<.01), showing a range of behaviour to either attempt to assert their own dominance over the offenders, or react in a hostile manner. Further, though, victims of lone offenders were also more likely than victims of group offences to remove their own clothes at the offender's instruction ( $\chi^2 = 6.98$ , df=1, p<.01), showing co-operation, or compliance. This may be linked to the finding reported earlier that group rape offenders more commonly remove the victim's clothing themselves rather than order the co-operation of the victim.

[Insert table 5 about here]

# Outcome of the attack

Table 6 shows the variety of different outcomes of the offences. Lone assaults were significantly more likely than group assaults to involve the offender apologising to the victim ( $\chi^2 = 5.65$ , df=1, Fishers Exact p<.05).

[Insert table 6 about here]

### Sexual Behaviours

Table 7 shows the range of sexual behaviours that were found to occur in the sample offences. There were few differences between the two samples with relation to the sexual acts that offenders forced upon the victims. However, group assaults showed significantly more incidences of completed vaginal penetration ( $\chi^2 = 6.98$ , df=1, p<.01), and also fellatio ( $\chi^2 = 5.17$ , df=1, p<.05).

[Insert table 7 about here]

# Impact Upon Victim

The impact upon the victim was also analysed. Table 8 shows that victims of lone offences were significantly more likely than victims of group assaults to find themselves unable to return to the scene of the crime, for example their own home, ( $\chi^2$  =12.11, df=1, p<.001) and also unable to return to work after the attack ( $\chi^2$  =6.32, df=1, p<.05).

### [Insert table 8 about here]

The frequency of behaviours in group and lone rape have revealed a number of interesting differences. Further, the most frequent behaviour in group assaults was completed vaginal penetration in 92% of cases, with multiple acts of violence in 78% of group offences. Group offenders typically removed the victim's clothing themselves (70%), often holding the victim down (57%) and using violence to restrain the victim (58%). Moving the victim to the rape location occurred in 66% of group cases. The approach and attack location was most frequently outside in group cases, with 58% and 53% respectively. Fifty-seven per cent of victims of group offences showed some form of resistance to the attack.

In contrast, lone assaults tended to occur inside, both in terms of the initial approach location (58%) and the actual sexual attack (71%). The highest frequency behaviour in lone assaults included victim resistance (83%), specifically verbal (67%) and physical (60%). However, although not as common as in group assaults, physical violence was also frequent in lone offender rape (63%) as was completed vaginal penetration (73%). Likewise a confidence approach was commonly occurring in both lone (70%) and group assaults (60%).

To summarise, findings show that, while general frequencies show that some form of violence is common to both lone and group attacks, group offenders display

significantly more behaviours along the theme of hostility than lone assaults. However, for the initial approach of the victim and the location of the attack, group offenders showed significantly more dominance and co-operative behaviours than did lone rapists, particularly regarding kidnapping the victim and moving her/him to a different location, often using a vehicle. In contrast, lone assaults more often exhibited features of an offender submissive, or (pseudo-submissive)/ victim dominance nature in both the approach (for example deceiving the victim and winning her/his trust) and the location of the attack and also producing more victim resistance or attempts by the victim to assert dominance over the offender in order to prevent or end the attack.

#### DISCUSSION

Archival data sources were analysed to investigate differences in behaviour between group and lone rape offences. The offenders involved in group rape were younger than those involved in lone rape, were typically males in groups of three and had a history of drug or alcohol use. However, lone offenders were found to be more likely married or to have a partner, possibly linked to the age differences found between group and lone sexual offenders.

On analysis of the data, interpersonal behavioural themes (Alison & Stein, 2001; Porter & Alison, 2004) changed according to the time or phase of the attack. Offender submissive/ victim dominant themed behaviours were predominant in the approach and location of lone offender rape, such as deception, indoor attack location and the use of alcohol. However, behaviours in group assaults included offender/victim co-operation, or compliance, and offender dominance/victim submission themed behaviours. Offender attack behaviours of group rape showed a

higher frequency of hostility themed behaviours than did lone assaults. In terms of victim behaviours, compared to group assaults, lone assaults showed greater victim reaction in terms of resisting, struggling and physically fighting offenders. However, victims of lone rape were also more likely to co-operate with lone offender's instructions to remove their own clothing, a demand seldom made in group rape. The final phase, the outcome of the attack, found offender dominance in group rape, with the offenders abandoning the scene, whereas the lone offenders tended to show more submissive behaviour such as apologising to the victim and falling asleep at the scene. Results, therefore, partially support the hypotheses proposed, finding that the pattern of significant differences between group rape and lone rape does, indeed, reflect a wider thematic distinction. Specifically, group rape involved more hostile, violent offender behaviour although victims rarely reciprocated this hostility (a hostile reaction to hostile offender behaviour was predicted by the principle of complementarity but not upheld in this study), while lone offences were found to exhibit more (pseudo-) submissive offender behaviour, with greater victim resistance (this hypothesised reaction of dominant victim behaviour to submissive offender behavior was predicted by the principle of complementarity).

As Wright and West (1981) stated, group rape "originates from the dynamics of youthful gangs" (p. 30), thus suggesting that group dynamics play an important role in group rape. Theories of group dynamics may, therefore, offer explanations for hostile behaviours in group rape, suggesting for example, feelings of male camaraderie (Holmstrom and Burgess, 1980), where offenders are not only interacting with the victim but also members of their own group. Likewise, Bijleveld et al, (2007) studied group rape suggesting that rivalry within the group, striving for performance and an element of entertainment all play a role in the behaviours displayed in group

rape. Offender hostility within a group would, therefore, enhance a sense of social identity within that group, whereby processes such as, deindividuation, a loss of an individual's sense of personal identity or responsibly within a group, lead to feelings of anonymity (Goldstein, 2002; Krahe, 2001). Following on from this, social bonding in groups may also be expressed in terms of hostile interactions through the use of violence and aggression (Decker, 1996), thus accounting for violent interaction observed in group rape. In the same manner, multiple rape by the same offender is more likely in group than lone offences and, it has been suggested, acts as a means of each individual expressing their power and status within the group context and further humiliating the victim (Bijleveld et al, 2007).

Group assaults are also more likely to involve the use of alcohol with both the offender and the victim. Researchers have suggested that group violence is likely to be facilitated by the use of alcohol and drugs, (Goldstein, 2002; Smith and Mackie, 2007). In contrast to this, lone assaults more frequently involved submissive offender behaviours and more attempted victim dominance. Lone assaults showed significantly more victim resistance, both verbally and physically, than group assaults, which could simply be accounted for in terms of the number of offenders in group rape. For example, the number of offenders may prevent victim resistance by overpowering the victim physically or psychologically with the victim believing resistance would either be hopeless or actually increase their chance of coming to some harm.

Co-operation, in particular the victims removing their clothes, was more frequent in lone assaults than group assaults and may be explained through the circumplex. Within the one to one interaction of lone assaults, the offender achieves active participation on the part of the victim in order for the rape to be carried out, and

as suggested by Porter and Alison (2004), the formation of pseudo-relationships. In lone assaults, therefore, (pseudo-) co-operation in terms of offender-victim interaction (whereby a "friendly behaviour elicits an equally friendly behaviour", Tracey, 1994, p.864), such as kissing the victim and the offender making the victim remove their own clothes, may be a strategy for rape completion as well as offender self-justification in terms of the normality of the behaviour indicating a consenting relationship. Wright and West (1981) proposed that lone assaults differ to group assaults as they reflect the individual pathology, where the sexual element drives the individual. In contrast, however, group rape is driven by more complex group processes, not only the sexual element of rape.

Many of the significant differences discussed above may be mediated, or even caused by, the ages of the offenders. The present study supported previous findings that group offenders are significantly younger than single offenders. As younger people, they may be more likely to socialise and conduct most of their activities in groups, including alcohol and drug use. However, while such behaviour may be fairly common among adolescents in general, the extreme sexual and physical violence displayed in these crimes are clearly not a normal activity for all groups of teenage friends. However, vulnerability at this age to peer group dynamics and pressures, and the importance of a social identity and status, (Corsaro & Eder, 1990) lend support to the group dynamics theory of group rape.

This study has, therefore, updated, revised and clarified some previous studies and theories of offender behaviour in sexual assault. This study has utilised a framework of the interpersonal nature of human behaviour, showing that features of behaviour not only differ between group and lone rape offences, but that such behaviour is dynamic to the context of the assault, more specifically changing through

the time course. In terms of theory, this study has opened awareness to different offender-victim interactions that occur in group and lone assaults, however there is little in this study reporting the perspective of the victim. Alison and Stein (2001) outlined that different themes of behaviour may have different impacts upon the victim such as anger from hostility, or guilt from co-operation. This issue would need further exploration in terms of the impact of such offender behaviours for the victim in group and lone sexual assaults, to give a more complete overview.

The findings of this comparison study provide an overview of typical rape offence behaviour of lone and group assaults, therefore providing a possible use for the prison service. Such applications of this and similar research may be valuable for offender treatment programmes and the prevention of re-offending. Treatment for lone rapists could, therefore, focus upon aspects of the personality reflecting (pseudo-) submissive interpersonal strategies, such as deceiving the victim, using false pretence to engage the victim in interaction and the attack occurring inside the victim's home. Likewise, aspects of personality reflecting the theme of co-operation, such as apologising to the victim or letting the victim go, may show empathy with a victim. These behaviours may suggest that the offender possesses the cognitive abilities to understand the interaction processes, thus offender rehabilitation could address the underlying motivations and manipulation of the interaction to pursue deviant sexual encounters (Howells, 1997). By addressing personality and deviant behaviours relating to aspects of interpersonal interaction, a more individual and focused prevention program may be achieved.

In contrast, group rapists exhibit clear hostile offender behaviour, where group dynamics are likely to play a more crucial role than any consideration of the victim.

Indeed, while lone rapists may see the function of the victim more in terms of

fulfilling sexual or relationship needs, group assailants may more likely view victims as outlets for displaying particular behaviour for the benefit of their esteem in the group. An appropriate rehabilitation program would, therefore, need to take such factors into account. Offenders would require a more holistic approach, whereby dysfunctional group behaviour could be addressed in terms of targeting social skills and increasing social self esteem (Burnby, 2006) in order to understand and mediate the group processes that can encourage an individual member of a group to commit rape. Further, given the levels of violence and hostility displayed by these offenders, clearly group offenders could benefit from the restructuring of hostile cognitions, including the expression of violence as a status enhancing behaviour, as well as learning to reduce and control levels of aggression and its expression through physically violent acts.

The results of this study also have wider implications for victim support programmes, since rape involving one offender or groups of offenders is likely to have differing effects upon its victims. As this study found, group offences were more likely to involve hostility themed offender behaviour than were lone offences. It has been suggested that victims of hostile interaction in group rape will be more likely to have feelings of aggression and anger as a result of post traumatic stress disorder (Alison and Stein, 2001) and thus these feelings would need to be adequately addressed. Likewise, the number of offenders involved may lead to feelings of helplessness, through their lack of control, particularly for those victims who did not offer any resistance. Following on from this a victim may experience heightened anxiety and further psychological problems. Thus, victim support would be beneficial to target such areas. In contrast, lone rape offenders were more likely to use

feelings of guilt of actively being involved in the offence and, therefore, issues such as personal responsibility and shame may be necessary to overcome. For these reasons, psychological effects of such horrific crimes may emerge differently for victims according to the specific interpersonal interactions experienced. Indeed, while some believe group rape is more serious than single offender rape (in the UK the involvement of multiple offenders in rape is considered an aggravating feature in criminal cases), in the present study victims of lone assaults were more likely than victims of group assaults to experience lifestyle difficulties following the attack.

Perhaps, given the difference in terms of the chances for resistance in each offence, while victims of group offenders may suffer more physical abuse and feel that there was nothing they could do to overcome their attackers, victims of single offenders suffer subsequent feelings of inadequacy at not resisting or for trusting manipulative offenders.

However, this result may be an artefact of the data source. It is possible that prosecutors of group offenders are confident that the offence is judged to be serious without the need to mention the victim's resulting psychological state, while the prosecutors of single offenders may feel that the consequences for the victim help strengthen their case. Therefore, the difference reported in this study may reflect the frequency of offering this information to the court for their consideration rather than any actual difference in experience of these consequences.

Human behaviour can be very difficult to analyse and make predictions of patterns. This study has examined frequencies of behaviours and makes assumptions based upon these. Future directions could incorporate a variety of different data collection methods, such as first hand victim and offender interviews, psychological reports or police reports, rather than relying solely on the law reports that summarise

details from these. However due to time, ethical, and accessibility constraints this may prove to be difficult.

Finally, it should be noted that this study incorporated a large number of statistical tests, which in itself could be argued to contribute to the significance of the findings through increasing the probability of a type 1 error. Certainly this should be considered when interpreting the results. However, this should also be weighed up in light of the pattern of the significant differences found, both in terms of the variables and the direction of the differences; how these fit the overall hypothesised thematic differences, and also; findings of previous research. Indeed, while individual significances were predicted, this study was more concerned with the bigger picture of how these significant differences fit not only a thematic pattern of behavioural differences but also a pattern of interpersonal relating.

In conclusion, though, this research has provided a contribution to understanding factors that may lead to typical behavioural characteristics in group and lone rape offences and assessed how these two forms of sexual crime differ. The study has revised and updated previous research from an interpersonal perspective showing that group and lone assaults differ not only in terms of individual behavioural elements but at a wider thematic level. Further, the interpersonal perspective offers predictions regarding potential motivations or objectives of offenders as well as likely reactions and post-event consequences for victims. It is, therefore, hoped that such insights will prove valuable to both prevention of, and recovery from, future incidents.

#### REFERENCES

- Alison, L. J., & Stein, K. (2001). Vicious circles: accounts of stranger sexual assault reflect abusive variants of conventional interactions. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, 12: 515-538.
- Amir, M. (1971). Patterns in forcible rape. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bennell, C., Alison, L., Stein, K., Alison, E. & Canter, D. (2001). Sexual offences against children as the abusive exploitation of conventional adult-child relationships. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 18: 155-171.
- Bijleveld, C., & Hendriks, J. (2003). Juvenile sex offenders: differences between group and solo offenders. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 9: 237-245.
- Bijleveld, C., Weerman, F.M, Loojie, D, & Hendriks, J. (2007). Group sex offending Juveniles; Coercive sex as a group activity. *European Journal of Criminology*. 4(1): 5-31.
- Brecklin, L. R., & Ullman, S.E. (2001). The role of alcohol use in rape attacks. *Journal of Interpersonal violence*, 16: 3-21.
- Burnby, K. (2006). *Understanding Treatment for adults and juveniles who have*committed sex offences. Retrieved March, 7, 2007 from

  http://www.csom.org/pubs/treatment\_brief.pdf.
- Canter, D. H., R. (1990). A Multivariate model of sexual offence behaviour. In Alison, L. J., & Stein, K. (2001). Vicious circles: accounts of stranger sexual assault reflect abusive variants of conventional interactions. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, 12: 515-538.
- Corsaro, W.A. & Eder, D. (1990). Children's peer cultures. <u>Annual review of sociology</u>, 16: 197-220.
- Decker, S. (1996). Collective and normative features of gang violence. *Justice Ouarterly*, 13: 243-264.

- Finney, A. (2006). *Domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking: findings from the*2004/2005 British Crime Survey. Retrieved December, 12, 2006 from

  <a href="http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs06/rdsolr1206.pdf">http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs06/rdsolr1206.pdf</a>.
- Gidycz, C. A., & Koss, M.P. (1990). A Comparison of group and individual sexual assault victims. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 14: 325-342.
- Goldstein, A. P. (2002). *The psychology of group aggression*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Greenfeld, L. A. (1997). Sex offences and offenders: an analysis of data on rape and sexual assault. Retrieved November 17, 2006 from <a href="http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/soo.pdf">http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/soo.pdf</a>.
- Groth, A. N., & Birnbaum, H. J. (1980). *Men who rape: The psychology of the offender*. New York: Plenum.
- Hilberman, E. (1976). The rape victim. New York: Basic Books.
- Holmstrom, L. L., & Burgess, A.W. (1980). Sexual Behaviour of Assailants during reported rape. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 9: 427-439.
- Howells, K., & Day, A. (1999). Rehabilitative Strategies for preventing re-offending.

  Retrieved March, 19, 2007 from

  <a href="http://www.cs.act.gov.au/\_\_data/assets/pdf\_file/27334/PublicationsLitRevReh">http://www.cs.act.gov.au/\_\_data/assets/pdf\_file/27334/PublicationsLitRevReh</a>

  ab.pdf.
- Kelly, L., Lovett, J, & Regan, L. (2005). A gap or a chasm? Attribution in reported rape: Home Office Research Study, 293. London: Home Office.
- Kiesler, D.J. (1983). The 1982 Interpersonal Circle: A Taxonomy for Complementarity in Human Transactions. *Psychological Review*, 90:185-214.
- Krahe, B. (2001). The social psychology of aggression. Hove: Psychology Press.
- Leary, T. (1957). *Interpersonal diagnosis of personality*. New York: Ronald Press.

- Plutchik, R. & Conte, H.R. (Eds.) <u>Circumplex Models of Personality and Emotion</u>.

  Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Porter, L. E., & Alison, L.J. (2004). Behavioural coherence in violent group activity:

  An interpersonal model of sexually violent gang behaviour. *Aggressive Behavior*, 30: 449-468.
- Porter, L. E. & Alison, L. J. (2005) Decisions, Actions And Orders As Influence Strategies Employed By Leaders Of Violent Gangs. *Small Group Research*.36(2):188-207.
- Porter, L. E., & Alison, L. J. (2006a). Examining Group Rape: A descriptive analysis of offender and victim behaviour. *European Journal of Criminology*, 3: 357-381.
- Porter, L.E. & Alison, L.J. (2006). Behavioural coherence in group robbery: A circumplex model of offender and victim interactions. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32(4): 330-342
- Schaefer, E.S. (1997). Integration of Configurational and Factorial Models for Family Relationships and Child Behavior. In Robert Plutchik & Hope R. Conte (Eds.)

  <u>Circumplex Models of Personality and Emotion</u>. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Scully, D., & Marolla, J. (1985). "Riding the bull at Gilleys": Convicted rapists describe the rewards of rape. *Social Problems*, 32: 251-263.
- Soldz, S. (1997). The Interpersonal Circumplex as a Structural Model in Clinical research: Examples from group psychotherapy, interpersonal problems, and personality disorders. In Robert Plutchik & Hope R. Conte (Eds.) <a href="Circumplex Models of Personality and Emotion"><u>Circumplex Models of Personality and Emotion</u></a>. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Tracey, T. J. (1994). An examination of the complementarity of interpersonal behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67: 864-878.
- Ullman, S. E. (1998). Does offender violence escalate when the rape victims fight back? *Journal of Interpersonal violence*, 13: 179-192.
- Ullman, S. E. (1999). A comparison of gang and individual rape incidents. *Violence and Victims*, 14(2): 123–133.
- West, D. J., Roy, C., & Nichols, F.L. (1978). *Understanding sexual attacks: a study based upon a group of rapists undergoing psychotherapy*\_London:

  Heinemann.
- Wiehe, V., & Richards, A.L. (1995). *Intimate betrayal: understanding and responding to the trauma of acquaintance rape*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Wiggins, J.S. & Trobst, K.K. (1997). When is a circumplex an "Interpersonal Circumplex"? The case of supportive actions. In Robert Plutchik & Hope R. Conte (Eds.) <u>Circumplex Models of Personality and Emotion</u>. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Woodhams, J. G., R. & Grant, T. (2007). Understanding the factors that effect the severity of juvenile stranger sex offences. *Journal of Interpersonal violence*, 22: 218-237.
- Wright, R., & West, D.J. (1981). Rape A comparison of group offences and lone assaults. *Medicine, Science and the Law*, 21: 25-30.

# Appendix A: full coding dictionary

# Offender Background

Employed Offender was employed at the time of the

offence

Married or Partner Offender was married (or had a partner) at

the time of the offence

Children Offender had a child (or children) at the

time of the offence

Previous Conviction At the time of the present sample offence

the offender had at least one previous criminal conviction (for any offence)

At the time of the present sample offence

Previous Conviction: Sexual At the time of the present sample offence

the offender had a previous criminal conviction for a sexual offence (e.g. sexual

assault, rape, indecent exposure)

Previous Conviction: Burglary At the time of the present sample offence

the offender had a previous criminal conviction for burglary (theft from

premises)

Previous Conviction: Robbery At the time of the present sample offence

the offender had a previous criminal conviction for robbery (theft through force

or threats)

Previous Conviction: Violent At the time of the present sample offence

the offender had a previous criminal conviction for a violent offence (e.g. assault, manslaughter, Grievous Bodily

Harm)

Offender previous imprisonment At the time of the present sample offence

the offender had served a previous prison

sentence

Alcohol / drug abuse Offender is reported as having a history of

Alcohol or drug abuse

Low I.Q. Offender is reported as having below

average IO

Learning Difficulties Offender is reported as experiencing

learning difficulties

Family problems Offender is reported as having experienced

difficulties at home either growing up or in adulthood (e.g., death of family member,

single parent family, own divorce,

dysfunctional relationships, family history

of drugs or alcohol)

# **Approach characteristic**

#### Offender Dominance/ Victim Submission:

Surprise Sudden attack on unaware victim (e.g. from

behind, jumping out from bushes)

Blitz Immediate use of violence towards victim Victim Drinking alcohol Victim had been drinking alcohol prior to, or

during, the attack

Kidnap Offender takes victim somewhere and keeps

him/her there for prolonged period of tine

#### Offender Submission/ Victim Dominance:

Confidence Approach Offender uses confidence techniques to initiate

contact or gain trust from the victim (asking questions e.g. "What's the time?", using false

introductions)

Deception Offender intentionally deceives the victim (eg.

Saying they are a police officer when this is

untrue)

Inside The offender approaches the victim in an

indoor location

Inside victim's home Offender gains entry to the victim's home to

approach the victim

Offender Drinking Alcohol Offender drinks alcohol prior to, or during the

attack

Offender using drugs Offender uses drugs prior to, or during the

attack

Offender Co-operation/ Victim Co-operation:

Use of a vehicle to approach

Offender in a vehicle (either driving or

passenger) when approaching and making

contact with the victim

# Attack location

#### Offender Dominance/ Victim Submission:

Secluded Location Offender carries out sexual attack in a

secluded location (e.g. Alleyway, bushes,

derelict land/ warehouse)

#### Offender Submission/ Victim Dominance:

Attack Inside Offender attacks victim indoors

Victim's home Offender attacks victim in the victim's own

home

Victim's Bedroom Offender attacks victim in the victim's own

bedroom

Offender's home Offender attacks victim in the home of the

offender (or one of the offenders)

**Offender Co-operation/ Victim Co-operation:** 

Move victim to rape location Offender purposely moves the victim from the

approach location to a different attack location

Use of a vehicle to move

Offender uses a vehicle to move the victim

between different locations

#### Offender behaviours

### **Offender Dominance/ Victim Submission:**

Tied/bound Offender ties either victim's hands or legs, or

uses a gag/blindfold to control the victim

Non sexual criminal activity Offender steals something from the victim, (for

example money, jewellery, clothing etc) or commits another crime such as GBH

Offender Co-operation/ Victim Co-operation:

Verbal Threats Offender threatens victim e.g. to comply / not

scream

Multiple Rape by same offender

The same offender rapes the same victim more

than once

Kissed victim Offender kisses or tries to kiss the victim

Offender Hostility/ Victim Hostility:

Physical violence Offender uses physical violence above that

necessary to control the victim

Single Violence Offender uses one act of violence

Multiple Violence Offender uses more than one act of violence Violence to restrain Offender uses physical acts of violence

specifically to restrain the victim

Held victim down
Offender removed victim's clothes
Offender removes victim's clothing himself

either manually or with the use of a weapon

Kicked Offender kicked the victim

Hit Offender hit (with open or closed hand) the

victim

Pushed Offender pushed the victim
Cuts Offender cuts the victim
Burning Offender burns the victim
Dragged Offender drags the victim

Suffocation Offender suffocates (or attempts to suffocate)

the victim

Strangulation Offender strangles (or attempts to strangle) the

victim, preventing the victim from breathing

Stabbed/shot Offender stabs or shoots the victim

Hands round throat Offender puts one or both hands on/around the

victim's throat for restraint/control

Weapon Offender uses a weapon during the offence
Multiple Weapons Use of more than one weapon in the offence
Sharp Weapon Offender uses a sharp weapon during the

offence e.g. Knife, blade, scissors

Gun Offender uses a gun

Blunt Weapon Offender uses a blunt weapon during the

offence e.g., baseball bat, wooden banister,

brick

Weapon to harm Offender uses a weapon to cause physical harm

to the victim

Weapon improvised Offender uses a weapon he finds at the scene

### Victim behaviours

**Victim Submission:** 

Loss of consciousness Victim looses consciousness during the offence

**Victim Dominance:** 

Victim resistance Victim uses forms of resistance in an attempt to

prevent the attack

Verbal Resistance Victim verbally resists - pleading / screaming Rang or threat to ring police Victim threatens offender with the police

Scream Victim screams

Struggle Victim struggles with offender in resistance
Pushed Victim pushes the offender in resistance

Victim Co-operation:

Victim Removes Own Clothes Victim forced to take her/his own clothes off

**Victim Hostility:** 

Physical victim resistance (fighting) Victim attempts to physically fight off the

offender

Victim kicked offender Victim kicks the offender

#### Outcome of the attack

### Offender Dominance/ Victim Submission:

Offender ran away Offender fled the scene quickly Offender walked away Offender slowly left the scene

Victim went to sleep Victim fell asleep in presence of the offender or

once left alone

## Offender Submission/ Victim Dominance:

Offender went to sleep Offender went to sleep at scene of the attack

Victim escapes Victim escapes from the offender

### Offender Co-operation/ Victim Co-operation:

Lets victim go Offender tells the victim s/he can go/leave Returns victim home/to safety Offender returned the victim to safety (home or

approach location)

Apologises to victim Offender cries/ apologises after the attack

## Offender Hostility/ Victim hostility:

Kills victim Attack ends by offender killing his victim

#### Sexual behaviours

## COMPARISON OF LONE AND GROUP RAPE 37

Vaginal Penetration Offender penetrates victim's vagina with his

penis

Anal Penetration Offender penetrates victim's anus with his

penis

Fellatio Offender forces victim to perform oral sex on

him

Fondled victim Offender touches the victim in a sexual (or

sexually suggestive) manner

Digital Vaginal Penetration Offender penetrates victim's vagina with his

finger (or fingers)

Digital Anal Pen Offender penetrates victim's anus with his

finger (or fingers)

Object Penetration Offender penetrates the victim's vagina or anus

with an object

## **Impact**

Psychological difficulties Victim reports psychological difficulties e.g.,

Sleep disturbances, depression, anger, loss of

confidence, constant fear, PTSD

Victim unable to return to scene Victim unable to return to where the attack took

olace

Victim unable to work

Victim unable to go to work/return to work

Table 1: Chi Square comparisons of Offender Background Details for lone and group offences (df =1)

Variable	Lone Assault	Group Assault	$\chi^2$	p
	frequency	Frequency		
	(n=60)	(n=60)		
Employed	9	7	.29	.591
Married/Partner	24	7	12.57	<.001
Children	14	5	5.07	<.05
Previous Conviction	28	20	2.22	.136
Sexual offence	15	8	2.64	.104
Burglary	9	8	.07	.793
Robbery	6	10	1.15	.283
Violent	9	10	.06	.803
Imprisonment	9	8	.07	.793
Alcohol or drug abuse	8	17	4.09	<.05
Low I.Q.	0	4	4.14	.119*
Learning Difficulties	1	6	3.79	.114*
Family problems	4	1	1.88	.364*

<sup>\*</sup> Used Fishers Exact Test; bold: significant

Table 2: Chi Square comparisons (df = 1) of lone and group assaults for approach characteristic variables by behavioural theme (offender behaviour and complementary victim behaviour)

Vori	abla	Long	Crown	. 2	
Vari	able	Lone	Group	$\chi^2$	p
		Assault	Assault		
		Frequency	Frequency		
		(n=60)	(n=60)		
Offender Dominance	/ Surprise	25	22	.32	.575
Victim Submission:					
	Blitz	14	15	.05	.831
	Victim Drinking	6	19	8.54	<.01
	alcohol				
	Kidnap	7	18	6.11	< .05
Offender Submission	/Confidence	42	36	1.32	.251
Victim Dominance:	Approach				
	Deception	13	3	7.21	< .05
	Inside	35	23	4.8	< .05
	Inside victims	25	10	9.08	<.01
	Home				
	Offender	13	23	3.97	<.05
	<b>Drinking Alcohol</b>				
	Offender use	4	12	4.47	<.05
	drugs				
Offender Co-	Use of a vehicle to	6	15	4.68	< .05
operation/ Victim Co	- approach				

## COMPARISON OF LONE AND GROUP RAPE 40

operation:			

Table 3: Chi Square comparisons (df = 1) of lone and group assaults for attack location characteristic variables by behavioural theme (offender behaviour and complementary victim behaviour)

Vari	able	Lone Assault	Group Assault	$\chi^2$	p
		Frequency	Frequency		
		(n=60)	(n=60)		
Offender Dominance	e/ Secluded	16	22	1.39	.239
Victim Submission:	Location				
Offender Submission	n/ Attack Inside	43	27	8.78	<.01
Victim Dominance:					
	Victims home	27	8	14.56	<.001
	Victims	23	6	13.14	<.001
	Bedroom				
	Offenders home	13	15	.19	.666
Offender Co-	Moving of the	18	40	16.15	<.001
operation/ Victim Co	o-victim to rape				
operation:	location				
	Use of a vehicle	7	20	8.08	<.01
	to move				

Table 4: Chi Square comparisons (df = 1) of lone and group assaults for offender behaviours during the attack by behavioural theme (offender behaviour and complementary victim behaviour)

Varia	ble	Lone	Group	$\chi^2$	p
		Assault	Assault		
		Frequency	Frequency		
		(n=60)	(n=60)		
Offender Dominance/	Tied/bound	5	11	2.6	.107
Victim Submission:					
	Non sexual	11	14	.46	.5
	criminal activity				
	(stealing)				
Offender Co-	Verbal Threats	26	22	.56	.456
operation/ Victim Co-					
operation:					
	Multiple Rape	7	19	7.07	<.01
	by same offender				
	Kissed victim	8	7	.08	.783
Offender Hostility/	Physical violence	38	46	6.01	< .05
Victim Hostility:					
	Single Violence	13	4	5.55	< .05
	Multiple	36	47	4.73	<.05
	Violence				
	Violence to	19	35	8.62	<.01

restrain				
Held victim	13	34	15.42	<.001
down				
Offender	40	42	.15	.695
removed victim's				
clothes				
Kicked	10	13	.48	.487
Hit	12	15	.43	.512
Pushed	19	30	4.17	< .05
Cuts	7	5	.37	.543
Burning	0	2	2.03	.496*
Dragged	8	19	5.78	<.05
Suffocation	2	2	0	1*
Strangulation	7	2	3	.163*
Stabbed/shot	0	3	3.08	.244*
Hands round	20	13	2.05	.152
throat				
Weapon	22	24	.14	.707
Multiple	6	15	4.68	< .05
Weapons				
Sharp Weapon	15	21	1.43	.232
Gun	3	7	1.75	.186
Blunt Weapon	9	7	.29	.591
Weapon to harm	7	11	1.05	.306
Weapon	8	9	.07	.793
	Held victim down Offender removed victim's clothes Kicked Hit Pushed Cuts Burning Dragged Suffocation Strangulation Strangulation Stabbed/shot Hands round throat Weapon Multiple Weapons Sharp Weapon Gun Blunt Weapon Weapon to harm	Held victim down  Offender 40 removed victim's clothes  Kicked 10 Hit 12 Pushed 19 Cuts 7 Burning 0 Dragged 8 Suffocation 2 Strangulation 7 Stabbed/shot 0 Hands round 20 throat Weapon 22 Multiple 6 Weapons  Sharp Weapon 15 Gun 3 Blunt Weapon 9 Weapon to harm 7	Held victim       13       34         down       40       42         removed victim's clothes       Kicked       10       13         Kicked       10       13         Hit       12       15         Pushed       19       30         Cuts       7       5         Burning       0       2         Dragged       8       19         Suffocation       2       2         Strangulation       7       2         Stabbed/shot       0       3         Hands round       20       13         throat       Weapon       22       24         Multiple       6       15         Weapons       15       21         Gun       3       7         Blunt Weapon       9       7         Weapon to harm       7       11	Held victim       13       34       15.42         down       40       42       .15         removed victim's clothes

improvised

<sup>\*</sup>Used Fisher's Exact Test

Table 5: Chi Square comparisons (df = 1) of lone and group assaults for victim behaviours during the attack by behavioural theme (offender behaviour and complementary victim behaviour).

$\chi^2$	p
.07	.786
10.16	<.001
4.13	<.05
.09	.769
.045	.831
8.78	<.01
2.5	.114
6.98	< .01
9.7	<.01
.34	1*
	<ul><li>6.98</li><li>9.7</li></ul>

<sup>\*</sup>Used Fisher's Exact Test

Table 6: Chi Square comparisons (df = 1) of lone and group assaults showing the outcome of the attack in terms of the behavioural themes (offender behaviour and complementary victim behaviour).

Varial	ble	Lone	Group	$\chi^2$	p
		Assault	Assault		
		Frequency	Frequency		
		(n=60)	(n=60)		
Offender Dominance/	Offender ran	11	20	3.52	.061
Victim Submission:	away				
	Offender walked	14	7	2.83	.093
	away				
	Victim went to	4	0	4.2	.057*
	sleep				
Offender Submission/	Offender went to	7	1	4.82	.061*
Victim Dominance:	sleep				
	Victim escapes	13	14	.05	.827
Offender Co-	Lets victim go	12	10	.22	.637
operation/ Victim Co-					
operation:					
	Returns victim	3	5	.54	.717*
	home/to safety				
	Apologises to	8	1	5.89	<.05*
	victim				
Offender Hostility/	Kills victim	1	3	1.03	.619*
Victim Hostility:					

## COMPARISON OF LONE AND GROUP RAPE 47

\*Used Fishers Exact Test

Table 7: Chi square comparisons (df = 1) of lone and group assaults for the sexual behaviours involved in the assault.

Variable	Lone Assault	Group Assault	$\chi^2$	p
	Frequency	Frequency		
	(n=60)	(n=60)		
Vaginal Penetration	44	55	6.98	<.01
Anal Penetration	6	6	0	1
Fellatio	16	28	5.17	< .05
Fondled victim	3	7	1.75	.186
Digital Vaginal Penetration	11	4	3.73	.053
Digital Anal Pen	5	1	2.81	.207*
Object Penetration	4	3	.15	1*

<sup>\*</sup>Used Fisher's Exact Test

Table 8: Chi square comparisons (df = 1) of lone and group assaults for the impact of the attack upon the victim

Variable	Lone Assault	Group Assault	$\chi^2$	p
	Frequency	Frequency		
	(n=60)	(n=60)		
Psychological difficulties	20	11	3.52	.061
Victim unable to return to	11	0	12.11	<.001
scene of attack				
Victim unable to work	6	0	6.32	<.05