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Abstract

Swedish rape cases that occurred during the years of 1998 to 2006 were selected to examine different rape patterns depending on the relationship between the offender and the victim. Five relationship categories were used: Stranger, Acquaintance, Friend, Partner, and Ex-Partner. These categories were used in the coding of the binary variables based on the offender’s behaviour in the police reports. The variables and relationship categories were analyzed and related with the use of Multidimensional Scaling (MDS). Furthermore, exploratory study of the behaviour of the rapist regardless of relationship category was carried out. The results based on the separate MDSs indicate that differences in motivation behind the rape were associated within the type of relationship between the offender and the victim. Acquaintance rapes might be motivated by the offender’s sexual need, partner rapes by sexual need, control and sadism. Ex-partner offenders may try to win back their former partner with the use of sex or rape as a form of control.
Relationship effects on the modus operandi and motivation of the offender in Swedish rape cases

Psychological profiling is a method that, in one way or another, has always been used by both police and “normal” persons to try to identify criminals. It may not always have been called psychological profiling but rather a “hunch”, or instinct; unknowingly using signs of a person’s behaviour to form a conclusion about the psychological characteristics of an offender or another person. These tools’ reliability has often come under scrutiny; mostly because of the lack of empirical research on the topic and the absence of research on the accuracy of the profiles of the offenders.

At the present time there is a lack of standard tools for investigating the psyche of offenders, besides the FBI-experienced based method. This shortage of a standard tool together with a popular media based interest in the field have led to a distrustful attitude towards this area of science by law enforcement staff as well as researchers.

There has been an increase in research within this field and this study of rape cases in Sweden is an attempt to add to this increasing research. Different relationship categories in this study will be used in order to explore the motivation of the offender.

As an example, in cases where the offender wears a mask when he attacks and rapes the victim this information might prove useful in police investigation. The investigation based on the MO (Mode Operandi) of the offender might then give the police a focal point on where to start looking for the offender in the victim’s social surroundings. The offender’s self-control mechanisms might have been overcome by wearing the mask. And this information may also prove useful in the post-treatment of the offender and victim.

This introduction will first present a review of the main theoretical paradigms for understanding the motivation of the sexual offender and then the variables used in the present study and the hypotheses of the study will be stated.
Theories of rape

All inclusive theories

To understand a behaviour as complicated as raping someone we need to be aware of previous and current theories about the motivation behind the act. More traditional research on rape has focused on the motivation of the offender rather than on the behaviour. For example, several feminist theories propose that men objectify, marginalize, and treat women as property and have as little control over their sexual drive as they have over their hunger (Baker, 1997). Although it is mainly men that rape, this type of theory fails miserably in explaining why the vast majority of men do not rape, nor does it explain why women rape men or other women.

Socio-cultural theory argues that certain sorts of cultural organization aid to increase or decrease the risk of rape (Hall & Barongan, 1997). This does focus on the offender himself but it merely states the fact that rapes have a greater risk to occur in certain situations.

The evolutionary theories explain the motive behind rape as being the transferral of genetic material and in that way securing the offender’s continued existence (Ellis, 1989). This theory fails to explain women rapists entirely and male rapists who specifically rape the victim anally with objects or his finger or hand.

In this author’s view these all-inclusive, descriptive and motivationally based theories have very little to offer in a police investigation or the classification of the offender; especially when the motive is genetically common amongst entire populations as most of those theories proposes. They also disregard the individual motivation, situation and the possible drug use. Furthermore they overlook the individual interaction between the perpetrator and victim.

Psychodynamic theory

Groth and Birnbaum (1979, pp. 12-60), writing in the psychodynamic tradition suggest that all rapes contain three elements. These are anger, power and sadistic patterns. The different intensity of these varies from offender to offender but they are always present.

The rage in Anger rapists manifests itself in more violence than needed to control the situation and to get compliance from the victim. This type of offender sees the sexual penetration as the ultimate way to violate and humiliate the other person. The offender might also perform
other, sexual or non-sexual, acts as he deems being humiliating for the victim, for example forcing the victim to perform fellatio on him, forcing her to accept cunnilingus by him. Urinating or masturbating and then ejaculating upon her. This type of rapist does not get any. Sexual gratification from the rape itself and the perpetrator did not previously anticipate to rape.

The Power rapist uses sex as a way to compensate for his own underlying feelings of inadequacy. The rape becomes his way to express issues of mastery, strength, control, authority, and capability. The goal of the rape is sexual conquest. He only uses violence to reach his goal. He might use threat, weapons, physical force or any means necessary to intimidate the victim.

The Sadist rapist uses violence to be able to function sexually. He thrives on the pain and suffering of the victim and this also gives him sexual gratification. He often uses bondage and torture. Sometimes he submits his victim to curious actions such as cutting her hair, washing her or making her dress in a certain manner. The curious actions are sometimes followed by the burning of cigarettes on her body, biting, and flagellation. Certain sexual areas of her body, such as breasts, buttocks or genitals, come into focus by him for the infliction of injury and abuse. Sometimes the offender is unable to use his own sex organ to perform the penetration and instead uses objects such as bottles or sticks.

Other Theories

Canter, Bennell and Alison (2003) presented a thematic approach and categorization of the offender behaviour in stranger rape cases. Here the motivation is categorized according to the offender behaviour on the scene of the crime. This approach has at least two uses, (1) in the investigation and linking of serial rapists (Santtila, Junkkila, & Sandnabba, 2005) and (2) it can also be used in treating the offender (Canter, Bennell, & Alison, 2003).

Canter et al. (2003) proposed that no matter what motivation the offender has, the offender might not behave according to the theme of that category of motivation. Santtila, Junkkila and Sandnabba (2005) put forward that it is hard evidence like DNA extraction, eyewitness and the victim’s observation that is the biggest help in an ongoing police investigation. Only when hard evidence is missing and there are no witnesses psychological forensics, such as profiling of the offender, might prove useful.

Canter et al. (2003) proposed three levels of violation in a rape situation. These are personal, physical, and sexual where the sexual occurs most frequently and is also the most awful kind of violation of the three. Examples of the different kinds of violations are:
violation might include that the offender implies knowing the victim, steals a belonging to the victim. Physical violation can be a demeaning of the victim, removal of clothes or use of violence. The sexual violation includes penetration of the victims’ orifices such as vagina, anal or mouth.

Canter et al. (2003) suggested that it is the least ordinarily occurring behaviour that gives the most information about the offender. Vaginal penetration with the penis provides very little information about the psyche of the perpetrator. The same authors also suggested four different themes that describes the motivation behind the rape based on the behaviour of the offender (see Figure 1). The four themes are (1) hostility which Canter et al. described as an overly aggressive style of offender behaviour, (2) control, that is shown by immobilization of the offender by for example binding and/or threatening the victim. The last two are the (3) theft theme where the offender steals or demands goods from the victim and finally (4) the involvement theme where the offender for example compliments, implies knowing the victim and shows affection in the form of kisses.

![Figure 1. Dividend of categories and themes (Canter et al., 2003, reprinted with permission).](image)

Closeness in a Multidimensional Scaling (MDS) map of rapes shows which variables tend to occur together (further explained below) the map also shows the most common variable (Canter, 2000). The further out from the centre the variable is placed, the less common the variable is. Canter named the different commonness, starting from the centre, as Typically, Behavioural Pattern, Modus Operandi and Signature.
Hendrix and Scimone (2007) in their study found that the four motivational themes (Involvement, Control, Theft and Hostility) might also show the different intensity of the relationship between the offender and victim. They used variables Intimate, Friends and Familiar to describe the levels of intensity of the victim/offender relationship. Even though Canter et al. (2003) studied stranger rape cases and Hendrix and Scimone (2007) studied cases where the offender and victim knew each other, they found similar results. The control theme was associated with Intimate, Theft with Friend and Hostility with Familiar. The Involvement theme was not related to any of the relationship variables. This might have been because Hendrix and Scimone only had three relationship levels while there were four motivational themes. Hendrix and Scimone also found that the closer the relationship between the offender and victim were, the more violence was present in the rape situation. In addition, they also found two additional levels of violation. They suggested the first level to be vaginal penetration and the second level being violence (see Figure 2). Hendrix and Scimone argued that the penetration of the anus was an act of violence since it “probably caused physical pain that might be equal, or worse, to major violence” (p. 15). However, they argued that this depends on the main goal of the rape. For example if the victim is a man then the main goal is probably the penetration of the anus and thus it might not be an act of violence.

Other researchers (Sturidsson et al., 2006) were not as successful in replicating Canter et al. (2003) results. Although the inter-rater reliability was high in the coding of the cases the MDS did not form as suggested by Canter et al. (2003).

The offenders’ own explanation for the offending was investigated by Mann and Hollin (2007). They interviewed 35 offenders that had been convicted for rape. They found a plenitude of motivations for the rape. For example, they found that some offenders could not give a clear reason as to why they raped except that they did it because they wanted to, while others had the idea that the victims encouraged or provoked them into offending. There were perpetrators that blamed drugs or alcohol for lack of control and culprits that did not know at all why they raped. There were felons that raped to achieve sexual gratification while some offenders said they lost control of their sexual impulses. Yet other perpetrators said they were motivated by the need to release stress or negative feelings and some offenders used rape as a way to gain or re-gain respect and/or control over the victim. The study also discovered the motivational theme of intimacy seeking, but this was only present in the explanations by child molesters. Moreover,
some offenders gave several reasons for offending which shows the complexity of the motivation behind a rape.

Figure 2. MDS spatial areas map resulting from Hendrix and Scimone (2007) study.

Hypothesis

The author predicts that the relationship between the offender and victim will show different levels of violence. There should be difference in the level of acts of violence as a function of relationship between the offender and the victim. The least violence should come from stranger then acquaintance, friend, partner and most violence from the ex-partner. This outcome implies that the results from the Hendrix and Scimone (2007) thesis will be replicated. 20 of the cases from the same study will be included in this study. However, they will be re-coded according to the variables used in this study.

The author believes that the relationship between the offender and victim is important for motivation behind the rape. Unfortunately, mixing psychological categories, such as relationship categories (Stranger, Acquaintance, Friend, Partner and Ex-Partner) with variables of action is problematic. Therefore a separate MDS will be created for every valid (N ≥ 19) relationship category. This should show the central, and most frequently occurring, variables in that relationship category. This approach will also show a difference in behaviour for each
relationship category and with that conclusion can be drawn about the likely motives for rapes in that relationship category.

Some exploratory analysis of the data will also be reported where the author will try to find patterns and behaviour characteristics in the different rape situations divided into the relationship categories and possible motivational themes based on the offenders’ behavioural pattern and MO.

Method

Exclusion criterion

The Swedish police in the region Skåne of Sweden was contacted with the request to deliver a list of rape cases between the years of 1998 thru 2006. The list of these cases was then given to the district attorney’s office to check which cases had been taken to court. When the list came back it was sent to the police once again in order for them to deliver the cases with the highest probability of a guilty offender and also containing enough information for finding usable variables in this study.

The author of this study used the definition of rape that exists in the 2006 version of Swedish law BrB 6 kap §1 (Gregow, 2006)¹ that states: “A person who, by violence or threat involving or appearing to the threatened personas imminent danger, forces the latter to have sexual intercourse or to engage in a comparable sexual act, shall be sentenced for rape to imprisonment for at least two and at most six years. Rendering the person unconscious or otherwise placing the person in a similarly helpless state shall be regarded as equivalent to violence.”. A more complete rendering of this text is given in footnote 1.

All the cases were read through once (N=160, pages ranging from 50-400 pages per case, roughly 35000 pages). The cases that did not contain enough information, no texted interview with the victim, no recollection of the rape from the victim (i.e. too drunk or unconscious) or if the victim were mentally retarded or underage the cases were removed from the study. It should be noted that three of the cases were homosexual rapes, by different persons, but that all the victims here were mentally retarded. These cases are not included in the study. There was no case present in this study where a woman had raped a man. The remaining cases (N=76) were then coded according to the variables in Appendix 1.

It should be noted that 20 of the cases in this study also existed in the Hendrix and Scimone study (2007).
Variables included in the present study

Definitions

The studies used five relationship categories that were defined as: Partner: two persons who are currently sexually involved regardless if they live together or not. This includes so called sex friends who see themselves as friends with benefits and without the necessity of emotional attachments or complications. The definition used of an Ex-Partner is where there used to be a sexual relationship but where one partner has informed the other that they are no longer in a relationship. In the cases where a divorce has been approved by the Swedish court system despite not having been approved by the involved persons’ religion that might oppose a divorce, the case was still coded as Ex-Partner. Friend is a person who has a history of spending time with the victim without any prior sexual relationship. If the victim and offender know of each other without having developed a friend relationship and they have never previously had any sexual contact then they were coded as Acquaintances. The definition of Stranger is a person who, at the time of the crime, is unknown to the victim.

Time dimension

In total 38 specific variables were used in the study. These variables and their definitions are shown in Table 1. A time dimension was added to the coding of the variables; this divided the rape situation into time segments from immediately before (Pre), during (Du) and after the rape (Post). This was done to get a clearer view of the temporal location of the variables. The distribution of the variables according to the time segment is Pre (n=7), During (n=29), Post (n=2) in Total N=38.

Observations

The History of Violence variable shows if there is a long running history of violence in the relationship. This variable can only exist in the cases where there is a history between the offender and victim. This variable will be a part of the results in order to compare the Ex-Partner and Partner categories and is used only for these categories.

In addition, more general variables will also be coded under the rubric “General”. These include offender’s age, number of days between rape and report, drug use, crime location, and the hour time of rape.
Table 1. Variables Coded in This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre Variables that preceded the rape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Victim Clothes</td>
<td>Offender orders victim to remove her clothes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat Direct</td>
<td>Direct threat towards the victim e.g. “I will kill you”</td>
<td>PreThreatDirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat Indirect</td>
<td>Indirect threat towards the victim e.g. “Do what I say or else”</td>
<td>PreThreatIndirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat Underlying</td>
<td>No spoken threat. The offender uses other way of intimidation or there is a history of violence and the victim hence feel threatened of violence by default</td>
<td>PreThreatUnderlying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Threat</td>
<td>The offender is none-threatening. No spoken or physical treat e.g. No response to the resistance or no communication at all with the victim.</td>
<td>PreThreatNothreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon use</td>
<td>The offender uses a weapon towards the victim before the rape</td>
<td>PreWeaponuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Variables during the rape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forceful Restraint</td>
<td>Penetration by fingers or other</td>
<td>DuForcefullRestraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forces Victim</td>
<td>Offender prevents the victim from using her arms.</td>
<td>DuForcesVictimParticipation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>The offender forces the victim to participate in the rape e.g. commands her to moan or say that she likes it</td>
<td>DuGagsVictim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gags Victim</td>
<td>The offender uses his hand or an item to prevent the victim from using her voice</td>
<td>DuOffenderAffection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Affection</td>
<td>The offender shows behaviour that might be interpreted as affectionate behaviour e.g. kissing, hugging or nibbling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Penis</td>
<td>The offender’s penis was erected at sometime during the rape</td>
<td>DuOffenderPenisErected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erected</td>
<td>The offender removes the victims clothes</td>
<td>DuOffenderRemovesClothes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Removes</td>
<td>The offender comments on the act or the victim e.g. “your pussy feel so good”</td>
<td>DuOffenderSexualComment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>The offender penetrates the victims vagina with his penis</td>
<td>DuVaginalPenis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Sexual</td>
<td>The offender penetrates the victims vagina with his finger or hand</td>
<td>DuVaginalFingerHand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The offender uses violence before/during/after the rape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penis Penetration</td>
<td>Offender strikes once with open or closed hand</td>
<td>DuViolenceSingle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the Vagina</td>
<td>Offender strikes multiple times with open or closed hand</td>
<td>DuViolenceMultiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger/Hand</td>
<td>Offender uses more violence than necessary to control the victim. Or he strangles her.</td>
<td>DuViolenceMultipleMajor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penetration of the</td>
<td>The offender uses a weapon towards the victim during the rape</td>
<td>DuWeaponUse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Penetration</td>
<td>The offender penetrates the victims vagina with an object</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the Vagina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Variables after the rape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steals</td>
<td>The offender steals from the victim</td>
<td>PostSteals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>The offender threatened the victim, direct or indirect, after the rape</td>
<td>PostThreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report – Variables in connection to the police interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Table 1 also for the variables coded.

The number of cases in this study in each category is Stranger (n=10) Acquaintance (n=19), Friend (n=8), Partner (n=19) and Ex-Partner (n=20).
Statistics

Multidimensional Scaling (MDS) is a statistical instrument that calculates the correlation/association between variables and then places each variable on a spatial map. First a correlation matrix is calculated where all variables are correlated with all other variables. Then distances between the variables in relation to the correlation matrix is calculated. The distance calculation is then used to place the variables in a spatial area with a certain number of dimensions. This renders a map where the correlations amongst the variables are easily seen without having to resort to reading a full correlation matrix.

The stress of the MDS measures the goodness of fit in the configuration or dimensions in relation to the data. This means that lower number value in the fit-measure, the more accurate the configuration and dimensions are in relation to the data. A good fit is considered to be between 0 and 0.15 (Stalans, 1995). Tucker's Coefficient of Congruence (TCC) measures the relationship between the independent and criterion variable. The closer to 1 (starting at 0) the better the MDS predicts the relationship. This is a number measurement on how well the MDS map correctly shows the actual distances between the data. A value between .85-.94 is considered as a fair similarity while a value over .95 implies that the two factors or components evaluated can be considered to be equal (Lorenzo-Seva & ten Berge, 2006).

The MDS will show 2 dimensions, dimension 1 from left (-1) to right (1) and dimension 2 from bottom (-1) to the top (1). They ease the interpretation of the distances in the dimensions in that for example if there is a variable on 1 then it most probably will not occur together with a variable on the -1. The further apart the variables are from each other the less correlation there is between them.

Distance between the variables was calculated based on their correlation. The calculation was done using Jaccard’s coefficient of association. This only calculates the similarities of the positive co-accuracies. Since negative correlations are not used in this study, Jaccard’s coefficient of association is considered suitable.

PROXCAL in the statistics program SPSS version 16 was used to render the MDS.

Three circles were drawn in the rendered MDS. The variables in the central circle contain variables that occur in more than 60% of the cases included in that MDS. The middle circle was drawn to include all variables that occur in 40% of the cases or more. And the most outer ring is
to mark the 20%. These rings are not exact and should be seen as guiding to simplify the overview of the MDS.

Coding

The coding of the variables was binary, meaning that if a variable was present it was coded as one (1) and if it was missing it was coded as zero (0).

A coding instrument, unique for this study, was developed in order to simplify the coding of the variables. These variables were then coded into a special made database for this study. When all cases were coded the data was imported into SPSS version 16 for closer examination and rendering of statistics.

There was no possibility to check the inter-rater reliability. This means that the variables identified by the author might not be found by another rater. However, considering that there were no inconsistencies in the inter-rater reliability in the Hendrix and Scimone (2007) study, the reliability might be high this time as well.

In most of the cases there was an interview with both the offender and the victim. However, it was the victim’s interview that was used as a basis in the coding of the variables; this because the entire case was based on the information in the victim’s report. Usually there were three interviews with the victim in every case on three different occasions. If the information of the rape situation changed prominently the first version was used or the version that was contained in two out of the three interviews. The nature of memory allows for some variations in the recollection without the person being willingly less than honest (Schacter, 2001).

As noted above, only one case per perpetrator was included. In the cases where multiple rapes were performed by the offender, regardless if there were one or multiple victims, the rape situation that contained the most information were used or the most recent.
Results

General Results

The mean offender age was overall 32 years (SD = 10) and in the different relationship categories: Stranger 31 (SD = 13), Acquaintance 30 (SD = 20), Friend 27 (SD = 8), Partner 28 (SD = 7) and Ex-Partner 39 (SD = 7).

The time variable was coded into blocks of 6 hours according to the hours of the day. These were Morning (6:00-12:00), Afternoon (12:00-18:00), Evening (18:00-24:00), Night (24:00-06:00) and Unknown.

The variable Blindfold Victim was removed since it was not present at all in any of the cases. It can be speculated that the reason for an offender to use a blindfold is to prevent identification. Since this is only a probable reason where the offender and victim has no previous interaction (i.e. Strangers) the lack of stranger cases might be a reason for its absence in this study.

Cunnilingus is only present in Ex-Partner, which means that it does not occur often enough in the other categories to be selected for the MDS. It is not present in the Overall MDS either since the frequency of occurrence was lower than previously stated cut-off value.

Most rapes (55%, n=42) occurred during night. This is the dominant time for a rape to occur in all of the relationship categories’ henceforth called “categories” (Table 2). It might be interesting to note that no rapes at all occurred in the afternoon in the Friends and Stranger categories. Furthermore, there were no rapes in the Friends category in the evening.

Table 2 Time of The Rape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Category</th>
<th>Time of Rape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Partner</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In total, 58% (n=44) of the rapes occurred in the victim’s home. This is the location that dominated the Partner (n=14), Ex-Partner (n=13) and Friend (n=3) categories. However, most Acquaintance rapes (n=6) occurred in the Offender Home followed by Outside (n=4) and in a secluded area where the general public has access, such as parks, streets and rest places. Public Secluded (n=4) such as the forests, toilet in bars and inside a car parked outside. Stranger rapes occurred outside in 4 out of 10 cases (Table 3). There were no rapes at the home of a friend of the victim.

Table 3. Location of The Rape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Category</th>
<th>Outside</th>
<th>Victim Home</th>
<th>Offender Home</th>
<th>Offender Friend</th>
<th>Victim Friend</th>
<th>Public Place</th>
<th>Public Secluded</th>
<th>Other Indoor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Partner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just as the victim, the offender was dominantly affected by alcohol during the rape in the Stranger (n=6) and Acquaintance (n=13) categories. However, different from the victim, the offender in the Friend (n=6) and Ex-Partner (n=9) categories was affected by alcohol during the rape while the Partner category had no such dominant usage (Table 4).

The drug used by the victim was dominantly alcohol in the Stranger (n=7) and Acquaintance (n=12) categories while Friend and Partner did not have any dominant drug. The Victims of Ex-Partner were most often sober (n=10) (Table 4).

The variable Violence Multiple Major had an escalating percentage of presence in the categories, depending on how well the victim and offender knew each other (Table 5). This is interesting since it shows a larger number of occurrences where major and multiple violence increase depending on what relationship category the rape case belongs to. However, forced fellatio had the reverse order with a decrease in percentage of presence (Table 5). It seems that the closer relationship, the less the victim is forced to perform fellatio but at the same time the more violent the rape.
Table 4. Usage of Drugs by the Victim and Offender in Connection to the Rape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Category</th>
<th>Victim Drug</th>
<th>Offender Drug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Partner</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ODV=Offender Drugged Victim, No I= No Information

Table 5. Distribution of Violence Multiple Major and Forced Fellatio across relationship categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Category</th>
<th>Violence Multiple Major</th>
<th>Forced Fellatio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Partner</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The History of Violence variable was found in 68% (n=13) in the Partner category and 55% (n=11) of the Ex-Partner. This result was shown not to be statistically significant in a two tailed t test.

Pre/Direct Threat was present in all the categories while Pre/Indirect Threat was only present in the Partner (n=4/5) and Ex-Partner (n=1/5) categories. Pre/Underlying Threat was present in Stranger (n=2/9) Partner (n=4/9) and Ex-Partner (n=3/9).
MDS results

In order neither clutter up the MDS nor to show the unique behaviour (i.e., the signature) of a few offenders, was any variable that occurred in less than 12.5% of the cases was removed from the MDSs’ (Table 6). This means that the MDS:s for the different relationship categories and the overall MDS contain different variables from each other as well as different number of variables.

This has left 21 variables to calculate statistics and render the overall MDS from. The number of variables in the different relationship categories Acquaintance was 18, Partner 23 and Ex-Partner 22.

Table 6. Variables Occurring Less Than 12.5%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDS</th>
<th>Removed Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>PreThreatIndirect, DuWeaponUse, PreThreatUnderlying, DuViolenceSingle, PreWeaponUse, DuBindsVictim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>PreOrderVictimClothes, PreWeaponUse, DuViolenceMultiple, DuViolenceMultipleMajor, DuAnalFingerHand, DuDemeansVictim, DuEjacUpon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>PreThreatNoThreat, DuWeaponUse, DuBindsVictim, DuVaginalObject, DuOffenderSexualComment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Partner</td>
<td>PreThreatIndirect, PreThreatNoThreat, DuWeaponUse, DuBindsVictim, PreWeaponUse, DuAnalPenis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERALL MDS

The first MDS, containing all the cases regardless of their relationship category is shown in figure 3. It was rendered in 28 iterations and had a stress value of .07 and TCC=.96 (Figure 3) indicating a good fit.

Figure 3. MDS where all cases are included, regardless of relationship category. The circles indicate the relative frequency of each variable with on occasion more than 60% of the cases for those within the inner circle, 40% within the second circle, and 20% within the third. The violence and affection variables are underlined for clarification.

The centre circle shows the main contents in a rape situation since the variables there occur in over 60% of rape cases (DuVaginalPenis, DuOffenderPenisErected, and DuOffenderRemovesClothes). This means that most rapes include these variables in the rape.
There is an overall violence on the right upper and side of dimension 1, indicated by DuViolenceMultiple, DuViolenceMultipleMajor. These rapes can be divided into anger and power rapists. Here anger includes PreThreatDirect, PreOrderVictimClothes, and DuViolenceMultiple and Power rapes include DuDemeansVictim, DuEjaculationNoEjaculation DuOffenderSexualComment and DuViolenceMultipleMajor.

Affection rapes can be seen in the left of Figure 3 specified by PreThreatNoThreat, DuOffenderAffection, DuOffenderRemovesClothes, DuFondlesVictim and DuVaginalFingerHand.

This suggests that it may be possible to divide the MO and therefore also the motivation behind the rape into violent (that might be motivated by control, domination, and/or revenge) and affectionate motivations (such as sexual need, love and intimacy seeking).

A fourth group at the bottom of Figure 3 includes DuBitesVictim, DuFellatio, PostThreat, and DuAnalPenis and will be dealt with in the discussion section.

Violence is rare amongst the affectionate rapes, it occurs more often and more violent in anger theme. In the power theme it is most common and also most violent.

ACQUAINTANCE MDS

Next a series of MDS will be presented, one for each of the three valid (N ≥ 19) relationship categories, Acquaintance, Partner and Ex-Partner.

The MDS showing the relationship category Acquaintance rendered stress=.06 in 64 iterations with a TCC=.97 (Figure 4) indicating a good fit.

Although demeaning of the victim occurs in 20-39% of the overall rapes, partner, and ex-partner rapes it is so rare in acquaintance rapes that the variable has been removed.

Figure 4 shows that the variables in the centre of the MDS Acquaintance cases show affectionate tendencies. The variables that are present in over 60% of the cases include DuOffenderAffection, DuOffenderRemovesClothes, DuFondlesVictim, DuOffenderPenisErected, and DuVaginalPenis. DuVaginalPenis and DuOffenderPenisErected are very closely correlated indicating that if the offender has an erect penis he will most likely also penetrate the vagina.

It is interesting that there are no variables close to -1 on dimension 1. The last variable ends at -0.5. This points to that the dimension of Acquaintance rapes is not as wide as the overall
rape, Partner or Ex-Partner rapes. This might indicate that the motivations and MO are not as
diverse as in Overall, Partner or Ex-Partner.

Looking at what is most commonly occurring we also see that most of the rapes done by
acquaintances contain variables that could be interpreted as affectionate but that it sometimes
develops into a more violent rape.

Figure 4. MDS of the relationship category Acquaintance. The circles indicate the occurrence of
variables in more than 60%, 40%, and 20% of the cases. The violence and affection variables
are underlined for clarification.

Direct threats were the most common form of threat for Acquaintance rapes.
PARTNER MDS

The MDS for the relationship category Partner was rendered in 18 iterations and the values for stress=.07 and for TCC=.96, indicate a good fit (Figure 5). There are no PreThreatNoThreat present at all.

Figure 5. MDS of relationship category Partner. The circles indicate the occurrence of variables in more than 60%, 40%, and 20% of the cases. The violence and affection variables are underlined for clarification.

The central variables here (60% of the cases) are DuForcefullRestraint, DuEjacInside, DuOffenderPenisErected, DuOffenderRemovesClothes, and DuVaginalPenis.
The threat variables are placed between the outer and middle circle, indicating that they occur in 20-39% of the cases.

EX-PARTNER MDS

The MDS for the relationship category Ex-Partner rendered in 19 iterations and had a stress=.07 and TCC=.96 indicating a good fit (Figure 6).

Figure 6 MDS of relationship category Ex-Partner. The circles indicate the occurrence of variables in more than 60%, 40%, and 20% of the cases.

The central variables are DuVaginalPenis, DuOffenderRemovesClothes, and DuForcefullRestraint. It is interesting to note that DuEjacInside and DuOffenderPenisErected are outside the central circle, indicating that they do not occur in the Ex-Partner category in
connection to the central variables. They are, however, correlated to each other. This is interesting since DuOffenderPenisErected are in the centre ring in all the other MDS:s and hence also central in the rape.

The threat variables are on the upper and left side. They occur drastically less often than in the Partner category and hence are placed further out from the centre.

The violence variables are also on dimension 2 around .05 and we find the affectionate variables on the opposite side of dimension 2.

**Discussion**

The goal of this study was to explore if the motive behind a rape could be dependent or influenced by the relationship between the offender and victim.

The prediction that violence increased depending on the relationship could not be confirmed or denied due to the lack of cases in Friend and Stranger categories. However, there is an indication that this might be true in the behaviours shown on the MDS layouts and in the frequency of violence found in Acquaintance, Partner and Ex-Partner categories.

There is a possibility that the motive of the offender is affected by the relationship between the offender and victim. This would be shown by that the MDS:s would show various possible motives by the clustering of variables in the MDSs. This will is presented and discussed below.

**Overall MDS**

The four possible themes (affectionate, power, anger, and sexual need) in the overall MDS have in common that they almost always include the actions that the offender removes the victim’s clothes, offenders’ penis is erected and that the perpetrator penetrates the victims’ vagina with his penis.

The power rape theme is where the offender deems the victim, forces her to participate, uses major violence and comments her and/or the act sexually. Here the offender does not ejaculate as frequently as in the other themes. This theme seems to include the Groth and Birnbaum (1979) pattern of power to a high degree. There is use of extensive violence, much more violence than is needed to control the situation. The power theme includes the following ideas. The violence is used as a way to control and almost own the victim, to show strength and ability. The offender does have an erection and does probably penetrate her vagina but the fact
that there is no ejaculation shows that the offender might not only feel inadequate, but also is inadequate and therefore uses the violence as a way to show that he is still an able man. The penetration of the vagina is here the ultimate way to humiliate the victim and prove the point of the man he still consider himself to be.

The anger theme of the rape includes direct threats to get the victim to comply and the offender shows his control by ordering the victim to remove her clothes. Here multiple violence is not frequently used (under 20%), possibly indicating that the victim is affected by the threats enough for her to obey with his wishes.

The third theme is the affectionate theme. Here the offender probably does not threaten the victim. Instead he shows affection by kissing and fondling the victim and uses his hand/fingers to penetrate her vagina. This MO-pattern contains none of the Groth and Birbaum (1979) patterns of rape. This could be the same MO and motivation as found for the acquaintance relationship.

Besides the violent/affectionate dimension mentioned above, there is a tentative grouping at the bottom of the Overall MDS that includes DuFellatio, DuBitesVictim, PostThreat and DuAnalPenis. According to Groth and Birbaum (1979) biting is an indication of exaltation and frenzy. This would include that the offender, in some way, lost control and bites out of almost frustration or has the intention to humiliate and hurt. The penetration of the anus with the penis and biting are both a part of the sadistic pattern. The threatening of the victim after the rape can then be seen as a part of this sadistic theme in an attempt to scare the victim further after the rape. Threatening the victim can also point towards that the offender recognizes that he has done wrong and that there are no intentions from his side to continue in a deeper and more emotional relationship but that the rape was about relieving himself of any sexual tension. When comparing with the Mann and Hollin study (2007) this theme could belong to any of their categories of sexual pleasure, alleviation or impulse. Here the motivation seems to be sex alone and not a control/domination theme.

The forced fellatio variable might point towards that the offender sees the act of fellatio as humiliating for his victim (i.e., sadism) or as a part of the sexual act itself. It is however unlikely that it is a theme of sadism since sexual sadism is such an extreme pattern of rape where the penetration itself is not the focus but rather the inflicting of pain and the humiliation of the victim. Since sadism is getting sexual gratification by inflicting pain and humiliation, the victim
would most likely have been submitted to violence as well. However, these variables are on the other side of dimension 2. This all speaks for the notion that these cases of rape have sex as the focus and not pain and humiliation.

**Acquaintance**

The main scenario found in the acquaintance relationship category is that the rapist tries to convince the victim of his excellence as a partner by sexual means or has the misconception that the victim is a willing participant in the sexual act. This category has affection in the centre and violence to the right on dimension 1. This possibly shows that the majority of acquaintance rapes are driven by the misconception by the offender that the victim will enjoy the sexual act itself if only given enough time.

Violence is relatively rare in these kinds of rapes, compared to overall, Partner, and Ex-Partner. This may indicate that the offender do not have violence as a part of the main motivation. The very close correlation between the erected penis and penetration of the vagina shows that they frequently occur in the rape situation together. This is in contrast to Ex-Partner where the penis is not erected in the same high frequency in connection to a penetration of the vagina (discussed below).

A typical case here would here involve a male offender in his 30s. The victim and the offender have both been out at the same place of social events and been utilizing alcohol. It is night and they probably met at this event. They might have seen each other before but this is the first time they decide to walk and talk. They then decide to walk to his home for a night cap or coffee. When there they might sit in the couch and there he starts to fondle her. She might not respond positively at this approach. Perhaps her intentions were to get a night cap or coffee but his reason for inviting her might have been sex and he believes that she knows this and agrees to sex by following him. There are probably not any threats towards her. He continues to fondle her, trying to show affection in the form of kisses in the hope of making her motivated to go along. She is trying to resist him in every way she can but he is using his body to restrain her. He is not violent towards her in the sense where he hits her with open or closed hand. She feels him removing her clothes and then performs the rape with his penis in her vagina, in many cases, ending the rape with ejaculation inside. He probably does not threaten her afterwards, unless he has been violent, perhaps because he lives in the illusion that they both wanted to have sex.
Partner

The central variables indicate that most Partner rapes include that the offender removes the victim’s clothes, he uses his body to hold her down, and he penetrates her vagina with his erected penis and then ejaculates inside her.

The closest variable outside the centre circle is the variable describing demeaning of the victim that occurs in about 50% of the cases. The offender fondles the victim in about 40% of the cases. These two variables are on different sides of dimension 1 which means that they have a negative correlation. This supports the notion that there actually are at least two themes, maybe three, relating to this relationship category.

The first theme is affection. This includes fondling of the victim, biting, finger inserted into the vagina, showing of affection, an underlying threat and ejaculation upon the victim. This shows that the rape is not violent with hits and kicks but the offender uses his body to control her movements. He might want to have intercourse but she is not willing. He does not use more violence than necessary to perform the rape. He even tries to make her a part of the rape by fondling her and trying to use his fingers to excite her. There is an element of underlying threat which means that even though the offender does not directly or indirectly threaten her he uses a body language or way that still threatens her. The biting might be out of frustration if she is still resisting or a sexual frenzy.

The typical rape in the theme of partner affection might then involve an offender that is in his 30s. He might sit at home watching football in the late evening, drinking a few beers. The victim might have gone to bed, perhaps sober. The football game ends and the offender might then feel in the mood sex. He then walks into the bedroom where the victim might be sleeping. He gets into the bed and starts to fondle her. His alcohol soaked breath and the fact that she just managed to fall asleep is possibly making her less interested than he might think. She tells him no and is not interested in sex at the present time. He ignores this and continues to fondle her. He says nothing threatening but there might be an underlying threat in the action of not listening to her pleads or not speaking any words. He removes her underwear by pulling them off. He kisses her breasts and lips. He then continues with penetrating her vagina with his fingers. He keeps ignoring her wishes for it to stop and he then spreads her legs, gets on top of her, holding her arms with his hands, preventing her from pushing him away. He then penetrates her with his
erected penis and continues his thrusting movements until he achieves orgasm and ejaculates inside her. He then turns himself over and falls asleep while she might stay awake.

The second theme in partner rapes is the violent theme where the offender uses excessive violence, orders the victim to remove her clothes, uses direct threats, gags her, and is unable to ejaculate. This theme is very much alike the power and anger rape mentioned in overall rape above. Here the goal seems to be to both humiliate and showing the offender’s mastery. Possibly indicating that the two patterns are intertwined into this theme and it could also indicate a theme of control.

The typical rape of an anger partner might then involve a man in his 30s; sitting with his partner in the living room drinking. Then an argument might start where the partner accuses the other of flirting with someone or another topic of discussion. The argument heats up and he slaps her hard. She might or might not take the hit standing up. She might start crying or tries to hit him back. He may then strike her again, regardless of her previous reaction to the first strike, and screams at her. He possibly will order her to remove her clothes. He might use direct threats in order to make her comply. She may still not remove her clothes and resist and be aggressive back. He then hits her again so that she falls on the floor. He then sits on top of her, preventing her from getting up, slapping her multiple times. He then removes her clothes. While he is penetrating her with his erect penis, she is screaming out for help or for him to un-mount her. He uses his hand to gag her screams. He continues his thrusting movements but does not ejaculate and after a while he gives up and goes back to the couch for more alcohol.

The third theme is a sadistic theme with multiple major violence, demeaning of the victim, penetration of the anus with his penis, forcing her to perform fellatio, and forces her to participate in the sexual act. All the variables in this third theme show high levels of sadism according to Groth and Birnbaum’s (1979) pattern of sadism.

The typical sadistic partner rape might then involve a man in his 30s. They may have consumed alcohol and it could be in the middle of the afternoon. He could explain how he is revolted by her appearance and that she has gained a lot of weight since they first met. That she should consider herself lucky that he is still with her. He continues to call her names and throws insults her way. He hits her over the face with his closed fist. She gets knocked down and lies bleeding on the floor. He then hits her in her stomach with his fist that she folds double. He continues to insult her and continues to call her names. He unbuttons his pants and orders her to perform fellatio. She does what he says and when she does he calls her demeaning names for
performing fellatio on him. He might then kick her and spit on her. He orders her to tell him how a great of a man he is. That he is a great sex athlete and that she is lucky to be with him. She complies again. He may rip her clothes off her and penetrate her vagina. Then he might order her to tell him how good he feels inside her. She continues to comply. He then turns her over and penetrates her anus. He ejaculates inside her. Ending the rape by possibly threatening her that this is what happens if she does not fully comply with all of his wishes directly and without reservation or hesitation.

Ex-Partner

Two main themes can be found in the Ex-Partner rapes. However, many different levels of violence occur, possibly indicating that that the patterns of anger, power, and sadism, are intertwined in this theme, as in Partner category. However, the rapes in the Partner category still show a clear line between the different levels of violence where sadism is separated from anger and power. The Ex-Partner rapes do not have such clear line. As can be seen by the close relationship between multiple violence and cunnilingus this violent Ex-Partner theme seems to be connected to a pattern of revenge. Excessive violence is used in connection with an act that can be considered to be for the victims’ pleasure (e.g., cunnilingus). This is also the only MDS where cunnilingus is not considered unique enough to be excluded from the MDS.

As noted, variables that in the other MDSs specify and separate the different levels of violence are here intertwined. For example, demeaning of the victim is in the middle of Multiple Violence and Multiple Violence Major. This means that they occur equally often when the offender demeans the victim. Since sadism has its main goal to humiliate and inflict as much pain as possible it should be closer to Multiple Violence Major. But this is not the case here and thus the conclusion can be drawn that either the sadism theme is entwined with anger/power, or they are separate but that the MDS in this case do not show this. As in partner rapes this could indicate a theme of control.

When looking at the correlations between the variables that express the occurrence of fondling the victim and forcing the victim to participate in all the other relationship categories and the overall MDS, the tendency is that they are split on the opposite sides on the same dimension. However, in the Ex-Partner category they are close to each other and on the same side of the centre. This designates the likelihood that the offender has a behaviour script where the victim is forced to participate by responding positively to the fondling. The offender also
gives the victim sexual comments on how he experiences the situation. These all correlate with the affection variable possibly showing that the offender cases belonging to this side of the MDS have affectionate motives and try to convince the victim to take them back by showing affection. The variable indicating that the offender did not ejaculate was in the opposite dimension of this affectionate theme. This demonstrates that the perpetrator did not have any problems ejaculating when following this MO and behaviour pattern. The offender might be motivated by a reclaiming of the former partner; that is, the Ex-Partner has the conviction that the former partner is still open for a change of mind and can be convinced by sex or still available sexually as they have been in the past.

An interesting note is that the offenders’ erection is not as correlated here to penetration of the vagina as in the other relationship categories or in the overall MDS. This could indicate that the offenders’ main goal is not sexual but rather of revenge or possibly a desperate attempt to win the former partner back. It might also point to that the offender, even though not sexually turned on, might still require sex in order to confirm a relationship that only exists in the offender’s mind.

Because of this lack of clear dividend of themes, besides the overall violence and affectionate theme, there will be no vignette of a typical case in the Ex-Partner relationship category.

Further Conclusions

Affection

The affection variable is further away from the centre in both the Partner and Ex-Partner categories compared to the Overall rape and Acquaintance. This may mean that the motivation of Acquaintance differs from that of Partner and Ex-Partner. It is also interesting to note that the offender’s penis being erected is highly correlated with penetration of penis in the vagina in the Acquaintance category and the Overall MDS but less so in Partner and even lesser in Ex-Partner. This might denote a decrease of sex as a motivation for the rape in the Partner and Ex-Partner categories and a simultaneous increase in other motivations such as control, power, anger, sadism and revenge. This further supports the hypothesis that relationship might be a part of the motivation of the offender in rapes.
Affection seems to be more common in the Ex-Partner than in the Partner category. However, the violence seems to be at the same distance in them both but a lot closer than in the Acquaintance category. It seems that if there is violence and demeaning of the victim then the offender has difficulties ejaculating, signifying that there is a problem ejaculating because of violence, or using violence to overcome his inability to ejaculate.

**Forceful restraint**

Forceful restraint, which points towards that the offender used his hands and/or his body to prevent the victim from leaving, seems to be the central part of a rape in Partner and Ex-Partner rapes. However, it seems to be used as a “necessity” in Acquaintance rapes and thus not used as frequent.

**Violence**

The increase in Multiple Violence Major as a function of relationship categories is interesting (Table 5). This could show that for example the Ex-Partner offender is more comfortable in the situation and perhaps the surroundings and therefore can spend more time being violent than a Stranger in, for example, an open field. If the main goal of the rape is sexual release, then the amount of violence should not exceed the level that is needed in order to control the victim with the minimum length of time necessary for that sexual release. If the notion of minimal time and violence to achieve the goal of rape is correct, then the increased violence depending on the relationship categories shows that there is another motivation than only sexual release. This might be motivations such as revenge, re-gain control or control as discussed above.

**Forced Fellatio**

The decrease of forced fellatio depending on the relationship category (Table 5) is also interesting. Fellatio could be considered as both a degrading act and as a part of a “normal” sexual act between two persons involved in a mutually agreed sexual act. The reason for the decrease could be that the motivation behind the rape correlates with the relationship category in that the sex as a focus reduces with the closer relationship. In the extremes it would mean that an Ex-Partner has another motivation and that the sex in the rape is a part of a broader picture while
the sex in the rape itself is the focus for a stranger. A Stranger would then be willing to spend the extra time at the rape scene to fulfil the fantasy he had before finding a suitable victim and the script is acted out in all details. Another reason could sometimes also be that the victim reporting factor becomes less, depending on the relationship, as fellatio is seen as a part of common sexual situations in many cultures.

Removal of Clothes

The ordering of removal of clothes, which is present in Partner and Ex-Partner, could be a sign of the offender wishing the victim to remove her own clothes for a better match of the illusion of consensual sex, but it can also be a sign of an order and control theme as well as a form of distancing himself from the victim. In this author’s view the most likely scenario may be the control/respect theme since the variable is closely correlated with the violence variables. This was also seen in the Mann and Hollin study (2007) in the offenders who used rape as tool to regain respect and control.

Risk assessment

Tables 2, 3 and 4 shows that in the typical, overall, rape both the victim and offender have consumed alcohol and the rape occurs in the victim’s home at night. The offender is probably in his 30s. However, the victim is less probable to have consumed alcohol than the offender. In order to do a risk assessment of a situation this information may prove useful. For example, a low risk situation might be that both the woman and man are sober, in the victims’ friends’ home and the man is in his 40s and it is in the afternoon. In contrast, a high risk situation might be that they are acquaintances, it is night, both have consumed alcohol and they are in his or her home and he is in his 30’s. Although this may seem obvious, this obvious situation happens again and again.

Rape prevention and victim treatment

It is important to remember that every case is unique in itself and that the interaction between the offender and victim is largely dependent on the victim and offender themselves; but also the history between them and the internal as well as the external situation and location
contribute to the outcome. The offender might behave differently in a various situations and so might the victim, even though the motivations might be similar. This study is not trying to reduce the horrid situation to numbers and decimal points but rather trying to understand the complexity of the rape situation and the perpetrator. In the ideal world we can stop this from happening in the first place. Since we all live in an imperfect world this will most likely happen over and over again, yet, this should not deter us from trying to stop it by investigating what situations are more or less risky as well as learning about the offender’s motivation. This way we can try and minimize the risk for rape to happen and also try and help the victim by giving an explanation of why the offender performed the hurtful and demeaning crime that a rape is. In this way we can also continue to develop a profiling tool to be used by the law enforcement in profiling the offender.

Deviant mind

The question in this study has been if there are different types of deviant minds depending on the closeness of the relationship. For example, there was a case where a man raped his own, very old, mother with his fist so that she started to bleed profoundly. His explanation in the interview was that she lost her balance, fell and screamed out of pain for help and he used his fist to penetrate her vagina to stop her from screaming. He had no explanations as to why he fondled her breasts except that they were there. Both of the persons were long time alcoholics and similar situations had occurred in the past. Of course this could very much be a unique behaviour in a onetime occurring situation by this individual alone. However, the selection of the victim could be a key to the state of mind behind the motivation, just as partners and ex-partners have theirs.

The above statement also applies to Stranger rapes. At least one of the offenders in the Stranger category had a psychiatric diagnosis of a mild version of Aspergers syndrome and therefore their MO and motivation might differ from the relationship categories used in this study.
Connection to Canters’ theories

This study did not find clear lines between the different levels of violation as Canter et al. (2003) suggested. However, different themes as proposed in the same article were found in the present study, although not exclusively on the same dimensions or in the same amount.

This study also found different levels in the frequencies of the behaviours as did Canter (2000). The most occurring behaviour was in the centre, the most unique towards the ends of the dimensions. Since the variables that were considered too unique were removed the MDS:s did not show the signature of the offenders.

Limitations

The relationship categories of Stranger and Friend proved to be fairly useless in the present study since the cases in these categories were too few. It can be argued that the reason why these cases were too few is the fact that the violation of being raped by a friend is greater than being raped by an acquaintance, even though both crimes are a foul violation of a person’s body and mind. Thereby the willingness to report the rape may decrease the closer the relationship between offender and victim. The stranger category is, however, an exception to this. Here the probable cause for lack of cases is probably reliant on the fact that in these types of cases it is difficult to find the culprit. Because of this there were not enough cases that have been processed through the court system and hence were not included in this study. To remedy this one could either extend the terra area of selection, use a larger temporal span and/or select cases that have not been through the Swedish court system.

Some cases lacked the details needed to find the variables used in this study. This made it, sometimes, hard to code whether the variable had existed or not. This could depend on the police interviewer, who at the time did not have a standard form for questioning which in turn affected the amount of information asked for at that time. The nature of human memory in the temporal dimension can also affect the recollection of details. The time between rape and report varied from between 0 and approximately 3.5 years.

The fact that this study was based on the victim interviews could make the results faulty since it is the experienced violation that is being coded. For the same reason variables could have been left out because victim might feel shame or guilt for some parts of the violation.
The fact that all the analyzed cases have gone to court does not mean that all the offenders are guilty. The court system is not perfect and thus this study might also be called into question for being imperfect since it is based on data from an court imperfect system. However, most of the offenders have to be assumed to be guilty because of hard evidence as DNA or other corpus delicti evidence.

The different numbers of cases in the different relationship categories might affect the placement of the variables in the different MDSs. It would have been ideal if the number of cases had been evenly distributed in all the categories.

The fact that the variables for the victim were not included in the present study leaves us without any response in resistance from the victim. This, unfortunately, made impossible any observation of correlation between violence from the offender contra resistance from the victim (or the other way around).

The written transcripts from the interrogations does not contain information about the tone of voice and body language; two very important communication systems. However, the nature of the binary coding, that something either exists or not, is probably not affected by this since they are not dependent on tone of voice or body language but more on the content of the information.

As noted above, during this study roughly 35000 pages of information were read in search for indications of offender behaviour. It is possible that some variables that are important for this study were overlooked by the researcher, not found, not recorded or observed/indicated by the victim or at the crime scene.

The different number and specifics of variables in the various MDS:s could be seen as making it difficult to compare the different MDS maps to each other. However, since the variables removed are considered unique in this study they should not effect the results of the more common variables that are more central.

20 of the cases used in the Hendrix and Scimone study (2007) were also included in this study. This might have effectuated the result enough to get similar result. However, the author considers this small amount of cases not affect the result of this study. They were also divided into completely new relationship categories than the Hendrix and Scimone study (2007) which further should limit the possible contamination of this study.
Suggested research

It would obviously be very good if this study could be repeated with a greater number of cases with an equal number of cases in the different categories.

It would also be very interesting to repeat the Mann and Hollin (2007) study but with the relationship variable included in order to confirm or reject the results of the present study.
References


Author Notes

The author would like to extend his gratitude towards Professor David Canter, Director at the International Centre for Investigative Psychology and President of International Academy for Investigative Psychology, for his guidance in the world of MDS.

Also to PhD Martin Bäckström at the university of Lund for taking time off his busy schedule to clear up some statistical questions.

Finally, but in no way the least, to Professor Carl Martin Allwood, for his continuing trust in me and this project; and for giving me freedom, ideas, stimulating arguments and discussions for this thesis.
Footnote

¹ BrB 6 kap §1 means Criminal (Penal) Code, chapter 6 paragraph 1.

“A person who, by violence or threat involving or appearing to the threatened personas imminent danger, forces the latter to have sexual intercourse or to engage in a comparable sexual act, shall be sentenced for rape to imprisonment for at least two and at most six years. Rendering the person unconscious or otherwise placing the person in a similarly helpless state shall be regarded as equivalent to violence.

If in view of the nature of the violence or the threat and the circumstances in other respects the offence is considered less serious, a sentence to imprisonment for at most four years shall be imposed.

If the offence is grave, a sentence to imprisonment for at least four and at most ten years shall be imposed for aggravated rape. In judging whether the offence is grave, special consideration shall be given to whether the violence involved a danger to life or whether the person who had committed the act had inflicted serious injury or serious illness or, having regard to the method used or the victim's youth or otherwise, exhibited particular ruthlessness or brutality”