

## **APPENDICES**

### **Appendix 1: Terminology: “Perpetrators” and “victims”**

Those active in research can be referred to as: “respondents”, “(research) participants”, “informants”, “interviewees”. Where those researched are less active or non-active, for example, through case files, then terms such as “(research) subjects” or simply “the researched” may be used. What is interesting in all such formulations is how those researched may be redefined from their (relation to) perpetrating or other relevant behaviour to their relation to the research in question.

### **Appendix 2 Professional perpetrators**

“Professional” perpetrators constitute a specific group of perpetrators. They may abuse trust within organisations and gain access to and abuse children within institutions or organisations where they work, such as those dealing with young people or sports clubs (Sullivan & Beech 2004). This raises complex questions about access to networks and organised forms of sexual violence and abuse. In such cases snowball sampling may be useful; in some cases there may be justifications for covert research, despite the ethical complications, but these need to be very carefully argued and justified with those legally responsible in the research context. In addition, vulnerable adults may also be abused by professional perpetrators.

### **Appendix 3: Adolescent perpetrators**

There is a large literature on adolescent perpetrators (Araji 1997; cf. Hutton & Whyte 2006). Some of this notes that propensity to sexual violence may begin at a relatively young age. Over 58% of the professional perpetrators studied by Sullivan & Beech (2004) stated that they first became aware of their sexual arousal to children before the age of 16. Estimates from some studies suggest that 25% - 30% of all child sexual abuse is committed by those under 18 (Hutton & Whyte 2006). According to Hudson (2004), 25% of males convicted or cautioned of a sexual offence in 2000 were between 12 and 20. There are specific ethical issues related to researching “children”, especially in terms of *informed* consent (Eder & Fingerson 2002). Parental, or guardian’s (individual or state), consent will be required in most cases; this may limit potential forms of research.

### **Appendix 4: Women perpetrators**

The question of women perpetrators is contested. There are key methodological issues and choices, in identifying prevalence and nature of women’s perpetration. Issues to be considered are: (1) different definitions; (2) does the research distinguish between offences committed with a (usually male) partner and those committed alone? (3) does the research reveal whether offences are carried out by family members? (4) are victims

children or adults, male or female? (5) what is the nature of the study? Is it a study of a clinical population or a prevalence study? With that backdrop, recent findings can be cautiously noted, they should not be taken to suggest any gender symmetry in this respect.

In a recent Dutch study Hendriks & Bijleveld (2006) suggest that underreporting of sexual violence relates especially to women perpetrators. Green (1999, cited in Hendriks & Bijleveld 2006) found that 14-24 % of boys and 6-14 % of girls who had been subject to sexual violence had been abused by women. In many such cases the women abused their own children, adopted, step- or foster children, or in childcare situations (Hendriks & Bijleveld 2006). The prevalence of female adolescent sexual abusers is difficult to generalise, but Hendriks & Bijleveld suggest that approximately 30-45% of adolescent sex abusers are female. Some evidence suggests that girls may start offending younger than boys, and the majority of offenders abuse children in a family context, are related to the victim, or in a childcaring situation (Hendriks & Bijleveld 2006). Grubin (1998: 23) states that the extent of female offending is difficult to determine given that in western societies women are permitted greater freedom than men in physical interactions with children. Where child sex abuse is perpetrated by women in the family this may often be connected to extensive physical abuse by the woman and by other members of the family (Peter 2006). There may be interconnections between abuses, sometimes by different perpetrators. However, all these comments need to be treated with great caution, as other studies have different findings.

### **Appendix 5: Problematising “the male perpetrator”**

Dominant discourses creating men and male sex offender through media and forensic disciplines tend to be underpinned by a natural science paradigm, be based only on convicted populations, ignore sexually coercive behaviours of non-convicted men, and assume a specific fixed identity for sex offender populations. Dominant constructions of male sex offenders are influenced by the media, often in terms of the stereotype of the “folk-devil”: a person or group portrayed as outsiders and deviant, and blamed for crimes or other social problems (Cohen 1972). Media representations often emphasise “stranger danger”, the predatory rapist, the deceitful paedophile, dangerous public space and safe domestic space. Their common feature is that the sex offender, including the male sex offender, is represented as “atypical” (Cowburn & Dominelli 2001).

While there is a strong tendency to portray male perpetrators as “folk devils”, they can also be thought of ordinary men. To construct male perpetrators as ordinary men may seem strange, but this approach is more viable in view of the low reconviction rates of sexual offenders. Hanson & Bussiere (1998) found 13.4% of 23,393 were reconvicted after 4-5 years (61 studies during 1943-1995). Hanson & Morton-Bourgon (2005) found a rate of 13.7% for 19,267 men after 5-6 years (73 studies during 1943-2003). On the other hand, over-emphasising legally-defined recidivism brings problems. Given the rarity of rape convictions, it is not surprising that those who rape would rarely get convicted more than once. In the light of reconviction data, it might be appropriate to focus more on the unconvicted. This is reinforced by low rates of criminal convictions of rape from crime reports, along with some prevalence studies (Cowburn 2005). Self-report

studies also lend weight to the preponderance of “ordinary men”, and research on “ordinary” US college students suggests that repeat perpetration is very common.

The difference between “ordinary men” and sex offenders continues to be unclear in research that examines the attitudes about, and proclivities towards, sexual violence in populations of “normal” adult men. Most of these studies, conducted in the last 30 years, use samples of white middle-class US college students. Although they cannot be regarded as representative of the general population, this research reveals that a significant proportion of “normal” men have pro-rape attitudes and proclivities. Stermac and colleagues (1990: 146), reviewing this literature note, that a fairly consistent finding of approximately 30-35% of the males across the studies indicated that there was some likelihood they would rape if there was no comeback. These studies suggest that there may be areas of similarity between male sex offenders and the wider population of men (Knight & Sims-Knight 2003; Malamuth 2003; Cowburn 2005; Jewkes et al. 2006). This adds further argumentation against individualisation of the problem, and instead points to the structural issues embedded in social hierarchies, such as the “normalising” of “objectification” and “commodification” of people for sexual purposes. On the other hand, it would be mistaken to assume that low conviction rates mean there is no significant difference between men who rape and those who do not.

#### **Appendix 6: Introduction to general ethical texts**

There are several ways to frame ethical concerns. Kantian ethics considers the innate nature of an action rather than its consequences. Moral actions live up to principles such as respect for the person, honesty and justice. In contrast, utilitarian ethics are more concerned with the outcome(s) of specific actions and judges them to be more or less ethical on this basis: the greatest good for the greatest number (Banks 2006). Ethics can also be seen in terms of the virtue of ethics of skills. Here ethical behaviour is seen less as the application of general principles and rules, than as the researcher internalising moral values. The personal integrity of the researcher, the interaction with the community studied, and the relation to their ethical values is prioritised. The emphasis is on the researcher’s ethical intuitions, feelings and skills as well as on negotiations between actors in a specific community (Kvale 1996: 122).

#### **Appendix 7: Quantitative and qualitative research**

While different research questions suggest different methods, Hudson (2004) and Scully (1990) argue for the use of multiple methods and advocate ethnographic observation in order to build up a strong relationship of trust. The use of repeated interviews helps build a relationship of trust and rapport that can encourage participants to be more open (Hudson 2004). Multiple perspectivism can also be built into research design in order to reduce the likelihood of expectations or assumptions on the part of the research subject leading to misunderstandings (Riessman 2005).

Survey research can involve asking sensitive questions to random samples. How this is handled for both perpetrators and non-perpetrators needs careful thought and planning. This includes the offering of possible and possible support, especially when they are themselves victims/survivors. This can include contact addresses of relevant

agencies, even if they cannot be specifically recommended or underwritten. The availability of such interventions is of course not always possible; so in this situation a judgement has to be made if any support can be offered. Community surveys raise extra complications beyond individualised researches. Surveys may, however, be the most effective and less ethically problematic means of eliciting information about undisclosed offending behaviour – both its nature and its frequency. Questions on sexual violence should be incorporated into surveys designed for other purposes only when ethical and methodological requirements can be met. Otherwise, research may be done “in passing” or inadvertently. After all, research participants may not be concerned whether a relevant series of questions is part of a specialist study on sexual violence or a study of “family life”. It is effects that count, not the researcher’s intentions (Knight & Sims-Knight 2003; Malamuth 2003; Cowburn 2005; Jewkes et al. 2006).

### **Appendix 8: Collaborative research**

Without good collaborative practices the epistemology of dominant one(s) may dominate the epistemologies of others. These points apply for all participants, and particularly for those in leadership positions. In particular, it is vitally important to develop facilitative and supportive research workings, research practices, and research leadership. Matters of research process cannot easily be separated from the content of research, including comparative, transnational and interdisciplinary research on sexual violence.

Thus we suggest these guidelines:

- Be respectful of all researchers and what they bring to the research; this extends to understanding of difference, and respect for others’ research and national and regional locations.
- In comparative, transnational and interdisciplinary research one cannot assume common ethical frameworks; these are need to be negotiated and developed at the outset of such collaborative projects.
- Be aware that the major regional differences among the collaborating countries mean that assumptions that single models should be applied in all countries should be treated critically and with great caution. As is often the case within structural and uneven power relations, those with less resources often know more about those with more resources, than vice versa. They typically hold different kinds of knowledge.
- Be aware of major national, legal and cultural differences among the collaborating countries, around openness/secretcy, financial accounting and many other matters - including disclosure of illegal acts and legal responsibility of researchers to report such acts.
- Value self-reflective approaches to development of multiple methods, and in the conduct of research.
- Be aware that much research is done by goodwill and overtime work by researchers, and with few or no additional resources. Thus excessive demands

can mean that time and resources are taken from other academic and related activities, and other research projects. This is an issue of ethical allocation of researchers' time and resources among different activities, which is especially important in working on questions of violence and violation.

- Express positive support and gratitude, not excessive criticism.
- Be aware that researchers may be working in their second, third or fourth language, and that extra attention may need to be given to clarity in the working language. This highlights the importance of exploring linguistic commonalities and differences within projects. Some languages have more restricted codes for speaking about sexual behaviours. For example, some South Asian languages have either a romantic or a profane linguistic code in which to discuss sexual matters (Neate 1991). Addressing these issues – of whose sex, and whose language - would be of great importance for international projects.
- Take care in writing emails and other communications; where possible, write clear short emails and other communications; do not use obscure phrases or make ungrounded suggestions in email and other communications.
- In collective research discussions give feedback in good time, and not late in the process of research production.
- Develop an appropriate and fair collective publishing policy, so texts and information are not used inappropriately by others as their own.
- Be aware of internal differences within research projects, especially between those who are more funded and those who are less (or not) funded, and among universities and similar institutions that are better resourced and universities and similar institutions those that are less well resourced. This involves a thorough grounded understanding of the conditions under which different researchers are working: some are working on permanent contracts, some temporary contracts; some are well paid, others are not; some are in supportive working environments, others are in situations lacking support. Researchers are subject to other social divisions and differences, such as by age, class, disability, ethnicity and racialisation, gender, sexuality.
- Develop projects that have fair distribution of resources, including between those with greater coordinating functions and other research functions, between those who are more funded and those who are less funded, and between universities and similar institutions that are better resourced (for example, in North America and Western Europe) and universities and similar institutions that are less well resourced (especially in the South, and in Central and Eastern Europe). This is especially so with the under-resourcing of research and the overwork of many researchers doing much work unpaid or in “overtime”.
- Recognise the importance of community collaboration and working with service providers and policy advocates who may also have input into and a stake in research. Such agencies complain that university researchers rarely want to pay

them to be involved, and often do not do a good job of communicating research results to enhance policy and practice.

- Develop ways of organisation and working that are free from violation, and aim to produce workplaces in which people wish to work. This includes giving recognition to issues of power, authority and decision-making in the management of projects (Hearn et al. 2007).

### **Appendix 9: Research Codes of Practice**

A Comparative Assessment of Good Practice in Programs for Men who use Violence Against Female Partners. (2004) Canberra, ACT: Office of the status of women, the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet [www.aifs.gov.au/acssa/research/vicservice.html](http://www.aifs.gov.au/acssa/research/vicservice.html)

*Code of Ethics and Conduct* (2006) The British Psychological Society. [www.bps.org.uk/](http://www.bps.org.uk/)

*Code of Ethics and Policies and Procedures of the ASA Committee on Professional Ethics.* (1999) American Sociological Association. [www.asanet.org](http://www.asanet.org)

*Code of Ethics of the American Anthropological Association* (1998) American Anthropological Association. [www.aaanet.org/committees/ethics/ethcode.htm](http://www.aaanet.org/committees/ethics/ethcode.htm)

Ethical guidelines and principles of conduct for anthropologists (2005) *Anthropology Southern Africa*, vol. 28(3&4), pp. 142-143

Ethical Principles of Psychologist (1981) *American Psychologist*, vol.36(6), pp. 633-638

Forskningsetiska principer inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning. (2002) Vetenskapsrådet. [www.vr.se](http://www.vr.se)

*Guidelines For Research.* (2006) National Children's Bureau. [www.ncb.org.uk](http://www.ncb.org.uk)

*NOTA Code of Ethics* (2002) The National Organisation for the Treatment of Abusers.

*Research Ethics Framework* (2005) The Economic and Social Research Council <http://www.york.ac.uk/res/ref/news.htm>

The RESPECT Code of Practice. Professional and Ethical Codes for Socio-Economic Research in the Information Society (2004) The Respect Projects [www.respectproject.org/code](http://www.respectproject.org/code)

*Statement of ethical practices for the British Sociological Association* (2002) British Sociological Association. [www.britisoc.co.uk](http://www.britisoc.co.uk)

UNESCO (2005) Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights, 19 October 2005. Available at: [http://portal.unesco.org/shs/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=1883&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/shs/en/ev.php-URL_ID=1883&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)

WHO (1999) *Putting Women First: Ethical and Safety Recommendations for Research on Domestic Violence Against Women*, Department of Gender and Women's Health Family and Community Health, World Health Organization.

WHO *Ethical and Safety Recommendations for Interviewing Trafficked Women* (2003) World Health Organization.

World Medical Association (2004) *Declaration of Helsinki Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects*.  
<http://www.wma.net/e/policy/b3.htm>

### **Referenced literature**

Araji, S. K. (1997) *Sexually Aggressive Children: Coming to Understand Them*. London: Sage.

Banks, S. (2006) *Ethics and Values in Social Work* (3rd ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cohen, S. (1972) *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*. MacGibbon and Kee, London.

Cowburn, M. (2005) Confidentiality and public protection: Ethical dilemmas in qualitative research with adult male sex offenders. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, vol.11 (1), pp. 49-63.

Cowburn, M., & Dominelli, L. (2001) Masking hegemonic masculinity: Reconstructing the paedophile as the dangerous stranger. *British Journal of Social Work*, vol. 31, pp. 399-414.

Eder, D., & Fingerson, L. (2002) Interviewing Children and Adolescents. In Gubrium, J. and Holsetin, J. A. (Eds.) *Handbook of Interview Research*, Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage.

Green, A. H. (1999) Female sexual offenders. In J.A. Shaw (Ed.) *Sexual Aggression*. Washington: APP

Grubin D. (1998) Sex offending against children: Understanding the risk. In B. Webb (Ed.) *Police Research Series Paper 99*. Home Office

Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005) The characteristics of Persistent Sexual Offenders: A Meta-Analysis of Recidivism Studies. *Journal of Counselling and Clinical Psychology*, 73(6), pp. 1154-1163.

Hayes, D., & Devaney, J. (2004) Accessing Social Work Case Files for Research Purposes. Some Issues and Problems *Qualitative Social Work*, vol. 3(3), pp. 313-333.

Hearn, J., Novikova, I., Pringle, K., Šmídová, I., Bjerén, G., Jyrkinen, M., Iovanni, L., Arranz, F., Ferguson, H., Kolga, V., Müller, U., Oleksy, E.H., Balkmar, D., Helfferich, C., Lenz, I., Wojtaszek, M.M., Pičukāne, E., Rosa, V. (2007) *Methodological Framework Report SN2*, CAHRV. Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, Helsinki, Final Network Report to the European Commission. Available at: [http://www.cahrv.uni-osnabrueck.de/reddot/Methodological\\_Framework\\_web.pdf](http://www.cahrv.uni-osnabrueck.de/reddot/Methodological_Framework_web.pdf), <http://www.cromenet.org/>

Hendriks, J. & Bijleveld, C.C.J.H. (2006). Female adolescent sex offenders-an exploratory study. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 12(1), pp. 31-41.

Hudson, K. (2004) Offending Identities: Sex offenders' perspectives of treatment and management. PhD, University of Wales, Cardiff

Hutton, L., & Whyte, B. (2006) Children and young people with harmful sexual behaviours: First analysis of data from a Scottish sample. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, vol. 12(2), pp.115-125

Jewkes, R., Dunkle, K., Koss, M. P., Levin, J. B., Nduna, M., Jama, N., Sikweyiya, Y. (2006) Rape perpetration by young, rural South African men: prevalence, patterns and risk factors. *Social Science & Medicine*, vol. 63(11), pp. 2949–2961.

Knight, R. A., & Sims-Knight, J. E. (2003) The Developmental Antecedents of Sexual Coercion against Women: Testing Alternative Hypotheses with Structural Equation Modeling. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, no. 989, pp. 72-85.

Malamuth, N. M., (2003) Criminal and Noncriminal Sexual Aggressors: Integrating Psychopathy in a Hierarchical-Mediational Confluence Model. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, no. 989, pp. 33-58.

Neate, P. (1991) Bridging the Cultural Divide. *Community Care*, vol. 21 (November), pp.12-14.

Peter, Tracey (2006) Mad, Bad, or Victim. Making Sense of Mother-Daughter Sexual Abuse. *Feminist Criminology*, vol. 1(4), pp. 283-302.

Stermac, L. E., Segal, Z. V., & Gillis, R. (1990). Social and Cultural Factors in Sexual Assault. In W. L. Marshall, D. R. Laws, & H. E. Barbaree (Eds.) *Handbook of Sexual Assault: Issues, Theories, and Treatment of the Offender*. New York: Plenum.

Sullivan, J., & Beech, A. (2004) A comparative study of demographic data relating to intra- and extra- familial child sexual abusers and professional perpetrators. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, vol. 10(1), pp. 39-50.