CRIMINOLOGICAL ENCOUNTERS

Vol 7(1) 2025
ISSN 2506-7583
DOI 10.26395/CE.2025.1.24

How Interactional Relationships Matter for Victim Resistance During Robberies: A Video-Observational Analysis

Marie Rosenkrantz Lindegaard
University of Amsterdam, Netherlands Institute for Crime and Law Enforcement
MRLindegaard@nscr.nl

Lasse Suonperä Liebst
University of Copenhagen, Netherlands Institute for Crime and Law Enforcement
lsl@soc.ku.dk

Keywords: Violence, victim resistance, motivations, interpersonal behavior, video observation

Abstract: Victims report resisting the offender's demands in around four out of ten robberies. Yet so far, little research has examined how and why people perform such fearful and potentially dangerous resistance behaviors. Based on a qualitative analysis of video-captured shop robberies, we argue that victim resistance may be interpreted as a response to a violation of an interaction-ritualistic order: robbery victims resist and repair disruptions of this micro-social order, which are emotionally pleasing and a ground for everyday solidarities in the commercial setting. Adding to this interpretation, we find that resistance is disproportionally displayed by persons who had a face-to-face interaction with the primary robbery victim before the event and, as such, engaged in establishing an interactional relationship the moment the robbery started. We discuss theoretical implications, study limitations, and the prospect of using video-observational methods for the study of micro-interactional processes in robberies and beyond.

Introduction

Like most violent crimes, robbery events unfold through sequences of victim-offender actions and reactions (Block, 1981). The focal point of this interaction is the offender's attempt to force those robbed to accept their role as a victim and abstain from resisting (Liebst et al., 2019; Luckenbill, 1980, 1981; Nassauer, 2018). The central question in this regard is whether potential victim resistance actions are linked with the more or less violent reactions of the offender—and the jury is still out regarding this association (Katz, 1988; Kleck & DeLone, 1993; Liebst et al., 2019; McCluskey, 2013; Tark & Kleck, 2004).

While extensive literature thus has focused on violent offender reactions to victim resistance, few studies have considered how the victims take action and why they might resist in the first place. For the most part, such victim resistance is simply treated as an *independent* variable—that serves the purpose of explaining the dependent robbery-violence variable or injuries of the victims (Cook, 1980; Guerette & Santana, 2010; Kleck & DeLone, 1993)—rather than being considered as a dependent variable that needs explanation. Despite the knowledge that victim resistance is common and occurs in around four out of ten robberies (Wolfgang, 1982), little is known of how the victims do it and that to such a large extent.

Probably, the understudied status of this question is because it appears self-evident how people do it: to protect their economic valuables, reflecting some underpinning utilitarian rationality. While such economic motive may be fruitful with respect to explaining robbery offenders' use of violence (Feeney, 1986; Lindegaard et al., 2015), the fact that the robbery is not premeditated on the part of the victims makes such cost-benefit considerations of economic gains a less obvious explanation (De Haan & Vos, 2003; Van Gelder, 2013).

In fact, we know from emotionally stressful emergencies that people often demonstrate a willingness to self-sacrifice for the greater good and their group (Buchanan & Preston, 2014; Drury, 2018). However, a significant difference from this body of emergency research is that group feeling of "we-ness" is assumed to emerge between complete strangers who happen to be present at the emergency site (Philpot & Levine, 2022). By comparison, robberies occur in a context where the victims present often have some degree of personal familiarity, either because they are colleagues or due to repeated customer-employee exchanges in a commercial setting over time. Research shows that prior social relationships foster helping (Liebst et al., 2019; Lindegaard et al., 2017). As such, we cannot analyze the emergency event in isolation from the interactional routines and social relationships that lie before the robbery and which plausibly influence how the victims act in the robbery event. In appreciating this, we draw on Brekhus's (1998) argument that our understanding of "extraordinary" events—such as violence, emergencies, or deviance—gets distorted if we lose sight of the "ordinary" nature of everyday life. That is to say, the victims in the robbery have an ordinary everyday routine together, which preconditions how they act when the extraordinary robbery event happens.

The role of social ties, understood as interactional relationships in everyday situations in the shop before the robbery, or more long-term relationships, were not previously considered in studies of victim resistance. One video-based study showed that social relationships mattered for victim actions in the aftermath of robberies, with colleagues, and thus people who know each other more long term, being more likely to help and console victimized colleagues (Lindegaard et al., 2017). By contrast, victim-based studies explained resistance as a response to the violence used by offenders, and, as such, as a form of self-defense (Block, 1981; Kleck & DeLone, 1993; Tark & Kleck, 2004). Similarly, one offender-based study explained victim resistance as a natural emotional response to unexpectedly being threatened on your life, but distinguished such initial resistance from calculating and escalatory resistance later during the event (Lindegaard et al., 2015). Additionally, offenders explained resistance as related to the streetwiseness of the victims, and with reference to their previous experiences with engaging in violent interactions (Huston et al., 1981). Video-based studies showed that victim resistance was related to the way the offender carried their body and weapon in the interaction (Nassauer, 2018), with the lack of dominance and conviction leading to resistance (Mosselman et al., 2018). These studies thus emphasized that victim resistance needs to be understood as related to the actions of the offenders, but not how the actions *between* victims—for example, during their everyday routines in the shop before they are victimized—might explain actions during the robbery.

Shop robberies tend to involve many people, and of all those people present, only some of them resist.

How come some people resist, and others do not? We here investigate whether interactional relationships, established during everyday encounters in the shop, might play a role for who resist and who do not resist. As such, we add evidence to existing knowledge that social relationships, including short-term routine interactional relationships, might foster helping behavior during emergencies (Levine & Manning, 2013; Liebst et al., 2019).

In theorizing these everyday matters, we follow the micro-sociological tradition, which offers a rich vocabulary for understanding how face-to-face routines influence human interpersonal behavior and crystalize into a micro-social order that we care for (Garfinkel, 1964; Goffman, 1963; Lawler, 2002) Specifically, we find inspiration in the insight that face-to-face exchanges in commercial settings are likely to produce mild positive emotions that, in turn, transform instrumental (e.g., rational choice-based) transactions into non-instrumental feelings of commitment (Lawler et al., 2009). This should be expected from interaction ritual theory (Collins, 2004), which would attribute this to how focused interactions build up shared attention, synchronized behaviors, and collective emotions that we enjoy partaking in and, in turn, develops feelings of solidarity with the other ritual participants. Closely related to this argument, both classical (Homans, 1950) and more recent exchange theory (Lawler et al., 2009) suggest that repeated exchanges in commercial contexts produce group affective sentiments and a micro-social order we feel committed.

Notice that these micro-sociological insights agree in rejecting a narrow rational choice focus on the instrumental acquisition of economic gain and losses. Commercial exchanges may initially have been structured around such gains—but soon, we develop solidarity for our colleagues and the shop we are visiting as regular customers. From the presence of these prosocial feelings, it follows that a robbery experience breeds negative feelings such as anger and resentment that, in turn, motivate victims to defend and repair the micro-social order and the group ties that we care for (Turner, 2002). This may be expressed as righteous anger targeted at those who violate the local morality reproduced by successful interaction rituals (Collins, 2004), alongside an urge to repair the broken interaction order (Schegloff, 1992). Based on this literature, we expect that people who have engaged in face-to-face interactions with the victim before the robbery takes place, and as such have had the possibility of transforming instrumental transactions into emotional commitment, are more likely to intervene in the robbery than people who have not developed an interactional relationship with the victims.

Method

Sample

The Rotterdam and Amsterdam police granted us access to robbery case files with permission from the Netherlands Public Prosecution Service.[1] This comprised 202 robbery cases, which took place between 2011 and 2018 and were mainly recorded in supermarkets, specialty shops, restaurants, or hotels. None of the videos involved sound.

From this sample, we selected cases that conformed to a number of specific criteria: in addition to having a recording quality and full capture that allowed for detailed behavioral analysis, the clips should include footage of the situation prior to the robbery taking place. Further, the footage should capture cases with victim resistance. To evaluate an act as victim resistance, we observed the victim's actions and the immediate response of the offender: if the victim act had no effect on the offender's action, we did not consider the act as resistance. As such, we did not perceive resistance as an isolated objective act that had meaning without considering the response of people experiencing the act in the situation (Becker, 2004). For example, "standing still" would not always be considered resistance in the interaction, but if the response of the offender indicated that they experienced standing still as resistance, we defined it as such. The final sample comprised 11 robberies, including two unsuccessful robberies.

Role-Taking Video Observation

Most studies on victim resistance draw on victim surveys or offender interviews capturing retrospective accounts of the events. However, retrospective accounts are known to be biased due to memory failures

1 Note that the current sample is part of a wider dataset of video-recorded robberies that has been analyzed with other study purposes or methods (Liebst et al., 2019; Lindegaard et al. 2017; Lindegaard et al., 2018).

and social desirability answers (Jerolmack & Khan, 2014). Additionally, they provide limited micro-details about how the robbery unfolded behaviorally, including the sequential order of behavior, non-verbal communication, movement, focus, and emotional expressions in face and postures (Philpot et al., 2019). By comparison, video footage provides detailed insights into such *in situ* behaviors and thus offers a fine-grained window to study why people do what they do (Collins, 2008; Nassauer & Legewie, 2018).

With this argument, we follow the tradition of other video-based scholars in the field (Katz,1999; Nassauer & Legewie, 2022; Philpot & Levine, 2022; Sytsma et al., 2021; Weenink et al., 2022) by arguing that video observation allows researchers to examine what some ethnographers have criticized a video-based approach for being unable to understand: the lived, subjective perspective (Geertz, 1973). Thus, by trying to position ourselves into the shoes of the victims—utilizing the human capacity for role-taking (Mead, 1934)—we tried analytically to get closer to what is at stake for resisting victims in robberies. As such, we took an "emic" perspective of the victims (Pike, 1967) by literally asking ourselves what the situation looked like from their perspective. In doing so, we asked ourselves questions like "why now and not later," "why in this direction and not another," and "why in this way and not another."

Rather than utilizing the bird's-eye view that CCTV footage also offers the researcher, we watched the footage as we did not have such a privileged view—but only the view of the particularly positioned victims that we were trying to understand. The possibility to rewind and watch again was key here, as it allowed us to scrutinize the flow of the movements, gazes, and actions as experienced.

Analysis Strategy

The robbery cases were analyzed with both "categorizing" and "connecting" strategies, respectively aimed at labeling all cases by categories and identifying the interactional elements that tie the single cases together (Maxwell, 2012). These strategies go hand in hand with and allow for two complementary manners of explanatory inference: variance and process analysis: a categorizing strategy entails a between-case examination of factors that vary with a social outcome of interest (e.g., victim resistance), while a connecting strategy involves within-case analysis of the causal processes at play.

In implementing these logics, we initially described the interactional unfolding of the events, and then chose a single and particularly rich case for in-depth process analysis. To strengthen the internal generalizability of our analysis, we then examined whether the victims' resistance varied systematically across all cases in a manner consistent with the mechanism identified in the process analysis. In doing so, we took seriously the suggestion to make use of numbers in qualitative data analysis as a means to identify patterns and summarize the evidence for interpretations (Becker, 1970; Maxwell, 2010).

Note that we worked on the reliability of our connecting and categorizing interpretations by first carrying out data analysis sessions with shifting groups of colleagues, followed by transcriptions of the videos with a trained assistant. The first author first analyzed the 11 videos and transcribed six of them. The assistant then analyzed the six videos according to these transcripts, and disagreements were settled through discussions. The assistant further transcribed five videos, which were discussed until consensus was reached (note that the full anonymized transcripts are available at tinyurl.com/5n9xtaju).

Table 1. Overview robbery characteristics

ID	Location	Ratio of primary target and victims resisting	Characteristics of resisting people	Primary target and victims had prior interactional relationship	Robbery successful
R61	Construction shop	2 of 3	Employee, customer	Yes	Yes
R63	Kiosk	1 of 3	Customer	Yes (but alone in resisting)	Yes
R80	Bike shop	2 of 4	Employee, employee	Yes	Yes
R69	Restaurant	2 of 5		Yes	Yes
R72	Supermarket	2 of 3	Employee, customer	Yes	Yes
R13	Supermarket	1 of 6	Employee	Yes (but alone in resisting)	Yes
R6	Fast-food restaurant	2 of 4	Employee, employee	Yes	No
R8	Kiosk	3 of 5	Employee, customer	Yes	Yes
R17	Goldsmith	2 of 2	Employee, employee	Yes	Yes
R3	Supermarket	2 of 5	Employess, customer	Yes	Yes
R60	Supermarket	2 of 3	Employee, customer	Yes	Yes

Elaborated more in detail, the *connecting strategy* involved that we described the step-by-step unfolding of interpersonal behaviors in the transcribed cases. Here, we found inspiration in the micro-sociological traditions of interactionism and conversational analysis, with their micro-detailed focus on behavioral turn-taking, synchronicity, and sequentially (Collins, 2004; Sacks et al., 1978). In doing so, we traced the sequence of the events, with particular attention to their turning points—such as the change from doing ordinary business to the robber's entry and staging of the drama, or the point where the victim begins challenging the violent interaction order established by the robber.

In analyzing the unfolding of these trajectories, we included attention to all actors involved in the interaction to understand in what ways the acts of victim resistance were a response to the actions of other people involved in the robbery. In doing so, we identified who engaged in interaction rituals with whom before the offender entered the scene. Interactional rituals were indicated by the performance of several behavioral cues: shared focus, close proximity, nodding, smiling, glancing, and touching. We also noted wherein the setting the interaction took place (e.g., central stage, door opening, or periphery) as previous studies show that claiming the centre of the locality guide the actions of both offenders and victims (Liebstet al., 2019; Nassauer, 2018) We then focused on the resisting victim, trying to understand the aim of their actions. This analysis involved analytical attention to how the victim moved in space, their actions, the timing of these actions, and what alternative movements, actions, and timings they could have followed but did not. This latter counterfactual reasoning informs why they chose to do this rather than that (Katz, 2002, 2015).

The *categorizing strategy* involved that we initially distinguished offenders from non-offenders through their actions, clothes, and weapon use. Any non-offender was considered a victim, given that the threat posed by the presence of offenders influenced their actions. We also distinguished customers from colleagues by taking into consideration their clothing and activities in the shop. We did not attempt to interpret other kinds of potential relationships between victims, like, for example, friends or family, as we considered such interpretations unreliable given the limited information from the video-recorded shop

settings. Further, all cases were labeled according to the type of victim resistance (e.g., refusing to move away from the offender or throwing objects at the offender) and whether or not the person performing resistance had interaction with the primary target of the robbery prior to the event. As we shall see, the existence of such prior face-to-face interaction was found to be critical for the performance of resistance, given that this signifies and stimulates solidarity that, in turn, may elicit negative emotions and resistance action. Bystander/strangers often intervene in street fights, though they have no prior relation with either party. That's the pattern in the existing literature that you should have discussed.

Analysis

Process Analysis

In what follows, we illustrate a micro-detailed process analysis of a single case (see online appendix for ten other cases) that encapsulates how interactional micro-sequences flow into victim resistance. We show that the reciprocal customer-employee interaction in the pre-robbery phase continues into the robbery phase and thus makes the customers refuse the orders of the offender. The robbery we describe took place in a restaurant in a large Dutch city in 2017, just before closing time in the evening. From the wall decorations and roof lamps, it appears like a Chinese restaurant. Customers enter the restaurant to the left of the camera frame through a double door. Upon entrance, there is a spacious walking area with a desk to the right. The desk is rounded and long with a long high cashier to the right and lots of bottles and glasses at the back wall. To the left side of the entrance, you can enter a seating area with space for approximately 30 customers. A low wall with lighted fishponds surrounds the seating area. The restaurant is dark, and the lights are soft.

A young man, that we interpreted as a deliveryman and short and lightly built, stands in front of the cashier, chatting to a young female employee standing at the opposite side of the desk. They are both looking at a booklet on the desk while talking together [inferred from non-verbal cues] in close proximity, smiling at each other with relaxed body postures. She notes down something in the booklet and walks slightly to the right side of the disk. The young man keeps talking with her while keeping his eyes on her, and when she makes that move, he also slightly moves to the right in order to remain in close proximity to her.

She now opens the cashier and takes out two notes, which she hands over to him. He smiles at her while receiving the notes, and they keep chatting, holding their gaze at each other, still in close proximity and with relaxed body postures. He puts the notes in his pocket, and looks like he is getting ready to leave. She points at the booklet at the desk with her index finger, asking him to sign, holding her finger on the booklet, while he smiles at her. He leans over the desk, still smiling, and signs while she still keeps her index finger on the booklet, now looking up, seeing the offender entering the restaurant. Theoretically, this exchange illustrates, with its social easiness, shared focus, relaxed body postures, close proximity, and smiles, how an essentially commercial transaction also is an emotionally pleasing interaction (Lawler et al. 2009)—a low-intensity interaction ritual in successful action (Collins 2004).

Three colleagues of the young woman employee are located in the seating area—on the left side of the entrance, surrounded by a half wall of fishponds—before the offender enters the restaurant. One sits at the table while the two others bring food and plates to the table, and they start eating. They now and then glance at the interaction at the desk without saying anything. At one point, one of them looks at her watch and stands up to get a glass of water from another table. She mediates contact between the two groups via her glances at the desk. She is the first one of that group that sees the offender entering, still with a glass in her hand.

The offender is a man in his 30s. He is widely built and wears grey clothes, gloves, and a baklava. His outfit comes across as unusually stylish, with his mask and gloves having the exact same color as the rest of his clothes. He carries a disproportionally large knife in his hand, which he holds in front of him. He points the knife toward the young man and woman at the desk. He moves the knife in the direction of the woman, leaning with his body over the desk, while he pushes the young man to the left of the desk, backward into the restaurant, displacing him from the center stage of the interaction that just took place. When he points the knife at the woman, the woman moves to the right side of the desk. Note that this negotiation of emotional domination, illustrated by who controls the center stage, is typical for robberies (Liebst et

al., 2019; Nassauer, 2018) and violent encounters in general (Collins, 2008).

The young man does not make the same move to avoid getting closer to the offender but stays put at the desk. This refusal to move away—a subtle but active form of resistance—makes the offender push the young man away, entirely removing him from the center stage and the interaction with the woman. That pushing movement makes the young man follow him, now moving backward out of the frame toward the backside of the restaurant. The offender looks in the direction of the young man at the back of the restaurant. He says something to him and, afterward, leans over the desk to pull away the cash register. He grabs the whole thing and holds it under his arm, now pointing the knife in the direction of the young man at the back, again saying something to him. When he pulls the cash register over the desk, notes of money fall out of the cashier, and the whole action comes across as desperate and messy. The colleagues sitting at the table in the seating area watch it happening while moving into hiding. They make themselves invisible behind the half wall with fishponds.

Before the offender turns around and starts moving towards the front door, he pauses for a few seconds with his back towards the service desk. He faces the back of the restaurant where the young man had moved, holding his knife in front of his body, pointing in the direction of the young men, stressing his position at the center stage of the space. He stands wide-legged in the middle of the room, with his breast towards the employees in the seating room, looking in the direction of the young man. One colleague in the seating area gets up and holds the back of the chair as if she needs to cling to something. Another colleague moves furthest away in the direction of the kitchen to hide, while the third employee remains hidden behind the half wall.

The offender now disappears out of the frame through the front door. This move makes the young man and the young woman at the desk make the same move toward the front door. The young man is tipping on his toes, moving slowly toward the front door from the back of a restaurant. His movements towards the front door happen at the same pace as the young woman, moving from behind the service desk towards the front door. When he reaches the front of the service desk, right next to the front door, he stops and starts moving backward again, now at a faster pace, still in movement synchronic with the young woman. His sudden shift in pace and direction is caused by the sudden return of the offender. The young woman makes a step backward to the right of the desk so that she now stands a little behind the desk but also not fully covered by it. The young man makes several steps toward the restaurant's back where he came from.

The offender does not come back into the image. The young man re-emerges in the frame, now running back to the center of the interaction while pointing his finger toward the front door and the offender—i.e., possible behavioral cues of anger (Dael et al., 2012) stressing that the robbers' attempt to monopolize the emotional dominance over the situation seems lost. The last two steps he makes before going through the front door are on his toes, giving it a light but also sneaky appearance as if he is still busy hiding or doing something undercover. While he makes this movement, the young woman also makes two steps in the direction of the center of the interaction, following him but staying parallel to the desk, not putting herself in the middle of the interaction like the young man is doing, looking to the left to follow what he is doing. She has an open body posture, leaning a bit forward, making small worried steps, stretching her neck to look out of the door as if she is worried the offender will come back again, without posing her full body in front of the door. When the entrance is clear, she moves through the front door and disappears out of the frame.

The three colleagues in the seating area remained on that side of the room but move towards the front door when the offender left. They gesture to each other and stay in close proximity while discussing what just happened. They look through the front door and take over the center stage when the young man and woman have left the restaurant through the front door, looking through the door as if they are expecting them to return. Throughout the robbery, the two groups—at the desk and at the seating area—remain connected and aligned.

Let us highlight the key analytical insights of this case. The behavior and resistance of the young man were not performed in a social vacuum but were contingent on and coupled with the behavior of the woman. They seemed to have a successful interaction ritual in the pre-robbery phase, and the young man insisted on staying interactionally aligned with her by staying put when he was commanded to move away. This resistance may be interpreted as an extension of the emotionally giving and meaningful interaction

ritual they had before the robber entered—a ritual order they also collaborate in upholding with their micro-coordinated action throughout the incident. Plausibly, positive emotions and a sense of solidarity produced in the pre-robbery phase thus seem to have carried over into the robbery phase. In turn, the robber's violation of this interaction-ritualistic order elicits feelings of resentment and righteous anger underpinning the resistance behavior. Further, their micro-coordinated actions may be interpreted as an attempt to counteract the negative emotions by clinging to or collectively repairing their emotionally pleasing interaction-ritualistic order.

Variance Analysis

If the above process analysis is valid, it should be mirrored in a simple behavioral pattern across the included cases: victims resisting the offender's demand are disproportionally likely to have a face-to-face exchange—i.e., a successful interaction ritual—with the primary robbery target before the robbery started. In line with this expectation, we found that a disproportionally large proportion of robberies, nine out of 11, conformed to this interactional pattern (see Ragin, 2000) In two robberies there was an interactional relationship but only one person that resisted. In one robbery (R63), the primary targets were two employees behind a desk, who were engaging with a customer. When the offenders entered the shop, the primary targets immediately escaped into a safe, leaving the customer alone in the shop, and she refused to move when the offenders asked her to do so because she blocked the route to the desk. As such this resisting victim had engaged in an interactional relationship with the primary target but resisted on her own. In another robbery (R13), the primary target was an employee and when she refused to let go of the money in her cashier, the offender grabbed her by the neck from behind to force her to let go. The customer she had interacted with prior to the robbery remained close to her and consoled her after the offender left but did not attack the offender when he grabbed her. As such the resisting employee was alone in her resistance.

In dissecting these patterns, it should be noted that seven of the nine resisting persons were shop customers rather than a colleague. In our view, this offers a compelling argument against that they are motivated by some economic consideration about the loss of the valuables: it is not their money, yet they involve themselves with potential personal risk. In other words, resistance indicates that robberies are disturbing, not because of the potential loss of valuables but because of the loss of a micro-social order. Based on these results, we hypothesize that the interactional relationship established through everyday shop interactions works protectively for victims who are more likely to receive help from people with whom they have established such relationships. While we see customers taking on this role slightly more frequently than colleagues, our sample is too small to draw conclusions about the importance of prior social relationships for the observed behaviors.

Discussion

Resistance is a common occurrence in robberies, yet research attention has centered on how offenders react to victim resistance, neglecting how and why victims are motivated to resist in the first place. In addressing this gap, we examined what happened between the moment the offender announced the robbery and the moment the first victim displayed resistance to their demands. In this relatively short period, victims often divide tasks between them, and the coordination of these tasks takes place between people who had already established an interactional relationship before the offender entered the setting. We proposed that victim resistance becomes a resistance of in-group members towards an outsider threatening the social order of the shop—plausibly driven by the feeling of anger and resentment that humans experience when our meaningful interaction ritual order is violated (Collins, 2004; Turner, 2002). From the perspective of the victims, the everyday interaction rituals in the shops do not break down but need temporary repair (Goffman, 1971). Victim resistance may be understood as repair work to restore the viability of the everyday interaction order.

Our identification of the importance of interactional relationships for the actions of victims is in line with previous studies of behavior in violent incidents showing that social relationships rather than categorical ties are key for understandng bystander intervention (Liebst et al., 2019; Lindegaard et al., 2017). These studies highlight that people who have a social bond with someone in a conflict situation are dramatically more likely to help. The question is whether the interactional bonds build up just before the crime takes place are more influential on victim resistance than the social relationships. Future studies should

investigate that.

In our study, we cannot rule out that what we identified as an interactional relationship might also involve long-term social relationships. As such, our analysis proposes that any form of relationship, whether established in the interaction of the shop prior to the robbery or having a more long-term nature, has an effect on the way people act. The question remains, however, how intense relationship bonds need to be for people to feel committed to engaging themselves. Additionally, it is unclear why social relationships matter for victim resistance, e.g., whether people do it because of potential social precautions of remaining passive (Fischer et al., 2006), or maybe to get rid of their own distress (Dovidio et al., 1991), or empathize with the distress of others (Batson & Shaw, 1991). Future studies need to distinguish between different kinds of relationship bonds in order to establish how much interaction is needed for people to feel committed to helping others and to further study motivations for actual involvement.

This perspective on victim resistance as repairment work for everyday interactional orders is a rare empirical example of the idea that instrumental transactions in depersonalized spaces might translate into non-instrumental feelings of commitment through everyday interactions (Lawler et al., 2009), in this case in shop settings. Often studies inspired by symbolic interactionalism focus on single cases, or on retrospective meaning-making processes. Video observations, however, offer a rare opportunity to systematically study instrumental transactions and acted commitment as they unfold in various kinds of video-recorded face-to-face encounters in everyday life. For example, video observations of street fights revealed that bystanders are committed to helping (Ejbye-Ernst, 2022; Philpot et al., 2020), but little is known about the ways in which instrumental transactions in face-to-face encounters play a role in acting out such commitments.

Our micro-sociological interpretation of the data at hand offers an alternative to understanding resistance as aimed at protecting the economic valuables. The fact that the majority of resisting persons were costumers—who have no direct economic incentive to protect the valuables—conflicts with such economic interpretation. For transparency, we note that this pattern is not uniformly robust, with the robberies starting with the destruction of objects being an exception. In three cases, the victims responded by throwing objects at the offender, which seemed focused on defending objects rather than the social order of the establishment.

However, the fact that these latter cases are exceptions does not imply that the majority of resisting persons, because of their emotional motivations for action, are simply acting in an "irrational" manner—as a traditional dualistic understanding of emotions and rationality would suggest (Weber, 1978). Rather, the behavior of the resisting persons may be considered strategic decision-making, centered on optimizing our participation in the interaction rituals (Collins, 1993). This argument resonates with the insight that emotions are what makes rational decision-making possible (Turner, 2009), as well as rational choice-oriented theory of helping behavior, which acknowledges that a sense of "we-ness" fosters stronger negative emotions in emergencies and thus a greater incentive to help (Piliavin et al., 1981). For humans, our strategically selfish and emotionally self-sacrificing motives may coincide.

The current results support studies showing that people involved in violent events act collectively in a process that happens in a flow of sequences without anyone assigning tasks but by people observing and sensing what is needed of them. This observation resonates with evidence showing that there is a surprisingly high level of group coordination during emergency events (Drury, 2018), and that affiliative behaviors serve as a social buffer against acute stress (Kikusui et al., 2006). Prior micro-sociological violence studies have mainly examined such emergent group action among bystanders coordinating help in the aftermath of emergencies (Bloch et al., 2018; Weenink et al., 2021), and we add to this research by showing that similar interaction-ritualistic behaviors unfold among victims during violent mid-events.

We hope that the current analysis illustrates the value of using video data for the study of violent events. As highlighted by Collins (2008) and others (Nassauer & Legewie, 2018; Philpot et al., 2019), video data allows for a more fine-grained behavioral analysis than any other social science method available (Goodwin, 2000; Mondada, 2008) For example, the micro-coordinated actions between the man and woman in the illustrative case would simply not have been possible to capture if observed on-site (Morrison et al., 2016). Such information cannot be derived from interviews with robbery victims, but they could provide additional insights about, for example, subjective perspectives and experiences involving retrospective

meaning-making processes about resistance (Lindegaard & Bernasco, 2018). Interviews with robbery victims, however, previously showed inconsistencies about sequential patterns in the behavior of the involved people when compared with offender perspectives on the same event (Indermaur, 1996). However, one limitation of video data analysis is that it invites a bird's-eye view perspective on social life, uncoupled from the phenomenologically lived perspective of those recorded (de Certeau, 1988). This limitation may be partially overcome, however: as we have demonstrated, repeated and role-taking observations of the video clips allow one to take the perspective of those present (Mead, 1934), and thus interpret their actions in light of how they perceived the situation unfolded (Valach et al., 1988). We hope that future micro-sociological video analyses of robberies and other everyday phenomena will utilize this role-taking potential of video data analysis.

A limitation of the current work is that video data offer limited information on the inner dimension of emotional motivation underpinning the resistance acts, also because the video clips do not capture sound and communication (Philpot et al., 2019). Although this point should not be exaggerated, given that emotions are displayed in and can be read from external nonverbal cues (Hochschild, 1979; Keltner et al., 2019), it would have added to the validity of the current analysis if we had triangulated our observational data with self-reports of experienced emotions (Lamont & Swidler, 2014), and with on-site studies of interactions in the analyzed localities of the robberies.

Another limitation is that video analysis does not provide insights into the personal characteristics and experiences of the people interacting in the robbery, which might influence the behavior observed, e.g., whether they have been trained to act in certain ways during robberies or have perhaps experienced victimization to robberies before. Future studies need to take these characteristics, and the potential variation in the type of shops, spatial layout and physical structure, into consideration when studying the interactional dynamics of violent encounters, for example, by referring them from police case files.

Further, it should be acknowledged that the current sample has limited external validity, given the small sample size and the reliance on recordings from only one urban national and Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic (WEIRD) study context. Future studies should investigate the proposed hypothesis about the influence of social bonds on victim resistance in varied samples of robberies with and without victim resistance. They should also establish if victims follow culturally-specific behavioral toolkits when navigating robberies (Lindegaard, 2017), whether their responses depend on the type of robbery setting (e.g., does the physical architecture of the shop matter?), and how victims perceive their own behavior (e.g., what are their self-reported motivations for resistance?). Additionally, comparing the way victims resist in successful and non-successful robberies (Nassauer, 2018) would enhance our understandings of the impact that resistance has on offender actions, and as such of the interactional dynamics of crime (Lindegaard, 2022). Broadening the analysis to include attention to understanding motivations for victim responses in other kinds of violent interactions—e.g., comparing sexual violence, homicides, and gang-related violence—would help explain victim resistance.

In conclusion, robberies violate everyday interactional orders, and through this disturbance, they expose what binds people together. People establish meaningful solidarity ties through their engagements in everyday interaction rituals, and they cling to this micro-social order in unexpected events like robberies. Robberies do not break down the social but expose it: humans resist violations of the interaction-ritualistic order they care for and become collectively engaged in repairing its functionality when disrupted.

Bibliography

Batson, C. D., & Shaw, L. L. (1991). Evidence for Altruism: Toward a Pluralism of Prosocial Motives *Psychological Inquiry*, *2*(2), 107–122. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0202_1

Becker, H. S. (1970). Sociological work: Method and substance. New Brunswick. *NJ: Transaction Books. A Framework for Analyzing Data*, *381*, 747–773.

Becker, H. S. (2004). Interaction: Some ideas. *Université Pierre Mendes-France, Grenoble*.

Bloch, C., Liebst, L. S., Poder, P., Christiansen, J. M., & Heinskou, M. B. (2018). Caring collectives and other forms of bystander helping behavior in violent situations. *Current Sociology*, *66*(7), 1049–1069.

Block, R. (1981). Victim-offender dynamics in violent crime. *J. Crim. L. & Criminology*, *72*, 743.

Brekhus, W. (1998). A sociology of the unmarked: Redirecting our focus. *Sociological Theory*, *16*(1), 34–51.

Buchanan, T. W., & Preston, S. D. (2014). Stress leads to prosocial action in immediate need situations *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, *8*, 5.

Certeau, M. de. (1988). The practice of everyday life. In *The practice of everyday life*. University of California Press.
Collins, R. (1993). Emotional energy as the common denominator of rational action. *Rationality and Society*, *5*(2), 203–230.
Collins, R. (2004). *Interaction Ritual Chains:* Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400851744
Collins, R. (2008). *Violence: A Micro-sociological Theory*. Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400831753
Cook, P. J. (1980). Reducing Injury and Death Rates in Robbery. *Policy Analysis*, *6*(1), 21–45.
Dael, N., Mortillaro, M., & Scherer, K. R. (2012). Emotion expression in body action and posture. *Emotion*, *12*(5), 1085.
De Haan, W., & Vos, J. (2003). A crying shame: The over-rationalized conception of man in the rational choice perspective. *Theoretical Criminology*, *7*(1), 29–54. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480603007001199
Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., Gaertner, S. L., Schroeder, D. A., & Clark III, R. D. (1991). The arousal: Cost-reward model and the process of intervention: A review of the evidence. In *Prosocial behavior.* (pp. 86–118). Sage Publications, Inc.
Drury, J. (2018). The role of social identity processes in mass emergency behaviour: An integrative review. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *29*(1), 38–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2018.1471948
Ejbye-Ernst, P. (2023). Does Third-Party Intervention Matter? A Video-Based Analysis of the Effect of Third-Party Intervention on the Continuation of Interpersonal Conflict Behaviour. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *63*(1), 78–96. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azab121
Feeney, F. (1986). Robbers as decision-makers. In D. B. Cornish & R. V. Clarke (Eds.), *The reasoning criminal: Rational choice perspectives on offending* (pp. 53-71). Springer.
Fischer, P., Greitemeyer, T., Pollozek, F., & Frey, D. (2006). The unresponsive bystander: Are bystanders more responsive in dangerous emergencies? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *36*(2), 267–278. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.297
Garfinkel, H. (1964). Studies of the Routine Grounds of Everyday Activities. *Social Problems*, *11*(3), 225–250. https://doi.org/10.2307/798722
Geertz, C. (1973). *The ınterpretation of cultures: Selected essays.* Basic Books.
Goffman, E. (1963). *Behavior in public places: Notes on the social organization of gatherings*. The Free Press.
Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in Public: Microstudies of Public Order*. Basic Books.
Goodwin, C. (2000). Practices of seeing: Visual analysis: An ethnomethodological approach. *Handbook of Visual Analysis*, 157–182.
Guerette, R. T., & Santana, S. A. (2010). Explaining Victim Self-Protective Behavior Effects on Crime Incident Outcomes: A Test of Opportunity Theory. *Crime & Delinquency*, *56*(2), 198–226. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128707311644
Hochschild, A. R. (1979). Emotion Work, Feeling Rules, and Social Structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, *85*(3), 551–575. https://doi.org/10.1086/227049
Homans, G. C. (1950). *The Human Group*. Harcourt, Brace. https://books.google.dk/books?id=-pjZAAAAMAAJ
Huston, T. L., Ruggiero, M., Conner, R., & Geis, G. (1981). Bystander Intervention Into Crime: A Study Based on Naturally-Occurring Episodes. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *44*(1), 14. https://doi.org/10.2307/3033858
Indermaur, D. (1996). Reducing the opportunities for violence in robbery and property crime: The perspectives of offenders and victims. *The Politics and Practice of Situational Crime Prevention. Crime Prevention Studies*, *5*, 133–157.
Jerolmack, C., & Khan, S. (2014). Talk Is Cheap: Ethnography and the Attitudinal Fallacy. *Sociological Methods & Research*, *43*(2), 178–209. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124114523396
Katz, J. (1988). *Seductions of Crime: Moral and Sensual Attractions in Doing Evil*. Basic Books.
Katz, J. (1999). *How Emotions Work*. University of Chicago Press.
Katz, J. (2002). Start Here: Social Ontology and Research Strategy. *Theoretical Criminology*, *6*(3), 255–278.
Katz, J. (2015). Situational Evidence: Strategies for Causal Reasoning From Observational Field Notes. *Sociological Methods & Research*, *44*(1), 108–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124114554870
Keltner, D., Sauter, D., Tracy, J., & Cowen, A. (2019). Emotional Expression: Advances in Basic Emotion Theory. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *43*(2), 133–160. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-019-00293-3
Kikusui, T., Winslow, J. T., & Mori, Y. (2006). Social buffering: Relief from stress and anxiety. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *361*(1476), 2215–2228.

https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2006.1941
Kleck, G., & DeLone, M. A. (1993). Victim resistance and offender weapon effects in robbery. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *9*(1), 55–81. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01064237
Lamont, M., & Swidler, A. (2014). Methodological Pluralism and the Possibilities and Limits of Interviewing. *Qualitative Sociology*, *37*(2), 153–171. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-014-9274-z
Lawler, E. J. (2002). Micro Social Orders. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *65*(1), 4. https://doi.org/10.2307/3090165
Lawler, E. J., Thye, S. R., & Yoon, J. (2009). *Social Commitments in a Depersonalized World* (1st ed.). Russell Sage Foundation.
Levine, M., & Manning, R. (2013). Social identity, group processes, and helping in emergencies. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *24*(1), 225–251.
Liebst, L. S., Lindegaard, M. R., & Bernasco, W. (2019). Dissecting the Role of Dominance in Robberies: An Analysis and Implications for Microsociology of Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *36*(15–16), NP8668–NP8686. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519845713
Liebst, L. S., Philpot, R., Bernasco, W., Dausel, K. L., Ejbye-Ernst, P., Nicolaisen, M. H., & Lindegaard, M. R. (2019). Social relations and presence of others predict bystander intervention: Evidence from violent incidents captured on CCTV. *Aggressive Behavior*, *45*(6), 598–609.
Lindegaard, M. R. (2017). *Surviving Gangs, Violence and Racism in Cape Town* (0 ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203578957
Lindegaard, M. R., & Bernasco, W. (2018). Lessons Learned from Crime Caught on Camera. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *55*(1), 155–186. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427817727830
Lindegaard, M. R., Bernasco, W., & Jacques, S. (2015). Consequences of Expected and Observed Victim Resistance for Offender Violence during Robbery Events. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *52*(1), 32–61. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427814547639
Lindegaard, M. R. (2022). Violence in Action: What We Know and What We See
Lindegaard, M. R., Daniël De Vries, T., & Bernasco, W. (2018). Patterns of Force, Sequences of Resistance: Revisiting Luckenbill with Robberies Caught on Camera. *Deviant Behavior*, *39*(4), 421–436. https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2017.1407100
Lindegaard, M. R., Liebst, L. S., Bernasco, W., Heinskou, M. B., Philpot, R., Levine, M., & Verbeek, P. (2017). Consolation in the aftermath of robberies resembles post-aggression consolation in chimpanzees. *PLOS ONE*, *12*(5), e0177725. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0177725
Luckenbill, D. F. (1980). Patterns of force in robbery. *Deviant Behavior*, *1*(3–4), 361–378. https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.1980.9967533
Luckenbill, D. F. (1981). Generating Compliance: The Case of Robbery. *Urban Life*, *10*(1), 25–46. https://doi.org/10.1177/089124168101000102
Maxwell, J. A. (2010). Using Numbers in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *16*(6), 475–482. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410364740
Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *A realist approach for qualitative research*. Sage.
McCluskey, J. D. (2013). A Comparison of Robbers' Use of Physical Coercion in Commercial and Street Robberies. *Crime & Delinquency*, *59*(3), 419–442. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128709352233
Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist.* (Vol. 111). Chicago.
Mondada, L. (2008). Using Video for a Sequential and Multimodal Analysis of Social Interaction: Videotaping Institutional Telephone Calls. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *Vol 9*, No 3 (2008): Visual Methods. https://doi.org/10.17169/FQS-9.3.1161
Morrison, C., Lee, J. P., Gruenewald, P. J., & Mair, C. (2016). The reliability of naturalistic observations of social, physical and economic environments of bars. *Addiction Research & Theory*, *24*(4), 330–340. https://doi.org/10.3109/16066359.2016.1145674
Mosselman, F., Weenink, D., & Lindegaard, M. R. (2018). Weapons, Body Postures, and the Quest for Dominance in Robberies: A Qualitative Analysis of Video Footage. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *55*(1), 3–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427817706525
Nassauer, A. (2018). How Robberies Succeed or Fail: Analyzing Crime Caught on CCTV. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *55*(1), 125–154. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427817715754
Nassauer, A., & Legewie, N. M. (2021). Video Data Analysis: A Methodological Frame for a Novel Research Trend. *Sociological Methods & Research*, *50*(1), 135–174. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124118769093
Nassauer, A., & Legewie, N. M. (2022). *Video Data Analysis: How to Use 21st Century Video in the Social Sciences*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
Philpot, R., & Levine, M. (2022). Evacuation Behavior in a Subway Train Emergency: A Video-based

Analysis. *Environment and Behavior*, *54*(2), 383–411. https://doi.org/10.1177/00139165211031193
Philpot, R., Liebst, L. S., Levine, M., Bernasco, W., & Lindegaard, M. R. (2020). Would I be helped? Cross-national CCTV footage shows that intervention is the norm in public conflicts. *American Psychologist*, *75*(1), 66–75. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000469
Philpot, R., Liebst, L. S., Møller, K. K., Lindegaard, M. R., & Levine, M. (2019). Capturing violence in the night-time economy: A review of established and emerging methodologies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *46*, 56–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2019.02.004
Pike, K. L. (1967). Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior. In *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior* (2., rev. ed.). Mouton.
Piliavin, J. A., Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Clark, I. R. D. (1981). Emergency Intervention. In *Emergency intervention*. Academic Press.
Ragin, C. C. (2000). *Fuzzy-Set Social Science*. University of Chicago Press.
Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1978). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn Taking for Conversation. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction* (pp. 7–55). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-623550-0.50008-2
Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair After Next Turn: The Last Structurally Provided Defense of Intersubjectivity in Conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, *97*(5), 1295–1345. https://doi.org/10.1086/229903
Sytsma, V. A., Chillar, V. F., & Piza, E. L. (2021). Scripting police escalation of use of force through conjunctive analysis of body-worn camera footage: A systematic social observational pilot study. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *74*, 101776. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2020.101776
Tark, J., & Kleck, G. (2004). Resisting Crime: The Effects of Victim Action on the Outcomes of Crimes. *Criminology*, *42*(4), 861–910. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2004.tb00539.x
Turner, J. H. (2002). Face to Face: Toward a Sociological Theory of Interpersonal Behavior. In *Face to face: Toward a sociological theory of interpersonal behavior*. Stanford University Press.
Turner, J. H. (2009). The Sociology of Emotions: Basic Theoretical Arguments. *Emotion Review*, *1*(4), 340–354. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073909338305
Valach, L., Von Cranach, M., & Kalbermatten, U. (1988). Social meaning in the observation of goal directed action. *Semiotica*, *71*(3–4). https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1988.71.3-4.243
Van Gelder, J.-L. (2013). Beyond Rational Choice: The Hot/Cool Perspective of Criminal Decision Making. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *19*(9), 745–763. https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2012.660153
Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology* (Vol. 1). University of California Press.
Weenink, D., Dhattiwala, R., & Van Der Duin, D. (2022). Circles of Peace. A Video Analysis of Situational Group Formation and Collective Third-Party Intervention in Violent Incidents. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *62*(1), 18–36. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azab042
Weenink, D., Tuma, R., & Van Bruchem, M. (2022). How to Start a Fight: A Qualitative Video Analysis of the Trajectories Toward Violence Based on Phone-Camera Recorded Fights. *Human Studies*, *45*(3), 577–605. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10746-022-09634-6
Wolfgang, M. E. (1982). Victim intimidation, resistance and injury: A study of robbery. *Victimology in Comparative Perspective. Tokyo: Seibundo Publishing Co. Ltd*.

Marie Rosenkrantz Lindegaard is a professor of sociology at the University of Amsterdam and a program leader of crime in context at the Netherlands Institute for Crime and Law Enforcement. Her work focuses on interactional dynamics of violence and peacekeeping behavior, including understanding processes of escalation and de-escalation of everyday conflicts.

Lasse Suonperä Liebst is an associate professor of sociology at the University of Copenhagen and a senior researcher at the Netherlands Institute for Crime and Law Enforcement. His work is transdisciplinary and spans the areas of micro-sociology, social psychology, criminology, and primate/human ethology. Methodologically, his expertise lies in quantitative research, particularly in combination with techniques for naturalistic video observation of interpersonal behavior.

How to cite this article (APA– 7th ed.):

Lindegaard, M. & Liebst, L. (2025). How Interactional Relationships Matter for Victim Resistance During Robberies: A Video-Observational Analysis. *Criminological Encounters.* 7(1). 238-251. https://doi.org/10.26395/CE.2025.1.22

© The author(s), 2025 | Licensed under Creative Commons CC BY-NC-ND 4.0.