

To cite this output:

Kelly, Liz(2007). Rape in the 21st Century: Old Behaviours, New Contexts and Emerging Patterns: Full Research Report
ESRC End of Award Report, RES-000-22-1679. Swindon: ESRC

Rape in the 21st Century: Old behaviours, new contexts and emerging patterns

Jo Lovett, Gordana Uzelac, Miranda Horvath and Liz Kelly

Project funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC)

**End of award report submitted to the ESRC August 2007
Award number: RES-000-22-1679**

Rape in the 21st Century: Old behaviours, new contexts and emerging patterns (Award Number: RES-000-22-1679)

End of award report submitted to the Economic and Social Research Council

Jo Lovett, Gordana Uzelac, Miranda Horvath and Liz Kelly

Background

Home Office statistics show a continuing decline in the rape conviction rate over the last three decades, with 2004 at an all-time low of 5.27 per cent. Acknowledgement of the difficulties of successfully prosecuting rape offenders has led to a number of largely policy-orientated studies of the way rape cases are dealt with by the Criminal Justice System (CJS) and of the issue of attrition, the process by which cases are lost or dropped from the CJS (Chambers & Millar, 1983; Grace, Lloyd & Smith, 1992; Harris & Grace, 1999; HMCPSI, 2002; Lees & Gregory, 1993). As most of these studies are retrospective, drawing from case file analysis, they preclude tracking the decision-making processes of key actors – complainants, police, prosecutors and judges – concentrating primarily on the distribution of case outcomes. One recent study, Kelly, Lovett and Regan (2005) has sought to combine both these aspects.

Attrition is a complex, multi-factorial process. Reforms that have been put in place are not delivering the hoped-for outcomes (Kelly, 2002). This suggests that re-evaluation of practice and intervention needs to occur at multiple levels.

Estrich (1987) suggested that the treatment of reported rape cases is influenced by stereotypical notions of 'real rape' – committed by strangers, occurring in outdoor locations and involving weapons and injury (Kelly, 2002). This is despite strong research evidence that the majority of rapes are committed by someone known to the victim (Kelly, 2002 and Walby & Allen, 2004). This study sought to explore whether the characteristics associated with 'real rape' influence attrition. In developing this project we are increasingly conscious that the term 'real rape' may serve to reinforce false distinctions which our analysis seeks to question. This led to a decision to undertake analysis using the term 'stereotypical rape' as Susan Estrich in her original (1987) where the phrase 'stereotypical notions of rape' explains her concept of 'real rape'.

Several qualitative studies have sought to examine some of the underlying beliefs associated with 'real rape' (see Jordan, 2004; Temkin, 2000; Lees 2002). All rely on relatively small samples making it difficult to explore the extent to which elements of the 'real rape' template impact on each step of the CJS process; especially in the earlier stages of police investigations, where the highest levels of attrition occur (Harris & Grace, 1999; Kelly, Lovett & Regan, 2005).

Objectives

The aims of this project were to:

1. Explore the manifestations and influence of the 'real rape' template in the processing of rape cases.
2. Refine understanding of the attrition process.
3. Develop theoretical and conceptual framings which are grounded in empirical data.

4. Influence strategic policy and practice interventions responding to rape/sexual assault.

Within this there were three methodological objectives all of which were achieved:

1. To enhance the case-tracking database by recouping missing outcome data.
2. To systematically code and enter the qualitative data from police pro formas.
3. To perform more complex and sophisticated analysis of the data set and investigate particular issues/variables.

There five more specific research questions the study was to investigate:

1. Are there particular factors or combinations of factors that correlate with being targeted for sexual assault?
2. Are there particular factors or combinations of factors that correlate with reporting to the police?
3. Are there particular factors or combinations of factors that correlate with case outcome?
4. What are the key elements in constructions of rape, rape victims and rapists?
5. How do all of the above connect to the questions of credibility, culpability and attrition?

Methods

Our primary source of data was a pre-existing case-tracking database compiled during a series of linked projects we conducted for the Home Office Crime Reduction Programme (CRP).¹ This comprised 3,527 cases reported between late 2000 and end-2002 to three Sexual Assault Referral Centres (SARCs) (St Mary in Manchester, REACH in Northumbria and STAR in West Yorkshire) and three police comparison sites (with no SARCs) in south-east England. Associated data were collected on a sub-sample of individuals by questionnaires (n=228), qualitative interviews (n=56), forensic medical reports (n=109) and police witness statements (n=50) (*Appendix 1a*).

The methodology employed relates to the objectives and research questions (*supra*).

Retrieval of missing data

Despite extensive attempts to follow up missing criminal case outcomes during the original CRP project, in a number of cases this information remained either unavailable or outstanding. Some cases were subject to ongoing investigations/prosecutions when data collection ended; in others gaps were simply due to the persistent non-return of pro-formas. To strengthen the data set missing data was sought using various methods². As two of the police comparison areas fell within the Metropolitan Police Area both Project Sapphire and London CPS were contacted. Unfortunately the files were no longer available. In the third comparison area, a police liaison officer coordinated requests for the missing information, which was supplied directly by officers at the divisional level.

Table 1 shows a breakdown by research site of the progress made in retrieving missing case outcomes. Despite repeated attempts it again proved impossible to capture all the missing data, with one site unable to assist at all.

¹ Evaluation of four pilot service interventions assessing the role of Sexual Assault Referral Centres and examining the nature of attrition.

² During the CRP research only one SARC employed a designated case tracker. Since then both the others have introduced this role to their staff teams, partly as a result of CRP research recommendations (see Lovett, Regan & Kelly, 2004; Kelly, Lovett & Regan, 2005).

Table 1: Missing data process and outcome

Site	Outcomes chased	Final outcome received	Full outcome still unknown ¹	No outcome data known ²
St Mary's	230	55	175	167
REACH	124	-	124	113
STAR	51	22	29	13
Brent & Newham	40	26	14	13
Thames Valley	27	23	4	4
Total	472	126	346	310

Notes:

- 1 Either final police classification or trial outcome remains unknown.
- 2 For a small number of cases where the police classification was unknown, a reason for the case not proceeding was given thus making clear the attrition point. These cases are excluded here.

Over a quarter (27%, n=126) of missing outcomes were fully clarified, leaving only 346 cases where the full outcome is unknown, either at the level of police classification or trial outcome (13% of all reported cases). In fact, the final picture is marginally better since there are some cases (n=36) where a reason for the case not proceeding is known even though the final police classification is not, enabling them to be included in some of the analysis. This reduces the proportion of unresolved case outcomes to 310 or two thirds (66%) of those previously outstanding. Whilst the dataset is now more complete, there are still limitations with respect to final outcomes.

Expanding the data set

This involved coding the qualitative material across the whole sample that has hitherto been unanalysed or under-explored. This material relates to two aspects of each case – the circumstances surrounding the assault and the details of legal case progress, if reported. These data were gained from a combination of agency records and police pro formas and vary in terms of level of detail.

New fields were developed relating to context and additional coding on the role of alcohol, drugs. This built on findings from the original research suggesting that between a third and half of cases involved alcohol and/or drugs (Kelly et al., 2005) and in relation to the definition of consent in the Sexual Offences Act 2003. Analysis drawing on these codes has already been written up into a policy-related document on the intersections between alcohol and sexual crime (Lovett, Kelly & Horvath, forthcoming) (*Appendix 1b*).

Multivariate analysis

The original CRP research analysis focused on frequencies and cross-tabulations. Our aim was to ascertain whether particular combinations of factors might be associated with being targeted for sexual assault, as well as specific layers of attrition, thus victimisation/targeting, reporting to the police and case outcomes were subjected to multivariate analysis.

Data analysis was directed by the research questions. Bivariate relationships are mainly examined with cross-tabulation method with results presented either in tabular or graphical form. The main methods of investigation of multivariate relationships were conducted through logistic regression, multivariate linear regression and exploratory factor analysis (*Appendix 1c*).

Results

We report here on the new codings which enable us to explore the contexts in which rape takes place in more detail and the regression analysis on attrition.

The new codings were used to explore further the finding in the original attrition report that 52% of reported rapes involved alcohol consumption. This was framed in terms of the media and police pre-occupation with 'drink spiking' and the government drug and alcohol strategy³. Whilst the strong association with alcohol reflects findings from other studies there is a specific alcohol-related sexual assault profile. Perpetrators tend to be acquaintances/strangers and our new analytic codings highlight the importance of what we term 'conductive contexts' within social and public spaces. These findings not only challenge the 'real rape' template, but also the 'new mythology' of rape encapsulated in the concepts of 'date rape' and 'drug rape' and suggest more complexity and variation. In particular the label 'date rape' is erroneous: rather than supporting the stereotype of men buying drinks for women they are 'dating' with the expectation of sex, approach women they do not know who are drinking independently. This large data set points to the importance of focusing on the actions of perpetrators - a mixture of targeting and situational opportunism – which place women in contexts where they have limited options/constrained space for action. Further analysis will be undertaken on conducive contexts.

The second layer of new analysis was to use regression analysis to explore the extent to which the 'real rape' template is predictive of the attrition process. This necessitated creating new codings across the total sample of 3,527 cases. Three groupings were created: **stereotypical rape** (14.5%, n=513) – rape and attempted rapes committed by strangers (anyone known for less than 24 hours); **non-stereotypical rape** (61.7%, n=2177) – rapes and attempts committed by known men; and **other assaults** (23.7%, n=837) – cases missing the assault type and non-penetrative sexual assaults. The finding that over three-quarters of stereotypical rapes did not occur in the victim's home (77.6%, n=398) led us to a further variable: these 398 being stereotypical rape 1, with those which did becoming stereotypical rape 2. The rest of this report uses these four groupings. The rest of the report explores each of the research questions.

Research Question 1: Are there particular factors or combinations of factors that correlate with being targeted for sexual assault?

Multivariate regression analysis was used to examine whether victim profiles were associated with different types of sexual assaults⁴. Marital status, ethnic origin, age at the time of assault and employment status served as a predictor set and recoded variables that indicate type of sexual assault as dependent variables. Multi-collinearity testing of this analysis produced no significant results.

Socio-demographic characteristics

Stereotypical rape 1

While marital status and age are not significant predictors for stereotypical rape 1, some ethnic origin and employment status groups are. The most significant difference occurs between employed and unemployed victims:- $\beta = .065$, $p < .001$, indicating that unemployed victims are somewhat more likely to be victims. The difference between white and black victims in the final step of regression was also significant:- $\beta = -.037$, $p < .05$, indicating that black women are less likely to be victims (*Appendix 2a*).

³ The details of this analysis can be found in Lovett, J., Kelly, L. & Horvath, M. (Forthcoming) Alcohol and sexual assault: A contextual analysis. Home Office.

⁴ Because of word constraints detailed analyses for 'other assaults' are not presented here unless they are pertinent.

Stereotypical rape 2

Broadly similar results were found for stereotypical rape 2 but age was also a significant predictor. Minors (≤ 18 years) are more likely to be victims than those aged 19 to 39 ($\beta = .062$, $p < .01$) (*Appendix 2b*).

Non-stereotypical rape

All steps of the multiple regression were significant. The final step's adjusted R^2 of .004 indicates that the predictors set explains only .4% of variance of the non-stereotypical rape ($R^2 = .007$, $F(11, 3515) = 2.573$, $p < .01$) (*Appendix 2c*).

The most significant predictor for non-stereotypical rape is the variable 'employed vs. students' ($\beta = -.054$, $p < .01$), with students less likely than employed people victims of non-stereotypical rape. Those who were divorced or separated ($\beta = .050$ and $.035$, $p < .01$ and $.01$ respectively) were more likely than single people to be victims.

Vulnerabilities

Analyses were undertaken on vulnerabilities previously noted in literature - disability (learning, mental or physical) (5.5% of victims), involvement in prostitution (2%) and previous allegations (4.3%). Multiple regression analyses were conducted for each type of rape and the identified vulnerabilities.⁵ Prostitution was the only statistically significant predictor for stereotypical rape 1 where $\beta = .085$ ($p < .01$).⁶ Vulnerabilities were significant predictors for stereotypical rape 2 ($F(4, 146) = 8.320$, $p < .001$). The predictor set explains 16.8% of variability of stereotypical rape 2 (adjusted $R^2 = .168$) with prostitution the most significant factor ($\beta = .386$, $p < .001$). Victims who had previously made allegations of sexual assault also have higher chances of being victims of stereotypical rape 2 than those who had not ($\beta = .223$, $p < .05$) (*Appendix 2d*). These factors were not significant predictors of non-stereotypical rapes ($F(4, 146) = 2.065$, $p > .05$) or of other assaults ($F(4, 146) = 1.728$, $p > .05$).

Victims' age; housing type; substance misuse and being an asylum seeker or refugee were also considered vulnerabilities. A comparison of all significant coefficients for all types of sexual assault was examined by multiple regressions (*Appendix 2e*).

Research question 2: Are there particular factors or combinations of factors that correlate with reporting to the police?

Of the 3,527 cases 3,172 come from SARC's and 355 from police comparison sites. Of the SARC cases 2,288 were reported to the police, therefore (2,288 + 355) 2,643 cases were reported to police and 884 cases were not.

Cross-tabulation between type of sexual assault and whether assault is reported reveals a significant relationship ($\chi^2 = 17.89$, $p < .001$). 81.3% of all cases of stereotypical rape, 72.8% of non-stereotypical rapes cases and 76.7% of other assaults are reported. Where perpetrators are known to victims rapes are less likely to be reported (a.r.=3.8) than when they are strangers (see also Kelly, 2002).

Cases were least likely to be reported where they occur abroad ($\chi^2 = 337.232$, $p < .001$) with the majority (78.2%) unreported (a.r.=17.3). Assaults occurring in the victim's and perpetrator's

⁵ The tests show no significant multicollinearity of variables.

⁶ This result is confirmed by its 95% confidence interval that does not include zero as a possible value, just as all subsequent significant t-values.

shared home are less likely to be reported (a.r.=2.7) than those in public spaces (a.r.=-4.0); vehicles (a.r.=-3.0); victims' home where perpetrator broke-in (a.r.=-2.7) and someone else's home (a.r.=-2.1).

The context in which sexual assault occurs is significant in complainants' decision making ($\chi^2 = 186.168$, $p < .001$). Values of adjusted residuals again point to the importance of the relationship between victim and perpetrator. Close to a third (31.5%) of sexual assaults that occur when victims are with a friend (a.r.=7.0) and 31.2% involving a family member (a.r.=5.3) were not reported. Cases that occur in the context of current relationships (a.r.=5.3) and authority (a.r.=2.2) are more likely to be unreported than those that occur when victims are followed/jumped/accosted (a.r.=-5.7); on the victim's journey to home (a.r.=-3.6); when perpetrator came in victim's bed (a.r.=-3.2) or when perpetrator broke in victim's home (a.r.=-2.7).

These results suggest that the 'real rape' template still influences reporting patterns.

Victims and perpetrators' profiles

Logistic regression analyses were used to examine the influence of certain socio-demographic characteristics on victims' decision to report sexual assaults to the police.

The first analysis revealed that victim's age, ethnicity, marital and employment status significantly effect the victim's decision not to report ($\chi^2 = 50.965$, $p < .001$) (*Appendix 3*). The values of R^2 indicate that the predictor set explains 3.3% (6.2% Nagelkerke's R^2) of variability of unreported sexual assaults. The significance level of Hosmer and Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test ($p = .288$) indicates the reliability of this model.

According to the values of exp b (2.210) black victims are twice as likely not to report sexual assaults than white victims. Similarly, married and employed victims are significantly more likely not to report than victims who are single or students (exp $b = 2.588$ and 2.305 respectively).

Other factors are better predictors of victims' decision not to report sexual assault than victims' socio-demographic characteristics. The logistic analysis (Table 3 below) shows that the predictor set explains from 6.8% to 14% of variability of not reporting sexual assaults ($\chi^2 = 129.385$, $p < .001$; Hosmer and Lemeshow test $p = .840$).

Table 3: Logistic Regression – Not-reporting as the dependant variable

Included	B	SE	95% CI for exp b		
			Lower	exp b	Upper
Constant	-1.768***	.103			
Victim: Prostitution	-1.661	1.021			
Victim: Disability	-1.250*	.523	.103	.286	.798
Victim: Alcohol Consumption	-.802***	.171	.321	.448	.627
Victim: Drugs Consumption	.177**	.061	1.059	1.194	1.346
Victim: Asylum Seeker/Refugee	3.613***	.630	10.795	37.095	127.469
Victim: <=16 years old	-1.652***	.464	.077	.192	.476
Victim: Vulnerable Housing	-.389	.533			
Victim: Other Abuse	-.359	.483			

$R^2 = .068$ (Cox & Snell), $.140$ (Nagelkerke), Model $\chi^2(8) = 129.385$, $p < .001$
 * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Involvement in prostitution, victims living in vulnerable housing types, and victims of other abuse, do not appear to significantly affect reporting decisions. The most striking result is that asylum seekers/refugee victims are 37 times more likely not to report sexual assaults. These numbers are confirmed by cross-tabulation analysis, which shows that out of 24 asylum seekers/refugee victims, 21 have not reported sexual assaults. This however is likely to be a function of these assessments taking place outside the UK in situations of conflict and displacement where reporting might be extremely difficult. Victims who consumed drugs were somewhat more likely not to report cases of sexual assaults (exp $b = 1.194$) but victims ≤ 16 years (exp $b = .192$); victims who consumed alcohol (exp $b = .448$) and victims with some form of disability (exp $b = .286$) are more likely to report sexual assaults.

When the relationship between victim and perpetrator is compared across reported and unreported sexual assaults, cross-tabulation revealed a significant relationship ($\chi^2 = 92.756$, $p < .001$). As indicated above, closer relationship to perpetrator discourages reporting. For example, victims are more likely not to report cases where perpetrators are friends (a.r.=4.3); family members (a.r.=3.5) or current partners (a.r.=2.9), than when they are strangers (a.r.= -4.6); recent acquaintances (a.r.= -4.4) or neighbours (a.r.= -2.0).

The earlier finding that authority is an important deterrent in reporting decisions is confirmed when relationship between victims and perpetrators are analysed as 41.3% of cases where the parties are in a professional relationship are not reported (a.r.=4.1).

No significant relationship was found between use of weapons and decision to report ($\chi^2 = 0.268$, $p > .05$). Thus context and relationship to perpetrator are more important than aspects (such as weapons) associated with the 'real rape' template in predicting reporting.

Research question 3: Are there particular factors or combinations of factors that correlate with case outcome?

Of the 3,022 cases where outcome is known, 29.3% (n=884) were not reported to the police; 63.7% (n=1925) were dropped from the legal process and 7% (n=213) resulted in a conviction. This section focuses on whether there are particular factors, or a combination of factors, that predict case outcome. The three general outcomes are compared followed by an analysis of attrition points⁷. The variable Attrition Point is recoded into a set of dummy variables to explore whether particular profiles of victims, perpetrators and characteristics of the case, influence the outcome cases across the process.

Comparison of case outcomes

Cross-tabulation between case outcomes and types of sexual assault shows rather weak (Phi=.072) but statistically significant association (sig=.004). Out of all cases of stereotypical rape 1 and 2, 70.2% drop out of the legal process, the same occurs for 62% of non-stereotypical rape and 64.5% of other assaults.

ANOVA of victims' characteristics reveals that victim's age at time of assault does not affect case outcome ($F(2618, 2) = .595$, $p > .05$). However, victims' ethnic origins, marital status and employment status do. Black victims are most likely not to report to the police (37%) while Asian victims are most likely to (only 14.3% did not report) but 80.2% of their cases suffer attrition (a.r.= 2.7) (*Appendix 4 Table A*). Further, cases involving black victims are least likely

⁷ Attrition is the process by which cases fail to proceed through the legal process. Attrition points refer to analytic categories which disaggregate the decision-making see Kelly, Lovett & Regan (2005) for detailed discussion.

to result in conviction 2.4% ($\Phi=.093$, $p<.001$, $a.r.=-2.5$) while 7.6% of white victims' cases ended in conviction ($a.r. = 2.4$). Even though the differences are not vast there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the conjunctions of rape, race and attrition need more attention since it appears that black victims have less access to justice.

Cases involving married victims are least likely to suffer attrition ($a.r.= -3.1$) whilst those involving student victims are most likely to end in convictions (14.1%, $a.r.= 6.1$) with those involving unemployed victim cases are least likely to (4.6%, $a.r.= -3.7$) (*Appendix 4 Table B*).

The relationship between victim and perpetrator significantly affects case outcome ($\Phi=.227$, $p<.001$). Cases where perpetrators are family members ($a.r.=3.3$); current partners ($a.r.=2.5$); friends ($a.r.=3.9$) or in professional relationship with the victim ($a.r.=3.8$) are more likely to be unreported than other relationships. However when cases are reported and the perpetrators are family members ($a.r.=3.6$), ex-partners ($a.r.=2.0$), or in professional relationships with the victim ($a.r.=2.2$) they are most likely to end in convictions. Cases where perpetrators are recent acquaintances ($a.r.=4.8$) or strangers ($a.r.=4.5$) are most likely to be dropped, undoubtedly in part due to failure to identify the assailant.

Perpetrator characteristics had a very limited effect on case outcomes though significant factors are previous accusations of ($\Phi=.171$, $p<.001$), or convictions for ($\Phi=.144$, $p<.001$) sexual assaults by perpetrators with these characteristics being more likely to be convicted.

Reasons for attrition

Only cases that were reported to the police and where we have an outcome are included in this analysis, ($n=1,925$). Table 5 shows the proportions lost at each of the five designated attrition points (fn⁸ *supra*).

Table 5: Attrition in reported rape cases

Attrition point	%	n
No evidence of assault / false allegation	15.6	301
Insufficient evidence	35.2	678
Victim withdrawal	36.3	699
CPS discontinue	6.1	118
Acquitted at trial	6.7	129
Total	100	1,925

Cross-tabulation, multiple regression and hierarchal multivariate regression was conducted to identify whether attrition points are linked to: type of rape; location of assault; context of assault; victim characteristics; perpetrator characteristics; police characterisations of victims and their assessments of their accounts; police characterisations of perpetrators; forensic reports.

No evidence of assault / false allegation

'No evidence of assault' and false allegation⁸ are the main reasons police 'no crime' cases (*Appendix 5 Table A*). Key findings are that 'perpetrators are strangers' and 'happen in public spaces' cases (ie. Stereotypical rapes 1 & 2) are more likely to be dropped than non-stereotypical rapes and other assaults ($\Phi=.140$, $p<.01$). This supports Jan Jordan's (2005)

⁸ 'No evidence of assault': cases where there was either no complaint of rape from the individual or people who regain consciousness with no memory of a time period. For further discussion see Kelly et al. (2005)

contention that false reports tend to involve accusations that fit the 'real rape' template.

The police investigation and police characterisation of victims and their accounts are significant ($F(11, 1924)=41.465, p<.001$). Previous allegations of sexual assault increases attrition ($\beta=.084, p<.001$), with some weak indications that this may correlate with mental health problems.

Whilst forensic evidence of alcohol or drug consumption does not play a significant role in dismissing cases as 'false/no evidence', intoxication strongly influences the police assessment of victims' account ($\beta=.211, p<.001$). Out of 60 cases where police characterised victims as under the influence of substances, 41 victims were disabled and/or unable to recall or give a clear account.

Insufficient evidence

Cases most likely to be dropped because of insufficient evidence are 'other assaults' occurring in public spaces ($\Phi=.172, p<.001, a.r.=5.7$) and where perpetrator is unknown to the victim (investigation fails to identify the perpetrator) ($\Phi=.183, p<.001, a.r.=6.2$) (*Appendix 5 Table B*). Also featuring strongly are police designation of the victim's account as inconsistent ($\beta=.068, p<.01$). Forensic evidence of alcohol consumption by the victim and perpetrator made it more likely that a case would proceed ($\beta=-.145, p<.01$).

Victim withdrawal

Complainants are most likely to withdraw when offences occur in situations of familiarity (defined as relationships and contexts which are part of the victim's everyday life). Factors that increase victims' vulnerability – substances misuse (exp $b=3.143$), current other abuse (exp $b=2.248$) – also increase withdrawal. Ethnicity also plays a role; black and other ethnic minority victims being somewhat more likely to withdraw their allegations than white victims (exp $b=2.243$; exp $b=2.458$) (*Appendix 5 Table C*).

CPS discontinuance

The CPS use two tests to decide whether cases should proceed: the public interest test and whether the evidence suggests a reasonable likelihood of conviction. At this point the perpetrators' profiles become a somewhat significant determinant of case outcomes ($F(4,1924)=7.042, p<.001, R^2=.014$). However our data are not strong enough to establish a clear picture of reasons for CPS discontinuance (*Appendix 5 Table D*).

Acquittal at trial

These findings should be viewed with caution due to reduced validity of some analyses (*Appendix 5 Table E*). Cases most likely to result in acquittal are those where victims and perpetrators are in closer relationships (non-stereotypical rapes, former relationships, ex-partners, acquaintances) ($\Phi=.142, p<.001$) and when sexual assaults occur in victim's home ($\Phi=.151, p<.001$). Additionally, if alcohol has been consumed by both victim and perpetrator; the police characterise the victim as having abused substances or having mental health issues, the chances of conviction are even lower (step1 $F(6,1924)=2.807, p<.05, R^2=.009$). These findings suggest that cases that do not fit the stereotypical rape template are most likely to suffer attrition.

Conviction at trial

Of 2,138 cases reported to the police we have trial outcomes for 285, of which 140 (49.1%) resulted in a conviction. Of indecent assaults charged 58.8% resulted in convictions ($a.r.=-2.0$)

compared to 44% for rape cases (a.r.=-2.5).

Further analysis found no significant patterns between location of assault and conviction ($\chi^2=21.959$, $p>.05$). Conviction is most likely in cases involving family members (a.r.=3.6), friend/relative/partner or known other (a.r.=2.9) or a person in a position of authority (a.r.=3.9). Conversely conviction is least likely in cases where first contact took place in clubs (a.r.=-2.6) and where victims are followed/jumped/accosted (a.r.=-2.8).

Other Factors

Logistic regression reveals that some risk and vulnerability factors significantly determine whether a case will result in a conviction ($\chi^2(8) = 69.477$, $p <.001$) (*Appendix 6 Table A*). The predictors set explains 5.1% (Cox & Snell, 11.1% Nagelkerke) of the variability. Three factors showed significant relationships. Cases where victims consume drugs (exp $b = .355$, $p<.05$) or live in vulnerable housing type (exp $b = .208$, $p<.05$) have significantly less chance of resulting in conviction, whereas cases where victims ≤ 16 years old are almost 4 times (exp $b = 3.744$, $p<.05$) more likely to do so.

Unsurprisingly perpetrators who have been previously convicted or accused of sexual assaults are more likely to be found guilty (exp $b=1.365$, $p<.001$). Conversely, where perpetrators were strangers only 8.3% were convicted (a.r.=-2.0). Where there is a relationship between victim and perpetrator cases are less likely to be reported but were more likely to result in conviction.

The results of logistic regression ($\chi^2(6) = 36.996$, $p<.001$, $R^2(\text{Cox \& Snell}) = .017$; $R^2(\text{Nagelkerke}) = .036$) (*Appendix 6 Table B*) show that the characterisation of the victim as an illegal substances user significantly lowers chances of the case resulting in a conviction (exp $b = .141$) (*Appendix 6 Table C summarises conviction correlates*).

Research questions 4 and 5: What are the key elements in socio-legal constructions of rape, rape victims and rapists? How do all of the above connect to the questions of credibility, culpability and attrition?

We are continuing to analyse these questions but present some initial observations.

The 'real rape' template was not entirely predictive of outcomes, especially when cases reach trial. It is now possible to obtain convictions that were previously impossible because of changes in the law (criminalisation of marital and male rape) or changes in how complainants are seen (eg, women in prostitution). At the same time the fall in the conviction rate over the last thirty years means that a much lower proportion of complainants see their attackers convicted. The legacies of the 'real rape' template are most evident in the early stages of attrition where it affects the police decision making, victims' willingness to report and/or stay in the criminal justice process.

Victim vulnerabilities play a crucial role in attrition, findings which are also emerging in an ongoing review and case tracking of rape allegations in London (Stanko, 2007). Our data also suggest previous allegations are significant. These factors influence complainants' decisions to withdraw allegations and police investigations. Current evidence suggests vulnerabilities and histories make some victims less believable/credible to CJS professionals and even act as cues to 'drop' cases. Insofar as this is true the CJS could be said to play a part in constructing some categories of women as effectively 'unrapeable'. Conviction is most likely in cases where men have previous charges and/or were detected strangers. Stereotypical constructions

of rape, rape victims and rapists continue to inform institutional responses, albeit in more complex formulations than previously recognised. We conclude therefore that there are grounds for hope and disappointment

Challenges for research are: to further unpick how familiarity and conducive contexts underpin current patterns of rape; to critically examine the complex conjunctions of rape, race and attrition; to explore targeting and opportunism with samples of unconvicted rapists; and, to study how young people and adults understand and negotiate consent.

Activities, Outputs and Impacts

Emerging findings from this research have been presented at four conferences/seminars (Scotland Rape Law Reform, SORI, BSA/BSC) and are drawn on in two forthcoming publications (see form). They will also form part of papers to be presented at international conferences in Berlin and Pennsylvania this autumn. CWASU staff have taken issues raised into the Home Office 'Rape Performance Group', established to decrease attrition in reported rape on which we are the only academics. Our work on attrition, of which this project is part, has had a significant influence on public policy, most recently in HMCPSI's inspection, *Without Consent*. The wider influence includes proposing using attrition as one of a proposed set of international indicators on violence against women, currently under discussion by various UN agencies (Kelly, 2007). Presentations on this have been made at international meetings organised by the UN and COE in New York and Lisbon and Prof Kelly will attend three-day meetings in Washington and Geneva organised by USAID and UNECE on developing global indicators.

References

- Allison, P.D. (1999) *Multiple Regression: A Primer*. London: Pine Forge Press.
- Chambers, G. & Millar, A. (1983) *Investigating rape*. Edinburgh, HMSO.
- Estrich, S. (1987). *Real rape: How the legal system victimizes women who say no*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Field, A. (2005) *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*, 2nd edition. London: SAGE Publications.
- Grace, S., Lloyd, C. & Smith, L. (1992) *Rape: From recording to conviction*. Home Office Research & Planning Unit Paper No. 71. London, Home Office.
- HM Crown Prosecution Service Inspectorate and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary (2002) *A report on the joint inspection onto the investigation and prosecution of cases involving allegations of rape*. London, HMCPSI.
- Harris, J. & Grace, S. (1999) *A question of evidence? Investigating and prosecuting rape in the 1990s*. London, Home Office.
- Jordan, J. (2004) *The word of a woman? Police, rape, and belief*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kelly, L. with Kennedy, L. & Horvath, M.A.H. (2007) *The next step: Developing transnational indicators on violence against women*. Final report submitted to UN Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women.
- Kelly, L. (2002) *A research review on the reporting, investigation and prosecution of rape cases*. London, HMCPSI.
- Kelly, L., Lovett, J. & Regan, L. (2005) *A gap or a chasm? Attrition in reported rape cases*. Home Office Research Study 293. London, Home Office.
- Lees, S. (2002) *Carnal knowledge: Rape on trial (2nd Edition)*. London, Women's Press.
- Lees, S. & Gregory, J. (1993) *Rape and sexual assault: A study of attrition*. London, Islington Council Police and Crime Prevention Unit.
- Lovett, J., Kelly, L. & Horvath, M. (Forthcoming) *Alcohol and sexual assault: A contextual analysis*. Home Office.
- Lovett, J., Regan, L. & Kelly, L. (2004) *Sexual assault referral centres: developing good practice and maximising potentials*. Home Office Research Study 285. London, Home Office.
- Stanko, E. (2007) *The attrition of rape allegations in London: A review*. January, Met Police.
- Statistics Canada, (1993a) *The Violence Against Women Survey*. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.
- Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (2007) *Using Multivariate Statistics*, 5th edition. Boston: Pearson

Education, Inc.

Temkin, J. (2002) *Rape and the legal process* (2nd Edition). Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Temkin, J. (2000) Prosecuting and defending rape: perspectives from the bar. *Journal of Law and Society*, 27, 219-248.

Walby, S. & Allen, J. (2004) *Domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking: findings from the British Crime Survey*. Home Office Research Study 276. London, Home Office.

Appendix 1a

All cases entered on the database were tracked prospectively and information was collected on the assault, the victim, the perpetrator(s), forensic examination, services accessed and legal process and outcome. The data were gathered through a combination of agency records and police data elicited through specially designed research pro formas. Obtaining case outcome data entailed repeated follow-ups at regular intervals, both with agency workers and police officers.

Appendix 1b

New database fields comprise: whether any alcohol/drug consumption was consensual or non-consensual; if consensual, whether consumption was chosen by the victim independently, or in conjunction with the perpetrator; drug type; how intoxicated the victim was at the time of the assault; and whether the victim was asleep. Three additional fields were developed with regard to context. Firstly, detailed coding was undertaken of the context of the initial approach or contact between the victim and perpetrator. Secondly, particular contexts were grouped under six analytic 'arenas' corresponding to routine spheres of daily life (personal, social, public space, residential, work/school and contacts with authority). Thirdly, whether any of the victim's circumstances could potentially heighten vulnerability or increase the opportunity for targeting by perpetrators – as age, disability, housing or asylum status. Combining these with existing data, such as victim and perpetrator characteristics, assault location and perpetrator-victim relationship, enables a more detailed analyses of the situations in which sexual assault occurs and the extent to which they are implicated in attrition.

The legal case, a coding frame relating to decision-making by the relevant parties involved in the criminal justice process and covers decisions and actions taken by complainants, police, CPS and the courts (judge and jury), enhancing exploration of different layers of attrition identified in the original research (see Kelly, Lovett & Regan, 2005), such as victim withdrawals, police designations of false allegations and insufficient evidence, CPS discontinuance and acquittals at trial.

With regard to complainants, new fields added to the database include: early actions taken indicating unwillingness to proceed with the reporting/investigative process; reasons for early victim withdrawals; and reasons for withdrawal from the later stages of the process.

The most detailed data was available at the level of the police, largely because it was obtained either directly from them or through case trackers consulting them/their records. This is also the point at which research concurs the majority of reported cases are lost (Harris & Grace, 1999; Kelly, Lovett & Regan, 2005), but which has received least attention in previous studies of attrition. New fields at the police level comprise: reasons given for designating cases false complaints; presence or absence of particular types of evidence; assessments of the complainant's character and account; and actions taken towards the suspected perpetrator.

At the level of CPS, fields have been added on: the mode of advice given to police; issues with the case impacting on the advice given to police; and reasons for any late discontinuance. At the final level of the courts, new fields have been created to record any factors noted by police officers leading to the defendant's acquittal at trial.

Appendix 1c

Logistic regressions are performed in situations where the dependent variable is a dummy variable, and the predictor set included a combination of interval and categorical variables. Since the analysis is led by the theoretical framework, all logistic regression analyses are conducted with the forced entry method and the models' goodness-of-fit is tested through the Hosmer and Lemeshow test. The results are presented in tabular form that include values of coefficients (B), their standard errors (SE) and 95% confidence intervals for $\exp b$. The models are assessed on the basis of values of coefficients of determination and significance level of chi-square.

When dependent variables and all variables in the predictor set are either interval or dummy variables, multivariate linear regression analyses are used.⁹ All linear regression analyses are conducted with forced entry method, and assumptions of no multicollinearity are tested by VIF values and assumptions of independence of errors by the Durbin-Watson test. In the cases where the model is based on clear theoretical assumptions, the analysis is conducted with blockwise entry method. All results of linear regression are presented in a tabular form, where values of all coefficients and their standard errors, betas, t-test values and their significance is given, including the 95% confidence intervals for Bs. In the case of hierarchical regression, the report includes results of the last step of analysis, where the table with all steps is given in the Appendix.

Exploratory factor analysis is used in order to determine the existence of latent variables and explore structures of the defined set of variables. The analyses use the principle components analysis technique. The initial solutions are rotated by application of Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization. Factor scores for all components are calculated using the regression method.

⁹ For discussion on use of dummy variables as dependent variables in linear regression analysis, see Tabachnick and Fidell (2007, Ch 10); Field (2005): Ch 6; and Allison (1999: 10). All cases where the dependent variable is a dummy variable are also analysed with logistic regression method. Results of linear regressions are presented where results of significance of particular predictors do not differ from the results of logistic regression analyses.

Appendix 2**2A: Table showing step 4 of the multiple regression analysis with the dependant variable stereotypical rape 1**

	B	SE B	β
Constant			
Single vs. Separated	-.027	.031	-.015
Single vs. Married	-.022	.025	-.015
Single vs. Living Together	.024	.028	.015
Single vs. Divorced	-.039	.040	-.017
White vs. Other	-.028	.058	-.008
White vs. Black	-.058	.027	-.037*
White vs. Asian	.023	.035	.011
19-39 old vs. 40 and above	-.004	.021	-.003
19-39 old vs. ≤18 years	.029	.015	.038
Employed vs. Student	-.010	.018	-.012
Employed vs. Unemployed	.059	.016	.065***

R²=.001 for step 1 (p>.05);R²=.002 for step 2 (p>.05);R²=.001 for step 3 (p>.05);R²=.004 for step 4 (p<.001);

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

2B: Table showing step 4 of the multiple regression analysis with the dependant variable stereotypical rape 2

	B	SE B	β
Constant	.095	.008	
Single vs. Separated	-.019	.028	-.012
Single vs. Married	.007	.023	.005
Single vs. Living Together	.023	.025	.015
Single vs. Divorced	-.043	.035	-.021
White vs. Other	-.080	.052	-.026
White vs. Black	-.075	.024	-.053**
White vs. Asian	.002	.031	.001
19-39 old vs. 40 and above	-.012	.019	-.011
19-39 old vs. ≤18 years	.042	.014	.062**
Employed vs. Student	.005	.016	.007
Employed vs. Unemployed	.052	.014	.064***

R²=.001 for step 1 (p>.05);R²=.004 for step 2 (p<.01);R²=.004 for step 3 (p<.01);R²=.004 for step 4 (p<.001);

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

2C: Table showing step 4 of the multiple regression analysis with the dependant variable non-stereotypical rape

	B	SE B	β
Constant	.621	.013	
Single vs. Separated	.088	.043	.035*
Single vs. Married	.029	.035	.014
Single vs. Living Together	.016	.038	.007
Single vs. Divorced	.157	.055	.050**
White vs. Other	-.149	.080	-.031
White vs. Black	-.018	.037	-.008
White vs. Asian	-.048	.048	-.017
19-39 old vs. 40 and above	-.029	.029	-.017
19-39 old vs. ≤18 years	.038	.021	.036
Employed vs. Student	-.067	.025	-.054**
Employed vs. Unemployed	-.026	.022	-.022

R²=.003 for step 1 (p<.05);

R²=.001 for step 2 (p>.05);

R²=.000 for step 3 (p>.05);

R²=.004 for step 4 (p<.05);

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

2d: Table showing step 4 of the multiple regression analysis with the dependant variable non-stereotypical rape 2

	B	SE B	β
Constant	-.017	.058	
Prostitution – yes vs. no	.994	.226	.386***
Disability – yes vs. no	.024	.030	.069
Previous Allegations – yes vs. no	.128	.050	.223*

R²=.135 for step 1 (p<.001);

R²=.006 for step 2 (p>.05);

R²=.049 for step 3 (p<.05);

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Appendix 2e: Comparison

Table 2 lists all significant coefficients for all types of sexual assaults examined by multiple regressions. This table serves as a basis for a comparison of significance and the importance of socio-demographic characteristics of victims, in predicting types of sexual assault.

Overall, demographic variables were relatively weak predictors, with the exception of some vulnerabilities. Victims' involvement with prostitution significantly increases chances for stereotypical rape 2, and was the best predictor of stereotypical rape 1. Substance misuse significantly increases chances for both types of stereotypical rape. The most significant factor in predicting non-stereotypical rape is whether the victim has previously been abused. Likelihood of being a victim of non-stereotypical rape also increases for victims who are separated or divorced and those who live in vulnerable housing.

Table 2: Comparison of significant β s

		Stereotypical rape 1	Stereotypical rape 2	Non- stereotypical Rape	Other assaults
Socio- demographic variables	Single vs. Separated			.035*	
	Single vs. Married				
	Single vs. Living Together				
	Single vs. Divorced			.050**	-.043*
	White vs. Other				.042*
	White vs. Black	-.037*	-.053**		.040*
	White vs. Asian				
	19-39 old vs.40 and above				
	19-39 old vs. 18 and younger		.062**		-.072***
	Employed vs. Student			-.054**	.071***
	Employed vs. Unemployed	.065***	.64***		
Vulnerabilities	Prostitution	.085**	.386***		
	Disability				
	Previous Allegations		.223*		
	Under16				
	Asylum / Refugee				-.039*
	Substance Misuse	.054**	.073***		
	Other Abuse	-.070***	-.057**	.084***	-.037*
Housing			.036*	-.038*	

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Appendix 3**Table 1: Logistic Regression – Unreported as dependent variable**

Included	B	SE	95% CI for exp b		
			Lower	exp b	Upper
Constant	-1.842	.230			
Victims' Age at Assault	-.023	.011			
Ethnic Cat: White vs. Asian	-.655	.542			
Ethnic Cat: White vs. Black	.793**	.298	1.231	2.210	3.968
Victim: Single vs. Divorced	.429	.435			
Victim: Single vs. Living Tog.	-.200	.331			
Victim: Single vs. Married	.951**	.282	1.489	2.588	4.499
Victim: Single vs. Separated	.213	.367			
Victim: Students vs. Employed	.835***	.216	1.511	2.305	3.517
Victim: Student vs. Unemployed	-.105	.239			

R² = .033 (Cox & Snell), .062 (Nagelkerke), Model $\chi^2(9) = 50.965, p < .001$
* p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Appendix 3

Table 2: Comparison of significant β s

		Not reported	Reported
Type of Sexual Assault	Real Rape		***
	Everyday Rape	***	
	Not-Rape		
Location of Sexual Assault	Abroad	***	
	Shared home – p	***	
	Public space		***
	Vehicle		***
	Victims' home – break in		***
	Someone's else home		***
Context of Sexual Assault	Family member	***	
	Position of authority	***	
	Current relationship	***	
	With a friend	***	
	Followed/jumped/accosted		***
	Journey home		***
	Came in bed		***
	Prostitute/pimp		***
	Break in		***
	Victims' socio-demographic profile	Victim: Students vs. Employed	***
Ethnic Cat: White vs. Black		**	
Victim: Single vs. Married		**	
Victims' risk and vulnerability factors	Victim: Disability		*
	Victim: Alcohol Consumption		***
	Victim: Drugs Consumption	**	
	Victim: Asylum Seeker/Refugee	***	
	Victim: <=16 years old		***
Perpetrators' relationship with Victims	Stranger		***
	Recent acquaintance		***
	Neighbour		***
	Family member	***	
	Friend	***	
	Professional	***	
	Current partner	***	

*** p<.001; ** p<.01; * p<.05

Appendix 4

4a: Attrition point and ethnic origin of victims

AttritPoint_reduced * EthnicCat_Victim Ethnic origins categories of Victim Crosstabulation

			EthnicCat_Victim Ethnic origins categories of Victim			
			1 Asian	2 Black	3 White	Total
AttritPoint_reduced	1 Convicted	Count	5	4	179	188
		% within AttritPoint_reduced	2.7%	2.1%	95.2%	100.0%
		% within EthnicCat_Victim Ethnic origins categories of Victim	5.5%	2.4%	7.6%	7.2%
		% of Total	.2%	.2%	6.9%	7.2%
		Adjusted Residual	-.6	-2.5	2.4	
2 Unreported	2 Unreported	Count	13	61	597	671
		% within AttritPoint_reduced	1.9%	9.1%	89.0%	100.0%
		% within EthnicCat_Victim Ethnic origins categories of Victim	14.3%	37.0%	25.3%	25.7%
		% of Total	.5%	2.3%	22.9%	25.7%
		Adjusted Residual	-2.5	3.4	-1.2	
3 Attrition	3 Attrition	Count	73	100	1580	1753
		% within AttritPoint_reduced	4.2%	5.7%	90.1%	100.0%
		% within EthnicCat_Victim Ethnic origins categories of Victim	80.2%	60.6%	67.1%	67.1%
		% of Total	2.8%	3.8%	60.5%	67.1%
		Adjusted Residual	2.7	-1.8	-.2	
Total	Total	Count	91	165	2356	2612
		% within AttritPoint_reduced	3.5%	6.3%	90.2%	100.0%
		% within EthnicCat_Victim Ethnic origins categories of Victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.5%	6.3%	90.2%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual				

4b: Attrition point and victims employment status

AttritPoint_reduced * VictimsEmploymentStatus Crosstabulation

		VictimsEmploymentStatus			Total	
		1 Employed	2 Unemployed	3 Student		
AttritPoint_reduced	1 Convicted	Count	36	25	79	140
		% within AttritPoint_reduced	25.7%	17.9%	56.4%	100.0%
		% within VictimsEmploymentStatus	6.1%	4.6%	14.1%	8.3%
		% of Total	2.1%	1.5%	4.7%	8.3%
		Adjusted Residual	-2.4	-3.7	6.1	
2 Unreported		Count	183	77	103	363
		% within AttritPoint_reduced	50.4%	21.2%	28.4%	100.0%
		% within VictimsEmploymentStatus	30.8%	14.2%	18.4%	21.4%
		% of Total	10.8%	4.5%	6.1%	21.4%
		Adjusted Residual	6.9	-4.9	-2.1	
3 Attrition		Count	375	439	378	1192
		% within AttritPoint_reduced	31.5%	36.8%	31.7%	100.0%
		% within VictimsEmploymentStatus	63.1%	81.1%	67.5%	70.3%
		% of Total	22.1%	25.9%	22.3%	70.3%
		Adjusted Residual	-4.8	6.7	-1.8	
Total		Count	594	541	560	1695
		% within AttritPoint_reduced	35.0%	31.9%	33.0%	100.0%
		% within VictimsEmploymentStatus	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	35.0%	31.9%	33.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual				

Appendix 5

5a: Comparison – False Allegations/No evidence of sexual assault

		False Allegations/ No evidence of SA	Not False Allegation/ no evidence of SA
Type of Sexual Assault	Stereotypical Rape 1 & 2	**	
	Non-stereotypical Rape		**
	Other assaults		
Location of Sexual Assault	Public space	**	
	Shared home		**
	Perpetrator home		**
Context of Sexual Assault	Followed/Jumped/Accosted	*	
	Institutions	*	
	Came into bed		*
Victims Profile	Vulnerability	**	
	Separated		**
Police Victim Characterisation	Previous Allegations	***	
	Prostitution	*	
	Abuse	*	
	Mental Health	***	
	Substances	***	
Police Victims' Account	Lies	***	
	Inconsistencies	**	
	Doubt Account	***	
	Confused/Disturbed	**	
	Unable to recall/ give clear account	***	
Police Perpetrator Actions	Absconded/Not identified		**
	Interviewed	**	
	Arrested	**	
	Charged		**
	Forensic Examination	***	
	Forensic Examination DNA	***	
	Forensic Examination Sexual History	***	

*** p<.001; ** p<.01; * p<.05

5b: Comparison – Insufficient Evidence

		Insufficient Evidence	Not Insufficient Evidence
Type of Sexual Assault	Stereotypical Rape 1 & 2		***
	Non-stereotypical Rape		
	Other assaults	***	
Location of Sexual Assault	Public space	***	
	Shared home		***
	Perpetrator home		***
	Victims Home – Perpetrator Invited		***
Context of Sexual Assault	Followed/Jumped/Accosted	***	
	Taxi	***	
	Former relationship		***
	Friend		***
Victims Profile	Other ethnicity	**	
	Re-victimisation		*
	Married Asian		**
	Black refugees/asylum seekers		*
Perpetrators' relationship with Victims	Stranger	***	
	Ex-partner		***
	Current partner		***
Police Victim Characterisation	Abuse		**
	Mental Health		*
	Substances		**
Police Victims' Account	Lies		*
	Inconsistencies	**	
Police Perpetrator Actions	Absconded/Not identified	***	
	Interviewed		***
	Known/Named		***
	Charged		***
Forensics – Substances misuse	Forensics Drugs		**
	Forensics Alcohol		**

*** p<.001; ** p<.01; * p<.05

5c: Comparison – Victim withdrawal

		Victim withdrawal	Not Victim withdrawal
Type of Sexual Assault	Stereotypical Rape 1 & 2		
	Non-stereotypical Rape	***	
	Other assaults		***
Location of Sexual Assault	Public space		***
	Shared home	***	
	Perpetrator home	***	
	Victims Home – Perpetrator Invited	***	
Context of Sexual Assault	Former relationship	***	
	Current relationship	***	
	Friend	***	
	Break-in		***
	Followed/jumped/accosted		***
	Institutions		***
	Journey home		***
Victims Profile	Ethnic category: White vs. Asian	***	
	Ethnic category: White vs. Black	***	
	Single vs. Married	*	
	Victim: Disability		**
	Victim: Substance Misuse	*	
	Victim: Previous Allegations		**
	Victim: <= 16 years old		**
Perpetrators' relationship with Victims	Stranger		***
	Ex-partner	***	
	Current partner	***	
Police Victim Characterisation	None or other vs. Learning Disability		**
	None or other vs. Abuse	*	
	None or other vs. Mental Health		**
	None or other vs. Substances		*
Police Victim's Account	Believe vs. Lies		**
	Believe vs. Inconsistencies		**
	Believe vs. Unable to recall/give clear account		**
Police Perpetrator Actions	Known/Named	***	
	Interviewed	***	
	Arrested	***	
Police – case outcome	Little evidence		***
	No evidence of sexual assault		***
	Third party complaint	***	
	Victim doesn't want police involved	***	
Police classification of case	Detected no proceedings	***	
	Detected		***
Forensic Examinations	Forensic Examination	**	
	Forensic Examination DNA	**	
	Forensic Examination – Sexual History	*	

*** p<.001; ** p<.01; * p<.05

5d: Comparison – CPS Discontinued

		CPS Discontinued	Not CPS Discontinued
Location of Sexual Assault	Residential homes	!	
Police Victim Characterisation	Learning Disability	***	
Police Victim's Account	Inconsistencies		*
Perpetrators' Profiles	Perpetrator Risk	**	
	Perpetrator Student	**	
	Perpetrator White	**	
Police Perpetrator Actions	Charged	***	
Police – Perpetrators' response	Admits (all or part)	***	
Police classification of case	Detected	*** = charge	
CPS Issues	Public interest	!	

*** p<.001; ** p<.01; * p<.05, ! analysis not valid

5e: Comparison – Acquitted at trial

		Acquitted at trial	Not Acquitted at trial
Type of Sexual Assault	Stereotypical Rape		
	Non-stereotypical Rape	*	
	Not-Rape		
Location of Sexual Assault	Public space		!
	Victims' home – invited	!	
	Victims' home – break in	!	
Context of Sexual Assault	Came to victims' bad	!	
	Friends	!	
	Family members	!	
	Former relationship	!	
Perpetrators' Profiles	Perpetrator Risk	**	
Perpetrators' relation to victims	Ex-partner	***	
	Friends	***	
	Acquaintance	***	
	Stranger		***
Police Victim Characterisation	Substances misuse	**	
	Mental health	*	
Forensic Examinations	Forensic Examination	**	
	Forensic Examination DNA	**	
Forensics – Substances misuse	Forensics Alcohol	**	

*** p<.001; ** p<.01; * p<.05, ! analysis not valid

Appendix 6 – Cases that result in conviction

Table A: Logistic Regression – Finding of Guilt as dependent variable

		Variables in the Equation					95.0% C.I. for EXP(B)		
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Step 1 ^a	Prostitution	1.099	.644	2.914	1	.088	3.000	.850	10.589
	Disability_dummy	-.200	.447	.201	1	.654	.818	.340	1.967
	PreviousAllegations	-1.011	.733	1.900	1	.168	.364	.086	1.532
	AlcoholConsumption	-.362	.190	3.622	1	.057	.696	.480	1.011
	DrugConsumption	-1.034	.485	4.545	1	.033	.355	.137	.920
	VulnUnder16	1.320	.220	36.038	1	.000	3.744	2.433	5.761
	VulnHousing	-1.572	.738	4.535	1	.033	.208	.049	.882
	VulnSubstanceMisuse	.373	.846	.195	1	.659	1.453	.277	7.625
	VulnOtherAbuse	-.227	.553	.169	1	.681	.797	.269	2.356
	Constant	-2.206	.145	232.147	1	.000	.110		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Prostitution, Disability_dummy, PreviousAllegations, AlcoholConsumption, DrugConsumption, VulnUnder16, VulnHousing, VulnSubstanceMisuse, VulnOtherAbuse.

Table B: Logistic Regression – Finding of Guilt as dependent variable

		Variables in the Equation					95.0% C.I. for EXP(B)		
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Step 1 ^a	PolVicChar_PreviousAllegat	-19.131	8038.594	.000	1	.998	.000	.000	.
	PolVicChar_Prostitution	-19.131	11602.711	.000	1	.999	.000	.000	.
	PolVicChar_LearningDisabil	-.924	1.027	.808	1	.369	.397	.053	2.974
	PolVicChar_Abuse	.337	.631	.286	1	.593	1.401	.407	4.823
	PolVicChar_MentalHealth	-1.917	1.012	3.588	1	.058	.147	.020	1.069
	PolVicChar_Substances	-1.959	.587	11.134	1	.001	.141	.045	.446
	Constant	-2.072	.074	781.747	1	.000	.126		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: PolVicChar_PreviousAllegat, PolVicChar_Prostitution, PolVicChar_LearningDisabil, PolVicChar_Abuse, PolVicChar_MentalHealth, PolVicChar_Substances.

Table C: Comparison – Finding of guilt

		Guilty	Not guilty
Offence Charged	Rape		*
	Attempted Rape		
	Indecent Assault	*	
Location of Sexual Assault	Abroad		**
	Victims Home – Break in	**	
Context of Sexual Assault	Family members	***	
	Friend/partner of known other	***	
	Position of authority	***	
	Clubs		***
	Followed/jumped/accosted		***
Victim's age category	40 and above	*	
Victims' employment status	Employed		
	Unemployed		***
	Students	***	
Other victim factors	Victim: Drugs consumption		*
	Victim: <= 16 years old	***	
	Victim: Vulnerable housing		*
Perpetrators' Profiles	Previous conviction or allegation for sexual assault	***	
Perpetrators' relationship with Victims	Family member	***	
	Stranger		***
	Professional	***	
Police characterisation of victim	Substances misuse		**
Forensic Exams	Forensic Examination	***	
	DNA	***	

*** p<.001; ** p<.01; * p<.05