

## Supporting documentation for dataset

### Rape in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Old patterns, new behaviours and emerging trends

Award number: RES-000-22-1679

#### Contextual information

This study was conducted against the background of a continuing decline in the rape conviction rate in England and Wales over the last three decades, which in 2004 dropped to an all-time low of just 5.27 per cent. The issue of attrition, the process by which cases fall out from the criminal justice system, has received sustained attention in both policy and academic arenas, as well as in the media. The treatment of rape cases continues to be beset with stereotypical notions about victims, perpetrators and the very nature of the crime itself. We sought to investigate how this impacts on the decision-making processes of the key actors involved (complainants, police officers, prosecutors and judges), and on the ultimate outcome of cases.

#### Description of the originating project

The dataset developed as part of this ESRC-funded research project was originally compiled as a key data component in a study for the Home Office Crime Reduction Programme Violence Against Women Initiative (CRP VAWI), which the Child and Woman Abuse Studies Unit was commissioned to undertake in 2000. The aim of the original project was to evaluate four demonstration projects on rape and sexual assault, whilst simultaneously evaluating Sexual Assault Referral Centres (SARCs) and increasing understanding of attrition. The findings are presented in *Sexual Assault Referral Centres: Developing Good Practice and Maximising Potentials* (Lovett *et al.*, 2004) and in two publications on forensic nursing, *Forensic Nursing: An option for improving responses to reported rape and sexual assault* (Regan *et al.*, 2004a; Regan *et al.*, 2004b). An additional publication presents the findings in relation to attrition (Kelly *et al.*, 2005).

The publication of the final research findings gave added weight to increasingly vocalised concerns about the low conviction rate for sexual offences. The issue has been revisited in a number of subsequent high-level policy documents and reports. One recent example is the joint thematic report by Her Majesty's Constabulary and Her Majesty's Crown Prosecution Service Inspectorates (2006) into the investigation and prosecution of rape cases, which drew on the framework for understanding attrition that we outlined.

It was in this context of a high level of public and official focus on the issues associated with successfully convicting in rape cases that the current project was conceived. The earlier study delineated a series of stages at which attrition tends to occur – attrition points. The current study set out to explore in greater detail a range of factors that either individually or in conjunction might be associated with attrition. An underlying research question was whether attrition can be influenced by stereotypical notions about rape.

#### Data collection methods

As explained above, this derived dataset is based on a dataset gathered for a study originally funded by the Home Office CRP VAWI. Data were collected in three SARCs (St Mary's in Manchester, REACH in Northumbria and STAR in West Yorkshire) and in three comparison areas (Brent, Newham and Thames Valley Police force areas) where no such service was available. Prospective case tracking across the six sites resulted in a relational database created in Microsoft Access of 3,527 cases reported to SARCs and/or the police during 2000-2002.

For each case, data on the assault, the victim, the perpetrator(s), forensic examination, service use and legal process and outcome were collected through a combination of agency records and follow-ups by the research team. The progress of cases reported to the police was tracked through a pro forma designed to pick up aspects of the attrition process, especially complainant and police decision-making, which was completed by investigating officers. Gathering outcome data often required repeated follow-ups with project staff, individual police officers and liaison officers in the six areas. All data were anonymised and assigned a unique project reference number prior to receipt by the research team. No personal identifiers, such as names or addresses, were collected or recorded in the database.

A small amount of new data collection was undertaken for this ESRC project, namely following up outcome details for those cases where data were missing at the conclusion of the original research (n=472). This applied, for example, to cases that were still awaiting trial as well as where data had simply not been supplied. This resulted in full clarification of the final outcome in 126 of these cases.

### **Structure of the dataset**

The database comprises a total of 3,527 cases. There are 273 defined variable elements and 260 named variables. One variable denoting the research site each case originated from has been removed to preserve the anonymity of individuals and sources.

### **Variables and values, coding and classification schemes**

One aspect of the present research project was to subject qualitative data in the original Access database to new content analysis, with the aim of generating a supplementary coding frame suited to quantitative analysis. Two main sets of qualitative material were available and related to the circumstances of the assault and the progress of the legal case.

New variables derived from this material 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 variables 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.

In relation to the legal case, variables denoting decisions and actions taken by complainants, police, CPS and the courts (judge and jury) were introduced, enhancing exploration of different layers of attrition identified in the original research. These include victim withdrawals, police designations of false allegations and insufficient evidence, CPS discontinuance and acquittals at trial.

With regard to complainant decision-making, new variables 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.

New fields for decision-making 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 decision-making, variables 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 variables have been created to record any factors noted by police officers leading to the defendant's acquittal at trial.

For a full list and description of all variables and coding schemes, please refer to Annex A.

### **Derived variables**

A series of derived variables were created using simple groupings of codes. Information about each derived variable and the process by which it was created is presented in Annex B.

### **Weighting and grossing**

Data are not weighted.

### **Data source**

The data derive from a combination of SARC and police records and were summarised by agency staff or police officers using specially designed research pro formas, with the precise process varying at each site. In the comparison areas all data were supplied by the police.

### **Confidentiality and anonymisation**

The database contains no confidential or identifying information at the individual level. It is also not possible to tell the provenance of each case in terms of which research site it was drawn from, as the code relating to specific SARC and Police area has been modified to simply 'SARC' and 'non-SARC'. Nevertheless, as they relate to sexual offences, the data contained remain sensitive and we have therefore stipulated that access to the dataset must be negotiated directly with the research team on a case-by-case basis.

### **Validation and other checks**

Frequencies were run on all variables in order to uncover any anomalies present in the dataset. All anomalies found were double-checked and corrected.

## Annex A: Data labelling

File Type: SPSS Data File

Creation Date: 07-OCT-2007 11:11:10

Label: None

N of Cases: 3527

Total # of Defined Variable Elements: 273

# of Named Variables: 260

Data Are Not Weighted

Data Are Compressed

File Contains Case Data

File Contains No Documents

File Contains No Variable Sets

File Contains No Trends Date Information

File Contains No Multiple Response Definitions

File Contains No Data Entry for Windows Information

File Contains No TextSmart Information

File contains No Clementine Information

### Variable Information:

Name (Position) Label

caseid (1) Case ID

Measurement level: Scale

Format: F11 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

casenumb (2) Case Number

Measurement level: Nominal

Format: A8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Left

source (3) Source of data

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

**NB: variable has been removed from final dataset to preserve anonymity**

source\_r (4) Source\_SARC vs. Police

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value Label

1 Police

2 SARC

referral (5) Referral Type

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

1 Police

2 Self

3 Self then Police

4 Other

9 Missing

notrepor (6) Not reported cases of sexual assaults

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value Label

0 Reported cases

1 Not reported cases

policere (7) Police Reported

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

0 No

1 Prior to SARC

2 After SARC

9 Missing

policeda (8) Police Date Reported

Measurement level: Scale

Format: DATE9 Column Width: 11 Alignment: Right

policewh (9) Police - Who Reported

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	Victim
2	Known other
3	Unknown other
9	Missing

agreedto (10) Agreed To Participate  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	Yes
2	No
3	Not asked
9	Missing

question (11) Questionnaires  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	None
1	Questionnaire 1
2	Questionnaires 1&2
3	Questionnaires 12&3
9	Missing

intervie (12) Interview  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	None
1	Yes

medicalr (13) Medical report  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	None
1	Yes

witnesss (14) Witness statement  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
-------	-------

- 0 None
- 1 Yes

assaultd (15) Assault Date

Measurement level: Scale

Format: DATE11 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

assaultl (16) Assault Location

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 99

Value	Label
1	Abroad
2	Friend's home
3	Hotel
4	Perp home
5	Pub/club/disco
6	Public place
7	Residential home
8	Educational institutions
9	Shared home - O
10	Shared home - P
11	Social gathering
12	Someone else's home
13	Vehicle
14	Victim's home - Break in
15	Victim's home - invited
16	Workplace
17	Other
99	Missing

assaul\_1 (17) Assault Location\_recoded

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 99, 17

Value	Label
1	Abroad
2	Friend's home
4	Perp home
5	Pub/club/disco
6	Public place
7	Residential home
8	Educational institutions
9	Shared home - O
10	Shared home - P
11	Social gathering
12	Someone else's home
13	Vehicle

- 14 Victim's home - Break in
- 15 Victim's home - invited
- 16 Workplace
- 17 Other
- 99 Missing

assault\_ (18) Assault\_Type\_rec

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value Label

- 1 Attempted rape
- 2 Indecent assault
- 3 Rape

assaul\_2 (19) Assault\_Type

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9, 5

Value Label

- 1 Anal rape
- 2 attempted rape
- 3 Indecent assault
- 4 Rape
- 5 Other
- 9 Unknown

assaultm (20) Assault Multiple Perps

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 0 No
- 1 Yes
- 9 Unknown

assaul\_3 (21) Assault Multiple Assault

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 0 No
- 1 Yes
- 9 Unknown

assaul\_4 (22) Assault Lift

Measurement level: Ordinal



Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Unknown

victimag (23) Victim Age  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F12 Column Width: 14 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 999

victim\_1 (24) Victim Age At Assault  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F11 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 999

victimdo (25) Victim DOB  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: DATE11 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

ethnicor (26) Ethnic Origin  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 99

Value	Label
1	Asian (STA)
2	Bangladeshi
3	Black (STA)
4	Black African
5	Black Caribbean
6	Black Other
7	Chinese
8	Indian
9	Middle Eastern
10	Pakistani
11	White
12	Mixed
13	Other
99	Unknown

ethnica (27) Ethnic origins categories of Victim  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9, 4

Value	Label
1	Asian

- 2 Black
- 3 White
- 4 Other
- 9 Missing

ethnicvi (28) Victim Ethnic\_White vs Other

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	Other
1	White

victimss (29) Victims Sex

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
1	Female
2	Male

victimsm (30) Victims Marital Status

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9, 6

Value	Label
1	Divorced
2	Living together
3	Married
4	Separated
5	Single
6	Widowed
9	Missing

vmarrita (31) Married vs. Other

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	Not married
1	Married

victimse (32) Victims Employment Status

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	Employed

- 2 Unemployed
- 3 Student
- 9 Missing

prostitu (33) Prostitution

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 0 No
- 1 Yes
- 9 Missing

disabili (34) Disability

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 1 Learning
- 2 Mental health
- 3 Other
- 9 Missing

disabi\_1 (35) Disability - yes or no

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value Label

- 0 No disability
- 1 Disability

housings (36) Housing Status

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 1 Council tenant
- 2 Hostel
- 3 Private tenant
- 4 Refuge
- 5 Residential care
- 6 With parents
- 9 Missing

housungr (37) Living with parents vs. risk housing

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value Label  
0 Parents  
1 Risk housing

previous (38) Previous Allegations of SA  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value Label  
0 No  
1 Yes  
9 Missing

numprevi (39) Number of Previous Allegations  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

levelofc (40) Level of contact  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value Label  
1 None  
2 Single  
3 Couple  
4 Several  
5 Extensive  
9 Missing

supportw (41) Supportworker  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value Label  
0 No  
1 Yes  
2 Not applicable

starisw (42) StarISW  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value Label  
0 No  
1 Yes

9 Missing

starcoun (43) StarCounselTakeup

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

0 No

1 Yes

9 Missing

startrac (44) StarTrackTakeup

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

0 No

1 Yes

9 Missing

reachwha (45) ReachWhatAttended

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

1 Councelling

2 Medical

3 Both

9 Missing

reachdat (46) ReachDateAssess

Measurement level: Scale

Format: DATE9 Column Width: 11 Alignment: Right

reachd\_1 (47) ReachDateFirstCounsel

Measurement level: Scale

Format: DATE9 Column Width: 11 Alignment: Right

recontac (48) Recontacted

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

0 No

1 Yes

9 Missing

counsell (49) Counselling

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

0 No

1 Yes

9 Missing

police\_1 (50) PoliceReportedWithPermission

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

0 No

1 Yes

9 Missing

policech (51) PoliceChaperon

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

0 No

1 Yes

9 Missing

policest (52) PoliceStatement

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

0 No

1 Yes

9 Missing

police\_2 (53) PoliceStatementWhere

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

1 At SARC

2 Police rape suite

3 Police station

- 4 Victim's home
- 5 Other
- 9 Missing

police\_3 (54) PoliceStatementWho  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	CID officer
2	RVLO/SOLO
3	Other
9	Missing

police\_4 (55) PoliceStatementWorker  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

policesu (56) PoliceSuspectIdentified  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

policepe (57) PolicePerpArrested  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

police\_5 (58) PolicePerpInCustody  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

policeno (59) PoliceNoCrimed  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

police\_6 (60) PoliceNoFurtherAction  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

police\_7 (61) PoliceReasonNoProceed  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 99

Value	Label
1	False allegation
2	Insufficient evidence
3	No evidence of assault
4	No prospect conviction
5	Not in public interest
6	Offender not identified
7	V won't support prosecution
8	Victim withdrawal
9	V declined to complete initial process
10	other
99	Missing

policead (62) PoliceAdviceFromCPS  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	No advice



- 2 Not proceed
- 3 Proceed
- 9 Missing

forensic (63) ForensicExam

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

0 No

1 Yes

9 Missing

forens\_1 (64) ForensicExamWho

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

1 Female doctor

2 Male doctor

3 Forensic nurse

9 Missing

forens\_2 (65) ForensicExamHoursWaited

Measurement level: Scale

Format: F11 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

reasonsf (66) Reasons for waiting

Measurement level: Nominal

Format: A49 Column Width: 32 Alignment: Left

forens\_3 (67) ForensicExamExternal

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

0 No

1 Yes

9 Missing

forens\_4 (68) ForensicExamInternal

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

0 No

- 1 Yes
- 9 Missing

forens\_5 (69) ForensicExamDNA

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

forens\_6 (70) ForensicExamSHist

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	None
1	Detailed
2	Limited
9	Missing

forens\_7 (71) ForensicExamSHist\_rec

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes

forens\_8 (72) ForensicExamSHistInfo

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
1	Previous sexual intercourse
2	No previous sexual intercourse
3	Sexual abuse/assault
4	Contraception
5	Pregnancy
6	Prostitution
7	STI/HIV
9	Unknown

forens\_9 (73) ForensicExamDrugsPerp

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label  
0 No  
1 Yes  
9 Missing

foren\_10 (74) ForensicExamAlcoholPerp  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value Label  
0 No  
1 Yes  
9 Missing

foren\_11 (75) ForensicExamDrugsVictim  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value Label  
0 No  
1 Yes  
9 Missing

foren\_12 (76) ForensicExamSamplesDrug  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value Label  
0 No  
1 Yes  
9 Missing

foren\_13 (77) ForensicExamEvidenceDrugs  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value Label  
0 No  
1 Yes  
9 Missing

foren\_14 (78) ForensicExamAlcoholVictim  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value Label  
0 No  
1 Yes  
9 Missing

foren\_15 (79) ForensicExamSamplesAlcohol  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value Label  
0 No  
1 Yes  
9 Missing

foren\_16 (80) ForensicExamEvidenceAlcohol  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value Label  
0 No  
1 Yes  
9 Missing

alcoholc (81) AlcoholConsumption  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value Label  
0 None  
1 Consensual - victim only  
2 Consensual - victim & perp  
3 Consensual - perp only  
4 Pressured  
9 Missing

vcontrol (82) Victim's Control of drinking  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value Label  
1 Full control  
5 No control

drugcons (83) DrugConsumption  
Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	None
1	Consensual - victim only
2	Consensual - victim & perp
3	Consensual - perp only
4	Consensual & non-consensual
5	Non-consensual - spiked drink
6	Non-consensual - forced
9	Missing

drugtype (84) DrugType  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	Class C
2	Class B
3	Class A
4	Multiple drugs
5	Other
9	Missing

consciou (85) Consciousness  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	Sober
2	Slightly drunk/high
3	Quite drunk/high
4	Very drunk/high
5	Unconscious/No memory
9	Missing

asleep (86) Asleep  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes - asleep naturally
2	Yes - in drink/drugs
3	Yes - state unknown

- 4 Yes - unconscious
- 9 Missing

asleep\_r (87) Asleep yes or no

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 0 No
- 1 Yes
- 9 Missing

arena (88) Arena

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 1 Authority
- 2 Familiarity
- 3 Movement/public space
- 4 Residence
- 5 Social
- 6 Work/school
- 7 Vulnerability
- 9 Missing

context (89) Context

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 99

Value Label

- 1 Bar/pub
- 2 Break-in
- 3 Came into bed
- 4 Club
- 5 Family member
- 6 Followed/jumped/accosted
- 7 Friend/relative/partner of known other
- 8 Institution
- 9 Journey home
- 10 Night out
- 11 Offered lift
- 12 Position of authority
- 13 Prostitute - punter/pimp
- 14 Relationship - current
- 15 Relationship - former

- 16 Taxi
- 17 With friends - group
- 18 With friends - one
- 19 Other
- 99 Missing

addition (90) AdditionalVictimVulnerability  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

vulnunde (91) VulnUnder16  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

vulnasy1 (92) VulnAsylumRefugee  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

vulnhous (93) VulnHousing  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

vulnho\_1 (94) VulnHousingType  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: A16 Column Width: 18 Alignment: Left

vulnsubs (95) VulnSubstanceMisuse  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

vulnsu\_1 (96) VulnSubstanceMisuseType  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	Alcohol
2	Drugs
3	Both
9	Missing

vulnothe (97) VulnOtherAbuse  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

vulnot\_1 (98) VulnOtherAbuseType  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	Domestic violence
2	Familial abuse
3	Extra-familial abuse
4	Sexual assault
9	Missing

victimea (99) VictimEarlyActions1  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 99

Value	Label
2	Uncertain/confused



- 3 Obstructive/refuses to assist
- 4 Refuses to make complaint
- 5 Refuses forensic
- 6 Refuses statement
- 7 Refuses to pursue/prosecute
- 8 Retracted
- 9 Uncontactable
- 11 Other
- 99 Missing

victim\_2 (100) VictimEarlyWithdrawal - recoded  
 Measurement level: Ordinal  
 Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label                    |
|-------|--------------------------|
| 1     | private                  |
| 2     | related to perpetrator   |
| 3     | related to legal process |
| 4     | other                    |

victimla (101) VictimLateActions  
 Measurement level: Ordinal  
 Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
 Missing Values: 9

- | Value | Label                    |
|-------|--------------------------|
| 1     | Victim withdrawal        |
| 2     | Did not attend court     |
| 3     | Refuses to give evidence |
| 4     | Uncontactable            |
| 9     | Missing                  |

victim\_3 (102) VictimLateActionsWhy  
 Measurement level: Ordinal  
 Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
 Missing Values: 9

- | Value | Label                      |
|-------|----------------------------|
| 1     | Concerns re. family/other  |
| 2     | Consent retraction         |
| 3     | Fear of court              |
| 4     | Fear of perp               |
| 5     | Own health                 |
| 6     | Perp is current/ex partner |
| 7     | Wants to put it behind     |
| 8     | Other                      |
| 9     | Missing                    |

policefa (103) PoliceFalseComplaints  
 Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	Victim - admits false
2	Victim - says consensual
3	Police - evidential issues
4	Police - victim unreliable
5	Police - witness statement
6	Police - other reasons
9	Missing

police\_8 (104) Police false complaint - recoded  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
1	Victim
2	Police

polfalse (105) Police False Complaint: Victim vs. Police reasons  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	Victim reasons
1	Police reasons

policefo (106) PoliceForensicEvidence  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	None
1	No semen
2	No DNA match
3	DNA eliminates suspect/IDs someone else
4	Partial DNA match
5	Mixed DNA match
6	DNA match
9	Missing

policeto (107) PoliceToxicologyEvidence  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	Does not support victim's account

- 2 Does not show victim drunk/drugged
- 3 Shows victim drunk/drugged
- 9 Missing

policewi (108) PoliceWitnessEvidence

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 0 None
- 1 Not located
- 2 Contradict victim's account
- 3 Say victim consented
- 4 Support perp's account
- 9 Missing

policecc (109) PoliceCCTVEvidence

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 0 None
- 1 Does not support victim's account
- 9 Missing

policeef (110) PoliceEFit

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F7 Column Width: 9 Alignment: Right

Value Label

- 0 no
- 1 yes

policeid (111) PoliceIDParade

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 1 Suspect identified
- 2 Suspect not identified
- 9 Missing

policevi (112) PoliceVictimChar\_rec1

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value Label

- 1 Substances (drug & alcohol)
- 2 Mental health
- 3 Abuse
- 4 Learning disability
- 5 Prostitution
- 6 Previous allegations
- 7 Other

police\_9 (113) PoliceVictimAccount

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 1 Believe account
- 2 Unable to recall/give clear account
- 3 Confused/disturbed
- 4 Doubt account
- 5 Inconsistencies
- 6 Lies
- 9 Missing

polic\_10 (114) PoliceVictimMotive

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 1 Attention
- 2 Cover up
- 3 Cry for help
- 4 Fear
- 5 Revenge
- 6 Other
- 9 Missing

policeca (115) PoliceCase\_rec

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value Label

- 2 Little evidence
- 4 No corroboration
- 5 No evidence of sexual assault
- 6 Suggests consent
- 7 Third party complaint
- 8 Victim doesn't want police involved
- 9 Other
- 99 Missing

polic\_11 (116) PoliceCase

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 99

Value Label

- 1 Delayed report
- 2 Little evidence
- 3 No complaint
- 4 No corroboration
- 5 No evidence of sexual assault
- 6 Suggests consent
- 7 Third party complaint
- 8 Victim doesn't want police involved
- 9 Other
- 99 Missing

polic\_12 (117) PolicePerpActions

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 99

Value Label

- 1 Absconded
- 2 Not identified
- 3 No complaint
- 4 No corroboration
- 5 No evidence of sexual assault
- 6 Known/named
- 7 Interviewed
- 8 Arrested
- 9 Charged
- 99 Missing

polic\_13 (118) PolicePerpActions\_rec

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value Label

- 1 Absconded/not identified
- 2 No corroboration/no evidence of SA
- 3 Known/named
- 4 Interviewed
- 5 Arrested
- 6 Charged

polic\_14 (119) PolicePerpResponse

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	Admits all
2	Admits part
3	Claims consent
4	Denies
5	Has alibi
9	Missing

polic\_15 (120) PolicePerpResponse\_rec  
 Measurement level: Ordinal  
 Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
1	Admits (all or part)
2	Claims Consent
3	Denies/has alibi

cpsadvic (121) CPSAdvice  
 Measurement level: Ordinal  
 Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
 Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	By phone
2	Advice file
3	Discussion/meeting
4	Other
9	Missing

cpsadv\_1 (122) CPSAdvice\_rec  
 Measurement level: Ordinal  
 Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
 Missing Values: 3

Value	Label
1	By phone
2	Advice file
3	M Other

cpsissue (123) CPSIssues1  
 Measurement level: Ordinal  
 Format: F7 Column Width: 9 Alignment: Right  
 Missing Values: 99

Value	Label
1	Consent
2	Lack of evidence
3	Public interest
4	Query re. charging

- 5 Query re. evidence
- 6 Query re. file preparation
- 7 Victim credibility/reliability
- 8 Victim disability/mental health
- 9 Victim evidence inconsistent
- 10 Victim won't support
- 11 Other
- 99 Missing

cpsiss\_1 (124) CPSIssues2

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F7 Column Width: 9 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 99

- | Value | Label                           |
|-------|---------------------------------|
| 1     | Consent                         |
| 2     | Lack of evidence                |
| 3     | Public interest                 |
| 4     | Query re. charging              |
| 5     | Query re. evidence              |
| 6     | Query re. file preparation      |
| 7     | Victim credibility/reliability  |
| 8     | Victim disability/mental health |
| 9     | Victim evidence inconsistent    |
| 10    | Victim won't support            |
| 11    | Other                           |
| 99    | Missing                         |

latedisc (125) Late discontinuance

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

- | Value | Label                          |
|-------|--------------------------------|
| 1     | Consent                        |
| 2     | Lack of evidence               |
| 3     | Suspect/victim dies            |
| 4     | Victim credibility/reliability |
| 5     | Victim withdrawal              |
| 6     | Other                          |
| 9     | Missing                        |

trialfac (126) TrialFactorsAcquittal

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

- | Value | Label            |
|-------|------------------|
| 1     | Consent          |
| 2     | Lack of evidence |

- 3 Victim inconsistent
- 4 Victim poor testimony
- 5 Victim unreliable
- 6 Witness testimony
- 7 Other
- 9 Missing

trialf\_1 (127) TrialFactorsAcquittal

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

- | Value | Label                 |
|-------|-----------------------|
| 1     | Consent               |
| 2     | Lack of evidence      |
| 3     | Victim inconsistent   |
| 4     | Victim poor testimony |
| 5     | Victim unreliable     |
| 6     | Witness testimony     |
| 7     | Other                 |
| 9     | Missing               |

attritio (128) Attrition Point

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: thru 9

- | Value | Label                                |
|-------|--------------------------------------|
| 0     | Guilty                               |
| 1     | Unreported                           |
| 2     | No evidence assault/false allegation |
| 3     | insufficient evidence                |
| 4     | Victim withdrawal                    |
| 5     | CPS discontinue                      |
| 6     | Acquitted at trial                   |
| 7 M   | Other                                |
| 8 M   | Pending                              |
| 9 M   | Unknown                              |

whosedec (129) WhoseDecision1

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 1     | Victim  |
| 2     | Police  |
| 3     | CPS     |
| 4     | Court   |
| 5     | Pending |



9 Missing

whosed\_1 (130) WhoseDecision1

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 1 Victim
- 2 Police
- 3 CPS
- 4 Court
- 5 Pending
- 9 Missing

perpid (131) PerpID

Measurement level: Scale

Format: F9 Column Width: 11 Alignment: Right

page (132) PerpAge

Measurement level: Scale

Format: F7 Column Width: 9 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 999

ethnic\_1 (133) EthnicOrigin

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 99

Value Label

- 1 Asian (STA)
- 2 Bangladeshi
- 3 Black (STA)
- 4 Black African
- 5 Black Caribbean
- 6 Black Other
- 7 Chinese
- 8 Indian
- 9 Middle Eastern
- 10 Pakistani
- 11 White
- 12 Mixed
- 13 Other
- 99 Unknown

ethnic\_2 (134) Ethnnc origin categories of Perp

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9, 4

Value	Label
1	Asian
2	Black
3	White
4	Other
9	Missing

reltovic (135) PerpRelationToVictim  
 Measurement level: Ordinal  
 Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
 Missing Values: 99

Value	Label
1	Family member
2	Current Partner
3	Ex-Partner
4	Friend
5	Acquaintance
6	Colleague
7	Neighbour
8	Professional
9	Recent Acquaintance
10	Stranger
99	Missing

acqlengt (136) Victim knows Perp Lenght in hours  
 Measurement level: Scale  
 Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

location (137) LocationMetVictim  
 Measurement level: Ordinal  
 Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
 Missing Values: 99

Value	Label
1	Abroad
2	Friend's home
3	Perp home
4	Pub/club/disco
5	Public place
6	Residential home
7	Educational institutions
8	Shared home - O
9	Shared home - P
10	Social gathering
11	Someone else's home
12	Vehicle
13	Victim's home - Break in
14	Victim's home - invited
15	Workplace

16 Other  
99 Missing

perpsex (138) PerpSex

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
1	Female
2	Male

numberpe (139) NumberPerps

Measurement level: Scale

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 999

weapon (140) WeaponUsed

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

dob (141) PerpDOB

Measurement level: Scale

Format: DATE11 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

disabi\_2 (142) Disability

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

perp\_emp (143) Perp\_Employment

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	Employed
2	Unemployed
3	Student
4	Retired

9 Missing

perpempl (144) PerpEmployment\_rec

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value Label

1 Employed

2 Unemployed

3 Student

previo\_1 (145) PreviousSexOffnc

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

0 No

1 Yes

9 Missing

numpre\_1 (146) NumPreviousSexOffnc

Measurement level: Scale

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

previo\_2 (147) PreviousAccuseSO

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

0 No

1 Yes

9 Missing

numpre\_2 (148) NumPreviousAccuseSO

Measurement level: Scale

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

schedule (149) Schedule1Offender

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

0 No

1 Yes

9 Missing

mpages (150) MultiplePerpsAges

Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	Under 16
2	16-21
3	22-30
4	31-50
5	50 and older
6	Various
9	Missing

mpsex (151) MPSEX  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	All male
2	Other
9	Missing

mprelwit (152) MPRELWITHVICTIM  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	All known
2	Known and acquaintance
3	Known and stranger
4	All acquaintance
5	Acquaintance and stranger
6	All recent acquaintance
7	All stranger
9	Missing

mppartne (153) MPPARTNER  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

mplocati (154) MPLocation

Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 99

Value	Label
1	Abroad
2	Friend's home
3	Hotel
4	Perp home
5	Prison
6	Pub/club/disco
7	Public place
8	Residential home
9	School
10	Shared home - O
11	Shared home - P
12	Social gathering
13	Someone else's home
14	University campus
15	Vehicle
16	Victim's home - Break in
17	Victim's home - invited
18	Workplace
19	Other
20	Unknown
99	Missing

mploc\_re (155) Mp Location recoded  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
1	Home
2	Public place
3	Pub/club/disco
4	Other

mpethnic (156) MPEthnicOrigin  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 99

Value	Label
1	Asian (STA)
2	Bangladeshi
3	Black (STA)
4	Black African
5	Black Caribbean
6	Black Other
7	Chinese

- 8 Indian
- 9 Middle Eastern
- 10 Pakistani
- 11 White
- 12 Mixed
- 13 Other
- 99 M Unknown

mpethn\_1 (157) MP Ethnic origins Categories

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 1 Asian
- 2 Black
- 3 White
- 4 Other
- 9 Missing

mpethn\_2 (158) White vs. Others

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value Label

- 0 Other
- 1 White

mpprevio (159) MPPreviousAccuse

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 0 No
- 1 Yes for 1
- 9 M Unknown

mpschedu (160) MPSchedule1

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 0 No
- 1 Yes for 1
- 9 M Unknown

mpacqlen (161) MP Length of Acquaintance with Victim in hours

Measurement level: Nominal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

legaldet (162) LegalDetailID

Measurement level: Scale

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

offencer (163) OffenceRecorded

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 1 Anal rape
- 2 Attempted rape
- 3 Indecent assault
- 4 Rape
- 5 Unlawful sexual assault
- 6 Other
- 7 None recorded
- 9 Missing

offenc\_1 (164) OffenceRecorded\_rec

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value Label

- 1 Rape
- 2 Attempted rape
- 3 Indecent assault
- 4 Other

classifi (165) Classification

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 1 No crime
- 2 Undetected
- 3 Detected no proceedings
- 4 Detected
- 9 Missing

cpsdecis (166) CPSDecision

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 1 Discontinue



- 2 Proceed
- 9 Missing

guiltyat (167) GuiltyAtPDH

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

dropatpd (168) DropAtPDH

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

court (169) Court

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

courtdat (170) CourtDate

Measurement level: Scale

Format: DATE11 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

offencec (171) OffenceCharged

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
1	Anal rape
2	Attempted rape
3	Indecent assault
4	Rape
5	Unlawful sexual assault
6	Other
7	None recorded

9 Missing

offenc\_2 (172) OffenceCharged\_rec

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value Label

- 1 Rape
- 2 Attempted rape
- 3 Indecent assault
- 4 Other

guilty\_1 (173) GuiltyAtCC

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Missing Values: 9

Value Label

- 0 No
- 1 Yes
- 9 Missing

courtout (174) CourtOutcome

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value Label

- 1 Suspect missing
- 2 Victim withdrawal
- 3 Discontinued
- 4 Acquittal
- 5 Caution/warning
- 6 Part conviction
- 7 Guilty plea
- 8 Conviction
- 9 Pending

courto\_1 (175) CourtOutcome\_rec

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value Label

- 1 Discontinued
- 2 Victim Withdrawal
- 3 Acquittal
- 4 Part conviction
- 5 Guilty Plea
- 6 Conviction
- 7 Pending

courtsen (176) CourtSentence  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: A50 Column Width: 32 Alignment: Left

courts\_1 (177) Court sentence categories  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 3

Value	Label
1	Non-custodial
2	Custodial
3	Unknown

noncusto (178) NonCustodialDetail  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
1	Fine
2	Conditional Discharge
3	Suspended sentence
4	Community Order
5	Other Order

custodia (179) CustodialDetail  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9999, 999

Value	Label
999	Life sentence
9999	Unknown

victimwi (180) VictimWithdrawal  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right  
Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

realrape (181) RealRape\_ReltoVict  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	Not stranger

1 Stranger

realra\_1 (182) RealRape\_AssLoc  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	In victims home
1	Not in Victims home

realra\_2 (183) RealRape\_Consc  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

realra\_3 (184) RealRape\_Drug  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

realra\_4 (185) RealRape\_AssType  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	Other sexual assaults
1	Rape and attempted rape

assaul\_5 (186) Assault Location - Victims' Home or not  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	In Victims' home
1	Not in Victims' home

realra\_5 (187) Real Rape = Rape and attempted rape by stranger  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	Not Real Rape
1	Real Rape

realra\_6 (188)  
Real Rape = Rape and attempted rape by stranger not in victims home  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	Not real rape
1	Real Rape

everyday (189) Everyday Rape = Rape and attempted rape by not-stranger  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	Not everyday rape
1	Everyday rape

noter\_rr (190) Not Real or Everyday Rape  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	Everyday or Real rape
1	Not Real or Everyday Rape

typeofra (191) Type of rape  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
1	Real Rape
2	Everyday Rape
3	Not rape

ethnic\_3 (192) White vs. Other  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

ethnic\_4 (193) White vs. Black  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

ethnic\_5 (194) White vs. Asian  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No

- 1 Yes
- 9 Missing

maritals (195) Single vs. Separated  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

marita\_1 (196) Single vs. Married  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

marita\_2 (197) Single vs. Living Together  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

marita\_3 (198) Single vs. Divorced  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

victim\_4 (199) Categories of Victims age at the time of assault  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label           |
|-------|-----------------|
| 1     | 18 and younger  |
| 2     | 19-39 years old |
| 3     | 40 and older    |

victim\_5 (200) 19-39 vs. 40 and above  
Measurement level: Nominal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

victim\_6 (201) 19-39 vs. 18 and younger

Measurement level: Nominal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

victimem (202) Employed vs. Student

Measurement level: Nominal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

victim\_7 (203) Employed vs. Unemployed

Measurement level: Nominal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

pagecat (204) Age categories of perpetrator

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
1	up to 18 years
2	18-39 years
3	40 and older

page\_40o (205) 19-39 vs. 40 and older perps

Measurement level: Ordinal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	younger
1	40 and older

page\_18y (206) 19-39 vs. 18 and younger perps  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	19 and older
1	18 and younger

pethnic\_ (207) White vs. Other  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

pethnicv (208) White vs. Black  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

pethni\_1 (209) White vs. Asian  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

pemploy (210) Employed vs. Student  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

pemplo\_1 (211) Employed vs. Unemployed  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
-------	-------



- 0 No
- 1 Yes
- 9 Missing

mploc\_ot (212) Public place vs. Other  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

mploc\_pu (213) Public place vs. Pub/Club/Disco  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

mploc\_ho (214) Public place vs. Home  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

mpagecat (215) Up to 30 vs. Others  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

mprealra (216) MP Real Rape vs. Other  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

mpeveryd (217) MP Everyday Rape vs. Other  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

mpnotrap (218) MP Not Rape vs. Other  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

mpsatype (219) MP type of sexual assault  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
1	MP Real Rape
2	MP Everyday Rape
3	MP Not Rape

vicfac1\_ (220) Victims Profile 1 - Students  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F11.5 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

vicfac2\_ (221) Victims Profile 2 - Risk Group  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F11.5 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

vicfac3\_ (222) Victims Profile 3 - Vulnerable Group  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F11.5 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

vicfac4\_ (223) Victims Profile 4 - Black Refugees and Asylum Seekers  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F11.5 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

vicfac5\_ (224) Victims Profile 5 - Older Divorced  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F11.5 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

vicfac6\_ (225) Victims Profile 6 - Asian married  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F11.5 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

vicfac7\_ (226) Victims Profile 7 - Separated  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F11.5 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

vicfac8\_ (227) Victims Profile 8 - Revictimisation group  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F11.5 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

vicfac9\_ (228) Victims Profile 9 - Other ethnic groups  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F11.5 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

perpfac1 (229) Perpetrators Profile 1 - Risk group  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F11.5 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

perpfac2 (230) Perpetrators Profile 2 - Students  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F11.5 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

perpfac3 (231) Perpetrators Profile 3 - Black  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F10.5 Column Width: 12 Alignment: Right

perpfac4 (232) Perpetrators Profile 4 - White  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F11.5 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

polic\_16 (233) Unknown Other vs. Victim  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	Victim
1	Unknown Other

polic\_17 (234) Known Other vs. Victim  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	Victim
1	Known Other

attrit\_1 (235) Attrition point - Acquitted at trial  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
-------	-------

- 0 No
- 1 Yes
- 9 Missing

attrit\_2 (236) Attrition point - CPS discontinue  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

attrit\_3 (237) Attrition point - Victim Withdrawal  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

attrit\_4 (238) Attrition point - Insufficient Evidence  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

attrit\_5 (239) Attrition point - No evidence/False allegation  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

attrit\_6 (240) Attrition point - Unreported  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

attrit\_7 (241) Attrition point - Guilty

Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

polvicch (242) None or other vs. Previous Allegations  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

polvic\_1 (243) None or other vs Prostitution  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

polvic\_2 (244) None or other vs Learning Disability  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

polvic\_3 (245) None or other vs Abuse  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

polvic\_4 (246) None or other vs Mental Health  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
-------	-------

- 0 No
- 1 Yes
- 9 Missing

polvic\_5 (247) None or other vs Substances

Measurement level: Nominal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

polvicac (248) PoVictAccount: Believe vs. Lies

Measurement level: Nominal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

polvic\_6 (249) PoVictAccount: Believe vs. Inconsistances

Measurement level: Nominal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

polvic\_7 (250) PoVictAccount: Believe vs. Doubt Account

Measurement level: Nominal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

polvic\_8 (251) PoVictAccount: Believe vs. Confused/Disturbed

Measurement level: Nominal

Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

polvic\_9 (252) PoVictAccount: Believe vs. Unable to recall/give clear account

Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

polperpa (253) PolPerpActions: Charged vs. Arrested  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

polper\_1 (254) PolPerpActions: Charged vs. Interviewed  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

polper\_2 (255) PolPerpActions: Charged vs. Known/Named  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

polper\_3 (256) PolPerpActions: Charged vs. No corroboration/No evidence of SA  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No
1	Yes
9	Missing

polper\_4 (257) PolPerpActions: Charged vs. Absconded/Not identified  
Measurement level: Nominal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
0	No

- 1 Yes
- 9 Missing

foren\_17 (258) Examined for Drug Use  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F11.5 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

foren\_18 (259) Examined for Alcohol Use  
Measurement level: Scale  
Format: F11.5 Column Width: 13 Alignment: Right

attritpo (260) Attrition Points - Recoded  
Measurement level: Ordinal  
Format: F8 Column Width: 10 Alignment: Right

Value	Label
1	Convicted
2	Unreported
3	Attrition



## Annex B: Information on derived variables

### RECODED VARIABLES:

assaul\_2 (19) Assault\_Type

Value	Label
1	Anal rape
2	attempted rape
3	Indecent assault
4	Rape

RECODE

assaul\_2

(1=3) (2=1) (3=2) (4=3) (MISSING=SYSMIS) INTO assaul\_ .

assault\_ (18) Assault\_Type\_rec

Value	Label
1	Attempted rape
2	Indecent assault
3	Rape

ethnicor (26) Ethnic Origin

Value	Label
1	Asian (STA)
2	Bangladeshi
3	Black (STA)
4	Black African
5	Black Caribbean
6	Black Other
7	Chinese
8	Indian
9	Middle Eastern
10	Pakistani
11	White
12	Mixed
13	Other
99	Unknown

RECODE

ethnicor

(1=1) (2=1) (8=1) (10=1) (3 thru6=2) (11=3) (ELSE=4) (MISSING=SYSMIS) INTO ethnicca .

EXECUTE .

ethnicca (27) Ethnic origins categories of Victim

Value	Label
1	Asian
2	Black
3	White
4	Other

RECODE

ethnicca

(1 thru 2=0) (4=0) (3=1) (MISSING=SYSMIS) INTO ethnicvi.

EXECUTE .

ethnicvi (28) Victim Ethnic\_White vs Other

Value	Label
0	Other
1	White

victimsm (30) Victims Marital Status

Value	Label
1	Divorced
2	Living together
3	Married
4	Separated
5	Single
6	Widowed
9	Missing

RECODE

victimsm

(3=1) (ELSE=0) (MISSING=SYSMIS) INTO vmarrita.

EXECUTE .

vmarrita (31) Married vs. Other

Value	Label
0	Not married
1	Married

disabili (34) Disability

Value	Label
1	Learning
2	Mental health
3	Other
9	Missing

RECODE

disabili

(1 thru 3=1) (ELSE=0) (MISSING=SYSMIS) INTO disabi\_1.

EXECUTE .

disabi\_1 (35) Disability - yes or no

Value	Label
0	No disability
1	Disability

forens\_6 (70) ForensicExamSHist

Missing Values: 9

Value	Label
0	None
1	Detailed
2	Limited
9	Missing

RECODE

forens\_6

(0=0) (MISSING=SYSMIS) (ELSE=1) INTO forens\_7 .

EXECUTE .

forens\_7 (71) ForensicExamSHist\_rec

Value	Label
-------	-------

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

asleep (86) Asleep

- | Value | Label                  |
|-------|------------------------|
| 0     | No                     |
| 1     | Yes - asleep naturally |
| 2     | Yes - in drink/drugs   |
| 3     | Yes - state unknown    |
| 4     | Yes - unconscious      |
| 9     | Missing                |

RECODE

asleep

(0=0) (MISSING=SYSMIS) (ELSE=1) INTO asleep\_r .

EXECUTE .

asleep\_r (87) Asleep yes or no

Measurement level: Ordinal

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 0     | No      |
| 1     | Yes     |
| 9     | Missing |

policefa (103) PoliceFalseComplaints

- | Value | Label                      |
|-------|----------------------------|
| 1     | Victim - admits false      |
| 2     | Victim - says consensual   |
| 3     | Police - evidential issues |
| 4     | Police - victim unreliable |
| 5     | Police - witness statement |
| 6     | Police - other reasons     |
| 9     | Missing                    |

RECODE

policefa

(MISSING=SYSMIS) (1 thru 2=1) (3 thru 6=2) INTO police\_8 .

EXECUTE .

police\_8 (104) Police false complaint - recoded

- | Value | Label  |
|-------|--------|
| 1     | Victim |
| 2     | Police |

RECODE

Police\_8

(MISSING=SYSMIS) (1=0) (2=1) INTO polfalse .

EXECUTE.

polfalse (105) Police False Complaint: Victim vs. Police reasons

- | Value | Label          |
|-------|----------------|
| 0     | Victim reasons |
| 1     | Police reasons |

cpsadvic (121) CPSAdvice

- | Value | Label |
|-------|-------|
|-------|-------|

- 1 By phone
- 2 Advice file
- 3 Discussion/meeting
- 4 Other
- 9 Missing

RECODE

cpsadvic

(1=1) (2=2) (MISSING=SYSMIS) (ELSE=3) INTO cpsadv\_1 .

EXECUTE .

cpsadv\_1 (122) CPSAdvice\_rec

- | Value | Label       |
|-------|-------------|
| 1     | By phone    |
| 2     | Advice file |
| 3     | Other       |

ethnic\_1 (133) EthnicOrigin

- | Value | Label           |
|-------|-----------------|
| 1     | Asian (STA)     |
| 2     | Bangladeshi     |
| 3     | Black (STA)     |
| 4     | Black African   |
| 5     | Black Caribbean |
| 6     | Black Other     |
| 7     | Chinese         |
| 8     | Indian          |
| 9     | Middle Eastern  |
| 10    | Pakistani       |
| 11    | White           |
| 12    | Mixed           |
| 13    | Other           |
| 99    | Unknown         |

RECODE

ethnic\_1

(1=1) (2=1) (8=1) (10=1) (3 thru6=2) (11=3) (ELSE=4) (MISSING=SYSMIS) INTO ethnic\_2 .

EXECUTE .

ethnic\_2 (134) Ethnnc origin categories of Perp

- | Value | Label   |
|-------|---------|
| 1     | Asian   |
| 2     | Black   |
| 3     | White   |
| 4     | Other   |
| 9     | Missing |

perp\_emp (143) Perp\_Employment

- | Value | Label      |
|-------|------------|
| 1     | Employed   |
| 2     | Unemployed |
| 3     | Student    |
| 4     | Retired    |
| 9     | Missing    |

RECODE

perp\_emp

(1=1) (2=2) (3=3) (4=MISSING) (MISSING=SYSMIS) INTO perpempl.

EXECUTE .

perpempl (144) PerpEmployment\_rec

Value Label

- 1 Employed
- 2 Unemployed
- 3 Student

mplocati (154) MPLocation

Value Label

- 1 Abroad
- 2 Friend's home
- 3 Hotel
- 4 Perp home
- 5 Prison
- 6 Pub/club/disco
- 7 Public place
- 8 Residential home
- 9 School
- 10 Shared home - O
- 11 Shared home - P
- 12 Social gathering
- 13 Someone else's home
- 14 University campus
- 15 Vehicle
- 16 Victim's home - Break in
- 17 Victim's home - invited
- 18 Workplace
- 19 Other
- 20 Unknown
- 99 Missing

RECODE

mplocati

(16 thru 17=1) (7=2) (6=3) (ELSE=4) (MISSING=SYSMIS) INTO mploc\_re .

EXECUTE .

mploc\_re (155) Mp Location recoded

- 1 Home
- 2 Public place
- 3 Pub/club/disco
- 4 Other

offencer (163) OffenceRecorded

Value Label

- 1 Anal rape
- 2 Attempted rape
- 3 Indecent assault
- 4 Rape
- 5 Unlawful sexual assault

- 6 Other
- 7 None recorded
- 9 Missing

RECODE

offencer

(1=1) (4=1) (2=2) (3=3) (ELSE=4) (MISSING=SYSMIS) INTO offenc\_1 .

EXECUTE .

offenc\_1 (164) OffenceRecorded\_rec

Value Label

- 1 Rape
- 2 Attempted rape
- 3 Indecent assault
- 4 Other

offencec (171) OffenceCharged

Value Label

- 1 Anal rape
- 2 Attempted rape
- 3 Indecent assault
- 4 Rape
- 5 Unlawful sexual assault
- 6 Other
- 7 None recorded
- 9 Missing

RECODE

offencec

(1=1) (4=1) (2=2) (3=3) (ELSE=4) (MISSING=SYSMIS) INTO offenc\_2 .

EXECUTE .

offenc\_2 (172) OffenceCharged\_rec

Value Label

- 1 Rape
- 2 Attempted rape
- 3 Indecent assault
- 4 Other

courtout (174) CourtOutcome

Value Label

- 1 Suspect missing
- 2 Victim withdrawal
- 3 Discontinued
- 4 Acquittal
- 5 Caution/warning
- 6 Part conviction
- 7 Guilty plea
- 8 Conviction
- 9 Pending

RECODE

courtout

(1=1) (3=1) (2=2) (4=3) (5 thru6=4) (7=5) (8=6) (9=7) (MISSING=SYSMIS) INTO courto\_1 .

EXECUTE .

courto\_1 (175) CourtOutcome\_rec

Value	Label
1	Discontinued
2	Victim Withdrawal
3	Acquittal
4	Part conviction
5	Guilty Plea
6	Conviction
7	Pending

attritio (128) Attrition Point

Value	Label
0	Guilty
1	Unreported
2	No evidence assault/false allegation
3	insufficient evidence
4	Victim withdrawal
5	CPS discontinue
6	Acquitted at trial
7	Other
8	Pending
9	Unknown

RECODE

attritio

(1=1) (2=2) (else=3) (MISSING=SYSMIS) INTO attritpo .

EXECUTE .

attritpo (260) Attrition Points - Recoded

Value	Label
1	Convicted
2	Unreported
3	Attrition

COMPUTED VARIABLES:

COMPUTE

IF (assault\_ = 3 & (reltovic < 6)) everyday = 1 .

IF (reltovic = 6 | reltovic = 7 & (assault\_ < 3)) everyday = 0 .

IF (assault\_ = 3 & (reltovic = 6 | reltovic = 7)) everyday = 0 .

EXECUTE.

IF (assault\_ = 2 & (reltovic = 0)) noter\_rr = 1 .

IF (reltovic NE 0 & (assault\_ NE 2)) noter\_rr = 0 .

EXECUTE.

IF (assault\_ = 3 & (reltovic = 6 | reltovic = 7)) realra\_5 = 1.

IF (reltovic < 6) realra\_5 = 0 .

EXECUTE.

COMPUTE

typeofra

realra\_5 = 1 & (realra\_5 = 0 | NotER\_RR = 0).

```
everyday = 1 & (realra_5 = 0 | NotER_RR = 0).  
noter_rr = 1 & (realra_5 = 0 | EverydayRape1 = 0).  
EXECUTE.
```

typeofra (191) Type of rape

Value	Label
1	Real Rape
2	Everyday Rape
3	Not rape

CREATION OF DUMMY VARIABLES:

```
RECODE victim_4 (3 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO victim_5.  
RECODE victim_4 (1 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO victim_6.  
EXECUTE.
```

```
RECODE attritio (6 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO attrit_1.  
RECODE attritio (5 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO attrit_2.  
RECODE attritio (4 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO attrit_3.  
RECODE attritio (3 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO attrit_4.  
RECODE attritio (2 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO attrit_5.  
RECODE attritio (1 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO attrit_6.  
EXECUTE.
```

```
RECODE victimse (3 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO victimem.  
RECODE victimse (2 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO victim_7.  
EXECUTE.
```

```
RECODE ethnicca (4 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO pethnic_  
RECODE ethnicca (2 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO pethnicv.  
RECODE ethnicca (1 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO pethni_1.  
EXECUTE.
```

```
RECODE victimsm (4 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO marital.  
RECODE victimsm (3 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO marita_1.  
RECODE victimsm (2 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO marita_2.  
RECODE victimsm (1 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO marita_3.  
EXECUTE.
```

```
RECODE polic_13 (5 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polperpa.  
RECODE polic_13 (4 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polper_1.  
RECODE polic_13 (3 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polper_2.  
RECODE polic_13 (2 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polper_3.  
RECODE polic_13 (1 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polper_4.  
EXECUTE.
```

```
RECODE police_9 (6 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polvic.  
RECODE police_9 (5 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polvic_6.  
RECODE police_9 (4 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polvic_7.  
RECODE police_9 (3 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polvic_8.
```



```
RECODE police_9 (2 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polvic_9.  
EXECUTE.
```

```
RECODE policevi (6 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polvicch.  
RECODE policevi (5 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polvic_1.  
RECODE policevi (4 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polvic_2.  
RECODE policevi (3 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polvic_3.  
RECODE policevi (2 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polvic_4.  
RECODE policevi (1 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polvic_5.  
EXECUTE.
```

```
RECODE policewh (3 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polic_16.  
RECODE policewh (2 = 1) (ELSE = 0) INTO polic_17.  
EXECUTE.
```

## **RES-000-22-1679 - Rape in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century - Old behaviours, new contexts and emerging patterns**

Home Office statistics show a continuing decline in rape conviction rates over the last three decades. Acknowledgement of the difficulties of successfully prosecuting rape offenders has led to a number of policy-orientated studies of the way rape cases are dealt with by the Criminal Justice System and issues of attrition (cases lost or dropped). Reforms that have been put in place have not delivered the hoped-for outcomes – suggesting the need for re-evaluation of current practices and interventions.

This project aimed to:

- Explore key factors influencing the processing of rape cases, including the ‘real rape template’.
- Better understand attrition processes at six identified stages.
- Develop theoretical and conceptual ‘framings’ – grounded in empirical data.
- Influence strategic policy and practice intervention in responding to rape/sexual assault.

### **Key Findings**

- The ‘real rape’ template affected attrition – in terms of willingness to report, and in the early decision-making of both victims and police.
- It was, however, less predictive of legal outcomes – especially when cases reached the courts.
- Convictions were possible that would not have occurred previously. This was either because of changes in the law, or in how complainants were perceived.
- Falling conviction rates in the last three decades meant that a lower proportion of complainants saw attackers brought to account.
- Victim vulnerability played a crucial role in attrition. Four vulnerabilities featured prominently in rape allegations: victims under 18 years, domestic violence, alcohol-related rape and mental health issues.
- Previous allegations were significant – they influenced complainants’ decisions about withdrawing allegations and how police conducted the investigations.
- Evidence raised the question of whether vulnerabilities and histories made some victims less believable/credible for Criminal Justice System professionals, and even act as a cue to drop cases – suggesting that some categories of women were effectively ‘unrapeable’.
- Despite legal and procedural reform, for most rapists a culture of impunity exists. Most incidents were not reported and among those that were the majority did not result in convictions.
- Most convictions were of men who had previous charges and/or were strangers to the victim.
- Stereotypical constructions of rape, rape victims and rapists continued to inform institutional responses, albeit in more complex formulations than previously recognised.

## **About the Project**

Professor Liz Kelly, Dr Gordana Uzelac, Ms Jo Lovett and Dr Miranda Horvath of the Child and Woman Abuse Studies Unit, London Metropolitan University, carried out the project.

A case-tracking database compiled during a series of linked projects previously conducted for the Home Office Crime Reduction Programme was the primary data source. It comprised over 3,500 cases reported between 2000 and 2002 to Sexual Assault Referral Centres and police comparison sites. Additional data were collected from questionnaires (228), qualitative interviews (56), forensic medical reports (109) and police witness statements (50).

Methodology followed three stages:

- Retrieval of missing case outcomes.
- Development of new fields and codes for the database.
- A more complex analysis of the revised data set.

## **Key Words**

Alcohol-related, allegation, , attrition rate, complainant, conviction rate, courts, credibility, Criminal Justice System, culture of impunity, domestic violence, Home Office, mental health, police, rape, rapist, Sexual Assault Referral Centres, sexual violence, victim, victimisation, victim-under-18 years, vulnerability, women, witness statement

## **Aims & Objectives**

### *Objectives*

The broad aims of this project were:

1. To explore the manifestations and influence of the 'real rape' template in the processing of rape cases.
2. To refine understanding of the attrition process at each of the six identified stages.
3. To develop theoretical and conceptual framings which are grounded in empirical data.
4. To influence strategic policy and practice interventions responding to rape/sexual assault.

Within this there were three main objectives all of which we have achieved:

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

Research questions:

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**

The primary source of data for this project was a pre-existing case-tracking database compiled during a series of linked projects the award-holders conducted for the Home Office Crime Reduction Programme (CRP). This comprised 3,527 cases reported between late 2000 and 2002 to three Sexual Assault Referral Centres (SARCs) and three police comparison sites (with no SARC) in England. Associated data were collected on a sub-sample of individuals in the form of questionnaires (n=228), qualitative interviews (n=56), forensic medical reports (n=109) and police witness statements (n=50) (see Appendix 1 for further details about the process).

The methodology had three key stages - the retrieval of missing case outcome data; development of the existing database through the addition of new fields and codes; and undertaking new and more complex analysis of the revised data set.

## **Research results**

In terms of the legal constructions of rape, rape victims and rapists there are grounds for both hope and disappointment. The 'real rape' template was not entirely predictive of outcomes, especially when cases reach the courts. It is possible to get convictions that would not have been possible in former times – either because of changes in the law

(criminalising rape in marriage and male rape) or changes in how complainants are seen (for example, women who sell sex). 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 brought to account. The legacies of the 'real rape' template are most evident in the early stages of attrition where it affects willingness to report and the early decision making of both victims and police.

This research has demonstrated that 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). Here four vulnerabilities feature prominently in rapes reported to the Metropolitan Police: victims aged under 18; domestic violence; alcohol related rape; and mental health issues. Our data also suggest previous allegations are significant. These factors influence not only decisions by complainants to withdraw allegations but also how police conduct the investigation. Whilst this is an emerging field of study, current evidence raises the question of whether vulnerabilities and histories make some victims less believable/credible for CJS professionals, and even acts as a cue to 'drop' cases. To the extent to which this is the case the CJS could be said to play a part in constructing some categories of women as effectively 'unrapeable'. The corollary is that, despite legal and procedural reform, for most rapists there exists a culture of impunity – the majority of incidents are not reported and the vast majority of those that are do not result in a conviction. Conviction is most likely in cases where men have previous charges and/or were strangers who have been detected. Stereotypic constructions of rape, rape victims and rapists continue to inform institutional responses, albeit in more complex formulations than previously recognised. Challenges for research are: to further unpick how familiarity and conducive contexts underpin patterns of rape in the 21<sup>st</sup> century; to explore the complex conjunctions of rape, race and attrition; to explore targeting and opportunism with samples of unconvicted rapists; and to explore how young people and adults understand and negotiate consent.

#### **Dissemination activities and Potential or actual impacts on policy and practice**

Emerging findings from this research have been presented at four conferences/seminars (Scotland rape law reform, SORI, BSA/BSC, Lisbon) and are in two forthcoming publications. It will also form part of papers to be presented at international conferences in Berlin and Pennsylvania in October and November 2007. CWASU staff have also taken the issues raised into the Home office 'Rape Performance Group', on which we are the only academics. It has informed the conceptualisation of performance management systems for the police and CPS. Our work on attrition, of which this project is a part, has had a significant influence on public policy, most recently evidenced in HMCPSP's recent inspection, Without Consent. The wider influence includes proposing tracing attrition over time 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 two three day meetings organised by UNAIDS and UNECE on developing global indicators in Washington and Geneva.

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 21<sup>st</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup> 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).<sup>1</sup> 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 methods<sup>2</sup>. 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.

---

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

<sup>2</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	No outcome data known <sup>2</sup>
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>310</b>

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 strategy<sup>3</sup>. 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 'conducive 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 assaults<sup>4</sup>. 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*).

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> 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 ( $\leq 18$  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.<sup>5</sup> Prostitution was the only statistically significant predictor for stereotypical rape 1 where  $\beta = .085$  ( $p < .01$ ).<sup>6</sup> 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

---

<sup>5</sup> The tests show no significant multicollinearity of variables.

<sup>6</sup> 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  $\leq 16$  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 points<sup>7</sup>. 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

---

<sup>7</sup> 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 (fn<sup>8</sup> *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 allegation<sup>8</sup> 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)

<sup>8</sup> '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  $\leq 16$  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*, 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 (2<sup>nd</sup> 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*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition. Boston: Pearson

Education, Inc.

Temkin, J. (2002) *Rape and the legal process* (2<sup>nd</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> 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.

---

<sup>9</sup> 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>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>β</b>
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***

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

\*p&lt;.05; \*\*p&lt;.01; \*\*\*p&lt;.001

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

	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>β</b>
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***

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

\*p&lt;.05; \*\*p&lt;.01; \*\*\*p&lt;.001

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

	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>β</b>
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

R<sup>2</sup>=.003 for step 1 (p<.05);

R<sup>2</sup>=.001 for step 2 (p>.05);

R<sup>2</sup>=.000 for step 3 (p>.05);

R<sup>2</sup>=.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>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>β</b>
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*

R<sup>2</sup>=.135 for step 1 (p<.001);

R<sup>2</sup>=.006 for step 2 (p>.05);

R<sup>2</sup>=.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  $\beta$ s**

		Stereotypical rape 1	Stereotypical rape 2	Non- stereotypical Rape	Other assaults
<b>Socio- demographic variables</b>	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***		
<b>Vulnerabilities</b>	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&lt;.05; \*\*p&lt;.01; \*\*\*p&lt;.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			

R<sup>2</sup> = .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  $\beta$ s

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

\*\*\* p&lt;.001; \*\* p&lt;.01; \* p&lt;.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**

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

\*\*\* p&lt;.001; \*\* p&lt;.01; \* p&lt;.05

**5b: Comparison – Insufficient Evidence**

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

\*\*\* p&lt;.001; \*\* p&lt;.01; \* p&lt;.05

**5c: Comparison – Victim withdrawal**

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

\*\*\* p&lt;.001; \*\* p&lt;.01; \* p&lt;.05

**5d: Comparison – CPS Discontinued**

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

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

**5e: Comparison – Acquitted at trial**

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

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

\*\*\* p&lt;.001; \*\* p&lt;.01; \* p&lt;.05