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ABSTRACT

Determining Capable Guardians in Rape Incidents

by

Alicia A. Boots

Dr. Hong Lu, Examination Committee Chair
Associate Professor of Criminal Justice
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Crime prevention is crucial to safeguard individual freedom and maintain social order. This is especially true in rape incidents as consequences may have long-lasting physical and mental effects on individual victims and great social costs. This study employs the routine activities theory to examine whether and how capable guardians (e.g., the presence of bystanders, the use of physical resistance, forceful verbal resistance or non-forceful verbal resistance) are likely to affect rape outcomes.

A sample of 638 females who were the victim of a single offender male perpetrated rape incident was drawn from the National Crime Victimization Survey, ranging from 1992 to 2003. The analysis of univariate, bivariate and binary logistic regression revealed that the presence of bystanders, physical resistance and forceful verbal resistance were predictive of attempted rape incidents, whereas the use of non-forceful verbal resistance was predictive of completed rape incidents. Theoretical and practical implications were discussed.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Female sexual victimization constitutes a significant issue in American society. In recent years, rape affected an estimated 12 to 22 percent of females over 18 in the United States (Russell and Bolen 2000). In addition to the victimization itself, rape exhibits particularly devastating effect on female victims. Victims report experiencing such varied effects as posttraumatic stress disorder, major depression, suicidal thoughts and increased use of drugs or alcohol (Brillon, Marchand and Stephenson 1999). Not surprisingly, females equate fear of crime with fear of rape (Silverman and Della-Giustina 2001). Given the enormity of social and psychological costs associated with rape, it is important to study the context of rape and its prevention.

This study uses the routine activities theory to investigate the effectiveness of several capable guardian (e.g., rape victims’ protective behaviors) indicators in rape incidents. The routine activities theory states that the volume of criminal activities is related to the nature of everyday patterns of social interaction. While engaged in the routine activities of daily life, individuals expose themselves or their property to victimization. More specifically, criminal events require the presence of a motivated offender, a suitable target and a lack of capable guardians.
Research on sexual victimization reveals a number of factors related to the outcome of rape incidents. For instance, rape incidents involving female victims are more likely to be committed by a single male offender, occur at night and be committed in the home of the victim or a friend/neighbor (Greenfeld 1997). Also documented are the effects of mitigating circumstances on the outcome of the incident. Empirical works demonstrated that alcohol use by the offender is generally associated with reduced likelihood of a completed rape (Brecklin and Ullman 2001) and that victim resistance is linked with the reduced likelihood of a completed rape (Clay-Warner 2002).

While some researchers applied the routine activities theory to sexual victimization in the past, this study expands the previous research in several ways. First, prior works frequently included female college students who responded to a survey (Schwartz and Pitts 1995; Fisher, Cullen and Turner 1999; Mustaine and Tewksbury 2002; Schwartz, DeKeseredy, Tait and Alvi 2001). This type of sample is likely non-representative of rape incidents as college females may be at increased risks for victimization, in particular incidents such as date rape (Ullman and Knight 1991) while at decreased risks in other incidents such as rape by strangers. While the above studies used cross-sectional data, studies using long range data are less prevalent. The current study represents a more comprehensive assessment of rape incidents through the use of a sample of incidents ranging from 1992-2003, making the findings more generalizable to a larger population.

Second, previous studies on sexual assault dichotomized victimization risk into those who were victimized by sexual assault (including rape) and those who were not (Schwartz and Pitts 1995; Fisher et al. 1999; Schwartz et al. 2001). This study varied
slightly from the approach used by Mustaine and Tewksbury (2002), who measured risk of general versus serious sexual assaults by comparing attempted versus completed rape incidents. Finally, previous researchers using the routine activities theory defined guardianship in numerous ways, such as presence of others, living alone, etc. Of particular interest in the current study is whether the presence of capable guardians can distinguish attempted victims from completed victims and whether their presence will remain significant with the introduction of situational variables in rape incidents. This study expands the measures of guardianship with several non-mutually exclusive measures including the presence of bystanders, and the use of physical, forceful verbal or non-forceful verbal self-protective measures.

Employing National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) rape data from 1992 - 2003, this study addresses the following interrelated questions: (1) Does the presence of bystanders equate capable guardians in rape incidents? (2) Does the presence of physical self-protective actions on the part of the victim equate capable guardians in rape incidents? (3) Does the presence of forceful verbal self-protective actions serve as capable guardianship in rape incidents? and (4) Does the presence of non-forceful verbal self-protective actions equate capable guardianship in rape incidents?

Significance of the Study

Although the NCVS possesses inherent methodological problems such as the under reporting of victimizations and self selection, this study inevitably contributes to the literature on the nature of sexual assault incidents and outcomes. The application of theoretical constructs in this manner broadens the capabilities of the theory. The results
strengthen the literature on the limitations of victim resistance, providing support for law enforcement or victim services personnel in sexual assault awareness and training purposes.

Chapter 2 presents a comprehensive review of pertinent literature. The routine activities theory is discussed, with particular attention placed on definitions, assumptions and empirical validity. The nature and extent of male perpetrated female victim rape is explored, followed by assessments of key variables on outcomes of rape incidents. Finally, previous applications of the routine activities theory to the crime of rape are summarized, followed by the discussion of the current study and the formulation of research questions.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology used in this study. The first section briefly summarizes the research questions. Next follows a description of sample selection from the National Crime Victimization Survey. Subsequently, major dependent and independent variables and their respective coding used in the study are described, along with a brief discussion of analytic procedures.

Chapter 4 presents results of univariate, bivariate, and multivariate analyses of these major dependent and independent variables and discusses whether and how capable guardianship, as proposed by the routine activities theory, influences the outcome of rape. The concluding chapter summarizes the findings of the study and discusses methodological limitations for the study, and relevant theoretical and practical implications for future research.
CHAPTER 2

ROUTINE ACTIVITIES THEORY AND THE INCIDENT OF RAPE

This chapter first describes the routine activities theory, its major components and empirical support. It then reviews previous studies on the nature and extent of rape in the United States. Discussions of previous studies on rape focus on offender and victim profile and situational dynamics of this type of offense. Next, previous applications of the routine activities theory to the incident of rape are discussed. The chapter is completed with an explanation of the research questions addressed in this study.

Routine Activities Theory

The routine activities theory developed as researchers attempted to explain the upward trend of crime rates in the 1970's (Cohen and Felson 1979). The theory assumed that daily life (e.g. going to work or socializing) produced circumstances ideal for direct contact predatory crime (Birkbeck and LaFree 1993). Crime occurred through the union of 1) a motivated offender; 2) a suitable target for victimization; and 3) a lack of capable guardians (Cohen and Felson 1979). When individuals left their homes to go to work, spend time with friends, or go shopping, probabilities increased for a violent encounter. Conversely, their absence exposed their homes or other property to increased likelihood of victimization due to their inability to provide protection.
Motivated Offenders

A motivated offender possessed “criminal inclinations and the ability to carry out those inclinations” (Cohen and Felson 1979, 590). The routine activities theory does not attempt to explain motivation but views it as a given. Other theoretical interpretations of motivation assumed offenders to be rational, choosing criminal activities based on the utilitarian concept of free will. Original interpretations operated via an economic model, with offenders bent on maximizing personal satisfaction (see Becker 1968). Based on the deterrence doctrine argued by Italian jurist Cesare Beccaria, rational offenders were most effectively deterred if punishment was swift, certain, and severe in a broader context. The notion of pure rationality received criticism for its implausibility and unclear link to deterrence (Akers 2000). Modern interpretations categorized choice as a softer, more dynamic issue. Thus, the adherence to strict economic based rationality was modified to include the significance of other factors (Clarke and Felson 1993).

A modified rational choice perspective argued offenders were dictated more by hedonism and subjective utility (Paternoster and Simpson 1993). First, the offender chose to participate in criminal activities presenting a low risk for anticipated physical or psychological pain. Second, the offender selected a crime resulting in rewards (either tangible or abstract) not pursued via legal means. Finally, the offender desired to avoid apprehension or imprisonment, and took measures to lessen this result (Clarke and Felson 1993).

Criminal opportunity acknowledged that some “situations are more favorable to crime than others” (Birkbeck and LaFree 1993, 123). Individual level opportunity can be envisioned as a spectrum, from coincidence to premeditation and involves such aspects as
“location, timing, target, tactic or even type of crime” (Birkbeck and LaFree 1993, 125). For example, an encounter with an unlocked car creates the opportunity to steal a stereo. On the other hand, the theft of an automobile from a sales lot required more attention to when and where access was achieved. In addition to offender decision making, opportunity may be created via large scale social changes, such as unemployment rates or the number of female headed households (Miethe and Meier 1994).

Various empirical studies demonstrated rationality and opportunity in some crimes. Experimental studies on corporate offenders supported offender’s perceptions of threat from both informal and formal sanctions (Paternoster and Simpson 1993). Interviews with repeat street crime offenders determined that calculation (i.e. waiting for the right moment) was an effective strategy in retaliatory violence (Jacobs 2004). The time frame of planned retaliation, instead of an immediate reaction, increased offender preparedness and satisfaction and lulled victims into increased vulnerability by a false sense of security.

Warr (1988) argued that individual level opportunity structures for the crimes of rape and burglary were similar. As rape often occurred in the home as the result of unlawful entry, Warr (1988) believed that opportunity factors of rape would exhibit a consistent relationship to burglary. For example, physical household and social characteristics which increased the opportunity for a burglary should be associated with increased opportunities for rape. Results demonstrated strong correlations between rape and burglary rates in the 1980 Uniform Crime Reports (UCR). In addition, opportunity variables (i.e., owner-occupied, low income, age of housing structure, female headed households, females living alone and separated, divorced and single women) were
significantly correlated. In conclusion, Warr (1988) stated that rape and burglary were consistently correlated via similar residences and victims.

An influential work by Cohen (1981) described the influences of the changing nature of society and its relationship to elevated crime rates. Opportunity was described via the number of women in the labor force, the increasing numbers of people living alone and the proliferation of mobile durable goods as indicators of opportunity, all predictive crimes of theft from the years 1947-1972. Therefore, society’s organizational and commodity production alterations led to increased opportunities for offenders to engage in criminal activity.

**Target suitability**

A suitable target represented something of value to the offender, “the material or symbolic desirability..., physical visibility, access and the inertia of a target against illegal treatment” (Cohen and Felson 1979, 591), determined via a target selection process. Desirable targets were high in value, easily controlled, visible to offenders and readily accessible (Felson 2000). Offenders calculated suitability based upon their needs (Brunet 2002); therefore targets may be considered attractive for varying reasons but often because they were “easy” (Hough 1987, 359).

Target suitability in personal crimes was frequently framed from a risk perspective. As victimization risk appeared neither random nor evenly distributed across the population, victimization literature isolated the relative importance of several factors. Researchers focused primarily on demographic/lifestyle characteristics of victims or characteristics of incident location clusters, including the interactions of these effects (Outlaw, Ruback and Britt 2002).
While demographic groups exhibited varying propensities for victimization, Hindelang, Gottfredson and Garafalo (1978) determined this was more aptly explained via lifestyle choices. For example, Miethe, Stafford and Long (1987) concluded that the relative risk of property victimization for different groups could be moderately mediated by the conditional effects of routine activities such as spending time outside of the home and at night activities away from home. Thus, the demographic makeup of groups was partially responsible for contributing to how much time individuals spent in situations more likely to result in victimization (Kennedy and Forde 1990). These differences were often explained in terms of the increased likelihood of exposure to offenders (Cohen, Kluegel and Land 1981).

Data illustrated that young, minority females who have never been married, are of lower socio-economic status and live in urban areas (targets) were at increased risk for sexual victimization (See Fattah 1991; Miethe and McCorkle 2001). Similarly, sexual assault offenders overrepresented the following groups: the young (under 25), low-income or the unemployed and African Americans (Miethe and McCorkle 2001). Discrepancies between the ability of lifestyle factors to predict violent versus property victimization were attributed to the reduced likelihood that violent victimizations were strictly rational (Miethe et al. 1987). However, recent findings suggest that introducing additional lifestyle measures such as violent offending (Bjarnason, Sigurdardottir and Thorlindsson 1999) or previous victimization (Wittebrood and Nieuwbeerta 2000) improved the predictability of lifestyle models of violent victimization.

Perhaps influenced by the early 1980's move toward the criminality of places (see Wilson and Kelling 1982), research on the risk of places was exemplified in the work of
Sherman, Gartin and Buerger (1989). Criminal activity tended to be higher in places possessing an increased opportunity for offenders and victims to converge, coined criminal “hotspots.” More specifically, hot spots, such as hotels and motels (Rice and Smith 2002) or outlets selling liquor (Sherman et al. 1989) were comparatively more criminogenic due to the increased likelihood of interactions between potential offenders and targets. Therefore, people frequenting these environments were at increased risk for victimization.

**Lack of capable guardians**

According to the routine activities theory, a “lack of capable guardians” was the third component for a predatory criminal event. Capable guardians were “persons, (e.g. housewives, neighbors, pedestrians, private security guards, law enforcement officers) or objects (e.g. burglar alarms, locks, barred windows)” (Cohen et al. 1981, 508). Guardian effectiveness may be as mundane as its presence, or may require actual intervention on the part of the guardian.

Although certain guardians applied broadly, they were more apt to be crime specific. For example, Clarke (1995) provided an overview of several effective theft opportunity reducing techniques such as the use of locks, fencing, gates, security alarms, closed circuit television, additional store personnel or increased police presence. For personal crimes, the presence of others such as peers (Kennedy and Baron 1993), parents or other relatives (Bjarnason et al. 1999; Warner and Griller 2003), roommates (Fisher et al. 1999) third parties (LaVigne 1997; Roman 2003) or employees such as bartenders or bouncers (Fox and Sobol 2000) constituted measures of guardians.
In addition, self-guardianship appeared in previous studies. For instance, measures of self-guardianship included participation in a crime prevention meeting (Fisher, Sloan, Cullen and Lu 1998), carrying a protective device like a cell phone or weapon (Mustaine and Tewksbury 2002) and self-reported ability to physically protect oneself from an attack by others (Miethe and Meier 1994). A different test of the routine activities theory associated lifestyle factors with the propensity to use self-protective guardianship behaviors (Tewksbury and Mustaine 2003). Self-protective guardianship measures (the possession of mace, knives, clubs, body alarms or guns) associated with lifestyles that made individuals more vulnerable to victimization (frequency of associating with strangers, use of walking as a mode of transportation, perceptions of safety and disorder in neighborhoods).

The effectiveness of guardianship was determined by who was available to guard and how effective they were at doing so. For example, Felson (1993) described social indicators available in the Census which were reflective of lowered guardianship. Census information provided measures of who can watch: such as number of family members, number of people who use private transportation, size of school grounds or membership in clubs or groups. An underlying assumption was that the people who are present will actually be effective, or become involved at all. Second, the Census provided measures of the effectiveness of potential guardians. Reduced guardianship was associated with poor health and nutrition, (i.e. people with lowered strength to ward off offenders) or drug and alcohol use leading to impaired abilities and reduced effectiveness.

More specifically, Decker (1995) assessed the function and effectiveness of witnesses in homicide events in Chicago. Five categories of witnesses were constructed
from case files, one of which was termed incapable guardians. These incidents involved some level of intervention on the part of the witness, yet the event resulted in death. This was often the case in incidents where the victim, offender and witnesses were known to each other, yet not exclusively in that domain. Decker’s (1995) findings were consistent with prior literature on the nature of witnesses and bystander apathy (Gillis and Hagan 1982): witnesses were more likely to intervene in a criminal incident if they were acquainted with the victim or the incident occurred close to their home. Thus, the role of guardians appears to be a function of crime type, incident location and nature of relationship between involved parties.

The Criminal Event

The criminal event occurred with the convergence of the motivated offender and suitable target in the absence of capable guardians. Orchestrating this event was the routine activities of the involved parties. Early conceptualizations of the theory thus assumed that people were at the least risk from victimization when they were in their own homes and not in public performing these routine activities. However, later empirical works determined that the relationship was not as clear-cut.

Empirical Support for the Routine Activities Theory

Researchers have attempted to understand the occurrence of criminal incidents using the routine activities theory, along with a wide number of other theories. Since the late 1970’s, researchers have attempted to solidify (or modify) the basic underlying assumptions of the theory. The following is a sample of major findings of the routine activities theory integral to the current study.
Cohen et al. (1981) tested the predictability of victimization based upon measures of risk factors as identified by the routine activities theory and the lifestyle model of criminal victimization (Hindelang et al. 1978). More specifically, the researchers were interested in determining whether the physical proximity to offenders, exposure to offenders, attractiveness to potential offenders and absence of guardians differed amongst groups based upon income, race and age. It was hypothesized that social inequality in society thereby made some groups more vulnerable to victimization by affecting their rate of interactions with risk factors.

Predictions were based upon three assumptions. First, individuals who shared demographic characteristics with offenders would be at a higher risk for victimization due to their exposure. Thus, based upon offender data, it was believed that low income, nonwhites and younger individuals were at higher risk for victimization. Second, individuals whose lifestyle allowed them to maintain contact with their possessions (targets) would have reduced likelihood of victimization. Therefore, individuals with higher income would increase guardianship, nonwhites would have lessened guardianship due to a reduced likelihood of marriage, and older people would be associated with increased guardianship. Finally, individuals tended to live in areas that are homogenic in regards to age, race and income. Therefore, the poor, young and nonwhite would be at higher risk due to proximity to offenders.

Using National Crime Survey (NCS) data from 1974 and 1977, Cohen et al. (1981) tested the predictability of victimization on burglary, assault and larceny. In addition to the independent variables of income, race and age, interaction effects were tested between lifestyle and proximity measures on the separate crime types. Age and
lifestyle were determined to have the strongest effects on victimization. For example, individuals under the age of thirty were at a higher risk for victimization than those over thirty. Additionally, while holding all else constant, married individuals had a lower risk of victimization, employed persons had a lower risk of victimization and households in which individuals work, are married and have a child were at higher risk of victimization, although households with married and employed individuals were still at a lower risk than average for victimization. While the researchers stated that the issue was more complex than could be directly determined, it was suggested that age was inversely related to victimization risk, that income had a direct effect on victimization risk and race exhibited no relationship to victimization risk.

Later research (Maxfield 1987) argued that differences between groups must be analyzed with more specific measures of risk. Therefore, not only did victimization risk vary across groups, it varied within groups as well. Maxfield (1987) identified discrepancies between individual victimization based upon household composition, possibly an effect of variations in why people were away from their homes and who they were victimized by. In order to increase generalizability, both the 1982 British Crime Survey and the 1983 NCS and Victim Risk Supplement were utilized in assessing the hypotheses.

Household composition was measured as one adult, two adults, one adult and children or two adults and children. The personal crimes of sexual assault, assault, robbery, personal theft and attempts, and household crimes of burglary, household thefts and attempts were measures of criminal victimization. By separating the sample into
household composition groups, it became clear that single parent households were at the highest risk for personal crimes.

Applying the routine activities theory, Maxfield (1987) argued that this may be a result of individuals in single parent households placing themselves in riskier situations or in situations lacking capable guardians. For example, Cohen et al. (1981) claimed that individuals who were not married were at higher risk for victimization due to fewer people available to act as guardians. Maxfield (1987) stated that as a single parent, the individual may need to be away from home for extended periods of time at work in order to support the family, thereby increasing victimization risk. On the other hand, bars and other leisure activity centers are often frequented by unmarried individuals, placing the individual at a higher risk of victimization.

Maxfield (1987) determined that employment, household composition, and number of nights out per week each were effective at predicting victimization risk. While it was apparent that there were differences among groups, Maxfield (1987) assessed the characteristics of victimizations in detail to discover discrepancies. Measures of victim offender relationship, whether the victim was employed at the time of the incident and where the incident occurred were thus included. This revealed that individuals in single parent households were much more likely to report being physically victimized by someone known to them. More specifically, female victims were likely to be violently victimized by intimate acquaintances, such as present or former spouses and boyfriends. In addition, it was clear that those in the single parent category were less likely to be employed than other categories. Finally, a majority of single parent home incidents occurred in or near the immediate vicinity of their own home. Results were
interpreted as supportive of the routine activities theory, but with some cautions as the data seemed to suggest that individuals in single parent households were at a greater risk for victimization by staying home— the most likely place to encounter the perpetrator of their specific criminal incidents.

The importance of contextual events was stressed by examining the connections between the victim, offender and situational contexts simultaneously (Miethe and Meier 1994). Termed the social context of crime, Miethe and Meier (1994) assessed the relative impact of the social context on both offender motivation and target characteristics using both individual and aggregate level measurements. Using census data, NCS data and a survey, they argued that the assumptions of the routine activities theory, lifestyle theories and criminal opportunity theories could be combined to explain group differences in victimization. More specifically, the overall social context of the event was an important predictor of the likelihood of criminal activity, which suitable targets and motivated offenders alone could not sufficiently explain.

Poor socio-economic conditions, the movement of populations in areas, racial compositions of neighborhoods and disruption of family unit were included as large scale indicators of criminogenic neighborhoods. Lifestyle measures included were physical proximities to high crime areas (distances between residence and concentrations of offenders), exposure to motivated offenders (“visibility and accessibility to crime” (Miethe and Meier 1994, 87), target attractiveness (measures of potential yield) and lack of guardianship.

Results demonstrated that overall, individuals living in areas that were higher in crime were more likely to be victims of all crime types. Additionally, younger, lower
socio-economic, individuals who moved frequently, lived in multi-family dwellings and lived alone were at increased risk for violent victimization. By including adjustments for the proportion of time that individuals spent in public locales, it was clear that individuals were at increased risk of violent victimization by strangers when they spent time in restaurants, places of public transit or parking lots. However, results demonstrated that dependent upon crime type, victims may have been at more risk of victimization from non-strangers than strangers, and in private versus public locations, thus weakening the capacity of the lifestyle theories to predict victimization via associations with risky places or situations.

While the routine activities theory has contributed to knowledge on the variation of victimization in society, the approach as a whole appears to be benefited by the introduction of some modifications. The theory’s ability to be accurate in predictions of risk appears to be tempered by including measures of the context of the criminal event. Knowledge of the contextual associations between victim, offender and guardians is important in understanding the criminal event (Maxfield 1987; Miethe and Meier 1994).

Rape

Several sources collect data on rape incidents. Official reports, such as the UCR, provide information on reported rape incidents and cleared incidents in which an offender was arrested. The UCR defined rape as “carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will” (FBI 2005). Information is voluntarily reported to the Federal Bureau of Investigations by local and state law enforcement agencies. The UCR delineates between crimes according to their severity and rate of recurrence; officials defined the serious and
serious and common crimes included in their reports as index (or Part I) offenses (FBI 2005). Currently, forcible female rape is considered Part I, while all other offenses of sexual assault (e.g., statutory rape or male victim rape) are considered Part II (FBI 2003).

The UCR collects information on offenders that are known or reported to law enforcement, unfounded events and information on arrested individuals. Additionally, victim, offender and contextual event details are included. Offenses are stratified into their respective crime categories and scored based upon several rules. The hierarchy rule limits the number of offenses reported. If crimes are committed simultaneously, only the highest-ranking offense is recorded. For example, if a victim is raped and then murdered, only the murder will be counted by the UCR. The UCR scores crimes according to the number of victims, not the number of offenders (Biderman and Lynch 1991).

Several limitations are associated with the UCR. First, the UCR’s definition is considered poor due to its narrow focus. The UCR’s definition of rape thus excludes “other forms of sexual penetration, incapacitation by means other than force, and male and spousal victims” (Ruback and Menard 2001, 132). Additionally, its reliance upon reported incidents severely limits its accuracy, as a large portion of sexual victimizations go unreported (Belknap 2001). For example, approximately 30 percent of rape cases were reported to police as compared to approximately 60 percent of robbery or aggravated assault incidents (USDOJ 2000).

The second source of rape information is victimization surveys, such as the NCVS. Approximately 56,000 U.S. housing units are selected annually at random for inclusion in the present survey (USDOJ 2004a). Questions concentrate on criminal victimization, including incident and offender specific questions. Crime types included
are rape, robbery, assault, burglary, personal or household larceny, and motor vehicle theft in the current surveys.

Early attempts at collecting victimization data included extremely poor constructs of sexual victimization. Respondents were not asked directly if they had been the victim of a rape. Rather, respondents first stated whether an incident had occurred in the last six months that they thought was a crime and either did or did not report this to the police. If a positive response was gathered on this question, respondents were asked to describe if the person hit you, knock(ed) you down, or actually attack(ed) you in any way? A positive response to this question was followed with how did the person attack you? From this, respondents could answer positively to raped or attempted rape. Thus, the interviewers did not ask specifically about rape, the respondent had to acknowledge yes or no to the survey question (USDOJ 1981).

If the respondent still did not understand, the definition of “carnal knowledge through the use of force or threat of force, including attempts; attempted rape may consist of verbal threats of rape” was given, which diverged from legal definitions of the crime, unlike other crime types in the NCVS (Koss 1996). This poor definition led to low reported victimization. Koss’ (1996) review of the literature review revealed that a 1977 study reported 15 rapes in a sample of 100,000 households with use of early NCVS data.

Such findings were instrumental in the redesign efforts and resulted in the modification of the definition and techniques that are utilized today. The current definition of rape by the NCVS is:

Forced sexual intercourse including both psychological coercion as well as physical force. Forced sexual intercourse means vaginal, anal, or oral penetration by the offender(s). This category also includes incidents where the penetration is from a foreign object such as a bottle. Includes attempted rapes, male as well as female victims, and
both heterosexual and homosexual rape. Attempted rape includes verbal threats of rape. (USDOJ 1998).

Rape occurs between males or females, yet a majority of incidents and literature are on female victims. The NCVS will be discussed at length in Chapter 3.

The strongest limitation of the NCVS is its reliance upon self-reported information which can be affected by memory. Acknowledging this inherent weakness, the NCVS is widely used by researchers as the best measure available. Its wealth of incident level information is beneficial in determining the nature of rape incidents. From the data, researchers are able to determine offender characteristics, victim characteristics and situational elements associated with rape incidents. Knowledge of these characteristics allows researchers to gain a broader understanding of rape incidents.

**Extent of Rape and Trend Data**

The UCR estimated 93,433 forcible rape offenses in 2003, comprising 6.8 percent of all reported violent crimes (FBI 2003). Of the reported forcible rape incidents, 91 percent involved completed incidents while 9 percent were attempted rape incidents. Using Census population estimates, 63.2 forcible rapes occurred per 100,000 females in 2003, decreasing from the 2002 rate of 65.0 (FBI 2003).

While the prevalence of rape has increased over the last several years, it was still lower than reported highs in the late 1980’s to early 1990’s (FBI 2003). Recent trend data estimated the 2003 rate increased 4.5 percent from 1999, yet was still 8.6 percent lower than reported rates from 1994 (FBI 2003). The NCVS demonstrates that rape has maintained a consistent downward trend since the early 1990’s, excluding a slight increase in 2002. More specifically, the NCVS rape rate decreased 71 percent between 1993 and 2003 (Catalano 2004).
Forty-four percent of rape incidents resulted in arrests. Forcible rape accounted for 4.4 percent of violent crime arrests with approximately 26,000 arrests in 2003. Taken as a whole, the national rate of arrests for forcible rape was 9.0 arrests per 100,000 persons. In all cities, the arrest rate was 9.4 arrests per 100,000 in population. Counties which include a principal city with a population of at least 50,000 are considered metropolitan counties. Metropolitan counties reported 7.8, while non-metropolitan counties recorded 8.9 arrests per 100,000 persons, respectively (FBI 2003).

Several factors correlated with a victim’s likelihood to report a rape incident. Overall, feelings of shame and the intensely personal nature of the violation decreased the likelihood of reporting, either to law enforcement or researchers. Some victims failed to acknowledge incidents as rapes and therefore will not report them. Certain rapes were more likely to be reported, such as incidents perpetrated by a stranger, incidents involving white victims or African American offenders, i.e. incidents viewed as legitimate rapes by society (Belknap 2001).

Conversely, acquaintance rapes or other rapes in which the nature of the incident is less clear (i.e. prostitutes, prior consensual sexual relations) were less likely to be reported (Belknap 2001). Warshaw (2000) explained that date and acquaintance rape is fostered by the very different ways in which males and females are socialized: males to be aggressive and females to be acquiescent to others, especially men. Finally, incident characteristics such as anal or oral victimizations are associated with less frequent reporting due to additional victim shame (Belknap 2001). Between 60 to 77 percent of rape incidents are reported by someone other than the victim, or as a result of the encouragement of a third party (Hall 1995).
Offender Characteristics

Several sources reported offender characteristics. Based on the UCR, adults (18 years of age and older), accounted for nearly 84 percent of 2003 forcible rape arrestees (FBI 2003). Of those adults arrested for the offense, 64.1 percent were white, 33.3 percent were black, and 2.6 percent were other races, with males accounting for 98.7 percent of arrestees (FBI 2003). Victimization surveys reported a majority of single offenders were 30 and older and that under 18 offenders frequently raped under 18 victims (Greenfeld 1997).

Offender motivation embodied an area of contention within the literature. Male biological drive (Quinsey 1984), the domination of women (Brownmiller 1975), anger and power (Groth 1979) or sexual motivation (Kanin 1985) all existed in the literature as possible sources. Incarcerated rapist surveys described such explanations as revenge, punishment, opportunity for other crimes (burglary), sexual access or fantasy, adventure or a sense of accomplishment (Scully 1990).

An additional distinction involved instrumental versus expressive aggression used in the commission of the incident. The instrumental use of aggression in rape was associated with enough violence to ensure victim compliance. On the other hand, expressive aggression was reflective of gratuitous aggression against the victim (Knight 1999). Researchers have debated the applicability of these distinctions to sexual crimes (Miethe and McCorkle 2001).

Victim Characteristics

Females experienced more sexual victimization than males – at a risk 20 times that of their male counterparts (Craven 1997). While younger women (aged 16-24)
comprised the highest risk age group for rape victimization, middle aged women (aged 25 to 49) were more likely to be threatened with a weapon and to experience a completed rape incident (Hall 1995). While some have shown that female African Americans were slightly more likely to experience sexual victimization than other race groups (Rennison 2001), others have found that there is no significant difference between races on victimization (Russell 1984). A majority of reported victimization incidents occurred within one mile of the victim's home (Greenfeld 1997).

Females who engaged in risky sex practices (i.e., sex with multiple partners or sex with recently acquainted individuals) increased their risk of victimization, along with females who self-reported alcohol dependency (Combs-Lane and Smith 2002; Siegel and Williams 2003), yet victim behavioral variables are not the sole risk factors for victimization. For example, Stermac, Reist, Addison and Millar (2002) argued that maternal neglect and childhood exposure to sexual acts by peers or adults was predictive of later sexual victimization. One of the most salient risk factors for rape was prior sexual victimization. More specifically, studies have determined that sexual victimization in adolescence (versus younger childhood) was a significant predictor of later sexual victimization (Combs-Lane and Smith 2002; Siegel and Williams 2003). National Violence against Women survey respondents who reported more than one rape in the last twelve months acknowledged an average of 2.9 rapes per year (Tjaden and Thoennes 1998). Additionally, 32 percent of raped women experienced injury during their incident and one third of injured women sought medical attention for their injuries (Tjaden and Thoennes 1998).
Factors Affecting the Outcome of Rape

Rape incidents resulted in two outcomes: an attempted incident and a completed incident. A general definition of attempted crimes required three components. The offender “knowingly and purposely” intended to commit the crime, engaged in “some act in furtherance of that intent” yet did not complete the crime (Hall 1997, 199). The major distinction between completed and attempted rape rested upon penetration of the female or forced oral copulation, thus attempts are labeled as “unsuccessful attempt of rape” (USDOJ 2000, 136).

One of the most plausible explanations for failed completion was victim resistance. Victim resistance in rape incidents was quite prevalent, comprising an estimated 70 percent of rape incidents in 2001 (USDOJ 2004c). Instead of a dichotomous measure of resistance, researchers have classified resistance into several forms such as physical resistance (e.g., pushing, kicking, etc.), forceful verbal resistance (e.g., shouting, yelling, etc.) and non-forceful verbal resistance (e.g., pleading, reasoning, etc.) (Amick and Calhoun 1987; Atkeson, Calhoun and Morris 1989; Block 1989; Block and Skogan 1986; Brecklin and Ullman 2001; Clay-Warner 2002; Kleck and Sayles 1990; Martin and Bachman 1998; Ruback and Ivie 1988; Ullman 1998; Ullman and Knight 1992).

Bivariate (Bart and O'Brien 1985; Block 1989; Fisher et al. 1999; Ruback and Ivie 1988; Ullman 1998; Ulman and Knight 1991) and multivariate (Block and Skogan 1986; Brecklin and Ullman 2001; Clay-Warner 2002; Kleck and Sayles 1990; Martin and Bachman 1998) analyses of victim samples demonstrated that physical resistance was associated with an attempted incident. Victims successfully prevented a completed rape
in more than 50 percent of rape incidents using physical protective actions (Block 1989; Clay-Warner 2002). While earlier studies reported a higher risk of injury or death associated with physical resistance (Bart 1981), later works revealed that injury most likely preceded resistance (Ullman and Knight 1992).

Non-forceful verbal as a distinction has not been studied extensively in the literature. A majority of studies combined the categories of non-forceful and forceful verbal resistance. Forceful verbal resistance, such as yelling or screaming has been associated with less completed incidents (Bart and O’Brien 1985; Ullman 1998; Ullman and Knight 1992), while non-forceful verbal, such as pleading, begging and reasoning was related to more severe sexual abuse or completed incidents (Bart and O’Brien 1985; Clay-Warner 2002; Ullman and Knight 1992).

Not all studies reached the same conclusion. Although acknowledging that physical resistance was associated with reduced completed incidents at the bivariate (Block 1989) and multivariate level (Block and Skogan 1986; Lizotte 1986), it was found to be less effective than other methods such as verbal resistance. This may be the case for several reasons. First, the studies offering divergent results all used NCS data from similar time frames (e.g., Block, and Block and Skogan used data from 1973 to 1979 and Lizotte used data from 1972 to 1975). Therefore, these particular studies may be capturing an anomaly that other works are not. Second, Block (1989) and Block and Skogan’s (1986) data sets were limited to stranger incidents (Lizotte does not provide information on victim offender relationship). Finally, some studies (Block 1989; Block and Skogan 1986) measured nonforceful resistance against forceful verbal or no resistance. Thus, their measures combined the categories of forceful verbal and non-
forceful verbal together, which was not the case in other studies. This coding resulted in less completed incidents (Block 1989; Block and Skogan 1986).

When Clay-Wamer (2002) limited the sample to only those using at least one form of self-protective behavior, physical resistance again was predictive of reduced completed incidents and non-forceful verbal was predictive of increased completed incidents, net of demographic and situational variables. Interaction effects were tested between physical resistance, bystander presence, location of the incident, the victim offender relationship and offender substance use, revealing that the predictive power of physical resistance did not vary across situations. Additionally, research determined correlations between the types of resistance strategies. For example, studies stated that the use of forceful verbal resistance was associated with the use of non-forceful verbal resistance (Clay-Wamer 2002), and that forceful verbal was also associated with physical resistance (Clay-Wamer 2002; Ruback and Ivie 1989).

The use of resistance strategy by type of rapist was contradictory in the literature. Ruback and Ivie (1988) associated physical resistance with known offenders due to the increased likelihood of stranger incidents to involve weapons. Conversely, a significant correlation was discovered between the use of non-forceful verbal techniques and the victim knowing her attacker (Clay-Wamer 2002). Clay-Wamer (2003) also reported a negative correlation between physical resistance and a known offender, which was strengthened via regression to demonstrate that victims were two-thirds as likely to use verbal resistance over physical resistance in such circumstances (Clay-Wamer 2003). This discrepancy may be reflective of different samples, as the Ruback and Ivie (1988)
study surveyed victims who visited a rape crisis center, while the Clay-Warner (2002; 2003) studies used NCVS data.

While resistance was a common cause for non-completed incidents, it was not the sole distinction. Victims may not resist yet were not raped (Block 1989) and occasionally victims did resist yet were still raped (Clay-Warner 2002). Independent of motivation, offenders may not have the skills necessary to complete the crimes, as described in robbery (Katz 1988) or homicide (Fritzon and Ridgway 2001). Surveys of convicted rapists demonstrate the fear of being caught or the disjuncture between the rape fantasy and reality may contribute to erectile dysfunction or lack of interest in completing the rape (Vogelman 1990).

Whereas these factors may be important, the focus of this study is on measures of guardianship which are not represented by offender skills or capabilities. Therefore, an additional factor that may affect the chances of a completed rape was the presence of other people. Victim surveys estimated approximately 66 percent of violent crimes (assault, robbery and rape) occurred in the presence of bystanders between the years 1993 to 1999 (Planty 2002). The NCVS defined third parties to include “eyewitnesses, bystanders, instigators, interlopers, other household members and police officers” (Planty 2002, 3). The presence of others may contribute to lowered victim feelings of “helplessness, insecurity and vulnerability” (Fattah 1984, 86).

Results have been mixed regarding the presence of bystanders and rape outcomes. Trend estimations from the NCVS demonstrated more than 40 percent of the time, bystanders did nothing to help or hinder the situation. In 36 percent of incidents, victims stated others helped the situation in some way, either by becoming involved or causing a
distraction so the victim could escape (Planty 2002). The presence of others alone may be enough to prevent completion, as Clay-Warner (2002) demonstrated that bystanders were predictive of attempted incidents at the multivariate level.

Other Contextual Factors and Outcomes of Rape

The literature described a number of contextual factors also associated with the outcomes of rape incidents. These factors were offender-victim relationship, location, time, offender alcohol/substance use, and the presence of weapon. One of the most important contextual factors may be the relationship between the victim and offender. Relationships were frequently categorized as well known (intimate, other relative, friends), casual acquaintances and strangers. Information from the 1994 NCVS revealed that individuals were most likely to experience sexual victimization by a well-known offender (35.0 percent), followed by strangers (29.4 percent) and casual acquaintances (22.5 percent), the only violent crime type for which this held true (USDOJ 1997). In addition, victims were more likely to suffer completed rape incidents at the hands of known versus unknown offenders in both bivariate (Bart and O’Brien 1985) and multivariate (Brecklin and Ullman 2001; Martin and Bachman 1998) analysis. This relationship exerted effects on various other aspects of the incident, such as propensity of stranger weapon use and the location of the incident (Miethe and McCorkle 2001).

Previous studies illustrated that rape was more likely to be completed in a private location than in a public location (Bart and O’Brien 1985; Brecklin and Ullman 2001; Lizotte 1986). Outdoor locations may provide an increased likelihood for witnesses to be involved or greater chance for the victim to escape (Bart and O’Brien 1985).
Additionally, prior works argued that women were more likely to be attacked by a stranger if the incident occurs outdoors (Ruback and Ivie 1988; Ullman 1997; Ullman and Knight 1991).

Time of day was also related to rape outcome. Approximately two thirds of sexual victimizations occurred between the hours of 6pm and 6am (Greenfeld 1997). Additionally, incidents occurring at night were more likely to result in a completed rape incident than in an attempt (Bart and O’Brien 1985; Brecklin and Ullman 2001). The literature offered a number of explanations for this, possibly due to the reduced likelihood of bystanders or the increased probability of a weapon at night (Ullman 1997).

Alcohol or substance use by the offender was frequently present in rape incidents. Forty five percent of state inmates imprisoned for rape or sexual assault offenses admitted to using drugs or alcohol at the time of the incident (Mumola 1999). Similarly, NCVS data for 1994 demonstrated victims believed the offender to be under the influence of drugs or alcohol 48 percent of the time (USDOJ 1997). Offender drug or alcohol use was associated with more attempted rape incidents (Brecklin and Ullman 2001; Martin and Bachman 1998). Alcohol or substance use at certain levels may affect offender motor skills or heighten victim belief that she can resist (Clay-Wamer 2003). Victims facing offenders under the influence were more likely to be injured (Martin and Bachman 1998) and more likely to use physical resistance in response to the attack (Clay-Wamer 2003).

Studies also found that while a majority of incidents did not involve weapon use, the presence of a weapon by the offender was strongly related to a completed outcome at the bivariate (Bart and O’Brien 1985; Brecklin and Ullman 2001; Clay-Wamer 2002;
Fisher et al. 1999) and multivariate levels (Kleck and Sayles 1990; Lizotte 1986). The NCVS measures the use of firearms, knives, sharp objects, blunt objects or other weapons (USDOJ 2003). Weapons were reported in only 11 percent of rape incidents in 2003, with knives as the most frequently reported choice (Catalano 2004). A stranger rapist (versus a known offender) was more likely to carry a weapon (Bruback and Ivie 1988; Ullman 1997) as interactions with strangers placed offenders "suddenly and intimately into a subjective world that he does not know well" and cannot assume the outcome of (Katz 1988, 186).

Routine Activities and Sexual Victimization

Several studies applied the routine activities theory to rape incidents (Fisher et al. 1999; Mustaine and Tewksbury 2000; Schwartz, Dekeserdy, Tait and Alvi 2001; Schwartz and Pitts 1995). In the following, a brief review of each of these major studies is provided.

Schwartz and Pitts (1995) hypothesized that females who drank alcohol regularly and those who were friends with males supportive of using alcohol to gain sexual consent from females constituted suitable targets for sexual victimization. It was believed that females drinking alcohol regularly would be in contact with males (motivated offenders) who victimized vulnerable females (suitable targets). Additionally, having male peers who support sexually coercive behaviors would increase female victimization through proximity (to motivated offenders) and lack of guardianship (peers being unmotivated to protect against victimization). Additionally, Schwartz and Pitts (1995, 10) believed that college campuses were criminal "places" where supervision (formal guardianship) is
minimal. The hypotheses offered by Schwartz and Pitts (1995) demonstrate their belief that college campuses were overrepresented by acquaintance rape incidents, most likely date rape more specifically.

Female college students \((n=253)\) were asked questions regarding their alcohol consumption and their male friendships. Respondents were asked to describe male friends that supported abusive behavior, but to exclude male friends that they had been victimized by. The Koss (1988) Sexual Experience Survey was used to determine exposure to a range of non-consensual sexual behaviors, from pressured unwanted sex acts to unwanted sex due to force. Nearly half of the sample had experienced some type of coerced sexual experience and close to one third admitted a rape or attempted rape situation. Schwartz and Pitts (1995) divided respondents into those who had been victims of a rape/attempted rape (labeled rape victims), and those who had been victims of a coerced sexual experience/no victimization (labeled non-victims), creating the dependent variable.

Bivariate analysis confirmed that rape victims went out for social drinking more often and on those occasions, consumed more alcohol than non-victims. Although this finding was representative of the first hypothesis, readers were cautioned against assumed causality. Further testing was needed to determine if women were victimized because they drank more, or they drank more because they were victimized. Women who had been sexually victimized were more likely to have friends that were supportive of female victimization. Additional examination confirmed that women who reported being victimized while drunk or high were much more likely to be friends with males who victimized women while drunk or high.
Multiple regression analyses revealed that victims’ lifestyles were indicative of higher risks of sexual victimization. Schwartz and Pitts (1995) interpreted these findings as supportive of the routine activities theory, as women who engage in these behaviors may be defined as suitable targets by male perpetrators of sexual aggression. The types of activities that females engaged in placed them at increased risk for a particular type of sexual victimization, mainly date rape.

Fisher et al. (1999) collected survey data on 4,446 nationally representative college women using random telephone dialing. Research questions focused on the extent, nature, risk factors and reactions to sexual victimization. Critical of previous limited definitions of sexual victimizations, Fisher et al. (1999) expanded the definitions of sexual victimization to include a range of behaviors, from sexist remarks and obscene phone calls to attempted and completed rape.

Fisher et al. (1999) utilized measures of lifestyle victimization factors to determine college females’ risk of sexual victimization. Using both individual and institutional level measures of exposure to crime, proximity to offenders, risk factors, and guardianship, it was hypothesized that respondents engaging in risky lifestyle behaviors were more likely to be victimized. As consistent with previous researchers, Fisher et al. (1999) believed that these lifestyle behaviors were more apt to place victims in proximity to offenders while lacking guardianship.

In particular, social activities such as going out at night, consuming alcohol, attending fraternity/sorority, or dorm social activities heightened the risks for young women. Additionally, Fisher et al. (1999) were interested in roommates as a proxy measure for guardianship, while recognizing that this person may also be a potential
offender. Communal living situations, such as dormitories, were likely to increase the risk of victimization as females were in close proximity to potential offenders. Institutional level measures included the crime rates on campus, the number of enrolled males, percent of full time students and the number of fraternities registered on campus.

Results showed that 1.7 percent of the sample had experienced a completed rape, while 1.1 percent had experienced an attempted rape incident \((n=157)\). Ninety percent of attempted and completed rape incidents involved an offender known to the victim. Additionally, two thirds of rapes occurred on campus or campus related activities such as going to parties or visiting classmates in dormitories. A majority of rapes occurred in or near living quarters as opposed to outdoor locations and most occurred after midnight.

Several victimization models were evaluated; those relevant to the current study will be discussed. In particular, a model of general sexual assault victimization risk was determined by including all measures of sexual victimization. Lifestyles associated with increased victimization risks included visiting places with men and alcohol, by drinking alcohol to get drunk, by living alone, and by not being married. For attempted and completed rape incidents, visiting places with men and drinking alcohol to get drunk were associated with increased risk. Interpretations followed Schwartz and Pitts (1995) – that is, females who engaged in these behaviors were more likely to be considered suitable targets by male offenders, providing moderate explanatory value from the routine activities theory perspective.

Schwartz et al. (2001) surveyed Canadian college students about sexual victimization \((N=3,142)\). Critical of previous assumptions of offender motivation, Schwartz et al. (2001) included male respondents to represent offender
motivations. Higher victimization was hypothesized for females who drank often, used drugs with dating partners and men were hypothesized to report committing abusive behaviors if they had friends who supported this type of activity.

Using Koss's (1988) Sexual Experiences Survey, a dichotomous dependent variable was constructed measuring female experience with force and male use of force. This variable was tested across four categories of victimization: rape, attempted rape, sex with coercion and no victimization. For females, alcohol and drug use were treated as proxy measures of target attractiveness. For males, offender motivation was measured through the use of alcohol or drugs and extent of male peer support (being friends with others who were supportive of violence). Similarly, measures of male peer support were representative of reduced guardianship. Males were not deterred from engaging in sexually coercive behavior from informal (i.e. peers) or formal (i.e. school administrators) social control. Additionally, males who supported this type of coercive behavior would not provide female guardianship against sexual victimization. Therefore, the overall atmosphere on college campuses was one in which the level of guardianship was perceived to be low. Nineteen percent of females in the sample reported being raped and 8.5 percent of the sample reported an attempted rape. For men, 5.6 percent of males reported raping a female victim and 2.8 percent of males acknowledged an attempted incident.

Overall, Schwartz et al. (2001) argued that the routine activities concepts were predictive of increased sexual victimization. As with previous studies, correlations were found between female alcohol use and victimization, although it was cautioned this was not indicative of a causal relationship. The measures associated with alcohol use
appeared to provide corroboration for encouraging motivation in offenders and creating suitable targets of the females. Thus, females were perceived to be less likely to protect themselves against a forced sexual act. The relationship between increased male alcohol use and propensity to use force was less clear, but the two were significantly correlated. Therefore, those males who reported using alcohol four or more times a week were very likely to report using force to obtain sexual consent.

The use of drugs with dating partners was not found to be statistically significant on the outcome. Receiving advice to be physically violent with females exhibited the strongest single variable relationship on the outcome of force by males. The combined power of drinking more than two times per week, and male peer support for emotional and physical violence increased the odds that a male would perpetrate a forced sexual incident by 9.6 times.

Mustaine and Tewksbury (2002) expanded upon Schwartz and Pitts’ (1995) study through increased lifestyle measures, a larger sample size and a more comprehensive definition of sexual assault. Using the routine activities theory as a conceptual framework, lifestyle variables were tested for their relation to sexual assault victimization risk. The dependent variable was based upon Fiebert and Tucci’s (1998) sexual assault scale. Twelve questions, ranging from being pressured into a date to rape with physical force, determined the extent of exposure females to such actions. The sample was divided into those who answered positively to any of the twelve questions \( (n=177) \) and those who answered positively to those questions measuring serious sexual assault (use of threats or force, \( n=73 \)), creating the dependent variable of experiencing general or serious sexual assault.
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Expanded lifestyle constructs measured factors associated with increased proximity to offenders. Mustaine and Tewksbury (2002) formulated questions about high school experiences (exposure and proximity to offenders), measures of lifestyle (target attractiveness), attendance at school related activities (exposure to offenders), leisure activities (exposure), drinking and drug use (proximity and suitable targets), and guardianship behaviors consisting of the possession of protective devices (body alarm, gun, knife, bat, club, cell phone). Results modestly supported the routine activities theory.

Victims of general sexual assault were more likely to be members of groups or clubs, use drugs, to go out at night and spent time with friends “doing nothing.” For serious sexual assault, victims were likely to belong to a group or club, to go out at night, and use drugs in public. These females were more likely to be exposed to potential offenders in places or situations that were conducive to victimization. As an example, it was clarified that not all females going out at night were significantly at risk for sexual assault. Females who went to the movies were less likely to report either general or serious sexual assault. These females were believed to be exposed to fewer offenders - the types of males spending time at the movies were different than the types of males spending time at bars or parties.

Mustaine and Tewksbury (2002) concluded the measures of self-protective behaviors, demographics, lifestyle status and alcohol-related behaviors were not significantly related to increased victimization risk. Several explanations for these findings arose, stating that the more conclusive use of variable measures created the drop in statistical significance. Mustaine and Tewksbury (2002) explained that as lifestyle risk
measures are introduced into models, the significance of demographic variables generally drops. It was argued that the increased specification of female behaviors thus negated the effects of such “status” variables (Mustaine and Tewksbury 2002, 113). Additionally, it was argued that the insignificance of guardianship behaviors may be reflective of the sample; a majority of the incidents involved someone the victim knew and she may have been unprepared to use such behaviors.

In summary, the previous applications of the routine activities theory to rape have provided some insight into the risks of female sexual victimization. Studies illustrated that females are likely to be at risk for victimization based upon choices made regarding social outings, friends and use of alcohol. While these studies have been useful in extending the routine activities theory to sexual victimizations, there are several limitations with prior works. The major limitation was the focus on risk factors for target suitability and offender motivation while neglecting to analyze guardianship specifically.

Other limitations include sampling issues. For example, all works used samples of college women, the age group most likely to be sexually victimized (Hall 1995). The routine activities theory benefits from the study of “specific subpopulations” within “specified domains of activity” (Mustaine and Tewksbury 1999, 47), yet these women and incidents may not be representative of victims and incidents as a whole. As a result, this has limited the generalizability of such studies. The use of a college sample affects the outcomes in a number of ways, such as distorting the types of offenders and the types of incidents experienced.

Additionally, women not in this age group may be less likely to engage in the types of behaviors used as proxy measures of target suitability. It cannot be assumed that
older or younger victims would be more likely to associate with men supportive of using alcohol to coerce women into sexual behavior. These measures would likely be absent or greatly reduced in general populations of females, making them unsuitable targets. The current study will focus not on what makes these women suitable targets, but the effectiveness of several guardianship measures.

Finally, measures of guardianship in previous studies have been slight at best. As Fisher et al. (1999) state, the use of roommates as proxy measures of guardianship may be a poor construct as they may represent offenders themselves. Guardianship has been assumed mostly through where victims spend their time and who they spend their time with. Thus, while the routine activities theory appears to modestly explain sexual victimization, it is evident there is room for improvement.

Research Questions

Following previous literature, this study will attempt to understand female sexual victimization utilizing the routine activities theory and in particular the types of guardianship indicators appropriate to this specific crime type. A review of the literature explained the various ways in which the three elements in the routine activities theory operate in order to facilitate victimization. For example, it is apparent that victimization risk varies across not only demographic groups, but also across groupings of crime types or offender types. As Maxfield (1987) demonstrated, it is not enough to understand the victimization likelihood of groups; other contextual information such as who they were being victimized by and where the victimization occurred was important.
This idea was furthered by the work of Miethe and Meier (1994), who determined that assessments of risk were more dynamic than previously believed. Spending time in risky places or engaging in risky behaviors was not the sole predictor of violent victimization, but was likely "more dependent upon the specific interpersonal and situational dynamics in a particular social setting than on simple physical exposure to a risky situation." (Miethe et al. 1987, 186) The fact that females are generally more at risk to be victimized by someone they know in a private residence (often theirs) may be representative of this. Therefore, if violent victimization risk is more dependent upon situational and contextual elements than assessments of risky behaviors, this study argues that measures of guardianship may be contingent upon knowledge of such contextual information.

Using what is known about the nature and outcome of rape incidents creates a template for how to apply the routine activities concepts to this particular crime type for analysis. In order to obtain more generalizable results, this study will use a longitudinal nationally representative sample of women. This study uses attempted and completed rape incidents as the dependent variable. As previous studies have done, this research does not test the routine activities theory as a whole. Instead, it is interested in one particular aspect, that of guardianship indicators. By limiting the sample to those individuals who were victimized, offender motivation and target suitability will be assumed. This study does not attempt to explain why offenders commit rape incidents; it is interested in assessing the outcome once a suitable target has been selected.

Previous studies of routine activities created measures of guardianship such as living with roommates (Fisher et al. 1998; Fisher et al. 1999), attending crime prevention
training (Fisher et al. 1999), male attitudinal beliefs about victimizing women (Schwartz et al. 2001) or the presence (not use) of self protective devices (Mustaine and Tewksbury 2002). A majority of guardianship measures involve other people. For example, it was argued that the presence of third parties or bystanders in rape incidents was predictive of reduced completed incidents across a variety of contexts (Clay-Wamer 2002). Therefore, the presence of bystanders should be representative of capable guardianship in rape incidents, even when controlling for known contextual associations.

Next, the literature demonstrated that victim resistance does have an effect on the outcome of rape incidents. More specifically, different types of resistance appear to vary in direction and magnitude of impact upon the outcome. Therefore, the current research is interested in a more specific assessment of which resistance strategies are representative of guardianship. Instead of a single measure of whether or not the victim resisted, three measures such as the presence of physical resistance, the presence of forceful verbal resistance and the presence of non-forceful verbal resistance will be used as indicators of guardianship.

Based upon previous literature, the presence of physical and forceful verbal self protective behaviors should be representative of capable guardians in rape incidents, net of known controls. On the other hand, as non-forceful verbal techniques appear associated with completed incidents, it is important to include this as a separate measure of guardianship instead of combining it with other forms of verbal resistance as some studies have done. Its statistically significant difference in direction from other forms of resistance argues that this type of resistance should not be considered a measure of capable guardianship in rape incidents.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Chapter 3 addresses the methodology in data collection and analysis. It focuses on major characteristics of the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) with regard to its sample selection, crime definition, response rate, and methodological limitations. Strategies of sample selection for this study are discussed, followed by discussions of major dependent and independent variables. As a project involving secondary data analysis, this research received approval from the Institutional Review Board at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

National Crime Victimization Survey

To address the research questions, this study uses data from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). The United States Department of Justice initiated the collection of crime victimization data in 1973 to augment the Uniform Crime Reports coverage of reported crimes (USDOJ 2003). Prior to 1992, the NCVS was known as the National Crime Survey (NCS). Data for the NCVS is collected by the United States Census and managed by the United States Bureau of Justice Statistics. The purpose of the NCVS is fourfold: to provide detailed information about victimization, to estimate the number of non-reported crimes, to provide consistent measures of crime types and to compare crime trends over time (National Archive of Criminal Justice Data 2004b).
Based on current practices, the NCVS collects data from approximately 42,000 households and roughly 75,000 individuals each year (NACJD 2004b). The target population is non-institutionalized household members who are at least twelve years old, including those individuals living in group dwellings such as dormitories. Excluded from the population are military personnel living on base, vessel crew members, institutionalized persons (e.g. inmates in correctional facility, persons living in mental institutions), U.S. citizens living abroad and foreign visitors to the country (USDOJ 2004c).

A national stratified multistage cluster sample of households is utilized in the sampling method. Primary sampling units (PSUs) are isolated from the Census, composed of counties or large metropolitan areas. The PSUs are then classified into self-representing clusters (SR) and non-self-representing (NSR) PSUs. All SR PSUs and a subset of NSR's are included in the sampling frame. In 1990, the sampling design included 93 SR PSUs and 152 NSR. In 1996, the sampling frame reduced the number of NSR's from 152 to 110 (USDOJ 2004c).

In stage two, selected sampling units are quartered into overlapping frames. Clusters of four housing units (or housing unit equivalents) are selected from each frame based upon Census address information and building permit data to include new construction (USDOJ 2004c). The sample is then subdivided into six sections (rotations), with household interviews conducted bi-annually for a three year period. Initial household contact establishes the bounded interview, which assists in the creation of a time frame and limits the amount of duplicate information. Rotation groups are further subdivided into six panels, with one panel being interviewed per month. Rotation groups
enter the sample every six months to replace a group that has completed a three year phase in the sample (USDOJ 2004c).

The response rate for NCVS has been considerably high. In 1992, approximately 60,500 households and 52,100 persons were interviewed, with a 96 percent response rate for eligible individuals (USDOJ 1993). For the 2003 NCVS, an estimated 83,660 households and 149,040 individuals were interviewed, with a response rate of 92 percent for households and 86 percent of eligible persons (USDOJ 2004c).

The interviewing proceeds in two ways. Individuals are contacted in person at their residence for the first interview. Respondents are self interviewed, with the exception of proxy interviews for young respondents (upon insistence of household members), incapacitated respondents and those absent from the household for the duration of the interviewing period. Other household members may generally serve as proxy respondents in the above mentioned exceptions. The alternative method of collecting interview information is Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI), in which the computer dials the selected telephone number. CATI prompts interviewers with the correct series of questions and allows for simultaneous response entry directly into a computer database (Babbie 1990). Due to the sensitivity of the questions and to reduce the prohibitive costs of in-person interviewing, interviews are conducted utilizing CATI whenever possible, with the exception of the first interview (USDOJ 2004c).

Screening questions are utilized to determine if individuals have been the victim of a violent or property crime, including attempts, during the last six month period prior to the first day of the current month (NACJD 2004b). Violent victimizations include rape, robbery, assault and burglary. Property crimes include larceny and motor vehicle
theft. Supplemental information gathered includes questions about incident characteristics (e.g., temporal, location, victim self protective actions), offender characteristics (e.g., victim offender relationship, demographics, offender use of weapons or substances) and outcomes (e.g., loss through injury or property lost, whether crime was reported and reasons). Respondent demographic measures (e.g., age, race, gender, marital status, household income) are also included (NACJD 2004b).

Quarterly data sets comprise annual estimations of victimization. Two major issues may convolute the accuracy of these estimates — sampling error and non-sampling error (USDOJ 2004c). Any subset of the population suffers from sampling error, meaning the sample selected fails to provide an accurate representation of the larger population. Additionally, the survey is unable to capture incidents where victims are homeless or living in some other type of non-Census structure, such as institutions or hotels, contributing to the total sampling error (USDOJ 2003).

Non-sampling error is introduced via researchers or interview subjects. Major sources of non-sampling error are recall error (being unable or unwilling to divulge information, or being unable to remember the correct time frame) and misclassification (errors in determining what constitutes a criminal event). For instance, the NCVS questions are based upon six month time frames, creating the possibility for respondents to inaccurately recall when incidents occurred. Additionally, it was believed that the NCVS previously underestimated incidents in which the victim and offender have a known relationship, such as relatives, friends or acquaintances. This could cause non-sampling error if respondents are unwilling to disclose certain categories of victimizations (USDOJ 1994).
Since the inception of the NCVS, efforts have focused on increasing the accuracy of measurement through a collaborative effort of policymakers, researchers, victim advocates, and statisticians. Major redesign efforts focused on accurately presenting domestic violence and sexual assaults. In addition to cue questions to help respondents better recall incidents, the redesign included more precise recall questions on sexual victimizations and known-offender victimizations (USDOJ 1994).

For example, individuals are now asked how did the offender attack you along with how did the offender try and attack you? More specific prompts are given, such as verbal threat of rape; unwanted sexual contact with (or without) force, such as fondling, grabbing, etc; forced or coerced sexual intercourse or a forced attempt to have sexual intercourse are given. Verbal threat of rape is selected if the offender was face-to-face with the respondent and verbally threatened to rape her. The response of unwanted sexual contact either with or without force prompts the interviewer to ask if this included fondling, grabbing, etc. Force is defined as grabbing, pushing restraining or other acts of force. If respondents state that they were raped or an attempt to rape was made, the interviewer asks do you mean forced or coerced sexual intercourse?

The purpose of the structured response is to distinguish between rape and other types of sexual victimization. To clarify the definition of rape, respondents are told that force includes both psychological coercion as well as physical force. Forced sexual intercourse means vaginal, anal, or oral penetration by the offender(s). The penetration can also be by a foreign object, such as a bottle. In a final effort to uncover victimization, interviewers later state incidents involving forced or unwanted sexual acts are often difficult to talk about. Other than incidents already mentioned, have you been
forced or coerced to engage in unwanted sexual activity by someone you didn’t know before, a casual acquaintance or someone you know well? This question is included to prompt respondents that victimizations are not limited to stranger incidents (USDOJ 2003).

To protect victim privacy from eavesdropping by other household members, the survey specifically designed questions that could be answered with a yes or no. Issues were addressed in multiple questions to allow numerous opportunities for victims to relate sensitive information (USDOJ 1994). Additionally, the redesign included several measures of direct interest to the current study, such as the presence of bystanders, victim self-protective behaviors and substance use by the offender (USDOJ 1994).

The redesigned survey was introduced in 1992 to the NCVS sample. For years 1992-1993, the sample was randomly divided into two halves, with one half receiving the original version and the other receiving the post-redesign version. The phasing in of the redesigned survey was intended to allow for the continuation of trend data, as well as creating the opportunity to compare victimization estimates between the two methods (Kinderman, Lynch and Cantor 1997). A majority of victimization rates increased, such as violent crimes by 49 percent, rapes by 157 percent and assaults by 57 percent in the two year time frame (Kinderman et al. 1997). More specifically, the redesign effort increased counts in known offender and attempted crimes, which could be attributed to both the redesign of the questions and the increased use of CATI.

Despite the efforts made in enhancing the reliability and validity of NCVS survey results, problems inherent to victimization may lead to inaccuracies. First, there is no guarantee that victims will be more likely to report incidents to survey workers versus
law enforcement or clinic workers. Additionally, although the NCVS collects more information than data sources such as the UCR, there is no guarantee that the information provided is accurate (Schwartz 2000). Victims are asked to recall incredible amounts of detail about individuals and situations, a task in itself. When coupled with the fear or trauma associated with the incident, victims may not estimate accurately such information as offender age or alcohol use. Conversely, respondents may exaggerate aspects of the event. The terminology used by survey workers may be inconsistent with how the respondent categorizes events (i.e., discrepancies between retaliation and self-protection), increasing the chance of missed data (Schwartz 2000, 817). Although the NCVS suffers from flaws, it provides insight into an area unable to be captured from official statistics such as the UCR.

Samples and Strategies of Sample Selection

The data selected for this study included rape incidents reported in NCVS (USDOJ 2004b). Access to the NCVS data was available via the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data. The NACJD was created in 1978 under the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, a clearinghouse for data covering a range of subjects. NACJD goals are to facilitate research on relevant criminal justice topics through access to data files and an online data base of citations using the data files (NACJD 2004a).

The time frame selected for this study was from 1992 to 2003, due to its accessibility via NACJD. Although the years 1992-1993 contained both the old and redesigned survey, prior researchers have utilized similar time frames without
confounding the results (See Brecklin and Ullman 2001; Martin and Bachman 1998). NCVS reported a total of 787 rape incidents during 1992-2003, of which 90 percent were female victims. Prior researchers have limited samples of rape victims to female victims of single offender, heterosexually perpetrated incidents because it is believed that other rape victims (male victims, multiple offenders, etc.) are qualitatively different (Brecklin and Ullman 2001). Following prior research, the sample selected for this study includes only female victims of single offender perpetrated rape reported in the NCVS during the selected time frame. As a result, the sample was limited to a total of 682 rape incidents in this study. In addition, cases with missing data were listwise deleted from the sample to provide consistency over analyses. Thus, the resulting sample consisted of 638 incidents.

Variables

In the following section, major dependent and independent variables and their respective codes are described (See table 1).

**Dependent Variable**

The outcome of the rape incident is the dependent variable for this inquiry. The outcome variable is a dummy variable with completed rape coded 1 and attempted rape coded 0. The NCVS posed a variety of questions on various criminal victimizations, including rape. Respondents, after acknowledging a victimization, were asked to answer the question, *How were you attacked?* Two response categories, *attacked, raped* (coded 1) and *attacked, tried to rape* (coded 0), are used in the analysis.
Independent Variables

Guardianship, operationalized in four terms of "bystanders," "physical," "forceful verbal" and "non-forceful verbal," serves as the major independent variables in the current study. The four independent variables are not mutually exclusive; therefore a respondent could have reported using more than one resistance strategy in addition to others being present at the time of the incident.

The first variable is the presence of others (bystanders) as used by previous researchers to determine personal guardianship (LaVigne 1997; Roman 2003). Respondents are asked Was anyone else present during the incident besides you and the offender (other than children under 12)? This variable was dummy-coded so that the presence of others was represented by 1 and the absence of others was coded as 0. From previous research (Clay-Warner 2002; Planty 2002), it is estimated that the presence of bystanders will result in less completed incidents. Eight incidents reported missing data on this variable, which were dropped from the final analysis.

The use of self protective actions by victims was determined by the question Was there anything you did or tried to do about the incident while it was going on? Victims responded either yes or no to this question. The next set of questions determined what type of behavior or action was taken by the victim. The use of physical resistance by the victim was assessed from her responses to a set of questions regarding physical actions. "Physical" is a composite variable, collapsing the original responses of attacked offender with gun, fired gun, attacked with other weapon, attacked without weapon (hit, kicked, etc.), threatened offender with gun, threatened offender with other weapon, threatened to injure, no weapon, defended self or property (struggled, ducked, blocked blows, held on
to property), chased, tried to catch or hold offender, and ran or drove away, or tried; hid, locked door into one variable. If the answer was yes to any one of these questions, the case was coded as 1; if the answer was no to all of the questions, the case was coded as 0. Following previous research, it is estimated that this variable may be associated with attempted incidents (Bart and O’Brien 1985; Block 1989; Clay-Warner 2002; Fisher et al. 1999; Kleck and Sayles 1990; Rubeck and Ivie 1988; Ullman 1998; Ullman and Knight 1991).

The variable “forceful verbal” captured incidents in which the victim used a verbal self-protective tactic. The original questions of yelled at offender, turned on lights, threatened to call police, got help or gave alarm, tried to attract attention or help, warn others (cried out for help, called children inside), and screamed from pain or fear were included as measures of forceful verbal resistance. If the answer was yes to any one of these questions, the case was coded as 1; if the answer was no to all of the questions, the case was coded as 0. Although the literature exhibited some inconsistency in effectiveness (see Clay-Warner 2002), this variable is expected to be associated with attempted incidents (Bart and O’Brien 1985; Ullman and Knight 1992).

Finally, the variable “non-forceful verbal” included incidents in which the victim employed a less aggressive verbal resistance approach. This composite measure incorporated cooperated, or pretended to (stalled, did what they asked), and argued, reasoned, pleaded, bargained, etc. If the answer was yes to any one of these questions, the case was coded as 1; if the answer was no to all of the questions, the case was coded as 0. It is estimated that this variable may be associated with completed incidents (Bart and O’Brien 1985; Clay-Warner 2002; Ullman and Knight 1992).
In addition to these major independent variables, several contextual variables that may be correlated with the outcome of rape are included in the analysis as controls. As found in prior studies, known offender incidents tend to be associated with more completed incidents (Bart and O'Brien 1985; Brecklin and Ullman 2001). This variable is included in the analysis measured by the question *Was the offender someone you knew or a stranger that you had never seen before?* Responses of “don’t know/residue” \((n=10)\) were coded as system missing and deleted from the final sample.

Previous studies found that incidents occurring in a private location are more likely to be associated with completed incidents (Bart and O'Brien 1985; Brecklin and Ullman 2001; Lizotte 1986). The location of incident was determined with the question *Where did this incident happen?* Victim responses were collapsed into two categories, (1) private: victimizations that occurred in or near the victim’s own residence or the residence of a friend or relative; (2) public: victimizations that occurred either outdoors, commercial location, or any other public place. The variable “location” was dummy-coded with 1 representing the incident occurring in a private location.

The literature has demonstrated that a majority of incidents occur at night (BJS 2002), and that these incidents are more likely to result in a completed rape (Bart and O'Brien 1985; Brecklin and Ullman 2001). A variable tapping the time of the incident was calculated by asking the following question: *About what time did this incident happen,* with possible responses as during the day (from 6am to 6pm, including don’t know what time during day), at night (from 6pm to 6am, including don’t know what time during night) and don’t know what time.
In 1999, the NCVS changed the category responses of this question in order to create smaller time frames. In order to determine the time for the entire sample, two variables were utilized (V4021 and V4021B). Respondents after 1999 were coded as “out of universe” on the first variable, and respondents from 1992-1998 were coded as “out of universe” on the second variable. The variable was subsequently combined into one by assessing responses on both variables. The variable “night” is dummy coded with 0 representing “day”, 1 representing “night”. Incidents with missing data (n=8) were deleted from the final model. It is expected that incidents occurring at night may result in more completed incidents, as according to prior literature (Bart and O’Brien 1985; Brecklin and Ullman 2001).

Prior literature has established that drug or alcohol abuse is frequently present in rape incidents and is associated with attempted incidents (Brecklin and Ullman 1991; Martin and Bachman 1998). The variable “substance” measures offender’s use of drugs or alcohol. Based on the answers to the question Was the offender drinking or on drugs, or don’t you know?, the answer no or unknown is coded 0 and yes is coded 1. Seven incidents with missing data on this question were deleted from the final sample. While recognizing inherent problems with victim perceptions with substance use on the part of the offender, it is assumed that the presence of drugs or alcohol may result in less completed attempts.

While only a small percent of rape incidents involved the presence of a weapon, previous studies found that it is associated with more completed incidents (Bart and O’Brien 1985; Brecklin and Ullman 2001; Lizotte 1986). The presence of a weapon by the offender was determined by the following question: Did the offender have a weapon,
such as a gun or knife, or something to use as a weapon, such as a bottle or wrench? For “weapon”, responses were dummy-coded with 1 representing the presence of any weapon.

Several demographic variables were also included in the analysis as statistical controls. The victim’s age is a continuous variable with the lowest possible number being 12. The offender’s age was estimated by the victim as (1) under 12; (2) 12 to 14; (3) 15 to 17; (4) 18 to 20; (5) 21 to 29; (6) 30 and up; or (7) don’t know (n = 27) by NCVS. After deleting cases with missing/don’t know information, it was apparent that this variable was highly skewed towards the older age category. Therefore, this variable was recoded as (1) 12 to 20; (2) 21-29; or (3) 30 and older.

Victim race was determined by asking the respondent if they considered themselves to be White, Black, American Indian or Asian/Pacific Islander. In 2003, the NCVS included a question that allowed respondents to state if they were of mixed racial heritage. Using a composite of three race questions (V3022, V3023, V3023A) it is possible to determine respondent’s race. Those who responded as being more than one race were coded as missing. Two variables were created to measure victim race. One variable, “VicAfAm,” is dummy coded with 1 representing victim being an African American and 0 for all others, with 3 cases as “system missing”, which were deleted from the final sample. The other victim race variable, “Vicwhite,” is also dummy coded with 1 representing victim being white and 0 for all others. As 87 percent of the sample was White, this second race variable was dropped from the study.

An additional race variable is included measuring whether the victim and offender share the same race; if the victim and offender share the same race, the case is coded 1.
If the victim and offender did not share the same race or are unknown, the case is coded as 0. Twelve incidents reported missing data on this variable and were deleted from the final sample.

To address the research questions in this study, a variety of statistical procedures will be utilized including univariate, bivariate, and multivariate analyses. More specifically, frequencies and percentages of incident characteristics will be conducted for all dependent, independent and control variables. The analysis of bivariate correlation (Pearson’s r) will be conducted to assess the strength and direction of the relationship among these variables. Finally, binary logistic multiple regression will be used to determine the main and net effect of these independent variables on the dependent variable.

Logistic regression estimates predictors of the outcome, attempted or completed incidents. Regression is particularly useful in that it separates variable effects. For example, while the sample included victims who used more than one type of protective action, regression statistically tests for each predictor individually. Interpretations rely on exponentiated coefficients [Exp (B)], also known as odds ratios. An odds ratio of one equates no effect on the dependent variable; odds of less than one suggest the odds are less for a completed incident and odds greater than one suggest the odds are greater for a completed incident.
CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter presents results of univariate, bivariate correlations and binary logistic regression analyses. The first section describes the univariate statistics for the major dependent and independent variables. Section two describes the direction and magnitude of the correlations among the variables. Finally, section three presents the results of logistic regression models that predicted rape incident outcome. Interpretations of significant findings are provided.

Description of Sample

The analysis included a total of 638 completed or attempted rape incidents reported in NCVS from 1992 to 2003. This research primarily examines the impact of guardianship variables on the outcome of rape. Table 1 presents frequency and/or mean of the major dependent and independent variables. According to table 1, among the 638 rape incidents, nearly two thirds of the incidents were completed whereas one third were attempted incidents.

Regarding the four guardianship variables, bystanders were present in less than one-fifth of the cases. Just over a quarter of incidents involved no resistance strategies. Two-thirds of the sample used either one or two of the resistance strategies and very few
Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outcome of Rape</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attempted</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 223 (35%)</td>
<td>n = 415 (65%)</td>
<td>N = 638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% or mean</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>% or mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bystanders present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0= No</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= Yes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical resistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0= No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= Yes</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forceful verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0= No</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= Yes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-forceful verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0= No</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known to victim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0= Stranger</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= Known</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0= Public</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= Private</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0= Day</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= Night</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender substance use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0= No</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= Yes</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender weapon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0= No</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= 12-20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2= 21-29</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3= 30+</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0= Other</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= African American</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0= No</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= Yes</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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used all three. Among those who used resistance, a majority used physical resistance. Slightly more than a third of resisting victims used forceful verbal resistance or used non-forceful verbal resistance. As consistent with prior literature, bystanders, physical resistance and forceful verbal resistance were more common in attempted incidents (Bart and O'Brien 1985; Block 1989; Clay-Warner 2002; Fisher et al. 1999; Kleck and Sayles 1990; Rubeck and Ivie 1988; Ullman 1998: Ullman and Knight 1991). Similar to previous findings (Bart and O'Brien 1985; Clay-Warner 2002; Ullman and Knight 1992), non-forceful verbal resistance was more common in completed incidents.

Table 1 also reveals the univariate statistics for distribution of other situational and contextual measures of sexual assault. For example, these data indicate that a substantial majority (75 percent) of the rape incidents involved the following contextual factors: night time hours, private residence, and non-weapons. When weapons were involved, it was most typically a knife. The most common victim offender relationship reported was either a boyfriend or friend. Additionally, more than a third of the sample reported the perpetrator had a right to be where the incident took place and that this was not the first incident this offender had committed against the household.

Some demographic characteristics of the offender and victim were included in the analysis. The mean age of victims in incidents was 27 years old and almost half of the incidents involved offenders that were thirty years or older. Fifteen percent of the incidents involved an African American victim and more than two thirds of incidents involved offenders and victims who shared the same race.
Bivariate Analysis

Bivariate correlation was conducted to determine the nature and magnitude of the relationships between the variables. As revealed in table 2, several variables reached statistical significance in relationship to the dependent variable. Of the four major independent variables, three variables including the presence of bystanders, the use of physical self protection and the use of forceful verbal resistance were inversely related with completed rape incidents. In contrast, the use of non-forceful verbal methods was more likely to be associated with completed rape incidents. Additionally, several of the contextual variables appeared correlated to the outcome variable. Incidents involving known offenders, private locations, and victims and offenders of the same race were associated with completed rape incidents. On the other hand, the perceptions of offender substance use were associated with attempted incidents.

Several significant correlations between the four guardianship variables and other variables were identified. The presence of bystanders was associated with the use of forceful verbal techniques, a known offender, night time incidents and younger victims and offenders. The use of physical self-protective actions was positively correlated with the use of forceful verbal resistance, offender substance use, and younger victims and offenders. The third guardianship variable, use of forceful verbal resistance, was positively correlated with the use of non-forceful verbal resistance. No other variables achieved statistical significance with this variable. The final guardianship variable, non-forceful verbal, was positively correlated with incidents perpetrated by a known offender and with older victims and offenders.
Table 2: Bivariate correlations between outcome, independent, contextual and demographic variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>Capable Guardians</th>
<th>Contextual Variables</th>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcome</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bystand</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Phys</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Force verbal</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Nonforce verbal</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Known</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Locat</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Night</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Offsubs</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Weapon</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Vicage</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Offage</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 VicAf</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Same Race</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05*, *p ≤ 0.01**
Therefore, results appear consistent with prior literature in terms of direction of impact of the independent variables on the dependent variable. The research questions stated that the presence of bystanders, physical resistance and forceful verbal resistance would be associated with attempted incidents. Additionally, the final research question stated that non-forceful verbal resistance would be associated with completed incidents, which is the case. At this point, the research questions appear to be supported in terms of determining which of the measures can be considered capable guardians. In order to control for the effects of the control variables, logistic regression is used.

Predicted Outcomes with Binary Logistic Regression

Results of the binary logistic regression are presented in table 3. Results suggest that several variables are significant predictors of outcomes in rape incidents, net of controls. According to the regression model, the presence of bystanders significantly reduced the probability of completed rape incidents. The odds ratio for incidents involving bystanders was .510, suggesting the reduced likelihood of completed incidents as compared to incidents without bystanders.

A strong predictor of incident outcomes was the presence of physical resistance. The odds ratio for incidents with physical resistance was .195, suggesting a lowered odds of completed incidents as compared to incidents without physical resistance. Similarly, the odds ratio of forceful verbal incidents was .608, suggesting reduced odds of completion as compared to incidents not involving forceful verbal resistance. Conversely, the odds ratio of non-forceful verbal indicates that the odds of a completed rape were nearly twice greater than incidents without non-forceful verbal resistance.
Table 3: Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Odds of Completed Rape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta (SE)</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bystanders present</td>
<td>-0.673**</td>
<td>0.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical resistance</td>
<td>-1.64***</td>
<td>0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forceful verbal resistance</td>
<td>-0.498*</td>
<td>0.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-forceful verbal resistance</td>
<td>0.601**</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known offender</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private residence</td>
<td>0.608**</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender substance use</td>
<td>-0.355</td>
<td>0.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim age</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender age</td>
<td>-0.260</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim African American</td>
<td>-0.246</td>
<td>0.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim-offender same race</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi square</td>
<td>128.101***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 log likelihood</td>
<td>697.666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ p \leq 0.05^*, p \leq 0.01^{**}, p \leq 0.00^{***} \]

Finally, incidents occurring in a private residence exhibited an odds ratio of completion that was close to two times that of incidents in public locations.

Overall, the analyses revealed that the presence of bystanders, physical resistance or forceful verbal resistance are associated with reduced odds of a completed rape.
incident. The presence of non-forceful verbal resistance is associated with increased odds of a completed rape incident. The model appears consistent with previous works, in terms of direction (Brecklin and Ullman 2001; Clay-Wamer 2002; Martin and Bachman 1998). Chi-square statistics demonstrate the model is statistically different from the null model. Thus, overall the model is better at predicting the outcome than when one assumes all variables are zero.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Rape is detrimental to society in a number of ways. It may cause devastating physical and psychological effects for victims such as sexually transmitted diseases, depression, and problems with substance abuse. In addition, as a serious violent crime, it drains the resources and manpower of law enforcement, the courts and the correctional system. Consequently, it would be beneficial to prevent and control this type of crime.

The routine activities theory states that for a criminal event to occur, a motivated offender and suitable target must converge in the absence of capable guardians. Variation in the outcome of rape incidents appears to be associated with whether capable guardians are present or not, as the routine activities theory predicts.

This study examines whether measures of guardianship affect the risks of completed and attempted rape. Guardianship is operationalized with four variables: the presence of bystanders, the use of physical resistance, the use of forceful verbal resistance, and non-forceful verbal resistance. The study addressed the effectiveness of each of the constructs of guardianship and provides policy recommendations based upon findings.
Major Research Findings

This research has yielded the following important findings. First, research question one predicted that the presence of bystanders would be related to a decrease in completed rape outcomes. Clearly, both the bivariate and regression analyses confirmed that the presence of bystanders was associated with the decreased odds of completed rape incidents. Logistic regression analysis also reveals that controlling for contextual, demographic associations, and other guardianship variables, the presence of bystanders was associated with the reduced odds of a completed rape. Thus, it may be safe to claim that the presence of bystanders appear to be representative of capable guardians in rape incidents.

Second, it was predicted that incidents involving physical self protective actions would be associated with less completed rape incidents. Again, both the bivariate and regression analyses demonstrated that physical self protective actions were associated with less completed incidents. Comparison of the results demonstrates physical actions have the strongest odds ratio against the odds of completed rape as compared to incidents not involving physical resistance. This research determined that the use of victim physical self protective actions is representative of capable guardianship in rape incidents.

Third, it was estimated that forceful verbal resistance strategies would be associated with reduced completed incidents. Both the bivariate and regression analyses confirmed that forceful verbal strategies were associated with less completed incidents. Thus, the use of forceful verbal strategies may be considered capable guardianship in rape incidents.
Finally, it was predicted that incidents involving non-forceful verbal resistance would be associated with increased completed incidents. Both the bivariate and regression analyses revealed that as consistent with predictions, the presence of non-forceful verbal resistance in incidents increased the probability of completed rape. Therefore, non-forceful verbal resistance is not an effective guardian against completed rape outcomes.

Data and Methodological Limitations

Several data and methodological limitations must be acknowledged. While Chapter 3 addressed the issues of accuracy and credibility of the NCVS data (e.g., memory lapses, underreporting, non-representative samples) in general, specific problems regarding data used in this study are discussed below, along with the analytical designs.

First, measures for some variables were limited, creating potential interpretation issues. For example, while it is apparent that the presence of bystanders is predictive of a reduced odds of completed rapes, this study was restrained from exploring the underlying reasons because the construction of this measure did not reveal who the bystanders were, their relationship to the offender or victim and whether, when and how they intervened. Additional information on bystanders, along with other significant predictors, may help to determine exactly how their presence relates to the outcome. While the NCVS did include questions on whether bystanders took actions to help and whether those actions were effective, large proportions of missing responses made the data unsuitable for use at
this time. This limitation illustrates the need for increased accuracy at the data collection level.

Second, problems of underreporting and self-selection, while existent in almost all survey research, may be particularly salient in rape cases. Victims may feel shame, responsibility or fear, perhaps more so than in other crime types, therefore reducing the propensity to report. This can be especially detrimental if incidents in which victims choose to report are somehow different from incidents in which victims do not report. This can affect not only the prevalence of rape estimates, but also may distort the true effectiveness of guardianship variables. Attempting to reach victims in new and creative ways to dissuade their apprehension of reporting is necessary. This will benefit not only researchers and the criminal justice system, but victims themselves in order to begin the healing process necessary to adapt to the traumatizing experience.

Third, as recommended previously, further progress toward generalizability of findings must also focus on other types of rape incidents (date rape, male victim rape, multiple offender rape) and other crime types (robbery, assault). These inclusions will lend further credibility to the representation of guardianship through the presence of bystanders or certain forms of victim self protection. This finding would have both theoretical and practical implications.

Fourth, while this study sets out to apply one of the contentions of the routine activities theory (namely greater guardianship leads to less successful crime) to rape incidents, it would be more substantively meaningful and conceptually complete if the other two components (e.g., motivated offender and attractive victim) of a criminal event were included in the analysis. While the routine activities theory does not attempt to
directly address motivation, failing to include offender motivation as a measure may alter the definitions of what may be a capable guardian.

This area has been explored tentatively. For example, Prentky, Burgess and Carter (1986) grouped offenders by types of rapist and predicted outcomes based upon assessments of the motivational factors of the offender. They argued that physical resistance strategies were believed to be less effective against sadistic rapists, who may view the response as active participation. While Prentky et al. (1986) did not test these predictions, this is an area that deserves exploration in the future.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Using a variety of statistical methods, this study suggests that the constructs of capable guardianship should be expanded to include situational factors such as the presence of bystanders and the victim self-protective actions of physical and forceful verbal resistance. These findings are important as they increase the utility of the theory and create new areas in which to test the assumptions.

The routine activities theory implies that criminal offenses may be reduced through the manipulation of motivated offenders, suitable targets or capable guardians. While the theory does not directly address what constitutes offender motivation, reducing crime through reducing motivation or opportunity appears to be the most prevalent method at use in the system today. The current punishment approach used by the criminal justice system fails to deter crimes. While sex offenders are less likely than comparable violent offenders (e.g. those convicted of homicide, robbery or assault) to have a prior record, as a whole they account for approximately 60 percent of violent
offenders with a history of sexual offenses (Greenfeld 1997). Barring sanctions to deter motivation, there is little consensus on what motivates sex offenders and how to best thwart this motivation.

Similarly, policies that aim to reduce target suitability in rape offenses may be veiled attempts at victim blame. While certain lifestyles may place individuals in higher risk categories for victimization, this should not be taken as evidence of deserving victims. Furthermore, evidence does not suggest that it is feasible to alter lifestyle factors affecting victimization, such as changing where individuals live or work or who they form relationships with, nor is it probable to assume changes may exhibit a "net benefit" to individuals (Rosenbaum, Lurigio and Davis 1998, 84).

Therefore, one area in which reductions may be introduced is through a more definitive identification of capable guardians in such incidents. The effectiveness of bystanders can be directly integrated into victim awareness training. For example, females should be aware that the presence of others is associated with the decreased odds of a completed incident. This should not be indicative that females cannot be alone, rather that females should be aware of whom they choose to spend time alone with. Additionally, educational efforts must extend to the general public. In the event that they are witness to a crime, it should be well publicized that their presence tends to be associated with decreased odds of completion, thus encouraging bystanders to be empathic and involved in some capacity.

Following the recommendations of sexual victimization and general bystander intervention behavior, Banyard, Plante and Moynihan (2004) undertook such a responsibility. Banyard et al. (2004) created a three part class in which both male and
female college students were introduced to the concepts of community, responsibility, sexual victimization, victim empathy and intervention. The sessions combined presentation of material, group participation, positive role modeling and role playing to explore strategies for identifying and eliminating inappropriate situations. Empirical data on the effectiveness of this program was not yet available; however it stands as an example of confronting sexual victimization in a creative way.

Consistent with prior work on victim resistance, recommendations on resistance must be interpreted conservatively. There cannot be one answer that will provide a solution to all rape incidents. At the same time, the data clearly suggest that incidents involving resistance are less probable to result in a completed attempt, barring non-forceful verbal resistance. Therefore, potential victims should be presented with information on how to effectively protect themselves such as through a self defense class or other training.

A difficulty of victimization policy implications is determining the best way to access potential victims. It is necessary to disseminate the information in a proactive, rather than reactive, manner. One way of approaching this is to include sexual assault awareness training in educational settings, such as middle schools, high schools and colleges. Additionally, classes should be made available to the general community through community centers, non-profits or police departments. Most importantly, women must be presented with the realities of sexual victimization, mainly that the greatest risk of victimization stems not from the stranger in the dark alley but from an acquaintance or intimate partner. Amidst inconsistent results, there is marginal support that victimized women are less able to pick up on "danger" cues from heterosexual
encounters (Söchting, Fairbrother and Koch 2004); thus females should be encouraged to
discriminate amongst such cues and prevent situational escalations or cease social ties
with individuals exhibiting such behaviors, if possible.

Most of all, training must include reminding females that regardless of how they
come to be in a rape situation or whether they choose to resist or not, they are not to blame for their victimization anymore than a victim of a street robbery. The traumatic and personal violation of rape incidents determines that victims and potential victims should be treated respectfully by educators and researchers without blame or conviction. It is the duty of law enforcement and the courts to determine criminal responsibility for such incidents.

Conclusions

This study has examined the effect of capable guardians on the outcome of rape using theoretical framework provided by the routine activities theory. Upon systematic analysis of selective rape incidents reported by the NCVS from 1992-2003, this study reveals that while guardianship variables such as bystanders, physical resistance and forceful verbal resistance were associated with reduced odds of completed rape incidents, and non-forceful verbal resistance was associated with increased odds of completed rape incidents. Therefore, the presence of bystanders, physical resistance and forceful verbal resistance appear consistent with capable guardians in rape incidents. Policies may be created which encourage potential victims to use available resources to prevent the completion of a rape incident.
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