Abstract This article examines an issue that has been largely ignored in the growing literature on the treatment of sexual offences within the criminal justice system, i.e. the treatment of adult male rape and sexual assault complainants by the police. This analysis is based upon a series of interviews with men who have reported their experiences of rape and sexual assault. It considers issues of victim care and satisfaction with the performance of the police, along with other criminal justice professionals. These experiences are placed in a broader research context that indicates some of the features of men's treatment by the police, along with recurrent themes that are also seen in the treatment of female complainants. Finally, this article critically considers claims that the criminal justice's treatment of male and female rape is influenced by gender bias.

Since the early 1990s there has been a significant increase in research that has examined the problem of adult male rape and sexual assault. This research has examined such issues as the problem of male sexual victimisation within institutional settings, within the general population, during wartime and has also examined the nature, dynamics and impact of male victimisation. This work has cast light on a problem that has remained largely hidden from public view and like female rape, continues to be shrouded in ignorance and misconception. This is also a problem in the context of the treatment of adult male victims who have sought help from the criminal justice system. Some research has examined male complainant's experiences of the court process and in some of the earlier literature there are suggestions that the police treatment of male complainants was poor. For example, 18 years ago Richie McMullen stated: "[male] victims are rarely believed [by the police], are assumed to be gay and thought to be responsible for not being man enough to fight off an attacker ... many male victims report that the treatment they receive by the police and in the courts is worse than the offence itself." While some work has been done domestically and in the USA on police treatment of male rape, thus far there has been no specific in-depth domestic study of men's experiences of the police that has brought together the existing literature, as well as original material.

The purpose of this article is to begin to fill this evidence gap. This is an area that is of growing importance due to the significant increase in the numbers of allegations of male rape being reported to the police. To assist this analysis, the article will consider the experiences of five male complainants, four of whom reported sexual victimisation to the police, along with discussion of evidence that has been gleaned from a range of other sources. Through such an analysis it will be possible to begin to identify trends in police responses to adult male rape and sexual assault, along with areas of strength and weakness.

Police responses: a brief overview

Since it became first legally recognised in 1994, there has been a very significant increase in recorded offences of male rape. In 1995 there were 150 offences of male rape recorded by the police, for 2004-05 the
number was 1,135. The most recent figure shows 1,150 recorded offences of male rape. This increase in reports over the last decade has, at least in part, its origins in measures taken by the police service to improve the treatment of male victims since the early 1990s, including the use of specially trained officers to work with male complainants. Since that time, awareness of the problem of male rape and sexual assault and the needs of victims has undoubtedly grown within the police service. A number of constabularies produce information in the form of leaflets or on websites that explain how they respond to the needs of male victims. For example, the Metropolitan Police's 'Sapphire Project' emphasises support for all victims of rape, including male victims. It has produced a leaflet that specifically targets male victims. It contains important information for victims, family members and friends, along with contact details for support groups. It discusses how men respond to rape and sexual assault and also covers some of the myths associated with male sexual victimisation. For example, it challenges the myths that 'male rape is a gay crime' and 'male rape doesn't happen'. Similarly, the Cheshire Constabulary provides information on its website for male victims along with an explanation of the investigatory process. It also explains the support available from local agencies such as Victim Support and the role of 'Sexual Offence Investigation Trained Officers'.

As well as the improvements in the police awareness of male rape and sexual assault, there are several other factors that may have contributed to this increase in recorded offences. For example, it may result from greater societal recognition of male rape following legal reform in 1994 and the reclassification of certain non-consensual sex acts as rape in 2003. However, given the lack of previous domestic research, it is not possible with any degree of precision to judge the extent to which the police response to male rape and sexual assault has improved, and in what ways, since the early 1990s. The next section examines reporting of male rape and evidence concerning the recording of male rape by the police.

**Reporting, recording and the early stages of attrition**

Early small-scale domestic studies of male rape and sexual assault suggested that between 12 per cent and 20 per cent of victims reported to the police. The most recent research findings by Kelly et al found a reporting rate of 69 per cent for men, compared with 75 per cent for women. The 2002 HMCSPI/HMIC joint inspection report noted that in the year 2000, of 586 callers to the support group for victims of male rape, Survivors UK, only 11 per cent had reported to the police. Based on research from Survivors UK, the report suggests various reasons for non-reporting by males, including: 'not knowing that it is a crime', 'fear of not being believed' and 'concerns that sexuality may become an issue'. In the survey by King and Woollett it was discovered that men: 'found it difficult to give reasons why they had not reported to police. Six were too ashamed, 2 were trying to forget the assault, 2 were too frightened, 1 could not talk about it, and 1 saw no point in reporting'. Indeed, the emotional complexities, fear and other potential implications of the decision to report are such that many men feel unable to do so. One interviewee in this study, Geoff, who was indecently assaulted by a man whom he had befriended while homeless, was concerned about the impact of reporting on his mother:

I have a history ... do you know what I mean? Drugs, suicide attempts ... a pretty sad life. I know it would all come out sooner or later. It'd kill my mum.

A male victim who participated in research by Sue Lees also expressed concern of what an allegation of rape might mean to his family. He stated:

I threatened to go to the police. He told me he was a solicitor and the police would believe his story rather than mine, also that they would think I was a rent boy. I was terrified not just for me but for my family who would be named in the papers ...

Despite continuing evidence that significant numbers of male victims do not report to the police, or indeed, confide in anyone, the increase in the reporting rate is encouraging and does suggest greater confidence by victims in police responses than in the past. The increase in reports may also reflect a 'changing social climate' of which the specific legal recognition of male rape is a contributory factor.

Compared to evidence concerning female victims, the current literature on how cases of male rape and sexual assault progress through the criminal justice system is limited. Some studies of rape-case attrition have deliberately and inexplicably excluded cases of male rape. Recent research has given a better, albeit lim-
ited, understanding as to how the police record allegations of male rape. In research by Lea et al it was found that of 19 recorded offences of male rape and two of attempted rape, none resulted in conviction.\textsuperscript{30} The Metropolitan Police recently published statistics on the recording of allegations of male and female rape. It was found that of 677 allegations of rape reported in London between April and June 2005, 511 (75.5 per cent) were recorded as crimes, with 32 (4.7 per cent) being 'no crimes' and 134 (19.8 per cent) recorded as 'not crime'.\textsuperscript{31} This study also found that 'whilst only 23% (143) of female complainants' allegations were recorded as 'No Crime'/'Not Crime', 41% (24) of male complainant allegations [were] recorded as 'No Crime'/'Not Crime'. In cases involving male victims, charges were more likely to be reduced from rape to another lesser offence and 'a higher number of false complaints linked to mental health issues were recorded with male complainants'.\textsuperscript{32} The linkage of mental illness to 'no criming' is also a striking feature of studies involving female complainants.\textsuperscript{33} One of the questions raised by these findings is the extent to which the use of the no-crime/not crime designation is appropriate. In other words, are men and women with mental health problems more likely to make false allegations or are the police inappropriately labelling reports by such people as false? As the report notes, this issue requires further research.\textsuperscript{34}

Further cross-over between cases of male and female rape appears in situations where allegations of female rape are 'no-crime' for reasons of complainant behaviour, for example, where the complainant delays reporting or where she withdraws a complaint.\textsuperscript{35} While we know that men do make false rape allegations,\textsuperscript{36} there is also limited evidence to suggest that the police may equate a man's unwillingness to pursue an allegation with an assumption that it is false. This suggestion comes from an investigation that examined \textit{inter alia} the handling of an allegation of male rape made by one of Prince Charles's staff, Mr George Smith. The subsequent report that examined the response to this allegation found '[n]o-one believed Mr Smith's rape allegation', including members of the Royal Household and Hounslow police.\textsuperscript{37} While concluding that there had been no 'improper cover-up' the report did find that:

A serious allegation of this sort should not, in our opinion, have been treated so dismissively, even though there was universal disbelief in its veracity, without (at minimum) full and documented consideration of the decision not to investigate. It might have been different if Mr Smith had unequivocally and apparently rationally confirmed that the allegation was not true. This is ... not, however, what he did ... he only indicated that he did not wish to pursue it ... \textsuperscript{38}

The extent of this particular problem of 'dismissive' treatment is a matter that requires further examination. There is, however, further evidence of this problem following a recent investigation by the Independent Police Complaints Commission into the initial police response to an allegation of male rape and sexual assault investigated by the South Wales Police. The investigation found \textit{inter alia} that officers had failed to preserve and secure the crime scene and evidence in the case. The report concluded that one of the officers working on this case 'failed to be conscientious and diligent in the execution of his duties'. Another officer, according to the report, failed to 'recognise the seriousness of the alleged stranger rape and sexual assault'.\textsuperscript{39}

\textbf{The experience of men who report}

For those men who do decide to report to the police, the existing literature indicates that there are significant differences in men's individual experiences. Some measures of this experience have been somewhat crude and limited. Early research conducted by support group Survivors UK found that of 62 men seen at the Wharfsdie Clinic at St Mary's Hospital Paddington in 1993, 11 per cent reported to the police with three reporting a positive response and four a negative response. In 1992, 70 men were seen at the clinic, eight (11.4 per cent) reported to the police, six indicated a positive response and two reported a 'very negative' response.\textsuperscript{40} In a study involving 115 male victims of rape and sexual assault, King and Woollett found only 17 reported to the police: 'In 8 cases the police’s reaction was reported as helpful, whereas in 5 it was perceived as negative. Seven men were glad (for three of whom the assailant had been apprehended) that they had reported to police'.\textsuperscript{41} Finally, in the most recent study of 40 British male rape victims Walker et al found that five reported to the police. They noted:

Of those who did report, only one man said that the police were responsive and helpful. The other four found the police to be unsympathetic, disinterested, and homophobic. They felt that their complaint was not taken seriously and all four regretted their decision to tell the police.\textsuperscript{42}
Some caution has to be shown when considering whether these specific findings prove a continuing problem in police responses to male rape. According to Walker et al the 'mean time between the assault and participation in the study was 10 years'. Consequently, we do not know when the five men reported. Clearly, a male reporting rape 10 or 15 years ago might have received very different treatment than one reporting more recently. This point is also made in recent research into men and women's experiences of reporting same sex abuse to the police. Researchers found that victims 'got a mixed response': 'Some had a sympathetic response but no follow through in terms of applying the law to the abusive partner ... A small number had very unhelpful responses from the police though these said this had happened a long time ago.'

Research from the USA suggests that negative police reactions are reported as common. Scarce notes:

Of those survivors I interviewed who reported their rape to authorities, all but one had an intensely negative experience. The one survivor who was the exception had only a neutral interaction--neither helpful nor overtly detrimental. The most common complaints I have heard from male survivors who I interviewed and have worked with professionally have been disbelief, mockery, homophobia, or a combination of all three from police officers.

There is evidence to suggest that negative reactions may be a particular problem with respect to male rape victims who are gay or who are presumed to be gay. Such men appear to have their experience of rape taken less seriously. For example, in a British study of prison sexual violence, Banbury cites the experience of one male victim thus:

When I tried to report [a sexual assault], one of the [prison] officers laughed and just said ’come on mate, you’re gay, hows [sic] that gonna sound?’ I had basically been told to forget the incident because I was gay and hence ’I wanted it’ and the incident was not reported.

Similarly, a study of prison sexual assault in the USA found that ’gay inmates, or those perceived as gay, often face great difficulties in securing relief from abuse. Unless they show obvious physical injury, their complaints tend to be ignored and their requests for protection denied.’ Likewise, on the basis of research involving the completion of questionnaires by police officers and male rape victims, Lees found:

Victim feedback suggested that gay men are treated less sensitively and sympathetically by the police than heterosexual men. Some police officers seem to believe that rape is less traumatic for gay men. Analysis of both police and victim questionnaires shows that police officers are more likely to regard the testimony of homosexual victims as ’unreliable’--either to assume that the sex was consensual or that the complaint was malicious.

Collectively, these findings are troubling. While some men do report a positive response, some police officers and other criminal justice professionals appear to attach to gay men or those they perceive as gay highly questionable assumptions regarding credibility, trauma and truthfulness. This suggests some degree of cross-over in police attitudes towards female rape, where some officers also make assumptions regarding credibility based on highly suspect criteria. The implications of such attitudes are significant given that homosexuality is a risk factor in rape and sexual assault. These findings also highlight a further point to be discussed later. There appears to be a clear linkage between police attitudes and societal attitudes towards male rape and sexual assault.

My first interviewee, (DD), who was featured in earlier research, was initially reluctant to report his rape to the police because he wanted to ’forget what had happened’. Having delayed reporting for two days, he was persuaded to go to the police by a friend:

She said that that if I didn't like what the police had to say then I could walk ... She wanted the police to get the man who had attacked me ... They [the police] were decent, they listened and believed me ... Yes, I was asked about the delay, they seemed okay about it. One of the officers said it was understandable and that helped. The downside was that I couldn't just forget it because of the trial and everything. It took ages for the trial to come round.

The second victim discussed in earlier research, (SB), was also generally positive regarding the police response to his allegation. He described the police as being ‘better than I had expected’. An interesting aspect of his experience is the extent to which his experience was influenced by the fact that his assailant was sub-
sequently arrested, charged and convicted. He noted: 'I felt vindicated, but I'm not sure I would have felt that had the case not gone to court'.

These broadly positive experiences can be contrasted with those of two other interviewees. The first male complainant was Greg. He was raped in his own home by an assailant while he was intoxicated. He described his contact with the police as 'difficult' and 'confusing' and recounted having great difficulty maintaining his composure with the police only a few hours after his rape. However, his primary concern about reporting to the police was in fact his questioning by a forensic medical examiner:

The medical examination was hell. I said I didn’t want a male doctor, but that’s all there was. I was really upset during the medical tests and then the doctor asks [sic] me something which gutted me. He said: "It’s strange that you don’t have more injuries, are you sure you’re telling me everything?" I ended up thinking he didn’t believe a word I said. I'd already said that I wasn’t beaten up, was I supposed to be beaten up or something? ... The chaperone dropped by [my flat] to talk to me about withdrawing. She was nice and told me I could go back, but I didn’t want to go through it all again.

The second complainant with a negative experience was Steve. His recollection of treatment by the police was characterised by real disappointment and regret that he reported. He stated:

One of the officers told me that in these types of cases it was virtually impossible to get a conviction. I thought he was trying to put me off. Do the police only prosecute [sic] if you’re attacked by a stranger?

Despite being heterosexual Steve, felt that homosexuality was an issue as he was asked questions about his sexuality. In addition, he described himself as being upset by one officer's reaction to other disclosures, which he interpreted as disbelieving:

I had to tell them that he'd tried to masturbate me during the attack and that I'd got a bit of an erection. One of the officers just went, hang on, how was that? You know, what he meant was how was that possible if you're saying you didn't want it?

One of the issues in both of these cases is that Greg and Steve saw the questioning as indicating suspicion and this impacted on their view of their treatment. But part of the problem in situations such as these might be a failure by criminal justice professionals to explain sensitively why particular questions need to be asked. Indeed, a recent joint inspection report noted that it was important for police officers to 'identify evidential weaknesses at an early stage, to obtain clarification in respect of ambiguities or inconsistencies ...'. However, as the report also noted, it is important that complainants feel 'supported and believed'. Clearly, similar considerations apply to forensic medical examinations. Steve's experience was also characterised by a classic example of a police officer 'second guessing' the reactions to a complaint at later stages of the criminal justice process, by suggesting the difficulty of securing a conviction. Studies involving female victims have shown that officers do sometimes warn complainants of such difficulties. Harris and Grace note: "[i]n warning complainants about the difficulty of securing a conviction, the police might put complainants off pursuing their case without meaning to". This was clearly Steve's reaction and contributed to his very negative experience of reporting. The apparent reaction to the disclosure that Steve had experienced an erection is particularly serious given that we know significant numbers of male victims experience erections during rape and sexual assault.

Some victims of male rape and sexual assault report aggressive questioning by the police. In the USA, the experience of Christopher Smith, who was raped at gunpoint by a stranger, gives an indication of the sense of despair that some male victims can experience and the way in which unskilled questioning can have a negative impact on a victim's ability to recall a traumatic event accurately. He recounts his experience with the police:

Then I told the story again. Then again. They asked questions. They interrupted. They told the story back to me, but changed things. They inserted information that I did not provide. Questions sprayed at me from every direction like bullets from a machine gun. Everything became so cloudy and confused ...

The officers also asked a series of questions that he found distressing:

Do you have any friends who are gay? ... Why didn’t you just run? He wouldn’t have shot at you, it’s hard to hit a moving target. I would have just started running. Why didn’t you run? ... After being degraded and hu-
miliated in so many different ways, I had reached the lowest point ever, I was convinced I was a terrible per-
son. I didn't even feel recognized as a human being. 59

Similarly, Fred Pelka recounts his questioning at the hands of police officers in the USA after he had been
abducted and raped by a man wielding a gun:

The bad cop asked me why my hair was so long, what was I doing hitchhiking at seven o'clock in the mor-
ing? Why were my clothes so dirty? Did I do drugs? Was I a troublemaker? ... [I was also told that] the best
thing to do would be to pull up my pants 'and forget it ever happened'. 60

These disclosures come from a variety of sources that are disparate in terms of the time and location when
these men brought their experiences to the attention of the police and other criminal justice professionals.
Consequently, the next section will analyse several emerging themes from the literature as a whole.

Analysis and emerging themes

The current evidence suggests that men's experiences of reporting rape and sexual assault are varied, with
some men being much more satisfied with their treatment, than others. These findings are unsurprising given
the similar experiences of female rape complainants. 61 The first identifiable theme to be taken from the inter-
views and previous literature is the way in which the men with negative experiences feel that they are under
suspicion or not believed. This can quickly undermine confidence in the investigatory process, and as in the
case of Greg, can result in an allegation being withdrawn. A second theme, clearly in evidence in the wider
literature, less so amongst the four interviewees, is the linkage between male rape and homosexuality. 62 In a
survey of victims and police officers Lees found that "[s]ome police officers seem to believe that rape is less
traumatic for gay men [and are] more likely to regard the testimony of homosexual victims as "unreliable"
...". 63 In attitude surveys it has been found that students attribute more blame to heterosexual women and
gay male victims of rape, than to lesbians and heterosexual male victims. 64 White and Kurpius found that
students inter alia attributed more blame to male, than to female rape victims and more blame to gay and
lesbian victims than heterosexual victims. 65 Likewise, Mitchell et al found that students were prepared to at-
tribute more blame and pleasure and less trauma to a male rape victim who is gay, than one who is hetero-
sexual. 66 In her study of correctional officers, Eigenberg found that of 166 correctional officers surveyed, 46.4
per cent 'believe that inmates deserve rape if they have consented to participate in consensual acts with
other inmates'. 67 In a recent review of the existing literature on attitudes toward male rape, Davies and
Rogers observe that in studies of people's attitudes to male rape:

All, without exception, and regardless of the assault situation, have found that gay victims are judged to be
more at fault or to blame than heterosexual victims are. It is reasoned that the homosexual (albeit
non-consensual) nature of male rape inspires homophobic attributions that result in victim blame and other
negative attributions towards male victims. 68

The unearthing of homophobic attitudes in the context of male rape might be explained in various ways. One
of the reasons may be the equation of men being anally penetrated with being less masculine and therefore
gay. In their interviews with gay men who engaged in anal intercourse, Kippax and Smith noted that for some
of the participants there was an 'incompatibility between being masculine and receptive' (emphasis in origi-
nal) and for some '[r]eceptivity is automatically associated here with being gay and feminine, suggesting one
is more or less gay according to whether or not one engaged in "feminine" sexual practices'. 69 The associa-
tion of anal intercourse with homosexuality can also be linked to attitudes that blame gay males for their own
victimisation. But of course, it goes further. This linkage can also support an assumption that by being anally
penetrated (and therefore less masculine), male victims must be gay. Thus, it cannot be assumed that the
issue of homosexuality only arises in the context of gay victims. As indicated elsewhere, the linkage between
male rape and homosexuality also impacts on cases involving heterosexual victims. 70 Another explanation
for the linkage of male rape and homosexuality is that it is a form of 'distancing'. Anderson observes: 'close
association between male rape and homosexuality/homophobia may be one way for participants to express
their disgust at this act ... for male participants, male rape perception may be linked to a combination of
hegemonic masculinity ... and emotionally defensive/distancing factors'. 71
A third theme to be found within the existing literature is negativity in response to men's reports of sexual victimisation. In the evidence presented in this article, there are examples of men being disbelieved, laughed at or demeaned as a result of their disclosures. There is also other evidence of negative reactions. On the basis of disclosures from four men who participated in a male rape survivors group, Isley et al found that their disclosures of being victims of sexual assault were met with negativity: 'Members shared personal stories about their negative responses of significant others when the rape was disclosed. Frequently, the men have encountered reactions such as hysterical laughter and assumptions about how “gay men would want to be raped”'. Similarly, Jim, who was sexually assaulted whilst homeless, told The Big Issue:

I was kipping on the Strand one night and woke up to find a man with his hand inside my sleeping bag. He had his hand between my legs. It really shook me up. But when I confided in my friends they were just embarrassed and laughed.

Likewise, Isley has also observed:

[Male victims] often feel safer suffering in silence and are reluctant to be revictimized by an unsympathetic legal system or disbelieving treatment professionals ... Those who do report a sexual attack often experience hostile and isolating reactions from the very service providers that are available to provide help. Too often, seeking assistance in dealing with the trauma that can follow a rape too often becomes a humiliating experience in which feelings of depression, anger, guilt, sexual confusion, and anxiety are reinforced in survivors as they become revictimized by the police, community agencies, and bewildered friends.

Clearly, these findings indicate ignorance, homophobia and insensitive social attitudes towards male victims of rape and sexual assault. Such reactions might also be explained as an attempt to distance or as a defensive mechanism. Further, negativity might also result from assumptions about masculinity. Poor institutional responses to male rape may result from a combination of all of these factors. However, it would be unwise to over-emphasise the impact of societal attitudes on institutional practices. Other factors also have a role to play. In a recent British study involving interviews with gay and lesbian victims of domestic sexual and physical abuse, researchers found that the response of agencies was mixed. The study found that voluntary and statutory agencies have no:

coordinated responses for responding to domestic abuse in same sex relationships ... many of the problems lie in agencies being governed by a domestic abuse model that is heterosexual and it is this that often prevents an appropriate response because of assumptions made about who might be the survivor/perpetrator.

Clearly, raising awareness of rape outside of the male-female paradigm is crucial in improving service responses. So too, the training of police officers with regard to the dynamics and impact of male rape and sexual assault.

**Is there credible evidence of a disparity in treatment?**

It is a mainstay of feminist analysis of rape law and its enforcement that '[t]he legal world, of courts, trials and even police investigations, is structured along gendered lines' and that the interests of male defendants are favoured over the interests of female rape victims. If the criminal justice system operates to promote the interests of male defendants, then a question that requires consideration is how are male rape victims to be situated? The increasing recognition of male sexual victimisation has given rise to a growing number of claims that male rape victims are receiving preferential treatment by the legal process, as compared to female rape victims. These claims can be judged on evidential and interpretative grounds. Indeed, it is clear that the argument that male rape victims are receiving preferential treatment is littered with errors and other shortcomings.

The first time it was claimed that adult male rape victims were receiving better treatment then female victims, was when it was asserted that in the first case of male rape to come before the courts in this country, the complainant received preferential treatment during cross-examination. More recently, Ruth Graham claimed that within the medical and social science literature male rape is 'often portrayed as especially horrific', that 'male rape is often portrayed as more physically violent [than female rape]' and '[t]he view of male rape as especially horrific is ... evident in the legal sphere'. Such claims have little in the way of factual foundation. Graham also makes reference to the 'almost exclusive focus on anal rape of men, rather
than on anal rape in general’ in discussions prior to the 1994 amendment that recognised non-consensual penile-anal intercourse as rape in English law. She also claims that ‘the discourse that led up to the 1994 amendment suggests that the penetration of the male body is the important violation, rather than the violation of the anus (male or female) ... how is it that the penetration of the male anus is privileged?’ This claim is contradicted by the actual parliamentary debates associated with this amendment in which there are repeated references to the anal rape of women. There was even a suggestion that anal rape maybe more traumatic for women, than for men. These debates, probably for the first time ever, did pay significant attention to the problem of male rape. This can be explained by the fact that at the time, males were completely excluded as victims from the definition of rape. The amendment was seen as a means of securing equality of treatment with female victims, as well as ensuring appropriate labelling and sentencing for male and female victims of anal rape. In the midst of these various claims of male rape being ‘privileged’, Graham does not explain how such treatment could exist alongside the dire treatment of male rape and sexual assault victims within the prison system, and the less than preferential treatment of male victims detailed in sources discussed throughout this article.

Another recent attempt to claim bias in the treatment of male rape is the most ambitious yet. It has been correctly observed by Candida Saunders that ‘with the exception of Gregory and Lees’ study, there is a distinct lack of data relating to the receipt and disposition of male rape allegations throughout the criminal justice process’. (citation added) Yet, despite the lack of crucial qualitative data, Saunders claims that there is evidence to suggest that men are treated more generously then women by the criminal justice system:

The comparison is necessarily crude and its findings therefore tentative; however, the analysis does suggest some disparity in criminal justice responses to male and female rape complaints posing questions for further empirical research.

Indeed, Saunders has suggested that there is bias within the criminal justice system’s handling of male rape cases at every point of the process: from the police response to male rape to the sentencing of those convicted of male rape. Her claim that male victims receive better treatment at the hands of the criminal process appears to rest largely on one limited quantitative study by Gregory and Lees in which they assessed a sample of 60 reports of male rape and sexual assault. They found that of the 11 cases that reached court there was a very high conviction rate of between 75 per cent and 100 per cent. Gregory and Lees compare these rates with the conviction rate in cases of female rape that they said was ‘about’ 30 per cent and speculate that these statistics ‘suggest that juries may be more willing to convict in cases where the victim is male’. Such a suggestion assumes much, not least, that these cases are very similar in general characteristics to cases involving female victims.

A number of problems lie in using the Gregory and Lees sample to prove bias. The number of cases that reached court was miniscule: a total of 11. Indeed, Gregory and Lees note that ‘[t]hese figures are very small so it is dangerous to draw any firm conclusions from them’. In making comparisons one has to ensure that what is being compared is amenable to such an analysis. For example, the Gregory and Lees study is not a study exclusively of ‘male rape allegations’ as suggested by Saunders. Gregory and Lees clearly state: ‘The majority of the rapes [sic] reported to the police involved indecent sexual acts other than anal penetration’. In other words, most of the cases in this sample did not involve rape. When comparing the outcome of a tiny sample of male rape and sexual assault cases, with thousands of rape cases involving female victims, one is evidently not comparing like with like. Another fundamental problem with using this research to suggest bias on the part of the criminal justice system is the fact that we know so little about the cases that are included. We know nothing of the extent to which these particular allegations were corroborated or even how many cases resulted in guilty pleas.

In the context of the conviction rate in the Gregory and Lees study, one also has to consider alternative explanations to the claim of bias. An example can be found in the context of the legal recognition of marital rape. In the early 1980s David Finkelhor and Kirsti Yllo examined the operation of the new marital rape law in California. In 1980-81, of 28 cases in their survey, that were prosecuted, 25 (89 per cent) resulted in conviction. By any measure this is a very high rate of conviction for rape offences. Could it therefore be reasonably concluded that criminal justice professionals and jurors in California were treating marital rape cases with greater seriousness than non-marital rape cases? This is not a reasonable explanation. As Finkelhor and Yllo point out the cases being prosecuted ‘were, on the whole, extremely brutal’. This suggests the presence of corroborative evidence that a rape took place and would make securing a conviction easier. In addi-
tion, 60 per cent of defendants in their study pleaded guilty at trial. Since Gregory and Lees provide very little information on the cases in their study, it is impossible to judge whether similar factors might be at work to explain the high conviction rate in their sample of 11 cases. By the same token, the absence of such evidence hardly provides a positive basis for arguing bias.

As a general observation on the claim of bias it is also worth pointing out that 'disparity of treatment' cannot be proven merely by differing outcomes in cases. As already noted, much depends on the nature of cases that are being reported and proceed through the criminal justice system. In addition, the treatment of rape cases is dependent on other factors that are often ignored by those claiming bias: 'although official bias has played an important role, most rape-case attrition appears to be due to a combination of the victim's unwillingness to seek legal redress, the prosecution's burden of proof in criminal cases, and jurors' attitudes'. Consequently, it cannot be fairly concluded on the basis of the current evidence that there is 'some disparity in criminal justice responses to male and female rape complaints'. Indeed, the current evidence clearly supports the claim that both male and female rape victims face significant difficulties when reporting rape. Some of these difficulties, as demonstrated here, are similar, others maybe largely unique, such as homophobia in the context of male rape victims. In order for those who claim gender bias to build a convincing case they require data that actually supports the conclusion of differential treatment and which indicates bias and excludes other explanations. Put simply, to suggest bias on the basis of the current evidence is at best speculation and at worst is an 'ideological projection' whereupon a particular theory-led interpretation is imposed on evidence, irrespective of whether or not the evidence supports that viewpoint.

**Conclusion**

This article has brought together information on the police treatment of adult male victims of rape and sexual assault from a variety of sources and jurisdictions. It has also brought into the public domain a small number of interviews with men who have reported their experiences of sexual victimisation to police in England. It would be inappropriate to generalise from these findings and claim that they represent the experiences of all male victims. However, within these findings, taken together with the wider literature we do see the emergence of certain themes. Some of these themes are also in evidence in the literature involving female victims. Men's experiences are varied, some positive, and some negative. The positive experiences emphasise the importance of communication, a sense of being believed and sensitivity on the part of the police. The negative experiences highlight problems with some complainants feeling that they are being met with discouragement or disbelief and ignorance, on the part of some officers, of the dynamics of male rape. An examination of the wider evidence suggests that there is a basis for arguing that there is linkage between male rape, homosexuality and negative attributions. These findings indicate the importance of training for criminal justice professionals and others working in support services. This is a view expressed by Susan Estrich, who recently wrote a syndicated newspaper column concerning the plight of male rape victims in the USA. In her article she drew comparisons with her own experience of rape: '[i]n so many respects, other than my gender, it was just the same as what is [sic] happening to boys my age then in Houston. It is time we treated it the same'. She also points to the need for education on this issue, stating:

This is a crime of violence, not sex. They need men--in police departments, hospitals and district attorney's offices--with the training and expertise to deal sensitively with the physical and emotional issues involved, in order to win the victim's cooperation, in order to catch and successfully prosecute the perpetrator. They need, in short, all the support structures we have built for women victims, and then some. It is time to take male rape out of the closet and deal with it in the courts.

There is one further point to add to Estrich's call for change. The treatment of male rape and sexual assault appears to be partly influenced by societal attitudes and rape myths. Consequently, the training of criminal justice professionals is important, but so too the challenging of misconceptions and ignorance in wider society. Legal scholars may have a role to play in both these endeavours, but only if they are prepared to listen to men's experiences and not impose dubious meanings on our current understanding of adult male sexual victimisation.
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The issue of appropriate behaviour and questioning on the part of forensic medical examiners is echoed in earlier research that examined the experiences of female rape complainants: J. Temkin, 'Medical Evidence in Rape Cases: A Continuing Problem for Criminal Justice' (1998) 61 MLR 821.

It is not clear from Steve's disclosures why the officer stated 'in these types of cases it was virtually impossible to get a conviction.'
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81 H. Codd, 'The Treatment of Complainants', New Law Journal, 29 March 1996, 447. Codd made this allegation of preferential treatment without reference to the trial transcript which indicates that the complainant did not experience bias. For discussion, see Rumney and Morgan-Taylor, above n. 5.

82 R. Graham, 'Male Rape and the Careful Construction of the Male Victim' (2006) 15 Social and Legal Studies 187 at 188.
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