

Running Head: ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

Note that this is a version of a manuscript that has been accepted at *Violence against Women*.

There might be slight variations in the published version.

You may cite this as Puthillam, A., Parekh, A., & Kapoor, H. (in press). Who are you to me?

Relational distance to victims and perpetrators affects advising to report rape. *Violence against Women*

WHO ARE YOU TO ME? RELATIONAL DISTANCE TO VICTIMS AND
PERPETRATORS AFFECTS ADVISING TO REPORT RAPE

Arathy Puthillam¹, Aneree Parekh¹, and Hansika Kapoor¹

¹Monk Prayogshala

Arathy Puthillam, Department of Psychology, Monk Prayogshala, ar@monkprayogshala.in

Aneree Parekh, Department of Psychology, Monk Prayogshala, aneree92@gmail.com

Hansika Kapoor, Department of Psychology, Monk Prayogshala, hk@monkprayogshala.in

Correspondence for this manuscript should be directed to Arathy Puthillam, Department of

Psychology, Monk Prayogshala, 4114, C-Wing, Oberoi Garden Estates,

Powai, Mumbai, 400072, +91-22-28477699 (fax)

ar@monkprayogshala.in

Acknowledgements

We thank Garima Bisoi for her earlier contribution and Sampada Karandikar for comments on previous versions of this manuscript.

Funding

This project was not funded by any particular grant.

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

Abstract

The victim's decision to report a crime is generally dependent on the advice received from a confidant. The effects of a confidant's relationship to victims and perpetrators on the advice given to report rape were investigated. Indian participants ($N = 418$) read one of seven scenarios of acquaintance rape as a confidant; the scenarios depicted different relationships between the victim and perpetrator (family versus friend versus stranger). Regression analysis found that confidants closer to victims were more likely to advise reporting, whereas confidants closer to the perpetrator were less likely to advise reporting. Rape Myth Acceptance and Victim Blaming negatively predicted reporting to agencies.

Keywords: acquaintance rape; rape myth acceptance; sexual assault; social distance; victim blaming

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

Who are you to me? Relational Distance to Victims and Perpetrators Affects Advising to Report Rape

The public outcry owing to a heinous rape in 2012 has spurred legislative changes in India's stand on the issue of women's safety, especially in response to sexual assault. However, these changes have not been reflected at the ground level; implementation and changes are still lacking even after seven years. Further, victim shaming has been reported to be rampant at all levels and the police does not inspire confidence among citizens (Press Trust of India, 2020).

To complicate things, in about 94% of rape cases, the perpetrator is an acquaintance of the victim (National Crime Records Bureau, 2019). Given this context, the present study aims to understand how one's relationship to the perpetrator and to the victim affects the advice to report rape to the police, to a hospital, to the victims' friends, and to their families. Further, whether victim blaming (VB) and rape myth acceptance (RMA) is linked to the relationship between relational distance and reporting behaviors is also studied.

Rape Perceptions and Victim Blaming

Rape perception and the tendency to blame victims strongly influence reporting advice (Solórzano, 2007). Rape perceptions are largely governed by the extent to which an individual accepts rape myths, which are prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and perpetrators (Basow & Minieri, 2011). High levels of RMA are linked to the minimization of rape incidents as well as reduced belief in the occurrence of rape (Mason et al., 2004). Additionally, individuals with high RMA are more likely to perceive the rape as less severe and are less likely to suggest that victims report the rape to the police (Frese et al., 2004; Krahé, 1988).

Various studies point to the entwined roles of RMA and VB on perceptions and judgements of sexual assault incidents (Hammond et al., 2011; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; Masser et al., 2010). VB refers to the process of finding caveats in the victim's behavior to hold

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

them responsible for their victimization (Schwartz & Leggett, 1999). Rape myths are believed to feed into the assumptions of the victim's fault and justify the actions of the perpetrator.

Further, people with high and low RMA show a significant difference in their estimation of victim responsibility, trauma intensity, and likelihood to report to the police in case of acquaintance rape (Frese et al., 2004). This relationship between RMA and VB is a great hindrance to reporting sexual assault and/or rape. Indeed, if you are blamed for your own assault or perceived that you will be, why would you report it?

Relational Distance and Reporting Behaviours

The people that surround victims of violence, especially in instances of rape, play a powerful role in the victims' reporting behavior as they are often consulted before formal agencies such as the police (Ruback & Thompson, 2001). (Ullman & Filipas, 2001) note that 94.2% of the victims who disclose their rape experience to others talk to their friends or relatives first before reporting it officially; about 63% of sexual assaults in the United States are not reported to the police at all (Rennison, 2002). Reporting to formal agencies in India is particularly low; Palermo et al. (2013) noted that only 0.56% of assault victims in India report to the police. Moreover, of the victims who disclose their rape, nearly half do so to their families and one-third to their friends (National Family Health Survey; (Kishor & Gupta, 2005)). The advice given by confidants about reporting is influenced by their biases, perceptions, and more importantly, the confidant's relationship to the victim and perpetrator. This is of particular importance as acquaintance rape is the most common type of rape in India as nearly 95% of the victims know the offender (National Crime Records Bureau, 2016). Given the high incidence rate of acquaintance rape and the propensity to report to confidants, there is a high likelihood of confidants knowing the perpetrators, potentially influencing bystander perceptions of crime. Further, reporting is less likely when victims and perpetrators are acquaintances, relatives, or partners, than when they are strangers (Black, 1971; Gravelin et al.,

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

2019; Palmer et al., 2018). In other words, the greater the relational distance, the more the likelihood to advise reporting.

However, the effect of the relationship between victim-perpetrator-confidant on advice and support given to victims has been overlooked. That is, how does one's relationship to the victim and to the perpetrator affect one's advice to report? (Knoth & Ruback, 2016) find that the advice given by the confidant to the victim is dependent on the relationship shared between all three: the confidant, victim, and the perpetrator. Additionally, the decision on advising to report is primarily influenced by the relationship shared between the confidant and the perpetrator, and not by the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator. They further suggest that the effect of the victim-perpetrator relationship is minimized with the absence or presence of a relationship between the confidant and perpetrator (Knoth & Ruback, 2016).

Freetly and Kane (1995) also found that perpetrator blame decreased as the familiarity between the victim and perpetrator increased. The fact that a victim is acquainted with her attacker creates a more ambiguous situation for third-party confidants; judgements concerning who is responsible for the incident become less clear.

The Role of Reporting Agencies

Besides internal biases or influences of relational distance, the perceptions held by individuals about *reporting agencies* also influence the advice given to victims to report the crime. In order to understand the full milieu within which victims are advised to report or not, the reasons or beliefs of the confidant vis-a-vis reporting agencies need to be assessed as well.

Negative experiences with and *perceived unhelpfulness* of formal agencies have been associated with higher levels of posttraumatic stress symptoms (Campbell & Raja, 2005), which may further dissuade one from reporting the crime. Similarly, given the societal stigma attached to crimes of a sexual nature, victims often prefer to keep their experiences private (Bachman, 1998). Indeed, the literature on VB has found that women who disclose to both

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

formal and informal agencies report more negative than positive reactions (see(Kennedy & Prock, 2016). Supposedly, a victim who refrains from reporting the crime avoids the secondary victimization of being blamed (Campbell et al., 1999). Thus, the perception of potential victim blame from agencies might affect the advice given to victims.

Similarly, *the fear of not being believed* is often a hindrance to reporting sexual assault to formal or informal agencies (Walsh & Bruce, 2014). For instance, Logan et al. (2005) found that victims of rape cited fear or disbelief and potential blaming reactions from formal and informal agencies as one of the major reasons for hesitating to seek help and report.

Other Factors Associated with Reporting

High *perceived seriousness of the crime* increases the likelihood of reporting the crime (Gartner & Macmillan, 1995; Greenberg & Ruback, 1992). In crimes involving rape, perceived seriousness decreases linearly as the level of familiarity between the victim and perpetrator increases (Monson et al., 2000). Past research has shown that rape by an acquaintance is perceived as less serious and more attributable to the victim than is rape by a stranger (Ben-David & Schneider, 2005). The closer the victim, the more serious the rape is perceived to be, and therefore the higher the likelihood to advise victims to report.

Fear of retaliation from the perpetrator is also a major concern for reporting crimes to officials or seeking help (Bachman, 1998; Sable et al., 2006). This is of particular concern when the perpetrator is known to the victim or confidant. Last, the *inconvenience or discomfort* caused due to processes of reporting rape, such as the legal process involved, can cause significant stress for victims making reporting less likely (Campbell, 2008). People in India also believe that the police are more likely to follow up a victim's complaint only if they are bribed (Nalla & Madan, 2012), making reporting procedures inconvenient. Thus, perceived seriousness, safety, potential of victim blame, disbelief, unhelpfulness, and inconvenience might facilitate or prevent confidants from advising victims to report to various agencies.

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

The Present Study

Research assessing the influence of informal third-parties on sexual assault has primarily focused on bystander attributions of stranger rape or perceptions of acquaintance or date rape (Bennett et al., 2014; Cohn et al., 2009). These bystander and third-party perceptions are usually those of individuals who neither know the victim nor the perpetrator. There is a dearth in research and understanding of the perceptions of acquaintance rape held by parties related to both, the victims and perpetrators. This may limit the understanding of rape perceptions and reporting behaviors.

This study proposes to assess the effects of the confidant's relational distance to the victim and perpetrator of acquaintance rape on the advice given to the victims to report the crime and seek help. This study also assesses the effects of the relational distance on the degree of blame attributed to victims by the confidants as well as their latent beliefs/acceptance of rape myths, in order to understand the larger context within which advising occurs.

Based on the research highlighted above, the current study hypothesizes the following:

H1: When the confidant is socially closer to the *perpetrator* than the victim, there is a lower tendency to advise reporting to various agencies, when VB, RMA, and social desirability are covariates.

H2: When the confidant is socially closer to the *victim* than the perpetrator, there is a higher tendency to advise victims to report to agencies, when VB, RMA, and social desirability are covariates.

H3: If the confidant and victim are acquaintances, the likelihood to advise reporting rape reduces as the relational distance to the perpetrator reduces, when VB, RMA, and social desirability are covariates. That is, advising to report would reduce if the perpetrator is a friend, compared to a stranger. Lowest advising to report would be when the confidant and victim are acquaintances and the perpetrator is a family member.

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

H4: RMA and VB negatively predict the tendency to advise victims to report to agencies.

In addition, we explore the reasons cited as motivations for advising or not advising victims to report to various agencies.

Method

Participants

A sample of 418 Indians (244 women, $M_{\text{age}} = 21.12$ years, $SD = 2.17$, range = 18–30) was obtained via Google Forms circulated online to student forums and social media websites. The data were screened for eligibility criteria of age (18–30 years), nationality (Indian), and self-reported scores of ≥ 5 out of 10 for English proficiency, attention to, and honesty in answering the questions. The latter was done because the study involved vignettes presented in English, and therefore participants needed to be sufficiently proficient in the language to understand and follow instructions.

Materials

Scenarios

Participants were asked to choose a number between 1 and 7, based on which they were assigned to read one of seven vignettes¹ (Appendix A in the Supplementary Materials). This technique is similar to the birthday technique (Reips, 2002, p. 246); participants picked their experiments by clicking on one of the seven letters corresponding to the experimental groups.

¹ Note that the 3 (relationship to victim: family, friend, stranger) x 3 (relationship to perpetrator: family, friend, stranger) design yields nine scenarios. However, the scenario where both the victim and perpetrator are family members of the confidant was not included as this usually occurs in the case of child sexual abuse, marital rape, or incest. The former entails different reporting procedures due to the involvement of minors, whereas marital rape is not illegal in India (above the age of 15 years) and consequently, cannot be reported. Incest is a form of assault that includes other important caveats (e.g., Fessler & Navarrete, 2004; Lieberman & Smith, 2012) not directly relevant to the study and hence was not included. Additionally, the scenario where both the victim and perpetrator are strangers to the confidant was not included, as such a scenario would come to the knowledge of the confidant usually through a third-party source or the media.

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

The use of written scenarios in the experimental investigation is consistent with previous work (Ben-David & Schneider, 2005; Bridges, 1991). The vignettes were constructed to reflect an Indian setting, by using Indian names and scenarios common in India. All the vignettes were alike in terms of the names of the victim and perpetrator, the setting where the incident takes place, and the way in which the events unfold.

To avoid bias, terminology such as “victim,” “perpetrator,” and “sexual assault/rape” was not used. The vignettes differed with regard to the relation between the participant (henceforth referred to as ‘confidant(s)'), victim, and perpetrator (Appendix A). Across all scenarios, the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim was that of acquaintances of the opposite sex.

Victim Blaming Questionnaire (VB; $\alpha = .77$)

Upon reading the vignettes, the confidants completed a 20-item scale drafted for the purpose of this research, due to the lack of a valid and culturally appropriate scale (Appendix B). Adapted from previous studies (Abrams et al., 2003; Ben-David & Schneider, 2005), this questionnaire was designed to measure the extent to which confidants blamed the victim for the incident in the aforementioned Indian setting. A 4-point Likert scale (1 = *not at all* to 4 = *to a great extent*) was utilized. A higher cumulative score was interpreted as higher victim-blaming behavior.

Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMA; $\alpha = .92$)

The 22-item Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance scale (Payne et al., 1999) was completed in its 5-point Likert format (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). The scale was used in its original form as it has shown good reliability in previous studies in the Indian context (e.g., Kamdar et al., 2017). Higher scores on this scale indicate higher acceptance of rape myths (Appendix C).

Initial Reporting Question (IRQ)

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

An IRQ (Appendix D) assessed whether or not the confidants would advise reporting. This question was repeated to assess reporting advice to all four agencies (i.e. police, hospital, family, friends). The IRQs were responded to on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = *definitely no* to 4 = *definitely yes*). Higher scores on the IRQ for an agency indicated a higher tendency to advise reporting to that agency. A high overall IRQ score (summation of the four agency-wise scores) indicated a higher general tendency to advise the victims to report the crime.

Facilitative Reasons Questionnaire (FRQ)/Preventative Reasons Questionnaire (PRQ)

Depending on the response to the IRQ, confidants were directed towards questionnaires assessing motivations to advise reporting or not reporting (Appendix D). Choosing either ‘definitely no’ or ‘maybe no’ to the IRQ directed confidants to the PRQ. Choosing either ‘maybe yes’ or ‘definitely yes’ directed confidants to the FRQ. The same process was followed for each agency. The FRQ contained six reasons assessing motivation to advise and the PRQ contained similar six reasons, structured in a way to assess reasons for not advising. For the present study, the motivations were operationalized as follows:

- a. *Seriousness*: To understand whether or not the incident was serious enough to report to an agency (Greenberg & Ruback, 1985).
- b. *Safety*: To assess whether or not the particular agency could provide protection to the victim (Bachman, 1998; Wolitzky-Taylor et al., 2011).
- c. *Help*: To assess the perceived helpfulness, or lack of it, of an agency (Dukes & Mattley, 1977).
- a. *Disbelief*: To assess whether or not the agency would believe the victim (Walsh & Bruce, 2014).
- d. *Victim Blame*: To assess whether or not the agency would blame the victim (Campbell et al., 1999).

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

- e. *Convenience/Comfort*: To assess whether the process or the procedures involved in telling an agency would be convenient or would cause discomfort to the victim (Campbell, 2008; Campbell et al., 1999).

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (SDS)

This 33-item scale ($\alpha = .69$) was used in its true-false format to assess the influence of social desirability on the responses given by the participants (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). A higher score on the scale indicates a bias in responding to questionnaires in order to manage their self-presentation.

Non-Moral Dilemmas

At the end of the questionnaire, participants were presented with an option to choose a letter from A-G, based on which they read an unconnected non-moral dilemma. Upon reading the dilemma, they answered a yes/no question. The purpose of presenting this was to neutralize any negative consequences of the questionnaire.

Procedure

Participants were first informed of the graphic nature of the vignettes and prompted to close their browser window at any time, including the duration of the study, should they wish to not participate. After obtaining informed consent and demographic details, participants were asked to pick a number from 1 to 7, which assigned them to one of the 7 vignettes. After reading each of the vignettes, the participants responded to the Victim Blaming Questionnaire, the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale, and then the Initial Reporting Question. Based on the IRQ, they were then directed to the Facilitative Reasons Questionnaire (FRQ)/Preventative Reasons Questionnaire (PRQ). The Social Desirability Scale was then presented and followed by reading unrelated non-moral dilemmas and answering a yes/no question. Participants were then debriefed, and were given the contact information of mental health helplines in case they experienced distress as a result of the task.

Results

The present study aimed to investigate the effects of relationships between confidant-victim-perpetrator, Rape Myth Acceptance, and Victim Blaming, on the advice given by confidants to victims to report. In addition, the reasons cited as motivations for advising or not advising victims to report were explored. Descriptive statistics and correlations are presented in Table 1.

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Zero-Order Correlations

| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. | 9. | 10. | 11. | 12. |
|--------------------------------------|----------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| 1. Sex | -- | -- | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Age | 21.12 | 2.17 | -.08 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Social Desirability | 17.89 | 4.59 | .02 | .02 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Relationship with the Victim | -- | -- | -.16** | .08 | -.02 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Relationship with the perpetrator | -- | -- | .09 | -.03 | -.09 | -- | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 6. Victim Blaming | 42.58 | 8.13 | -.15** | -.04 | .03 | -.02 | .06 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 7. Rape Myth Acceptance | 54.03 | 15.48 | -.26** | .02 | -.01 | -.01 | .02 | .54** | 1 | | | | | |
| 8. Report to Police | 3.42 | .83 | .20** | .04 | .07 | -.11* | .06 | -.45** | -.34** | 1 | | | | |
| 9. Report to Hospital | 3.56 | .72 | .24** | .00 | .05 | -.05 | .10* | -.25** | -.25** | .39** | 1 | | | |
| 10. Report to Family | 3.46 | .81 | .23** | -.01 | .06 | -.09 | .09 | -.33** | -.24** | .55** | .30** | 1 | | |
| 11. Report to Friends | 2.57 | .96 | .22** | .03 | -.02 | -.06 | .07 | .23** | -.22** | .19** | .18** | .19** | 1 | |
| 12. Overall Reporting | 13.02 | 2.28 | .32** | .02 | .05 | -.12* | .12* | -.46** | -.38** | .76** | .64** | .73** | .61** | 1 |

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

The means and standard deviations of the relationship with the victim and the perpetrator have not been reported as they are manipulated categorical variables. Similarly, the correlation between the confidant's relationship with the victim and the perpetrator has not been reported as it is the interaction between the two manipulated categorical independent variables.

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

To test the effect of the relationship between the confidant and the victim on the advice to report the assault (H1), we ran multiple hierarchical regressions, controlling for Social Desirability, RMA and VB in Step 1. The relationships between the confidant and the victim were dummy coded (Family Member = 0, Friend/Acquaintance = 1, and Stranger = 2). We found that the closer the confidant and victim were, the higher the overall likelihood of advising to report ($b = -.38$, $R^2 = .25$, $F(413,1) = 8.00$, $p = .005$). Further, the closer the relationship between the confidant and the victim, the higher the likelihood of advising to report to the police ($b = -.14$, $R^2 = .24$, $F(413,1) = 7.83$, $p = .005$) and family ($b = -.11$, $R^2 = .13$, $F(413,1) = 4.16$, $p = .04$). However, the relationship was not significant with respect to advising to report to the hospital ($b = -.05$, $R^2 = .09$, $F(413,1) = 1.15$, $p = .28$) or to friends ($b = -.09$, $R^2 = .07$, $F(413,1) = 1.84$, $p = .18$).

Next, to test the effect of the relational distance between the confidant and the perpetrator on the advice to report the assault (H2), we ran multiple hierarchical regressions, controlling for Social Desirability, RMA, and VB in Step 1. The relationships between the confidant and the perpetrator were dummy coded (Family Member = 0, Friend/Acquaintance = 1, and Stranger = 2). We found that the closer the confidant and the perpetrator are in relation, the lesser the overall likelihood of advising to report ($b = .43$, $R^2 = .26$, $F(413,1) = 11.39$, $p = .001$). Further, the closer the relationship between the confidant and the perpetrator, the lesser the likelihood of advising to report to the police ($b = .10$, $R^2 = .23$, $F(413,1) = 4.46$, $p = .04$), hospital ($b = .11$, $R^2 = .10$, $F(413,1) = 5.93$, $p = .02$), and family ($b = .12$, $R^2 = .13$, $F(413,1) = 6.23$, $p = .01$), but not to friends ($b = .10$, $R^2 = .07$, $F(413,1) = 2.70$, $p = .10$).

Additionally, to examine whether the likelihood to advise reporting rape reduces as the perpetrator and victim get socially closer (H3) when the confidant and the victim are friends, we ran multiple hierarchical regressions, controlling for Social Desirability, RMA, and VB in Step 1. We found that there is no difference in the advice to report if the confidant and the

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

perpetrator are family members versus friends ($b = -.58$, $R^2 = .32$, $F(128, 1) = 2.82$, $p = .09$). However, there is a significantly higher likelihood to advise to report when the confidant and the perpetrator are family members versus strangers ($b = .36$, $R^2 = .27$, $F(199, 1) = 4.50$, $p = .04$), and when they are friends versus strangers ($b = 1.16$, $R^2 = .27$, $F(137, 1) = 12.56$, $p = .001$). However, the relationship is more speculative between the likelihood to advise and specific agencies (Table 2). Thus, the closer the confidant and the perpetrator are in relation, the lower the likelihood of advising to report.

To examine the relationships between RMA and VB on the tendency to advise victims to report to agencies (H4), multiple hierarchical regressions were conducted, controlling for Social Desirability in Step 1. RMA negatively predicted the advice to report overall ($b = -.06$, $R^2 = .14$, $F(415, 1) = 69.36$, $p < .001$), and to the police ($b = -.02$, $R^2 = .12$, $F(415, 1) = 53.51$, $p < .001$), hospital ($b = -.01$, $R^2 = .06$, $F(415, 1) = 26.77$, $p < .001$), friends ($b = -.01$, $R^2 = .05$, $F(415, 1) = 21.00$, $p < .001$), and family ($b = -.01$, $R^2 = .06$, $F(415, 1) = 24.83$, $p < .001$). VB also negatively predicted the advice to report overall ($b = -.13$, $R^2 = .215$, $F(415, 1) = 112.59$, $p < .001$), and to the police ($b = -.04$, $R^2 = .22$, $F(415, 1) = 111.32$, $p < .001$), hospital ($b = -.02$, $R^2 = .07$, $F(415, 1) = 27.72$, $p < .001$), friends ($b = -.02$, $R^2 = .05$, $F(415, 1) = 22.68$, $p < .001$), and family ($b = -.03$, $R^2 = .12$, $F(415, 1) = 52.28$, $p < .001$).

Finally, the motivations for advising or not advising to report were explored, along with gender differences in the motivations (Table 3a-c). Women ($M = 13.64$, $SD = 1.91$) were significantly more likely than men ($M = 12.15$, $SD = 2.47$) to advise to report overall, $t(416) = -6.94$, $p < .001$, $d = .68$, and to each of the agencies. Men, on the other hand, were likely to discourage reporting to each of the four agencies. They were more likely to believe that the assault was not serious enough to be reported to the police, but that the police would not blame the victim, compared to women. Further, they were more likely to believe that hospitals would not be able to start an investigation for the victim and would not be able to help her. Women,

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

on the other hand, believed that the incident was serious enough to be reported to the police, the hospital, and family, and were more likely to advise reporting to the three agencies. They were also more likely to advise reporting to friends.

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

Table 2: Effects of the relationships between the victim and the perpetrator, when the confidants and the victim are friends on reporting behavior to the four agencies.

| <i>Models</i> | <i>Variables</i> | Police | | | Hospital | | | Family | | | Friends | | |
|---|------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|----------|-----------------------|----------|----------|-----------------------|----------|----------|-----------------------|----------|
| | | <i>b</i> | <i>R</i> ² | <i>F</i> | <i>B</i> | <i>R</i> ² | <i>F</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>R</i> ² | <i>F</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>R</i> ² | <i>F</i> |
| 1. Family versus Friends (Controls) | Constant | 5.72 | | | 4.92*** | | | 5.04*** | | | 4.12*** | | |
| | RMA | -.01 | .28 | 16.52*** | -.01* | .15 | 7.61*** | .00 | .15 | 7.48*** | -.01 | .08 | 3.71** |
| | VB | -.05 | | | -.02* | | | -.04*** | | | -.01 | | |
| | SDS | -.01 | | | .00 | | | -.01 | | | -.04* | | |
| 2. Family versus Friends | Constant | 6.04 | | | 4.98*** | | | 5.23*** | | | 4.24*** | | |
| | RMA | -.01 | | | -.01* | | | .00 | .16 | 1.67 | -.01 | .08 | .09 |
| | VB | -.05 | .30 | 4.93* | .02* | .15 | .20 | -.05*** | | | -.02 | | |
| | SDS | -.01 | | | .00 | | | -.01 | | | -.04* | | |
| | Relationship | -.28 | | | -.60 | | | -.19 | | | .05 | | |
| 3. Friends versus Strangers (Controls) | Constant | 5.15*** | | | 4.50*** | | | 4.81*** | | | 3.95*** | | |
| | RMA | -.01 | .17 | 9.19*** | -.01 | .08 | 3.94** | -.00 | .09 | 4.68** | -.01 | .06 | 2.67* |
| | VB | -.03*** | | | -.02 | | | -.03** | | | -.02 | | |
| | SDS | -.02 | | | .00 | | | -.01 | | | -.02 | | |
| 4. Friends versus Strangers | Constant | 4.74 | | | 4.23*** | | | 4.38*** | | | 3.82*** | | |
| | RMA | -.01 | | | -.01 | .11 | 4.96* | -.00 | .15 | 8.60** | -.01 | | |
| | VB | -.03*** | .23 | 10.70*** | -.02* | | | -.04*** | | | -.02 | | |
| | SDS | 0.01 | | | .01 | | | .00 | | | -.02 | | |
| | Relationship | .38*** | | | .26* | | | .34** | | | .12 | | |
| 5. Strangers versus Family (Controls) | Constant | 5.35*** | | | 4.78*** | | | 4.97*** | | | 3.99*** | | |
| | RMA | -.01 | .22 | 18.74*** | -.01** | .13 | 10.23*** | .00 | | | -.00 | .06 | 3.87** |
| | VB | -.04*** | | | -.02** | | | -.04*** | .13 | 9.68*** | -.02 | | |
| | SDS | -.00 | | | .00 | | | -.00 | | | -.03 | | |
| | Constant | 5.23*** | .23 | 2.29 | 4.63*** | | | 4.82*** | | | 3.95 | | |

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------|---------|--------|-----|------|---------|-----|------|------|-----|-----|
| 6. Strangers | RMA | -.01 | -.01** | .15 | 3.51 | .00 | .14 | 3.05 | -.00 | | |
| versus Family | VB | -.04*** | -.02** | | | -.04*** | | | -.02 | .06 | .12 |
| | SDS | -.00 | .01 | | | -.001 | | | -.03 | | |
| | Relationship | .09 | .12 | | | .12 | | | .03 | | |

Note: RMA = Rape Myth Acceptance; VB = Victim Blaming; SDS = Social Desirability Scale; * $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$,

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

Table 3a. Results of *t*-test comparing responses to the Initial Reporting Question between men and women.

| | Female | | Male | | <i>T</i> | | Female | | Male | | <i>t</i> |
|--------------------------------|----------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|-------------------------------|----------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|
| | <i>n</i> | <i>M (SD)</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>M (SD)</i> | | | <i>N</i> | <i>M (SD)</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>M (SD)</i> | |
| Advising to Report to Police | 244 | 3.56 (0.75) | 174 | 3.23 (0.89) | -4.11** | Advising to Report to Family | 244 | 3.62 (0.68) | 174 | 3.24 (0.92) | -4.87*** |
| Advising to Report to Hospital | 244 | 3.70 (0.58) | 174 | 3.35 (0.85) | -5.03*** | Advising to Report to Friends | 244 | 2.75 (0.89) | 174 | 2.33 (1.01) | -4.51** |

Note: ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

Table 3b. Results of t-test comparing responses to the Facilitative Reasons Questionnaire between men and women

| | | Female | | Male | | | | Female | | Male | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|----------|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| | | <i>n</i> | <i>M (SD)</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>M (SD)</i> | <i>t</i> | | | <i>n</i> | <i>M (SD)</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>M (SD)</i> | <i>t</i> |
| Advising to Report to Police | | | | | | Advising to Report to Family | | | | | | | |
| Seriousness | | | 4.58(0.69) | | 4.28(0.97) | -3.48*** | Seriousness | | 4.75(0.48) | | 4.54(0.68) | -3.36*** | |
| Safety | | | 3.71(0.89) | | 3.76(0.92) | 0.42 | Safety | | 4.42(0.78) | | 4.36(0.95) | -0.58 | |
| Help | | | 4.08(0.77) | | 4.08(0.83) | 0.08 | Help | | 4.44(0.76) | | 4.51(0.77) | 0.82 | |
| Disbelief | 221 | | 2.93(0.97) | 143 | 3.36(1.15) | 3.89*** | Disbelief | 225 | | 3.58(0.98) | 140 | 3.68(1.02) | 0.94 |
| Victim Blame | | | 4.27(0.97) | | 4.12(1.05) | -1.43 | Victim Blame | | 4.26(0.96) | | 4.20(0.92) | -0.61 | |
| Convenience/ Comfort | | | 2.79(1.10) | | 3.01(1.93) | 1.82 | Convenience/ Comfort | | 4.11(0.90) | | 4.09(0.99) | -0.14 | |
| Total | 244 | | 20.26(7.22) | 174 | 18.59(9.36) | -2.06*** | Total | 244 | | 6.59(9.05) | 174 | 10.43(9.81) | -3.55*** |
| Advising to Report to Hospital | | | | | | Advising to Report to Friends | | | | | | | |
| Seriousness | | | 4.09(0.93) | | 3.80(1.04) | -2.79* | Seriousness | | 4.04(0.82) | | 4.08(0.95) | 0.32 | |
| Safety | | | 3.41(1.17) | | 3.41(1.15) | 0.001 | Safety | | 3.85(0.88) | | 4.09(1.06) | 1.86 | |
| Help | | | 4.27(0.66) | | 4.18(0.78) | -1.22 | Help | | 4.27(0.62) | | 4.36(0.88) | 0.92** | |
| Disbelief | 223 | | 3.42(0.99) | 152 | 3.52(1.1) | 0.87 | Disbelief | 157 | | 4.08(0.83) | 78 | 4.00(1.01) | -0.67 |
| Victim Blame | | | 4.23(1.00) | | 4.14(1.01) | -0.83 | Victim Blame | | 4.39(0.86) | | 4.22(1.08) | -1.31** | |
| Convenience/ Comfort | | | 3.43(1.08) | | 3.50(1.09) | 0.63 | Convenience/ Comfort | | 4.34(0.77) | | 4.37(0.90) | 0.3 | |
| Total | 224 | | 21.82(5.81) | 174 | 19.71(8.90) | -3.07*** | Total | 244 | | 16.06(12.25) | 173 | 11.32(12.91) | -3.81** |

Note: * $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

Table 3c. Results of t-test comparing responses to the Preventative Reasons Questionnaire between men and women

| | Female | | Male | | <i>T</i> | Female | | Male | | <i>T</i> | |
|--------------------------------|----------|------------|----------|------------|----------|-------------------------------|--------|------------|--------|-------------|---------|
| | <i>n</i> | M (SD) | <i>n</i> | M (SD) | | <i>n</i> | M (SD) | <i>n</i> | M (SD) | | |
| Advising to Report to Police | | | | | | Advising to Report to Family | | | | | |
| Seriousness | | 2.52(1.24) | | 3.55(1.41) | 2.78 | Seriousness | | 2.42(1.22) | | 2.65(1.23) | 0.65 |
| Safety | | 3.65(1.30) | | 3.16(1.19) | -1.44 | Safety | | 2.58(0.90) | | 2.74(1.24) | 0.48 |
| Help | 23 | 3.22(0.90) | 31 | 3.42(1.18) | 0.69 | Help | 19 | 3.05(1.08) | 34 | 3.06(1.18) | 0.02 |
| Disbelief | | 4.13(1.01) | | 3.90(1.04) | -0.80 | Disbelief | | 4.00(1.05) | | 3.59(1.16) | -1.28 |
| Victim Blame | | 2.65(0.94) | | 2.84(1.16) | 0.63 | Victim Blame | | 2.89(1.05) | | 2.91(1.16) | 0.05 |
| Convenience/Comfort | | 4.13(0.87) | | 3.90(1.04) | -0.85 | Convenience/Comfort | | 3.89(0.99) | | 4.09(0.87) | 0.74 |
| Total | 236 | 1.98(6.14) | 167 | 3.86(8.24) | 2.63*** | Total | 231 | 1.55(5.33) | 164 | 3.95(7.94) | 3.59*** |
| Advising to Report to Hospital | | | | | | Advising to Report to Friends | | | | | |
| Seriousness | | 3.45(0.82) | | 3.68(1.09) | 0.61 | Seriousness | | 2.26(0.99) | | 2.53(1.04) | 1.86 |
| Safety | | 2.82(1.08) | | 3.50(1.19) | 1.6 | Safety | | 3.37(0.90) | | 3.43(0.97) | 0.43 |
| Help | 11 | 2.64(0.92) | 22 | 3.82(0.73) | 4.00 | Help | 87 | 3.34(0.83) | 96 | 3.30(0.99) | -0.32 |
| Disbelief | | 3.00(0.63) | | 2.91(1.27) | -0.22* | Disbelief | | 3.03(1.05) | | 2.96(0.92) | -0.52 |
| Victim Blame | | 2.45(1.04) | | 2.50(1.26) | 0.10 | Victim Blame | | 2.23(1.10) | | 2.53(1.23) | 1.74 |
| Convenience/Comfort | | 2.64(0.81) | | 3.36(1.29) | 1.70 | Convenience/Comfort | | 4.09(0.71) | | 4.15(0.88) | 0.45* |
| Total | 180 | 0.95(3.99) | 128 | 2.16(6.32) | 2.06*** | Total | | 6.59(9.05) | | 10.43(9.81) | 4.12** |

Note: * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$ *** $p \leq .001$.

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

Discussion

This study examined the relationships between advice to report sexual assault and the relational distance between the confidant and the victim, victim blaming, and rape myth acceptance.

The closer the relationship between the confidant and the perpetrator, the lesser was the likelihood of advising to report overall, and to the three agencies of police, hospital, and family, but not to friends (H1). This is in line with previous findings suggesting that sexual assault involving non-strangers are less likely to be reported (Felson & Paré, 2005; Williams, 1984). Knoth and Ruback (2016) report that the confidant-perpetrator relationship influences the advice given to report sexual assault. Bystanders are less inclined to report if the perpetrator is known (Nicksa, 2014), perhaps for fear of retaliation (Bennett et al., 2014). In other words, if the perpetrator is known, the bystander may perceive it less safe to punish them fearing retribution at a later point, something strangers are less likely to do. This might also explain our finding that there is no difference in the advice to report when the confidant and the perpetrator are family members versus friends, in a situation where the confidant and the victim are friends (H3). On the other hand, there is a significantly higher likelihood to advise to report when the confidant and the perpetrator are family members (versus strangers), and when they are friends (versus strangers). Thus, only when the perpetrator is a stranger, do confidants encourage reporting assault (H3), perhaps because a stranger may not retaliate. Further, it is possible that when a third party is involved, the embarrassment may be lower (Shearn et al., 1999) compared to when one's acquaintance is involved in a crime.

On the contrary, the closer the relationship between the confidant and the victim, the higher the likelihood of advising to report overall as well as to the police and family. However, the relationship was not significant for reporting to the hospital or friends (H2). Knowing the victim might help in empathizing with them, and therefore might trigger a sense of

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

responsibility to act (Banyard, 2011). This is in line with the finding that help is more likely to be extended to those in the in-group than others (Levine et al., 2002), applicable to a variety of sexual assault situations, including child abuse (e.g., Christy & Voigt, 1994). This might be because of a greater sense of responsibility to intervene (Burn, 2009). Further, those in the in-group might not be blamed for the assault due to the fundamental attribution error, thus encouraging reporting (Ogletree & Archer, 2011) especially to others in the family. They might rationalize that, by reporting transgressions within the in-group to others in the in-group internally (such as “keeping it within the family”), support systems can be built. When the victim is one’s in-group, a higher willingness to punish norm violations has been observed (Bernhard et al., 2006; Goette et al., 2006). Consequently, sexual assault might be reported to the police because the bystander might want justice (Moore & Baker, 2018). However, the event may not be reported to hospitals, owing to lack of knowledge about the medical ramifications of assault. Hospitals themselves might not follow medico-legal protocols (Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug vs Union of India and Others, 2009; Bajoria, 2017), thereby losing trust among bystanders.

Perception of the help-seeking resource, such as the police, influences victims’ decisions to employ them (Xie & Baumer, 2019). It is possible that friends are perceived to be not resourceful, and therefore, are not considered candidates for reporting, regardless of the confidant’s relationship with the victim or the perpetrator. Further, the range of relationships labelled “friends” are broad. Therefore, it is likely that confidants discourage reporting to them, in the face of moral judgments by some of them, especially if they are not as close to the victims.

As expected, both Rape Myth Acceptance and Victim Blaming negatively predicted advise to report overall, as well as to the four agencies (H4). RMA and VB have been linked to each other (Klement et al., 2019), and these two together have been linked to the lower

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

likelihood to report sexual assault (Solórzano, 2007; Suarez & Gadalla, 2010). This might be because those who accept rape myths attribute the victim with responsibility for the crime and have decreased negative feelings towards the perpetrator (Clarke & Stermac, 2011). Further, they might blame the victim, judge the trauma of sexual assault as less severe, and therefore, be less likely to advise reporting to the police than those with low RMA (Frese et al., 2004). Those who victim blame also view the victim as unworthy of intervention (Burn, 2009). Thus, if one believes that the victim is at fault for the assault and trivializes the seriousness of the incident, one is also less likely to advise reporting the assault.

Finally, men were less likely to advise reporting to the agencies, because they were largely uncertain about the seriousness of the crime and the helpfulness of the agencies. Women were motivated by the seriousness of the crime and therefore, encouraged reporting to all four agencies. Women categorize a broad range of behaviors as harassment (Rotundo et al., 2001), and men are less likely to perceive sexual touching as harassment (Gutek, 1985). Thus, it is likely that women perceive sexual harassment as a serious issue. A crime that is considered serious is more likely to be reported than one that is perceived as less serious (Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 1987). This is perhaps why women are more likely to advise reporting than men. In fact, we found that men are likely to discourage reporting, especially to the police, because they believe that the incident was not serious enough.

Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions

This study examined effects of relations to the victim and perpetrator on confidants' advice to victims to report rape. Those closer to the perpetrator were found to be less likely to advise reporting whereas those closer to the victims were more likely to advise reporting. Rape Myth Acceptance and Victim Blaming were found to negatively affect advising-to-report scores. To the best of the authors' knowledge, this study was the first to explore relationships between the confidant-victim-perpetrator triad and reporting advice to formal and informal

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

agencies, particularly in the Indian context. Thus, the results filled a critical gap in knowledge of culturally-relevant reporting behaviors. Due to high incidence of acquaintance rape in India, it was imperative that a systematic study highlight the influence as well as the motivations of third parties related to both the victim and perpetrator.

One of the critical limitations of this study was that the results were all based on hypothetical scenarios. Sleed et al. (2002) noted significant differences in blame attributions of date rape scenarios wherein participants were found to blame the victim more and were less likely to define the situation as rape when exposed to written vignettes as compared to video vignettes. The limitations of a vignette study also apply. For instance, self-reported behavioral intentions are likely to differ from actual behavior (e. g., Eifler & Petzold, 2019). However, considering the subject matter of the study, which is sensitive in nature, it is difficult to use a behavioral measure. The study is also limited in that it only accessed situations where the victim was female and the perpetrator was male. Given the legal and cultural sequelae of same-sex relations in India, the effect on confidant perceptions if the victim were male or if the situation were to occur in a same-sex relationship is unclear. Next, in one vignette, participants were related to the victim and we considered whether participants would suggest reporting to other family members. It is likely that participants did not envision other family members while considering reporting, even though it was assumed. Further, the study was conducted online and in English. It is likely that the findings may not be generalizable to those who are not very fluent in English and those who may not have access to the internet. Future studies should attempt to replicate this study using the various Indian languages.

The findings suggest a need for further systematic research into culturally relevant variables of rape and sexual assault, such as influence of confidants. A better understanding of the influence of third-parties on reporting behavior may lead to the creation of educational programs specifically targeting victim blaming behaviors and may lead to a supportive

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

environment for victims. A useful line of investigation would be into the effects and influences of confidants for reporting domestic abuse. Additionally, the confidence in formal and informal institutions regarding their efficacy in dealing with sexual assault victims must also be explored. Underreporting of crimes lead to skewed government data, misunderstanding the scope of the issue, and inefficient policy implementations that affect current and probable victims of rape. Thus, it is imperative to investigate the role of stakeholders such as confidants and other third parties.

References

- Abrams, D., Viki, G. T., Masser, B., & Bohner, G. (2003). Perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape proclivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(1), 111. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.1.111>
- Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug vs Union of India and others, Pub. L. No. WRIT PETITION (CRIMINAL) no. 115 of 2009 (Supreme Court of India Proceedings) 2009 (2009).
- Bachman, R. (1998). The factors related to rape reporting behavior and arrest: New evidence from the National Crime Victimization Survey. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 25*(1), 8–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854898025001002>
- Bajoria, J. (2017). Everyone Blames Me: Barriers to Justice and Support Services for Sexual Assault Survivors in India. *Human Rights Watch, New Delhi*
- Banyard, V. L. (2011). Who will help prevent sexual violence: Creating an ecological model of bystander intervention. *Psychology of Violence, 1*(3), 216. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023739>
- Basow, S., & Minieri, A. (2011). “You owe me”: Effects of date cost, who pays, participant gender, and rape myth beliefs on perceptions of rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(3), 479–497. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510363421>
- Ben-David, S., & Schneider, O. (2005). Rape perceptions, gender role attitudes, and victim-perpetrator acquaintance. *Sex Roles, 53*(5–6), 385–399. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-6761-4>
- Bennett, S., Banyard, V. L., & Garnhart, L. (2014). To act or not to act, that is the question? Barriers and facilitators of bystander intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29*(3), 476–496. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513505210>

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

- Bernhard, H., Fischbacher, U., & Fehr, E. (2006). Parochial altruism in humans. *Nature*, *442*(7105), 912–915. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04981>
- Black, Donald. J. (1971). The social organisation of arrest. *Stanford Law Review*, 1087–1111.
- Bridges, J. S. (1991). Perceptions of date and stranger rape: A difference in sex role expectations and rape-supportive beliefs. *Sex Roles*, *24*(5–6), 291–307. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00288303>
- Burn, S. M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles*, *60*(11–12), 779–792. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9581-5>
- Campbell, R. (2008). The psychological impact of rape victims. *American Psychologist*, *63*(8), 702. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.8.702>
- Campbell, R., & Raja, S. (2005). The sexual assault and secondary victimization of female veterans: Help-seeking experiences with military and civilian social systems. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *29*(1), 97–106. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00171.x>
- Campbell, R., Sefl, T., Barnes, H. E., Ahrens, C. E., Wasco, S. M., & Zaragoza-Diesfeld, Y. (1999). Community services for rape survivors: Enhancing psychological well-being or increasing trauma? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *67*(6), 847–858. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.67.6.847>
- Christy, C. A., & Voigt, H. (1994). Bystander responses to public episodes of child abuse. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *24*(9), 824–847. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1994.tb00614.x>
- Clarke, A. K., & Stermac, L. (2011). The influence of stereotypical beliefs, participant gender, and survivor weight on sexual assault response. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *26*(11), 2285–2302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510383039>

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

- Cohn, E. S., Dupuis, E. C., & Brown, T. M. (2009). In the Eye of the Beholder: Do Behavior and Character Affect Victim and Perpetrator Responsibility for Acquaintance Rape? 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(7), 1513–1535.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00493.x>
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*(4), 349. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0047358>
- Dukes, R. L., & Mattley, C. L. (1977). Predicting rape victim reportage. *Sociology & Social Research.*
- Eifler, S., & Petzold, K. (2019). Validity Aspects of Vignette Experiments: Expected “What-If” Differences Between Reports of Behavioral Intentions and Actual Behavior. *Experimental Methods in Survey Research: Techniques That Combine Random Sampling with Random Assignment, 393–416.*
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119083771.ch20>
- Felson, R. B., & Paré, P. (2005). The reporting of domestic violence and sexual assault by nonstrangers to the police. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*(3), 597–610.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00156.x>
- Freetly, A. J. H., & Kane, E. W. (1995). Men’s and women’s perceptions of non-consensual sexual intercourse. *Sex Roles, 33*(11–12), 785–802.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01544779>
- Frese, B., Moya, M., & Megías, J. L. (2004). Social perception of rape: How rape myth acceptance modulates the influence of situational factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(2), 143–161. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260503260245>

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

- Gartner, R., & Macmillan, R. (1995). The Effect of Victim-Offender Relationship on Reporting Crimes of Violence against Women. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 37. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cjcrim.37.3.393>
- Goette, L., Huffman, D., & Meier, S. (2006). The impact of group membership on cooperation and norm enforcement: Evidence using random assignment to real social groups. *American Economic Review*, 96(2), 212–216. <https://doi.org/10.1257/000282806777211658>
- Gottfredson, M. R., & Gottfredson, D. M. (1987). *Decision making in criminal justice: Toward the rational exercise of discretion* (Vol. 3). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Gravelin, C. R., Biernat, M., & Bucher, C. E. (2019). Blaming the victim of acquaintance rape: Individual, situational, and sociocultural factors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(JAN), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02422>
- Greenberg, M. S., & Ruback, R. B. (1985). A model of crime victim decision making. *Victimology*, 10(1–4), 600–616. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-3334-4>
- Greenberg, M. S., & Ruback, R. B. (1992). *Self-Reports* (pp. 151–179). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-3334-4_8
- Gutek, B. A. (1985). *Sex and the workplace*. Jossey-Bass Inc Pub.
- Hammond, E. M., Berry, M. A., & Rodriguez, D. N. (2011). The influence of rape myth acceptance, sexual attitudes, and belief in a just world on attributions of responsibility in a date rape scenario. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 16(2), 242–252. <https://doi.org/10.1348/135532510X499887>
- Kamdar, Z. N., Kosambiya, J. K., Chawada, B. L., Verma, M., & Kadia, A. (2017). Rape: Is it a lifestyle or behavioral problem? *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 59(1), 77. https://doi.org/10.4103/psychiatry.IndianJPsychiatry_78_16

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

- Kennedy, A. C., & Prock, K. A. (2016). "I Still Feel Like I Am Not Normal": A review of the role of stigma and stigmatization among female survivors of Child Sexual Abuse, Sexual Assault, and Intimate Partner Violence. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 152483801667360. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838016673601>
- Kishor, S., & Gupta, K. (2005). *National Family Health Survey: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment In India*.
- Klement, K. R., Sagarin, B. J., & Skowronski, J. J. (2019). Accusers lie and other myths: Rape myth acceptance predicts judgments made about accusers and accused perpetrators in a rape case. *Sex Roles*, 81(1–2), 16–33. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-018-0950-4>
- Knoth, L. K., & Ruback, R. B. (2016). Reporting Crimes to the Police Depends on Relationship Networks: Effects of Ties Among Victims, Advisors, and Offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516662848>
- Krahé, B. (1988). Victim and observer characteristics as determinants of responsibility attributions to victims of rape. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 18(1), 50–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1988.tb00004.x>
- Levine, M., Cassidy, C., Brazier, G., & Reicher, S. (2002). Self-Categorization and Bystander Non-intervention: Two Experimental Studies 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(7), 1452–1463. <https://doi.org/10.1111/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2002.tb01446.x>
- Logan, T. K., Evans, L., Stevenson, E., & Jordan, C. E. (2005). Barriers to services for rural and urban survivors of rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(5), 591–616. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260504272899>
- Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1994). Rape myths. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 18(2), 133–164. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1994.tb00448.x>

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

- Mason, G. E., Riger, S., & Foley, L. a. (2004). The impact of past sexual experiences on attributions of responsibility for rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(10), 1157–1171. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260504269094>
- Masser, B., Lee, K., & McKimmie, B. M. (2010). Bad Woman, Bad Victim? Disentangling the Effects of Victim Stereotypicality, Gender Stereotypicality and Benevolent Sexism on Acquaintance Rape Victim Blame. *Sex Roles, 62*(7–8), 494–504. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9648-y>
- Monson, C. M., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Binderup, T. (2000). Does “no” really mean “no” after you say “yes”? Attributions about date and marital rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*(11), 1156–1174. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626000015011003>
- Moore, B. M., & Baker, T. (2018). An exploratory examination of college students’ likelihood of reporting sexual assault to police and university officials: Results of a self-report survey. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33*(22), 3419–3438. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516632357>
- Nalla, M. K., & Madan, M. (2012). Determinants of Citizens’ Perceptions of Police-Community Cooperation in India: Implications for Community Policing. *Asian Journal of Criminology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11417-011-9110-2>
- National Crime Records Bureau. (2016). *Crime in India 2016*.
- Nicksa, S. C. (2014). Bystander’s willingness to report theft, physical assault, and sexual assault: The impact of gender, anonymity, and relationship with the offender. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29*(2), 217–236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513505146>

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

- Ogletree, S. M., & Archer, R. L. (2011). Interpersonal judgments: Moral responsibility and blame. *Ethics & Behavior*, *21*(1), 35–48.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2011.537569>
- Palermo, T., Bleck, J., & Peterman, A. (2013). Tip of the iceberg: Reporting and gender-based violence in developing countries. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *179*(5), 602–612. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwt295>
- Palmer, J. E., Nicksa, S. C., & McMahon, S. (2018). Does Who You Know Affect How You Act? The Impact of Relationships on Bystander Intervention in Interpersonal Violence Situations. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *33*(17), 2623–2642.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516628292>
- Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois rape myth acceptance scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *33*(1), 27–68.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1998.2238>
- Press Trust of India. (2020, March 20). Post-Nirbhaya changes in laws not yielded results due to poor implementation, say experts. *India Today*.
<https://www.indiatoday.in/india/story/post-nirbhaya-changes-in-laws-not-yielded-results-due-to-poor-implementation-say-experts-1657772-2020-03-20>
- Reips, U.-D. (2002). Standards for Internet-based experimenting. *Experimental Psychology*, *49*(4), 243. <https://doi.org/10.1026//1618-3169.49.4.243>
- Rennison, C. M. (2002). *Rape and sexual assault: Reporting to police and medical attention, 1992-2000*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs Washington, DC.
- Rotundo, M., Nguyen, D.-H., & Sackett, P. R. (2001). A meta-analytic review of gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(5), 914. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.86.5.914>

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

- Ruback, R. B., & Thompson, M. P. (2001). *Social and psychological consequences of violent victimization*. Sage.
- Sable, M. R., Danis, F., Mauzy, D. L., & Gallagher, S. K. (2006). Barriers to reporting sexual assault for women and men: Perspectives of college students. *Journal of American College Health, 55*(3), 157–162. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JACH.55.3.157-162>
- Schwartz, M. D., & Leggett, M. S. (1999). Bad dates or emotional trauma? *Violence Against Women, 5*(3), 251–271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778019922181211>
- Shearn, D., Spellman, L., Straley, B., Meirick, J., & Stryker, K. (1999). Empathic blushing in friends and strangers. *Motivation and Emotion, 23*(4), 307–316.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021342910378>
- Sleed, M., Durrheim, K., Kriel, A., Solomon, V., & Baxter, V. (2002). The effectiveness of the vignette methodology: A comparison of written and video vignettes in eliciting responses about date rape. *South African Journal of Psychology, 32*(3), 21–28.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630203200304>
- Solórzano, B. H. (2007). A comprehensive review of the influences on reporting of sexual assaults. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*(2), 225–226.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00354_10.x
- Suarez, E., & Gadalla, T. M. (2010). Stop blaming the victim: A meta-analysis on rape myths. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(11), 2010–2035.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260509354503>
- Ullman, S. E., & Filipas, H. H. (2001). Correlates of formal and informal support seeking in sexual assault victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*(10), 1028–1047.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/088626001016010004>

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

- Walsh, R. M., & Bruce, S. E. (2014). Reporting decisions after sexual assault: The impact of mental health variables. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 6(6), 691. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036592>
- Williams, L. S. (1984). The classic rape: When do victims report? *Social Problems*, 31(4), 459–467. <https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.1984.31.4.03a00070>
- Wolitzky-Taylor, K. B., Resnick, H. S., McCauley, J. L., Amstadter, A. B., Kilpatrick, D. G., & Ruggiero, K. J. (2011). Is reporting of rape on the rise? A comparison of women with reported versus unreported rape experiences in the National Women's Study-Replication. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(4), 807–832. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510365869>
- Xie, M., & Baumer, E. P. (2019). Crime victims' decisions to call the police: Past research and new directions. *Annual Review of Criminology*, 2, 217–240. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-criminol-011518-024748>

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

Appendix A: Vignettes

Note. The relation of the confidant to the victim is mentioned before that to the perpetrator in parenthesis.

Scenario 1 (Family/Acquaintance)

Aditya and you have been friends for five years.

It was the weekend and your sister Diya was staying alone at home as your parents and you had gone out of town for a wedding.

Diya was studying for college exams when the doorbell rang. She opened the door and saw that your friend Aditya was at the door.

He had come over to collect your notes, thinking you'd be at home. Diya invited Aditya to wait inside the apartment as she got the notes from your backpack. Aditya shut the door and entered the apartment.

As Diya was getting the notes, Aditya leaned over and started kissing Diya's neck. Diya was startled and took a step behind. Aditya grasped Diya tightly and kissed her mouth. He put his hands under her shirt and touched her breasts. Diya protested and said "No". Aditya refused to listen and kept going. He managed to remove all of Diya's clothes and had sex with her.

Scenario 2 (Family/Stranger)

It was the weekend and your cousin Diya was staying alone at home as her parents had gone out of town for a wedding.

Diya was studying for her college exams when the doorbell rang. She opened the door and saw that Aditya from the society staff was there to collect the maintenance fee. Diya invited Aditya to wait inside the apartment as she got the money from her wallet. Aditya shut the door and entered the apartment.

As Diya was getting the money from her backpack, Aditya leaned over and started kissing Diya's neck. Diya was startled and took a step behind. Aditya grasped Diya tightly and kissed

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

her mouth. He put his hands under her shirt and touched her breasts. Diya protested and said “No”. Aditya refused to listen and kept going. He managed to remove all of Diya’s clothes and had sex with her.

Scenario 3 (Acquaintance/Family)

Diya and you have been friends for the past five years. Aditya is your brother.

It was the weekend and Diya was staying alone at home as her parents had gone out of town for a wedding.

Diya was studying for college exams when the doorbell rang. She opened the door and saw that your brother Aditya was at the door. He had come over to collect notes from Diya on your behalf. Diya invited Aditya to wait inside the apartment as she got the notes from your backpack. Aditya shut the door and entered the apartment.

As Diya was getting the notes from her backpack, Aditya leaned over and started kissing Diya’s neck. Diya was startled and took a step behind. Aditya grasped Diya tightly and kissed her mouth. He put his hands under her shirt and touched her breasts. Diya protested and said “No”. Aditya refused to listen and kept going. He managed to remove all of Diya’s clothes and had sex with her.

Scenario 4 (Acquaintance/Acquaintance)

Aditya, Diya, and you have been friends for the past five years.

It was the weekend and Diya was staying alone at home as her parents had gone out of town for a wedding.

Diya was studying for college exams when the doorbell rang. She opened the door and saw that Aditya was at the door. He had come over to collect notes from Diya. Diya invited Aditya to wait inside the apartment as she got the notes from her backpack. Aditya shut the door and entered the apartment.

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

As Diya was getting the notes from her backpack, Aditya leaned over and started kissing Diya's neck. Diya was startled and took a step behind. Aditya grasped Diya tightly and kissed her mouth. He put his hands under her shirt and touched her breasts. Diya protested and said "No". Aditya refused to listen and kept going. He managed to remove all of Diya's clothes and had sex with her.

Scenario 5 (Acquaintance/Stranger)

Diya and you have been friends for the past five years.

It was the weekend and Diya was staying alone at home as her parents had gone out of town for a wedding.

Diya was studying for her college exams when the doorbell rang. She opened the door and saw that a person named Aditya was at the door. He said that he was there to collect the maintenance fee for the apartment. Diya invited Aditya to wait inside the apartment as she got the money from her wallet. Aditya shut the door and entered the apartment.

As Diya was getting the money from her wallet, Aditya leaned over and started kissing Diya's neck. Diya was startled and took a step behind. Aditya grasped Diya tightly and kissed her mouth. He put his hands under her shirt and touched her breasts. Diya protested and said "No". Aditya refused to listen and kept going. He managed to remove all of Diya's clothes and had sex with her.

Scenario 6 (Stranger/Family)

Your brother, Aditya, and Diya are college friends; but you have never met Diya.

It was the weekend and Diya was staying alone at home as her parents had gone out of town for a wedding.

Diya was studying for college exams when the doorbell rang. She opened the door and saw that your brother Aditya was at the door. He had come over to collect notes from Diya. Diya

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

invited Aditya to wait inside the apartment as she got the notes from her backpack. Aditya shut the door and entered the apartment.

As Diya was getting the notes from her backpack, Aditya leaned over and started kissing Diya's neck. Diya was startled and took a step behind. Aditya grasped Diya tightly and kissed her mouth. He put his hands under her shirt and touched her breasts. Diya protested and said "No". Aditya refused to listen and kept going. He managed to remove all of Diya's clothes and had sex with her.

Scenario 7 (Stranger/Acquaintance)

Aditya and you have been friends for the past five years. Diya and Aditya are college friends, but you have never met Diya.

It was the weekend and Diya was staying alone at home as her parents had gone out of town for a wedding.

Diya was studying for college exams when the doorbell rang. She opened the door and saw that Aditya was at the door. He had come over to collect notes from Diya.

As Diya was getting the notes from her backpack, Aditya leaned over and started kissing Diya's neck. Diya was startled at first and then took a step behind. Aditya grasped Diya tightly and kissed her mouth. He put his hands under her shirt and touched her breasts. Diya protested and said "No". Aditya refused to listen and kept going. He managed to remove all of Diya's clothes and had sex with her.

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

Appendix B: *Victim Blaming Scale*

Please answer the following questions.

Scale: (1) Not at all (2) Very little (3) Somewhat (4) To a great extent

- 1) To what extent did Aditya misunderstand Diya's desires?
- 2) To what extent do you believe Diya really wanted to have sex with Aditya?
- 3) To what extent was the incident influenced by Aditya's psychological problems?
- 4) To what extent was Diya's behaviour of taking a step behind justified?*
- 5) To what extent was the incident influenced by Aditya's sex drive?
- 6) To what extent do you sympathize with Aditya?
- 7) To what extent was the incident influenced by Diya's desire to have sex?
- 8) To what extent was Aditya's behaviour of kissing Diya justified?
- 9) To what extent do you agree with the statement "Diya should not have invited Aditya over when she was alone in the house"?
- 10) To what extent do you believe that Aditya was led on by Diya?
- 11A) To what extent was Aditya's behaviour of having sex with Diya justified?
- 11B) To what extent was Diya responsible for the incident?
- 12A) To what extent was Diya's behaviour of protesting and saying no justified?*
- 12B) To what extent did Aditya have control over the situation?*
- 13) To what extent do you sympathize with Diya?*
- 14) To what extent did Diya act carelessly?
- 15) To what extent do you agree with the statement "Aditya should not have been invited over to Diya's house"?
- 16) To what extent did Diya act provocatively?
- 17) To what extent do you believe Aditya really wanted to have sex with Diya?*

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

- 18) To what extent do you believe that Diya led on Aditya?
- 19) To what extent was Aditya responsible for the incident?*
- 20) To what extent did Diya have control over the situation?

Note. Items marked with * were reversed scored.

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

Appendix C: Rape Myth Acceptance Scale**Subscale 1: “She asked for it”**

1. If a girl is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of hand.
2. When girls go to parties wearing slutty clothes, they are asking for trouble.
3. If a girl goes to a room alone with a guy at a party, it is her own fault if she is raped.
4. If a girl acts like a slut, eventually she is going to get into trouble.
5. When girls get raped, it's often because the way they said “no” was unclear.
6. If a girl initiates kissing or hooking up, she should not be surprised if a guy assumes she wants to have sex.

Subscale 2: He didn't mean to

7. When guys rape, it is usually because of their strong desire for sex.
8. Guys don't usually intend to force sex on a girl, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.
9. Rape happens when a guy's sex drive goes out of control.
10. If a guy is drunk, he might rape someone unintentionally.
11. It shouldn't be considered rape if a guy is drunk and didn't realize what he was doing.
12. If both people are drunk, it can't be rape.

Subscale 3: It wasn't really rape

13. If a girl doesn't physically resist sex—even if protesting verbally—it can't be considered rape.
14. If a girl doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say it was rape.
15. A rape probably doesn't happen if a girl doesn't have any bruises or marks.
16. If the accused “rapist” doesn't have a weapon, you really can't call it rape.
17. If a girl doesn't say “no” she can't claim rape.

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

Subscale 4: She lied

18. A lot of times, girls who say they were raped agreed to have sex and then regret it.
19. Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at guys.
20. A lot of times, girls who say they were raped often led the guy on and then had regrets.
21. A lot of times, girls who claim they were raped have emotional problems.
22. Girls who are caught cheating on their boyfriends sometimes claim it was rape.

ADVICE TO REPORT RAPE IN INDIA

**Appendix D: Initial Reporting Question (IRQ)/ Facilitative Reasons Questionnaire
(FRQ)/Preventative Reasons Questionnaire (PRQ)**

Would you advise Diya to report to the/her <agency>

NRQ/RQ Scale: (1) Strongly Disagree; (2) Disagree; (3) Neither; (4) Agree; (5) Strongly Agree

IRQ Scale: (1) Definitely No; (2) Maybe No; (3) Maybe Yes; (4) Definitely Yes

| <u>NRQ</u> | <u>Reason</u> | <u>RQ</u> |
|---|---------------|---|
| The <agency> will not be able to protect Diya from further harm. | Safety | The <agency> will be able to protect Diya from further harm. |
| The <agency> procedures would be inconvenient for Diya. / It would cause Diya discomfort. | Convenience | The <agency> procedures would be convenient for her. / It would comfort Diya. |
| The <agency> will blame Diya for the incident. | Disbelief | The <agency> will not blame Diya for the incident. |
| The incident is not a crime. /The incident is not serious enough to be shared with <agency>. | Seriousness | This incident is a crime. / This incident is serious enough to be shared with <agency>. |
| The <agency> will not be able to start an investigation for Diya. / The <agency> will not be able to help Diya. | Help | The <agency> will be able to start an investigation for Diya. / The <agency> will be able to help Diya. |
| Diya is at fault. | Victim Blame | Diya is not at fault. |